**Additional Table 1.** Number, mean score and median score of responses to each item in the "perception of workplace environment" section.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Very low (1)** | **Low (2)** | **High (3)** | **Very high (4)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 1. Investigator competitiveness | 35 (5.1%) | 117 (16.9%) | 193 (27.9%) | 347 (50.1%) | 2.7 (0.77) | 3 (2,3) |
| 2. Pressure on investigators to obtain tenure | 13 (1.9%) | 76 (11%) | 308 (44.5%) | 295 (42.6%) | 3.2 (0.73) | 3 (3,4) |
| 3. Pressure on investigators to obtain external funding | 58 (8.4%) | 302 (43.6%) | 222 (32.1%) | 110 (15.9%) | 2.5 (0.85) | 2 (2,3) |
| 4. Severity of penalties for scientific misconduct | 215 (31.1%) | 356 (51.4%) | 100 (14.5%) | 21 (3%) | 1.8 (0.75) | 2 (1,2) |
| 5. Chances of getting caught for scientific misconduct if it occurs | 164 (23.7%) | 394 (56.9%) | 123 (17.8%) | 11 (1.6%) | 1.9 (0.69) | 2 (2,2) |
| 6. Investigators’ understanding of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 75 (10.8%) | 406 (58.7%) | 202 (29.2%) | 9 (1.3%) | 2.2 (0.63) | 2 (2,3) |
| 7. My own understanding of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 9 (1.3%) | 175 (25.3%) | 419 (60.5%) | 89 (12.9%) | 2.8 (0.64) | 3 (2,3) |
| **Additional Table 1 (Continued).** | | | | | | |
| **Item** | **Very low (1)** | **Low (2)** | **High (3)** | **Very high (4)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 8. Other research staff's understanding of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 4.3 (6.2%) | 362 (52.3%) | 272 (39.3%) | 15 (2.2%) | 2.3 (0.63) | 2 (2,3) |
| 9. Investigators’ support of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 73 (10.5%) | 450 (65%) | 156 (22.5%) | 13 (1.9%) | 2.1 (0.61) | 2 (2,2) |
| 10. Research coordinators’ support of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 116 (16.8%) | 368 (53.2%) | 185 (26.7%) | 23 (3.3%) | 2.1 (0.73) | 2 (2,3) |
| 11. Other research staff’s support of rules and procedures related to scientific misconduct | 111 (16%) | 423 (61.1%) | 141 (20.4%) | 17 (2.5%) | 2.0 (0.67) | 2 (2,2) |
| 12. The effectiveness of your organization’s rules and procedures for reducing scientific misconduct | 179 (25.9%) | 385 (55.6%) | 116 (16.8%) | 12 (1.7%) | 1.9 (0.70) | 2 (1,2) |

SD: Standard deviation; Q1: The first quartile; Q3: The third quartile.

**Additional Table 2.** Number, mean score and median score of responses to each item in "awareness of scientific misconduct" section.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Never** | **Once** | **2-5times** | **6-10 times** | **>10 times** | **Mean score (SD)** |
| 1. In your work environment, how often have you been aware that an investigator engaged in scientific misconduct during the past year? | 175 (25.3%) | 151 (21.8%) | 271 (39.2%) | 61 (8.8%) | 34 (4.9%) | 2.4 (1.1) |
| 2. In your work environment, how often have you been aware that research coordinator or other personnel engaged in scientific misconduct during the past year? | 349 (50.4%) | 120 (17.3%) | 148 (21.4%) | 38 (5.5%) | 37 (5.3%) | 1.9 (1.1) |
| **Item** | **Observed myself** | **Heard from others** | | | | **Mean score (SD)** |
| 3. How did you learn about the instances of scientific misconduct you are aware of | 285 (41.1%) | 407 (58.9%) | | | | NA |

SD: Standard deviation; Q1: The first quartile; Q3: The third quartile.

**Additional Table 3.** Number, mean score and median score of responses to each item in the "reporting of scientific misconduct" section.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Probably nothing** | **Oppose but not report** | **Ask to report, otherwise report themselves** | **Will report the misconduct** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 1. What do you think a typical research coordinator in your area would do if they knew a principal or co-investigator violated accepted rules for research integrity on a project or assignment? | 237 (34.2%) | 268 (38.7%) | 68 (9.8%) | 119 (17.3%) | 2.0 (1.0) | 2 (1,3) |
| 2. What do you think a typical research coordinator in your area would do if they knew a member of a research team or staff member violated accepted rules for research integrity on a project or assignment? | 225 (32.5%) | 257 (37.1%) | 48 (6.9%) | 162 (23.4%) | 2.2 (1.1) | 2 (1,3) |
|  | Not at all likely | Somewhat likely | Very likely | | Mean (S.D.) | Median (Q1, Q3) |
| 3. If someone engaged in scientific misconduct and was reported to your institutional authorities, how likely do you think it is that they would be disciplined? | 216 (31.2%) | 409 (59.1%) | 67 (9.7%) | | 1.7 (0.60) | 2 (1,2) |

SD: Standard deviation; Q1: The first quartile; Q3: The third quartile.

**Additional Table 4.** Number, mean score and median score of responses to each item in the "attitudes and beliefs about scientific misconduct"section**.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Completely disagree (1)** | **Disagree (2)** | **Indecisive (3)** | **Agree (4)** | **Completely agree (5)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 1. I am concerned about the amount of misconduct | 8 (1.2%) | 44 (6.4%) | 125 (18.1%) | 344 (49.7%) | 171 (24.7%) | 3.9 (0.8) | 4 (3,4) |
| 2. I think the responsibility for the scientific integrity of a study lies with the principal investigator only | 118 (17.1%) | 340 (49.1%) | 43 (6.2%) | 149 (21.5%) | 42 (6.1%) | 2.5 (1.1) | 2 (2,4) |
| 3. All professional education programs should include information about standards of research ethics | 6 (0.9%) | 13 (1.9%) | 42 (6.1%) | 354 (51.2%) | 277 (40%) | 4.2 (0.7) | 4 (4,5) |
| 4. I feel uncomfortable talking with RCs and other research personnel about their ethical behavior | 46 (6.6%) | 180 (26%) | 157 (22.7%) | 234 (33.8%) | 75 (10.8%) | 3.1 (1.1) | 3 (2,4) |
| 5. Dishonesty and misrepresentation of data is common in society and doesn’t really hurt anybody | 345 (49.9%) | 235 (34%) | 58 (8.4%) | 40 (5.8%) | 14 (2%) | 1.7 (0.9) | 2 (1,2) |

SD: Standard deviation; Q1: The first quartile; Q3: The third quartile.

**Additional Table 5.** Number, mean score and median score of responses to each item in the "publication pressure questionnaire" section.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Completely disagree (1)** | **Disagree (2)** | **Indecisive (3)** | **Agree (4)** | **Completely agree (5)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 1. Without publication pressure, my scientific output would be of higher quality | 19 (2.7%) | 106 (15.3%) | 85 (12.3%) | 281 (40.6%) | 201 (29%) | 3.7 (1.1) | 4 (3, 5) |
| 2. My scientific publications contribute to better (future) medical care | 10 (1.4%) | 35 (5.1%) | 97 (14%) | 388 (56.1%) | 162 (23.4%) | 3.9 (0.8) | 4(4,4) |
| 3. I experience judgement of my publications by colleagues as stressful | 47 (6.8%) | 178 (25.7%) | 127 (18.4%) | 224 (32.4%) | 116 (16.8%) | 3.2(1.2) | 3 (2,4) |
| 4. I experience the scientific output criteria set by the university for my appointment and reappointment as stimulating | 94 (13.6%) | 199 (28.8%) | 91 (13.2%) | 255 (36.8%) | 53 (7.7%) | 2.9 (1.2) | 3 (2,4) |
| 5. Publication pressure puts pressure on my relations with fellow researchers | 10 (1.4%) | 74 (10.7%) | 81 (11.7%) | 351 (50.7%) | 176 (25.4%) | 3.8 (0.9) | 4 (4,5) |
| 6. I suspect that in some colleagues, publication pressure leads to (un)intentional data manipulation | 8 (1.2%) | 52 (7.5%) | 72 (10.4%) | 346 (50%) | 214 (30.9%) | 4.0 (0.9) | 4 (4,5) |
| **Additional Table 5 (Continued).** | | | | | | | |
| **Item** | **Completely disagree (1)** | **Disagree (2)** | **Indecisive (3)** | **Agree (4)** | **Completely agree (5)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 7. Worldwide, publication pressure adds validity to medical science | 198 (28.6%) | 314 (45.4%) | 89 (12.9%) | 65 (9.4%) | 26 (3.8%) | 2.1 (1.0) | 2 (1,3) |
| 8. On a global scale, publication pressure causes serious doubts regarding the validity of research results | 9 (1.3%) | 46 (6.6%) | 94 (13.6%) | 319 (46.1%) | 224 (32.4%) | 4.0 (0.9) | 4 (4,5) |
| 9. I think the pressure to publish has become excessive | 7 (1%) | 38 (5.5%) | 60 (8.7%) | 322 (46.5%) | 265 (38.3%) | 4.1 (0.8) | 4 (4,5) |
| 10. The competitive scientific culture stimulates me to publish more | 39 (5.6%) | 103 (14.9%) | 97 (14%) | 354 (51.2%) | 99 (14.3%) | 3.5 (1.0) | 4 (3,4) |
| 11. My colleagues mainly judge me on my publication record | 12 (1.7%) | 114 (16.5%) | 128 (18.5%) | 286 (41.3%) | 152 (22%) | 3.6 (1.0) | 4 (3,4) |
| 12. Fellow professors adequately maintain their clinical and educational skills, despite publication pressure | 122 (17.6%) | 290 (41.9%) | 113 (16.3%) | 149 (21.5%) | 18 (2.6%) | 2.4 (1.0) | 2 (2,3) |
| 13. I cannot trust my colleagues on innovative research proposals | 17 (2.5%) | 107 (15.5%) | 157 (22.7%) | 305 (44.1%) | 106 (15.3%) | 3.5 (1.0) | 4 (3,4) |
| **Additional Table 5 (Continued).** | | | | | | | |
| **Item** | **Completely disagree (1)** | **Disagree (2)** | **Indecisive (3)** | **Agree (4)** | **Completely agree (5)** | **Mean score (S.D.)** | **Median (Q1, Q3)** |
| 14. The urge to publish makes science sick | 9 (1.3%) | 40 (5.8%) | 52 (7.5%) | 299 (43.2%) | 292 (42.2%) | 4.1 (0.8) | 4(4,5) |
| Total score | 49.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

SD: Standard deviation; Q1: The first quartile; Q3: The third quartile.