



[DEFENDANT]
Click here to enter text.

Ruling by the Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty for Cultural and Social Sciences (UKSF)

**Danish Committees on
Scientific Dishonesty**

28. oktober 2013

**Dansih Agency for Science,
Technology and Innovation**

Bredgade 40
1260 Copenhagen
Phone 3544 6200
Fax 3544 6201
E-mail fi@fi.dk
Website www.fivu.dk
CVR-nr. 1991 8440

Ref.-nr. 13/021368-28

1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. RULING.....	2
3 BRIEF SUMMARY	2
4 PROCESS, BACKGROUND AND SUBJECT MATTER FOR THE CASE.....	4
5 THE PARTIES' CLAIMS, RESPONSES AND CONTENTIONS.....	6
5.1 THE COMPLAINANTS' CLAIMS, RESPONSES AND CONTENTIONS	6
5.2 THE DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES AND CONTENTIONS	14
6 RULES AND REGULATIONS	19
7 THE DCSD'S ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT OF THE CASE	20
7.1 THE ALLEGATION OF PLAGIARISM.....	20
7.2 UNJUSTIFIED DECLARATION OF AUTHORSHIP	22
7.3 UNDISCLOSED UNUSUAL AND MISLEADING USE OF STATISTICAL METHODS.....	23
7.4 THE ALLEGATION OF MANIPULATION OF AND DECEPTION WITH DATA	24
7.5 ALLEGATION OF UNDISCLOSED BIASED OR DISTORTED INTERPRETATION OF OWN RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS.....	27
7.6 OTHER ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING IMPROPER AUTHORITY, THE EDITOR ROLE, POLITICAL AGENDA AND SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS.....	28
8 SUMMARY	28
9 APPEALS PROCEDURE	28

1 Introduction

On 12 September 2011, [COMPLAINANT] (Complainant 1), [COMPLAINANT] (Complainant 2) and [COMPLAINANT] (Complainant 3) (hereinafter referred to collectively as “the Complainants”) submitted a complaint by letter, followed on 13 September 2011 by supplementary appendices attached to an e-mail, to the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty (DCSD) against your (the Defendant’s) research as the author of the article [TITLE].



The case has been considered by the Danish Committee on Scientific Dishonesty for Cultural and Social Sciences (UKSF). A draft ruling of 14 June 2013 was sent to the parties for consultation pursuant to section 13, 3 of executive order no. 306 of 20 April 2009 on the Committees on Scientific Dishonesty, as amended by order no. 144 of 20 February 2012. The parties' comments on the draft ruling have been included in this final version to the extent that they contained significant new information (see section 5).

2. Ruling

The ruling is made by Caroline Heide-Jørgensen, Michael Møller, Hans Henrik Edlund, Lene Koch, Signild Vallgård and Henrik Gunst Andersen (chairperson). Mogens N. Pedersen participated in the proceedings until his term of office expired on 31 August 2013.

The Committee finds that the Defendant [DEFENDANT] did act in a scientifically dishonest manner when drawing up and reporting on his research by specifying a misleading reference in a manner conducive to it being the equivalent of undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data, as per section 2, 1 of executive order no. 306 of 20 April 2009 on the Committees on Scientific Dishonesty, as amended by order no. 144 of 20 February 2012 (the "DCSD order").

A majority of the Committee (Hans Henrik Edlund, Lene Koch, Signild Vallgård and Henrik Gunst Andersen) also finds that the Defendant acted in a scientifically dishonest manner by unjustified declaration of authorship, as per the DCSD order, section 2, 6.

Pursuant to section 15(1), 2, of the DCSD order, the Committee recommends that the following articles be withdrawn:

[TITLE]

A minority of the Committee (Caroline Heide-Jørgensen and Michael Møller) finds that the Defendant did not claim unjustified authorship.

The ruling is made in accordance with the majority's view.

3 Brief summary

In 2011, the Defendant published an article outlining the Defendant's predictions about what happens to modern sub-fertile high-IQ Western populations when "Internal Relaxation of Darwinian Selection" (IRDS) (characterised by low birth rates among the highly intelligent and an ageing population) combines with "External Relaxation of Darwinian Selection" (ERDS) (in the form of super-fertile low-IQ non-Western immigrants) and leads to "Double Relaxation of Darwinian Selection" (DRDS). Based on a demographic analysis, the article concludes that a decline in genotypic IQ as a result of DRDS will ruin the economic and social infrastructure needed to maintain quality education, welfare, democracy and Western civilisation.

In September 2011, the Complainants submitted a complaint to the DCSD, alleging scientific misconduct in connection with the publication of the above article. The Complainants accused the Defendant of plagiarism, claiming unjustified authorship and manipulation of and deception with data.



The allegation of plagiarism was based on the fact that the article's "Methodology and Analysis" section, as well as a number of figures, were, in the view of the Complainants, identical with those published by another person (hereinafter referred to as "X").

The allegation of an unjustified declaration of authorship was based on the fact that significant and substantial parts of the content of the article were not written by the Defendant but by X, and that X was neither cited as co-author of the article nor were details of his contribution mentioned in the "acknowledgments".

The Complainants' allegation of manipulation of and deception with data refers to the fact that the Defendant, according to the Complainants, had not used the computational models that are commonly used in demographic literature. In the view of the Complainants, the Defendant had concealed that the assumptions for applying the method were not met, and that no provisos to this effect were stipulated. The Complainants also alleged that the Defendant failed to include data from other sources that could have contradicted or weakened the conclusions reached by the Defendant in the article. The Complainants further alleged that the article contained a reference to a source (a link to a UN website) that did not refer to the data specified in the article.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Complainants presented a series of additional arguments concerning the Defendant's title, the Defendant's relations with the international journal that published the article, and the political aspects of the article in order to demonstrate that the complaint falls under the remit of the DCSD.

In its analysis and evaluation of the case, DCSD found that as far as the methodology and analysis section is concerned, two almost identical texts exist – one presented as authored by the Defendant and the other by X. Due to the fact that it is not possible to determine with absolute certainty who is the original author of the text that is almost identical in both publications, DCSD finds that insufficient documentation has been submitted to prove that the Defendant plagiarised X. DCSD also finds that there is significant similarity between the figures in the text by the Defendant and X. However, it was not possible for DCSD to verify the Defendant's figures, since no data was available for such a process. As a result, it was not possible to ascertain unambiguously whether the figures are identical or merely closely coincide, as claimed by the Defendant. DCSD does not therefore find any basis on which to conclude unambiguously that the figures in the article were plagiarised from X's material.

DCSD concluded in this case that X made a significant contribution to the production of the article. In the light of the above, a majority of the Committee (Hans Henrik Edlund, Lene Koch, Signild Vallgård and Henrik Gunst Andersen) found that the Defendant, by presenting himself as the sole author of the article, committed a serious breach of good scientific practice in the form of an "unjustified declaration of authorship", as per the DCSD order, section 2, 6. The majority also concluded that this breach was deliberate, and that the Defendant had therefore committed scientific dishonesty. A minority of the Committee (Caroline Heide-Jørgensen and Michael Møller) found that the Defendant's failure to cite X's contribution in the article could not be characterised as a serious breach of good scientific practice.

It is the considered opinion of DCSD that the calculation method used in the article to project population growth is a simple calculation model, partly because the method does not take into account the age composition of the population. DCSD did not find grounds to stipulate that the use of an annuity analysis in the article automatically misleads the reader and concluded that the choice of methodology falls within the author's room for manoeuvre in the context of a scientific article. DCSD found that sufficient information was provided about the choice of the population model and therefore that its use did not constitute a breach of good scientific practice.



DCSD did not find grounds to conclude that the Defendant had acted in a scientifically dishonest manner by failing to include data from other sources that could contradict or weaken the conclusions reached by the Defendant in the article.

Based on the available information in the case and the external opinion that DCSD commissioned from Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen, the Committee found that the source reference to UN data was misleading to readers of the article, as it is used to support data not shown in the source to which the link refers. The Committee found that this constitutes a serious breach of good scientific practice on a par with “undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data”, as per section 2, 1 of the DCSD order, and that this breach was committed with gross negligence on the part of the Defendant. The Committee therefore found that the Defendant did commit scientific dishonesty.

The ruling was made in accordance with the majority view. Having examined the case, DCSD found that the Defendant acted in a scientifically dishonest manner twice during the preparation and writing of a scientific article. Firstly, by intentionally claiming unjustified authorship, as per the DCSD order, section 2, 6. Secondly, by citing, in a grossly negligent fashion, a misleading reference in a manner conducive to it being the equivalent of “undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data”, as per the DCSD order, section 2, 1.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

4 Process, background and subject matter for the case

On 12 September 2011, the Complainants submitted to DCSD by letter, followed on 13 September 2011 by supplementary appendices attached to an e-mail, a complaint against the Defendant as the author of the article [TITLE] (hereinafter “the Decay article”) in the scientific journal [TITLE].

On 21 September 2011, DCSD sent the complaint to the Defendant for consultation. On the same day, DCSD sent confirmation of receipt of the complaint to the Complainants.

On 25 October 2011, DCSD received the Defendant’s initial response to the consultation.

On 8 November 2011, DCSD sent the Defendant’s initial response to the Complainants for consultation.

On 7 December 2011, DCSD received the Complainants’ comments on the Defendant’s response of 25 October 2011. DCSD sent the Complainants’ comments to the Defendant for consultation.

On 6 January 2012, DCSD received the Defendant’s second response.

On 19 January 2012, DCSD sent the Defendant’s second response to the Complainants by e-mail. The Complainants responded by e-mail on the same date.

On 25 January 2012, DCSD confirmed receipt of the Complainants’ latest comments and announced that the case would be considered following the standard replacement of DCSD members in the spring.



On 30 January 2012, DCSD sent the Complainants' latest comments to the Defendant for information.

On 31 January 2012, the Defendant sent his third response to DCSD.

On 2 February 2012, DCSD confirmed receipt of the Defendant's latest response and informed the Defendant how the case would proceed.

On 3 February 2012, DCSD sent the Defendant's latest comments to the Complainants for information.

On 18 April 2012, the Defendant requested information about, among other things, how the case would proceed.

On 20 April 2012, DCSD informed the Defendant that due to the previously mentioned replacement of DCSD members, the case would be considered at DCSD's next UKSF meeting.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

On 28 June 2012, DCSD informed the Defendant that the case had been discussed for the first time at a meeting on 29 May 2012 and that a ruling was unlikely until after 1 September 2012. The same information was sent by e-mail to the Complainants on the same date.

On 24 August 2012, the Complainants requested, by telephone, information about, among other things, DCSD's practice with regard to sending (or not sending) draft rulings to the Defendant and the Complainants for consultation. The Complainants also wished to ascertain whether it was possible to submit supplementary material in the case. DCSD informed the Complainants that the standard practice is to send the draft ruling to the Defendant for consultation in cases where the conclusion is that scientific dishonesty has taken place, but that it is not standard practice to send the draft ruling to the Complainants unless there is doubt about facts, etc. DCSD also informed the Complainants that in this particular case, certain studies would have to be conducted before a final ruling could be expected.

On 13 August 2012, DCSD sent a letter to Professor Niels Keiding, requesting that he answer a number of specific questions about the discipline of making demographic projections.

On 5 September 2012, Professor Niels Keiding informed DCSD that he has previously been involved as an expert in a case concerning the Defendant.

On 13 September 2012, DCSD informed Professor Niels Keiding that, under the circumstances, DCSD had decided to withdraw its request and instead seek the assistance of another expert. On 14 September 2012, DCSD sent a letter to Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen, asking her to answer the questions about demographic projections.

On 4 December 2012, Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen submitted her evaluation of the case to DCSD.



During the proceedings, the Committee realised that it was uncertain as to whether the research had been publicly or privately funded. On 14 January 2013, DCSD therefore requested that the Defendant indicate how the research that preceded the article had been funded, in order to clarify whether the scientific output had been generated under private auspices or whether it had been funded in whole or in part by the public sector. The Committee's remit only covers cases where the research is publicly funded, unless the private person or company in question agrees that DCSD should be involved. At the same time, DCSD asked the Defendant to decide – if the outcome was solely the result of private funding – whether he wanted DCSD to continue with the case, pursuant to section 31,(2) of the Act on Research Consulting, etc.

On 23 January 2013, the Defendant informed DCSD by e-mail that the research was funded exclusively by private sources. On 28 January 2013, the Defendant confirmed that he wanted the merits of the case to be considered by DCSD, as per the current rules.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

On 14 June 2013, DCSD sent a draft ruling to the Complainants and the Defendant for consultation, with a deadline for comments of 15 August 2013. At the same time, copies of DCSD's questions of 14 September 2012 to Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen, as well as her reply of 4 December 2012, were sent to the parties.

On 15 July 2013, DCSD received the Defendant's comments on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013.

On 15 August 2013, DCSD received the Complainants' comments on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013.

On 22 August 2013, the DCSD Secretariat sent the Complainants' comments of 15 August 2013 to the Defendant for potential final comments. At the same time, the DCSD Secretariat also sent the Defendant's comments of 15 July 2013 to the Complainants for any potential final comments.

On 11 September 2013, DCSD received further comments from the Complainants on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013.

On 12 September 2013, the DCSD Secretariat received the Defendant's final comments by e-mail.

On 12 September 2013, the DCSD Secretariat received the Complainants' final comments by e-mail.

On 7 October 2013, the Defendant sent a supplement to his final comments to the DCSD Secretariat by e-mail. The supplement was sent to the Complainants for information along with the ruling.

5 The parties' claims, responses and contentions

5.1 The Complainants' claims, responses and contentions



The Complainants alleged that the Defendant, intentionally or as a result of gross negligence, was guilty of plagiarism, claiming unjustified authorship and the manipulation of and deception with data in connection with the Decay article, pursuant to section 2 of the DCSD order, and that the Defendant had therefore acted in a scientifically dishonest manner.

The Complainants specified a number of allegations, which the Committee divided up into the following points:

- 1) Plagiarism
- 2) Unjustified declaration of authorship and “ghost authorship”
- 3) Lack of information about unusual and misleading methodology
- 4) Manipulation of and deception with data
- 5) Misleading interpretation of his own results and conclusions
- 6) Other allegations made by the Complainants

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

5.1.1 The Complainants’ claims, responses and contentions concerning the allegation of plagiarism

To support the Complainants’ allegation of plagiarism, the Complainants assert that the Defendant’s data and methodology were derived from MSc. in Economics [“X”].

Regarding methodology and analysis:

The Complainants assert that the methodology and analysis section of the Defendant’s article was copied more or less *ad verbatim* from a document written and published on the Internet by [“X”]. The Complainants submitted the Decay article as enclosure A to the complaint lodged on 12 September 2011.

The Complainants allege plagiarism on the grounds that the scientific community and general public were misled about both the way in which the article was produced and the origins of the individual parts, irrespective of any violation of copyright and the right to be credited.

In their responses of 7 December 2011, the Complainants also assert that the article appropriates other people’s ideas, methodology, arguments, etc. and fails to credit them. The Complainants assert that two almost identical texts have been published: the first was signed by [“X”], while the other was published more recently in the Decay article.

The Complainants also assert that they do not find it credible that it was [“X”] – as claimed by the Defendant on page 8 of the response of 26 October 2011 – who had copied a text written by the Defendant and published it under his own name. In this context, the Complainants assert that: “[...] *there are stylistic and other differences between the two texts that do indicate that [DEFENDANT] was not the author of the earliest version. The linguistically skilled [DEFENDANT]’s mastery of academic English writing is, for example, far better than the text concerned.*” The Complainants submitted the text published by [“X”], dated 9 January 2011, as enclosure B, appendix 3.



The Complainants informed DCSD that, on 15 September 2010, ["X"] published on the Internet an account of the same factors that he had built up over a period of time. The Complainants therefore find it improbable that ["X"] suddenly replaced this with a text written by the Defendant.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants assert that the Committee did not conduct a sufficient study of the Complainants' claim, because the Committee failed to obtain documentation of the Defendant's claim of the existence of a document that ["X"] allegedly copied from the Defendant.

Regarding charts:

The Complainants assert that multiple charts in the Decay article stem from a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet containing the data, which ["X"] mentions on his blog can be purchased for DKK 20,000.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Complainants further assert that the Defendant's contention that the charts on ["X"]'s website and the ones in the Decay article are not identical is contradicted by the fact that ["X"] has himself written on the front page of his account of the population statistics that his spreadsheet forms the basis for the Defendant's article. The Complainants thus state that the Defendant's model is identical to ["X"]'s, but that there may be a slight difference in the data input on which the charts are based. The Complainants submitted copies of the charts that ["X"] drew up and published as part of his report on population statistics (2010 edition), dated 30 March 2011 with the title [TITLE], as enclosure B, appendix 1.

In enclosure B, appendix 8 to the complaint, the Complainants support their accusation of plagiarism by presenting the charts side by side to show that they are identical.

During the consultation about the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants conducted an analysis of the charts that, in the Complainants' view, show that plagiarism did take place.

5.1.2 The Complainants' contentions concerning the claim of unjustified declaration of authorship

In support of the claim of an unjustified declaration of authorship, the Complainants assert that in their view it "can be shown that ['X'] made a substantial and original contribution in terms of ideas, methodology, critical analyses, generation of data and wording".

Furthermore, the Complainants assert so-called "ghost authorship", since ["X"]'s role in the article is not stipulated, nor is he mentioned by reference or listed in the "acknowledgements". According to the Complainants, this means that the reader is unaware of ["X"]'s influence on the article's arguments and conclusions.

The fact that ["X"] is not mentioned as co-author, or at least listed in the "acknowledgements" or references, creates, in the Complainants' view, a problem for the readership to whom the article is addressed, because the actual authorship



remains unstated. In this respect, the Complainants assert that the readership is precluded from being able to assess the credibility of the article and any underlying interests, the importance of which they should be allowed to evaluate.

In this context, the Complainants refer to DCSD's guidelines for good scientific practice from 2009 on the obligation to provide rightful information about who participated in the production of the article and in what way.

The Complainants claim, on the basis of the Defendant's responses to the consultation, that ["X"] is essentially the source of the basis for the article. In support of this, the Complainants assert that a substantial part of the article consists of data and models developed and selected by ["X"] before he started working with the Defendant, and that this fact is not stated in the Decay article. According to the Complainants, the Defendant's responses show, therefore, that the population model of the article is ["X"]'s.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Complainants assert that ["X"] not only contributed as a consultant but also supplied original ideas. The Complainants also assert that ["X"]'s population statistics report referred to above, to which the Defendant also refers in his initial consultation response, shows that ["X"]'s contribution to the development of the ideas and methodologies used in the article was significant, and that it is therefore scientifically dishonest that he is not listed as co-author.

The Complainants also assert that ["X"] himself, on the front of his population statistics report, states that his spreadsheet forms the basis for the Defendant's article.

In addition, the Complainants assert that it is irrelevant that ["X"] has imposed the condition that he not be mentioned in the article, since the Complainants are of the opinion that the Defendant has a commitment to the scientific community and the public to mention ["X"] as co-author or similar. In the Complainants' view, this obligation cannot be restricted by an agreement between the Defendant and ["X"].

5.1.3 The Complainants' contentions concerning undisclosed unusual and misleading statistical methodology

In support of this claim, the Complainants assert that the Defendant does not use the computational models that are commonly used in the demographic literature, and fails to state this in the article. It is the Complainants' view that the Defendant concealed the fact that the assumptions for the methods used were not met, and that no provisos were stated for the use of the methods. The Complainants further assert that the necessary information on the use of data and methodology was concealed from the article's readers.

The Complainants claim that it is misleading and dishonest to pretend to use a widely accepted scientific method, when this is not in fact the case. In addition, the Complainants assert that if the authors had been explicit about their choice of methodological assumptions – namely, the unchanged birth rates and separation of population groups – the article's readers would, according to the Complainants, have had the opportunity to assess the lack of realism in the assumptions.



According to the Complainants, the assumptions are neither mentioned nor discussed, and therefore the Complainants claim that the methods and results lack transparency, which in the Complainants' view is dishonest.

The Complainants also assert that, when the assumptions for the projection from 2011 to 2072 are enumerated in four points in the article, the preconditions for the birth rates used for resident populations in Denmark with non-Western countries of origin are not mentioned, even though, according to the Complainants, they constitute the central key for the use of model. The Complainants assert that the decision to leave these values unchanged throughout the whole projection period, and also to treat the populations as separate throughout the whole period, reflects manipulation of statistical methods.

The Complainants also assert that it is crucial that, irrespective of whether the people referred to and the number of them are assigned to different statistical categories, this in no way justifies not taking the low birth rates shown by all of the groups concerned in Denmark as the starting point. Instead, the much higher birth rates in most of the groups' countries of origin are used. According to the Complainants, this is misleading because it conceals from the reader the completely different levels of the birth rates.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants asserted that section 2, 3 of DCSD must be understood such that it is sufficient to establish dishonesty if it remains undisclosed that a given method is unusual. In connection with this, the Complainants argue that there is no comma between "undisclosed" and "unusual" in the order, as otherwise indicated in the draft ruling of 14 June 2013. Thus, the Complainants assert that they did not complain that the use of the annuity model in the Decay article is undisclosed, but that the article does not state that this method is unusual.

5.1.4 The Complainants' contentions concerning the claim of manipulation of and deception with data

The Complainants claim that the Defendant manipulated data by not including accessible and relevant data in the analyses and calculations, which in the view of the complainants weakens or contradicts the article's conclusions. In this context, the Complainants assert that that this is done by not disclosing either the existence or the nature of the data, and thereby not disclosing the consequences that the incorporation of this data would have for the article's conclusions.

The Complainants thus claim that the data in the article was manipulated, as the reader, according to the Complainants, was not informed that Statistics Denmark's data on birth rates, which was not used and therefore not included in the article, differs from the UN data used in the article.

The Complainants assert that the Defendant provides misleading information about which data sources are used, which robs the article of the transparency that enables the reader to evaluate what the author has done to achieve his results.

In addition, the Complainants assert that the Decay article refers to a link to UN data on fertility, which, it is stated, was used in the backward calculations from



1979 to 2010. The Complainants argue that, based on the Defendant's response to the consultation, the same applies to the projections from 2011 to 2072. The Complainants further assert that it is undisclosed that the Defendant uses unusual demographic projections that are not supported in the literature, with reference to neither the data nor the methodology.

In addition, the Complainants assert the following on page 10 of their response to the consultation: *"It is striking that the article's (enclosure A) list of references includes a link to UN fertility data, which is said to have been used for the calculations. The link is to an infographic (appendix P), on which the birth rates that the authors state were used for their calculations are not stated directly, nor can they be calculated without further data preconditions that are not disclosed in the article (primarily, the age and gender distribution of the populations)."*

The Complainants further assert that the Defendant ignores the information from the infographic that the specified fertility rate is clearly declining across practically the entire world.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Complainants assert that if the Defendant, as stated in his consultation response, has UN data for population projections for 2011–2072, then it must stem from a different UN source, in which the relevant birth rates are actually listed, rather than the source cited by the Defendant in the article.

The Complainants assert that the misleading reference to the infographic makes it difficult for the reader to work out what the Defendant has done, and that the Decay article therefore does not meet the transparency requirement.

The Complainants further assert that readily accessible UN projections for populations in countries of origin are available, and that the fact that the existence of this data is not disclosed in the article is a form of manipulation.

The Complainants also assert that the explanation for the above, as shown in ["X"]'s statement, and which was included in the Defendant's response to the consultation, is, in the view of the Complainants, an attempt at evading the fact that the relevant data from Statistics Denmark was ignored because it would have contradicted the Defendant's desired conclusions, and that this is not mentioned in the Decay article.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants asserted that the Committee did not explore further the accuracy of the Defendant's claims about the lack of usability of Statistics Denmark's data. The Complainants also assert that the Committee ought to have called for relevant academic expertise from another committee when considering this contention.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants asserted that the Defendant continues to deny that there is an error in the reference to UN data in the article. Thus the Complainants reiterate their claim that there has been construction of data, since this reference does not support the data in the article. In this context, the Complainants assert that the Defendant, in his response to the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, admitted that a proportionality conversion had been conducted in relation to the UN data, and that this conversion



calculation, according to the Complainants, is not disclosed in the Decay article. The Complainants also assert that the figure of 9.6 cannot be explained by the information that the Defendant has included in his response to the draft ruling of 14 June 2013.

5.1.5 The Complainants' contentions concerning undisclosed biased or distorted interpretation of own results and conclusions

The Complainants allege that, in the Decay article, the Defendant uses two self-invented concepts, respectively Internal Relaxation (or Reversal) of Darwinian Selection (IRDS) and Double Relaxation (or Reversal) of Darwinian Selection (DRDS).

In this context, the Complainants note that the annuity model used by the Defendant does not take into account natural selection or genetic population development.

According to the Complainants, it is therefore assumed in the article that immigrant groups retain exactly the same fertility and national IQ rates as exist today in their countries of origin, and that these values will remain constant until the endpoint of the analysis in 2072. These assumptions are, in the Complainants' view, completely arbitrary and devoid of any foundation in demographic, population genetics or evolutionary biology literature.

In this light, the Complainants assert that all the talk of genetics and Darwinian selection is pure window dressing that only serves to endow the article with an unwarranted biological/genetic authority.

The Complainants assert that it is reprehensible that the Defendant pretends to possess authority beyond his area of psychological expertise.

The Complainants claim that the scientific product does not cite academic biological works in support of the Defendant's claims. Since the relevant article, according to the Complainants, does not use academic concepts of a biological and genetic nature, this results, in the Complainants' view, in a deliberately biased or distorted interpretation of the Defendant's own findings and conclusions.

The Complainants further assert that the Defendant misled readers of the article by pretending that the article's conclusions are supported by natural science by referring to biological concepts such as Darwinian selection.

5.1.6 Other claims made by the Complainants

The Complainants have made a number of additional allegations of scientific misconduct. The Committee has summarised the various allegations under the following points.

Regarding the Defendant's statement of affiliation:

The complainants allege that the Defendant assumes false authority by stating his Master's and doctorate and past position as a professor at [UNIVERSITY]. In support of this, the Complainants assert that the Defendant in an article refers to his total period of employment at [UNIVERSITY] ([YEAR]). In another article



in the same edition of the periodical, the affiliation to [UNIVERSITY] is stated without the period. When the Defendant has been accorded credibility and expertise and has made public appearances, emphasis has, in the Complainants' view, been placed on his authority and prestige by virtue of his university background, his doctorate and his position as professor at [UNIVERSITY].

Regarding the Defendant's role as editor of [JOURNAL]:

The Complainants assert that it does not make the damage any less severe that the Defendant's alleged plagiarism and misrepresentation occurs in a special issue of the journal of which the Defendant is, by his own admission, the editor.

Regarding the political aspect of the Decay article:

In addition, the Complainants allege that the Decay article's political conclusions appear to be improperly grounded in biological science, and that the title obscures, according to the Complainants, the fact that the actual subject and method is demographic extrapolation without reference to the selection conditions.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

In the Complainants' view, the fact that propaganda rooted in the Den Danske Forening (the Danish Association) is, through plagiarism, made to look like internationally accepted research has crucial significance for the material's credibility and weight in the eyes of the Danish public, as well as in relation to other research that might use the findings because of the author and the journal's status. Moreover, the Complainants state that the national credibility of Danish research is significantly weakened if it appears that it has been subject to external, highly motivated political interests. The complainants refer to an article in *Weekendavisen*, in which the Defendant's conclusions from the Decay article are referenced directly, and which describes the Defendant as "intelligence researcher and former Professor of Psychology at [UNIVERSITY]". In the view of the Complainants, the latter supports the importance of the Decay article's credibility.

The Complainants also assert that the Defendant has lectured in Danish political assemblies on the basis of the Decay article and its conclusions, and at these events emphasis has also been placed on the Defendant's authority as a DPhil and former professor at [UNIVERSITY].

It is therefore the Complainants' view that it would be detrimental to the credibility of Danish research if no action were taken against researchers who assist political organisations in "laundering their propaganda material" so it is included in "peer-reviewed" international research and used in public debate as authoritative knowledge.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants state that, in the context of the points listed in this section, they are not alleging scientific dishonesty, merely arguing that the Complainants' full range of contentions fall under the DCSD's powers and responsibilities.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants further assert that the DCSD has not dealt with the Complainants' allegation that the Defendant has made untruthful statements to the Committee regarding his relationship to ["X"].



5.2 The Defendant's responses and contentions

The Defendant contends that he is innocent of the complaint alleging scientific misconduct. The Committee summarises the Defendant's contentions below into the following points:

- 1) The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there was no plagiarism
- 2) The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there was no unjustified declaration of authorship
- 3) The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there was no undisclosed unusual use of statistical methods
- 4) The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there was no manipulation of and deception with data
- 5) The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there is no undisclosed bias or distorted interpretation of his own results and conclusions
- 6) The Defendant's contentions to the effect that the Complainants' other claims should be rejected

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

During the consultation about the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Defendant also asserted that the Committee should withdraw its recommendation that the Decay article be withdrawn, due to the DCSD, in the view of the Defendant, not having the jurisdiction to make such a recommendation in relation to this article, as the article was privately funded.

5.2.1 The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there was no plagiarism

The Defendant asserts that there is no question of plagiarism since ["X"] and the Defendant used two different models. The Defendant states, in his response of 26 October 2011, that ["X"]'s population model uses two different fertility numbers and not IQ, while the Defendant's model uses the UN's publicly available fertility data and Lynn's publicly available data on national IQs (Lynn and Vanhanen, 2006).¹

The Defendant also asserts that the models actually do provide virtually identical results and near-identical curves, which the Defendant, as disclosed, described in the relevant article. The Defendant notes that his idea was to *"use the UN's publicly available fertility data and Lynn's national average IQs in a Danish annuity analysis, with the intention of conducting a retro-analysis with an endpoint of 1 January 2010 and then projecting to 2072, based on official figures from DSS"*.

Furthermore, the Defendant asserts that there is no question of plagiarism, since the Defendant's data does not stem from ["X"], but from, according to the Defendant, information from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank (DSS), the UN and Lynn, Harvey and Nyborg (2009)/Lynn & Vanhanen (2006). The Defendant also

¹ Lynn & Vanhanen (2006). *IQ & Global Inequality. A sequel to IQ and the Wealth of Nations*. Augusta, Georgia: Washington Summit Publishers.



asserts that he cited the necessary and sufficient references to this data in his article.

The Defendant also asserts that it is not correct that he plagiarised the figures in the Decay article. In this context, the Defendant states that there is a close coincidence, as well as similarities and minute differences, between the figures on [“X”]’s website and the figures in the Decay article, but that, in the Defendant’s view, they are not identical. The Defendant states the following about the differences:

“The figures in [‘X’]’s statistical analysis are thus based on the Alsager School’s information about the nations’ total fertility, but [‘X’]’s and my analyses both use the same total death rates from Statistics Denmark and the same population data in Denmark in the retro-analysis, as well as Lynn’s IQ data.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The figures in my UN-based model naturally therefore assume, of course, similar forms as some of [‘X’]’s figures, but they are not identical. Moreover, the differentiation is clear from [‘X’]’s statistical analysis (e.g. page 4) with regard to the choice of birth data. Furthermore, the data basis, tabular material, text content and the whole way in which the issue is approached are different from the content of my article, which has a different aim. Also, the background material taken up by [‘X’] concentrates on the critical analyses of birth rates of those with origins abroad in Denmark and their influence on the estimate of the total birth rate in Denmark. Set against the birth rates from Statistics Denmark, they do, however, cast an excellent light on the birth rates of the sub-populations of Danish and immigrants in Denmark. Finally, it should be noted that [‘X’]’s critical comments/corrections to/of DSS publications must be characterised as unique in public population debate in Denmark.

[‘X’]’s statistical analysis was based on updated demographic data from DSS for the year 2010, extracted on 1 January 2011, published by Statistics Denmark on 9 February 2011 – almost one month after I had submitted the Decay article to [JOURNAL].”

The Defendant thus asserts that [“X”]’s statistical-analytical article has a different data content than that used by the Defendant in the Decay article. According to the Defendant, [“X”]’s article cited the Decay article and by agreement was not published before the latter. This is, according to Defendant, also not possible, as [“X”]’s population data did not become available until 9 February 2011 and the Decay article was submitted in mid-January 2011.

The Defendant further asserts that, on the contrary, it is the case that [“X”] has unlawfully made use of a draft idea regarding the data concerned, which is authored by the Defendant. However, the Defendant does not wish to pursue any further action against [“X”] on this occasion.

The Defendant asserts that he bought a packet of data from [“X”] that basically consisted of selected and purpose-oriented processing of downloads of publicly available data from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank. According to the Defendant, [“X”] had advertised this data package on the Internet in the form of a commercially available product. The Defendant states that he also bought consul-



tancy services from [“X”]. According to the Defendant, both were adapted to the Defendant’s special interest in population trends based on IQ and country of origin.

5.2.2 The Defendant’s responses and contentions to the effect that there was no unjustified declaration of authorship

The Defendant states that he paid [“X”] DKK 20,000 to assist him as a methodology consultant. The Defendant argues that [“X”] was to provide the following assistance:

- Data from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank (DSS) on the situation in DK
- Advice about how the data mentioned above can be integrated into [“X”]’s model as variables and parameters
- Supervising the Defendant regarding the Defendant’s new model
- A description in his own words of the choice of DSS’s population data and his own method and analysis with respect to demographics

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Defendant contends that the Defendant then shortened [“X”]’s and his own account, moving the background, methodology and analysis to a formal short academic presentation in the methodology section of the Decay article. Finally, [“X”] was to verify the statistical correctness of the formalised methodology section.

The Defendant further asserts that the Defendant, because of [“X”]’s valuable contribution, invited [“X”] to be co-author of the relevant article. [“X”] refused, stating that he thought that he had only contributed a paid piece of consultancy work, and that he had merely supervised in relation to a widespread and easily accessible general model.

The Defendant further asserts that he, via e-mail to [“X”] on 17 August 2010, raised the following questions about data rights and rights as sole author:

“[...] does the DKK 20,000 cover the spreadsheet, supervision and exclusive rights to publication of the results? Incidentally, I am not casting doubt on your work and feel bad about not being able to fund it as it merits [...]”

The Defendant states that, on the basis of this e-mail and further correspondence, the Defendant and [“X”] agreed that the Defendant was not allowed to forward or transfer [“X”]’s population model to assignments other than the Defendant’s own, while the model, which deals with IQ, belongs solely to the Defendant. The Defendant also argues that the Defendant noted to [“X”] that [“X”] was not allowed to publish IQ results before the Decay article was published.

The Defendant also argues that both parties were clear from a very early stage about who has the author’s rights and the right to use the data and models, and when what may be cited by whom.

It is also the Defendant’s perception that [“X”] has not had any influence on the design of the article itself, and that [“X”] has only proofread the methodology section. In this context, the Defendant argues that [“X”] had only reviewed and



suggested corrections to section 3 of the Decay article, “Method and Analysis”, which relates to population data, projection method and associated demographic terminology, which was a natural consequence of [“X”]’s paid consulting work, as per the above.

Therefore, the Defendant asserts that he is the sole author of the article, and that as such he has not claimed unjustified authorship.

During the consultation about the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Defendant asserted that he had not breached good scientific practice in the form of an unjustified declaration of authorship, as it is the Defendant’s view that he has complied with the Vancouver rules² fully.

5.2.3 The Defendant’s responses and contentions to the effect that there was no undisclosed unusual use of statistical methods

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Defendant asserts that a common annuity analysis is used in the article and that the demographic use of this model is widespread. The Defendant asserts that the model is not, as claimed by the Complainants, a mathematical algorithm, but rather a step-by-step adjusted model for population trends.

In addition, the Defendant asserts that in the Decay article he describes a series of significant “limitations” and cites a reference to Coleman’s comments that *“one thing is certain – population projections do not describe reality accurately – they are only as good as their assumptions”*.

Whether these assumptions, which are stated in the Decay article, are correct, is in the Defendant’s opinion, a matter for the international scientific forum and not for the Complainants.

The Defendant further asserts that the limitations with regard to the application of UN birth rates in the Danish context are discussed in the article.

In connection with the Complainants’ allegations/contentions regarding the choice of data variables and methods, the Defendant also refers to the detailed account by [“X”] enclosed along with the Defendant’s responses.

5.2.4 The Defendant’s responses and contentions to the effect that there was no manipulation of and deception with data

The Defendant asserts that he could not use the available data from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank as it was a particular problem that DSS divides the population of Denmark into three groups: Danes, immigrants and their descendants.

The Defendant asserts that the Complainants do not seem to understand that the Defendant could not use the official Danish population model with its legally/administratively defined categories.

² International Committee of Medical Journal Editors – Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals.



Furthermore, the Defendant asserts that birth rates for non-Western citizens cannot be extracted as raw data from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank.

The Defendant also points out that all scientific articles in the journal [JOURNAL] are subjected to an upper limit of 5,000 words. On this basis, according to the Defendant, it is not physically possible to meet the Complainants' demands for more detailed descriptions. In the view of the Defendant, based on the information disclosed, none of the international review specialists have deemed these more detailed descriptions necessary.

The Defendant asserts that the selected retro-analysed population variables in Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank were inserted into a clearly described model in the Decay article. According to the Defendant, there is nothing arbitrary about this clear choice, which has been clearly described.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

In connection with the Complainants' allegations/contentions regarding the choice of data variables and methods, the Defendant also refers to the detailed account by ["X"] enclosed along with the Defendant's responses.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Defendant asserted that the source reference to UN data is correct, as the data is shown in the source cited. In this context, the Defendant contends that the UN, in the table referred to, indicates the numbers on which the model analysis is based, and that these are the numbers that form the basis for the proportional conversion to the number of children born per 1,000 per year in the sub-population based on ethnicity, as described in the Decay article. The Defendant also asserts that he has made, via Nationmaster, a proportional conversion from the UN table's Total Fertilities to Crude Birth Rates, as used in the article. The Defendant regrets that this intermediary step, due to space requirements, had to be left out of the Decay article. The Defendant has asked the publisher that the proportionality conversion be produced as an addendum to the article.

During the consultation on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Defendant also asserted that the figure of 9.6 is clearly presented and briefly commented on in a note to Table 1 in the Decay article. The Defendant argues, with reference to Table I.20 in 'World Population Prospects: The 2000 Revision – Volume III: Analytical Report', that the UN presents "Crude Birth Rates" in six separate figures for the period 2005–2015, for the expected low and medium level. The Defendant asserts that when the high levels are also included, the average of these figures is 9.575. The Defendant further asserts that the UN, in a colour-illustrated overview of World Population Prospects, also uses 9.6.

5.2.5 The Defendant's responses and contentions to the effect that there is no undisclosed biased or distorted interpretation of his own results and conclusions

The Defendant contends that it is correct that the method in the article is not a selection model but an annuity model. The Defendant also asserts that the rest of the article contains a series of Darwinian-inspired considerations such as "Cold



Winter Theory”, selecting for certain characteristics, migration, fertility, population dynamics, etc.

5.2.6 The Defendant’s contentions to the effect that the Complainants’ other claims should be rejected

With reference to stating the Defendant’s affiliation:

It is the Defendant’s view that he did not assume false authority by stating his correct master’s and doctorate degrees and previous position at [UNIVERSITY]. The Defendant adds that [DEAN], [UNIVERSITY], stated in the Researcher Forum that the university cannot prevent the Defendant from doing this.

The Defendant also finds it undocumented that the above statement of the Defendant’s affiliation should be central to the credibility of Danish research.

Concerning the Defendant’s role as editor of [JOURNAL]:

The Defendant contends that it is correct that he edited the mentioned special edition of the journal, but that all of the articles in the special issue have been exposed to the publisher’s usual anonymous peer-review process.

Regarding the claim about the political aspect of the Decay article:

The Defendant asserts that there are no political conclusions, and that there is no link between the Decay article and any association. It is an original academic presentation in an internationally recognised journal. Furthermore, the Defendant asserts that any political or other relationships that [“X”] or anybody else may have are none of the business of the Complainants.

6 Rules and regulations

This case has been processed under the Danish act on research consulting, etc., cf. consolidation act no. 1064 of 6 September 2010 and the related executive order no. 306 of 20 April 2009 on the Committees on Scientific Dishonesty, as amended by order no. 144 of 20 February 2012 (the DCSD order).

Scientific misconduct is defined in section 2, 3 of the act and in section 2 of the DCSD order:

“Section 2. Scientific misconduct is understood to mean: Falsification, fabrication, plagiarism and other serious violations of good scientific practice committed intentionally or due to gross negligence during the planning, implementation or reporting of research results. Scientific misconduct includes:

- 1) Undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data*
- 2) Undisclosed selective or surreptitious discarding of own undesired results*
- 3) Undisclosed unusual and misleading use of statistical methods*
- 4) Undisclosed biased or distorted interpretation of own results and conclusions*
- 5) Plagiarism of another person’s results or publications*
- 6) False statements concerning authorship, title or workplace*
- 7) Submission of incorrect information about scientific qualifications.”*

DCSD’s remit is described in the DCSD order, sections 3 and 6:

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation



“Section 3. The committees do not rule on cases concerning scientific theories’ validity or truth or on cases related to the quality of the research associated with a scientific product.”

*“Section 6. The Committees on Scientific Dishonesty hear cases involving complaints about written scientific products voluntarily submitted for publication by the Defendant, cf. section 1,4.
[...].”*

7 The DCSD’s analysis and assessment of the case

The following section accounts for the Committee’s analysis and assessment of the case. The individual allegations/contentions will be considered separately as per the categories used in section 5. The parties’ allegations, responses and contentions.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Committee has made use of the statement from Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen in its analysis and assessment of the case.

The Committee notes that the Defendant’s additional closing comments of 7 October 2013 do not, in the Committee’s view, contain significant new information, and thus are not specifically dealt with in the Committee’s analysis and assessment of the case.

7.1 The allegation of plagiarism

The Complainants allege that the data and methodology used by the Defendant stem from [“X”], and that the Defendant’s Decay article includes plagiarised material from [“X”]’s previously published charts.

7.1.1 Regarding the methodology and analysis section of the article

The Complainants allege that the Defendant plagiarised the methodology section of the Decay article from [“X”]. The Committee has been informed that [“X”] has published a text, as shown in enclosure B, appendix 3 (published 9 January 2011), that coincides with/is identical to the methodology section of the Decay article as it appeared when submitted to the journal on 18 January 2011.

The Defendant claims that it is true that [“X”] has improperly made use of a draft idea about population data and projection modelling that was authored by the Defendant.

The Committee finds that, on the basis of the material presented, it is clear that there are two almost identical texts, one of which appears to have been written by [“X”]. The second constitutes the methodology and analysis section of the Decay article, which, the Committee has been informed, the Defendant has authored/published.

Based on the information available in the case, the Committee cannot unambiguously ascertain who is the original author of the text that appears almost identical in



[“X”]’s and the Defendant’s publications. The Committee finds that the Complainants’ comments on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013 do not occasion the Committee requesting further information in connection with the assessment of this allegation.

The Committee therefore finds that it has not been documented that the Defendant plagiarised the methodology section from [“X”].

This does not mean that [“X”] did not contribute to the drafting of the text concerned, which follows from the Defendant’s information about the agreement that the Defendant has entered into with [“X”] for assistance with the article. This issue is discussed separately below.

7.1.2 Concerning the charts in the article

The Complainants assert that several of the charts found in the Defendant’s article stem from a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet containing the data that, according to the Complainants, [“X”] mentioned on his blog could be purchased for DKK 20,000.

In enclosure B, appendix 3, the Complainants submitted a statement found on the website [WEB-SITE]. The Complainants have also provided documentation (enclosure B, appendix 5) that the website belongs to [“X”].

The Complainants assert that [“X”]’s material, which the Complainants have attached as an enclosure with the complaint, contains two charts that are almost identical with six of the ones included in the Decay article. In enclosure B, appendix 8 to the complaint, the Complainants present the charts side-by-side to show how identical they are.

The Defendant, in his response of 26 October 2011, stated that [“X”]’s population model uses two different fertility numbers and not IQ, while the Defendant’s model uses the UN’s publicly available fertility data and Lynn’s publicly available data on national IQs (Lynn & Vanhanen, 2006).

The Defendant also asserts that the models actually do provide virtually identical results and near-identical curves, which the Defendant has stated is described in the relevant article. The Defendant notes that his idea was to *“use the UN’s publicly available fertility data and Lynn’s national average IQs in a Danish annuity analysis, with the intention of conducting a retro-analysis with an endpoint of 1 January 2010 and then projecting to 2072, based on official data from DSS”*.

The Committee initially finds that there is a significant similarity between the charts concerned.

However, the Committee finds that it cannot be unambiguously determined whether the charts are identical or just closely coincide. Since, on the basis of the information from the parties, no data has been available to verify the Defendant’s charts, the Committee has no basis on which to reject the Defendant’s explanation that the data used provides similar results and near-identical curves. The Committee finds that the Complainants’ comments on the draft ruling of 14 June 2013 do not occasion the Committee requesting further information in connection with the assessment of this allegation. In this context, the Committee notes that the Com-



plainants' analysis of the charts contains too much uncertainty to form the basis for the Committee's ruling.

The Committee concludes that, on this basis, it cannot be established that the charts in the Decay article were plagiarised by the Defendant from ["X"]'s material.

7.2 Unjustified declaration of authorship

It is not disputed by the parties to the case that the Defendant and ["X"] reached an agreement that ["X"] would supply various contributions to the Decay article and that the Defendant would pay a fee for this. It is thus clear from the Defendant's contentions that ["X"] was to provide the following contributions to the drafting of the Decay article:

- Data from Statistics Denmark, Statistics Bank (DSS) on the situation in DK
- Advice about how the data mentioned above can be integrated into ["X"]'s model as variables and parameters
- Supervising the Defendant regarding the Defendant's new model
- A description, in his own words, of the choice of DSS's population data and his own method and analysis with respect to demographics
- Verification of the statistical correctness of the formalised methodology section.
- Corrections to section 3 of the Decay article, i.e. "Method and Analysis".

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

Based on the Defendant's own description of the assistance provided by ["X"], e.g. obtaining data, description of methods, etc., the Committee concludes that ["X"] has made a significant contribution to the article. This is also supported by the fact that the Defendant offered ["X"] co-authorship of the article.

However, the Decay article cites the Defendant as sole author. The Defendant alone thus appears as the one who collected data, developed ideas and methods and wrote the text. Nowhere in the article does it state that ["X"] has made what was a highly significant contribution with regard to the collection and processing of data and the design and checking of text sections. The Committee observes that ["X"] has significant expertise in this field.

The Defendant asserts that ["X"] was paid for his contributions to the Decay article and that ["X"] declined the role as co-author. Against this background, the Defendant opted not to cite ["X"]'s contribution to the Decay article in the article itself. These conditions do not alter the Committee's assessment that the Defendant improperly appears as sole author of the article, and that ["X"]'s significant contributions to the article are thus concealed from the reader. The Defendant could have cited ["X"]'s contribution elsewhere in the article, for example by reference or "acknowledgement".

A majority of the Committee finds, in the light of the above, that the Defendant, by presenting himself as the sole author of the article, committed a serious breach of good scientific practice in the form of an "unjustified declaration of authorship" as per the DCSD order, section 2, 6. The majority has, in this connection, placed emphasis on the fact that ["X"] has made a significant contribution to the article. It is,



in the majority's view, a serious matter to deny the reader the opportunity to gain insight into significant contributors. This leads the reader to believe that the whole article is the result of new research conducted solely by the Defendant.

The majority finds that the failure to cite ["X"]'s contribution to the Decay article, and thus the serious breach of good scientific practice, was intentional, because the Defendant himself states that he knowingly failed to cite ["X"] as co-author, since ["X"] did not wish to be cited.

In this light, the majority finds that the Defendant acted in a scientifically dishonest manner in the preparation for and reporting of an article with a significant contribution from a contributor who is concealed from the reader by the presentation of the Defendant as the sole author. The majority finds that the Defendant's reference to the Vancouver rules does not change this assessment, as the Vancouver rules were not followed.

Two members (Caroline Heide-Jørgensen and Michael Møller) note that the Defendant's purchase of the data from ["X"] and the latter's desire not to be cited can, in some way, explain the failure to cite ["X"]'s role. These members, however, agree with the majority that the Defendant, regardless of ["X"]'s wishes, should have cited ["X"]'s role in providing the data underlying the article, but after an overall tangible assessment, do not find that this constituted a breach of the provisions of order no. 306 of 20 April 2009, section 2, 6, i.e. it cannot be characterised as a serious breach of good scientific practice.

The ruling is made in accordance with the majority's view.

7.3 Undisclosed unusual and misleading use of statistical methods.

The Complainants allege that the Defendant misled the readers of the Decay article by using a population model not commonly used in demographics. The Complainants also assert that the description of the assumptions for the application of the model was flawed.

7.3.1 Regarding the choice of population model/method

The Complainants assert that in the Decay article the Defendant does not use a computational model that is commonly used in the demographic literature, and fails to state this in the article. The Complainants assert that it therefore appears from the article as if a well-established scientific method has been used, which, according to the Complainants, is not the case.

The Defendant asserts that the article makes use of a common annuity analysis and that demographic use of such analyses is widespread.

On the basis of the information presented, the Committee finds that the calculation method for the projection of population growth, which is used in the Decay article, is a simple calculation model, partly because the method does not take into account the population's age composition.



In this light, however, the Committee does not find reason to ascertain that the use of an annuity analysis in the article automatically constitutes misleading the reader.

The Committee therefore finds that the choice of population model/method in the Decay article reflects the author's room for manoeuvre in relation to the choice of methods, etc., in connection with scientific work. In the opinion of the Committee, the choice of population model is sufficiently clearly explained. As such, no breach of good scientific practice occurred in this context.

7.3.2 Regarding the description of the assumptions

The Complainants assert that the description of the assumptions for the model's application in the article was flawed. The Complainants assert that the Defendant has not been explicit with regard to the choice of methodological assumptions, especially in relation to the birth rates used for population groups of non-Western origin resident in Denmark. Since the assumptions, according to the Complainants, are not mentioned in the article, the article's methods and results, in the Complainants' view, lack transparency.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Defendant asserts that the section "Limitations" in the article lists a series of limitations in relation to the methods and models used, such that the limitations associated with the use of UN birth rates in the Danish context are discussed in the article.

The Committee notes at the outset that the methods section contains a number of assumptions for the extrapolation from 2011 to 2072. In addition, the article's "Limitations" section includes the following:

"The official legal mixing of ethnicities with different fertilities leads to demographically confusing results, and the true number of children born to foreign citizens and naturalised could not be counted directly. It had to be estimated. The fertility estimates were based on individual birth rates for each of the 235 COOs given in the United Nations official birth statistics, and balanced against common yearly total Danish birth- and mortality rates."

In this light, the Committee finds that the article accounts for the methodological assumptions in such a way that the reader is given a sufficient basis on which to evaluate the article's data content and results. On this basis the Committee therefore finds that no breach of good scientific practice occurred.

7.4 The allegation of manipulation of and deception with data

The Complainants allege that the Defendant misleads the reader of the article by not including all of the relevant data in the article and by citing a misleading reference.

7.4.1 Concerning the failure to cite relevant data

The Complainants assert that the Defendant manipulated data by not incorporating data from Statistics Denmark, and by not citing existing and, according to the



Complainants, readily available UN projections for populations in countries of origin. In addition, the Complainants assert that the Defendant did not indicate that the data not used differs from the UN data used in the article.

The Defendant asserts in this context that he could not use the available data from Statistics Denmark as it was a particular problem that DSS divides the population of Denmark into three groups: Danes, immigrants and their descendants. Furthermore, the Defendant informed the Committee that birth rates for non-Western citizens could not be extracted as raw data from Statistics Denmark.

The Committee takes into account that the data from Statistics Denmark is not necessarily more useable than UN data. The Committee believes that when the Defendant wished to make forecasts for 235 populations, Statistics Denmark's observations could possibly have been highly uncertain and random due to low population sizes. Nor can the Committee exclude that Statistics Denmark could not provide data of a relevant character for the Decay article.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Committee notes that an author must be given some leeway in terms of what data is included in the article, as long as it is clear to the reader what data is involved. The Committee is also of the opinion that, taking into account the journal's space limitations in relation to the number of words, etc., it is not possible to include all more or less relevant data in a scientific article.

Against this background, the Committee believes that the Complainants' allegations regarding non-inclusion of data cannot be regarded as a breach of good scientific practice.

The Committee has not found it necessary to involve additional experts from one of the other subcommittees in DCSD.

7.4.2 Concerning the reference to UN data

The Complainants assert that a link to UN data on fertility in the article's list of references leads to an infographic on which the birth rates that the Defendant states formed the basis for calculations in the article are not immediately obvious and cannot be calculated.

During the consultation on the draft ruling, the Defendant stated that he, via a proportional conversion, had recalculated the numbers on the UN display from total fertility to "Crude Birth Rates". The Defendant also stated that 9.6 is the average for "Crude Birth Rates" for "More Developed Countries" when the calculation includes low, medium and high levels for the period 2005–2015 from Table I.20 in "World Population Prospects: The 2000 Revision – Volume II: Analytical Report".

The Committee notes that the Decay article cites the following link as a source for the UN's birth data:

un.org/esa/population/publications/worldfertility2007/Fertility_2007_table.pdf

In the Decay article, Table 1 appears under the heading: "Projected population growth: Proportional birth rates by IQ band, similarity to DK IQ and ethnic origin.



Finally, total percentages of birth by Western/non-Western origin.” Under the table, in note a), the Defendant adds, that the “UN recommends a birth rate of 9.6”.

Based on the Complainants’ contentions concerning the reference to UN data, the Committee asked Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen to answer the following questions concerning data sources in the Decay article:

“Can you identify the data source for the information in Table 1 on birth rates?”

To this, Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen, in her statement of 4 December 2012, answered as follows (excerpt from statement by Lisbeth B. Knudsen):

“Under Table 1 it is mentioned that the ‘UN recommends a birth rate ...’ and a UN web page is cited in the literature. I have been on the UN website and found the specified page on ‘worldfertility2007’. In addition, the middle of column two on page two of the article includes the name of a UN website and mention of ‘total birth rates’. This website: <http://un.org/esa/> supersedes the one indicated in the bibliography. When I follow the latter (http://un.org/esa/population/publications/worldfertility2007/Fertility_2007_table.pdf), I find a table with Total Fertility Rates (TFR) and age-specific fertility rates for a number of countries, but not the figure of 9.6 mentioned in note 1 under Table 1 as ‘a birth rate’ that the UN ‘recommends’. (Incidentally, I do not understand the use of the word ‘recommends’ in this context.) From the numbers presented in the table, it is not possible to calculate a summary rate. I have Googled and found another UN website on which I did find the summary fertility rate (live births per 1,000 inhabitants) for individual countries, but not for 235 countries and not in 1979, as discussed in the article: <http://data.un.org/Data.aspx?d=SOWC&f=inID%3A90>.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

My conclusion on this first question must therefore be that I cannot identify the source and thus the figures used in Table 1 from what is written just below and around the text.”

Based on the available information, including the parties’ contentions and Professor Lisbeth B. Knudsen’s statement, the Committee concludes that the Defendant’s information about the fertility data used in the Decay article is inadequate and does not allow an unambiguous identification of the data source.

In making this assessment, the Committee emphasises that the numbers in Table 1 of the Decay article have been the subject of a proportionality conversion compared to the figures referenced, and that this intermediate calculation is not provided in the article.

The Committee also finds that the figure of 9.6 as an average for “Crude Birth Rates” is not readily apparent from the source reference in the Decay article and can only be calculated from Table I.20 in “World Population Prospects: The 2000 Revision – Volume II: Analytical Report”. In this context, the Committee notes that 9.6 is the average for the low and medium level in Table I.20, and not, as stated by the Defendant, low, medium and high.



The Committee finds that from the references listed in the published Decay article it is not possible for an outside researcher to check and reproduce the study. The Committee therefore finds that the reference to UN data misleads the reader of the article, as this reference is used to support data that is not readily apparent from the source to which the reference refers.

The Committee also finds that it is clear from the article's section on references that the reference to UN data represents a major source in the context of the other references that are used in the article.

Against this background, the Committee finds that a serious breach of good scientific practice has been committed, on a par with "undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data", as per section 2, 1 of the DCSD order.

The Committee also notes that the Defendant, by stating the wrong reference, has acted at least grossly negligently, since a simple check of the reference would show that the data the reference is supposed to support does not appear in the source referenced. The Defendant has not subsequently informed the Committee of any other reference where those numbers could be found.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

The Committee therefore finds that Defendant has acted in a scientifically dishonest manner in the drafting and reporting of an article in which a reference to a significant data source does not support the data that the reference is supposed to support in the article.

7.5 Allegation of undisclosed biased or distorted interpretation of own results and conclusions

The Complainants allege that the Defendant, in the Decay article, uses two self-invented concepts, respectively Internal Relaxation (or Reversal) of Darwinian Selection (IRDS) and Double Relaxation (or Reversal) of Darwinian Selection (DRDS).

The Complainants further assert that the Defendant misled readers of the article by pretending that the article's conclusions are supported by natural science by referring to biological concepts such as Darwinian selection.

The Defendant contends that it is correct that the method in the article is not a selection model, but it is an annuity model. The Defendant also asserts that the rest of the article contains a series of Darwinian-inspired considerations such as "Cold Winter Theory", selecting for certain characteristics, migration, fertility, population dynamics, etc.

The Committee bases its ruling on the fact that the article contains certain statements of a natural-scientific character. However, the Committee finds that this is not a case of scientific dishonesty, as the article is not presented as containing analyses of a natural-science nature or as if the conclusions are somehow underpinned by natural-science facts.



The Committee finds that this allegation has more to do with the quality of the research that forms the basis for the Decay article. The allegation therefore falls outside the remit of the Committee, as per the DCSD order, section 3.

7.6 Other allegations concerning improper authority, the editor role, political agenda and speaking engagements

The Committee notes that, in the hearing concerning the draft ruling of 14 June 2013, the Complainants stated that they did not wish to allege scientific dishonesty in connection with the circumstances related to the Defendant's undue authority, editor role, political agenda and speaking engagements. In this light, the Committee will not address these issues in this ruling.

Concerning the Complainants' allegation that the Defendant has made untruthful statements to the Committee, the Committee finds that this is not an allegation of scientific dishonesty and does not therefore give cause for further action by the Committee either.

Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation

8 Summary

The Committee finds that, on two occasions, the Defendant acted in a scientifically dishonest manner in the preparation and reporting of research findings in the article:

[TITLE]

The Committee finds that the Defendant intentionally cited an unjustified declaration of authorship pursuant to the DCSD order section 2, 6, and that the Defendant grossly negligently cited a misleading reference in a manner conducive to it being the equivalent of undisclosed construction of data or substitution with fictitious data, as per section 2, 1 of the order.

The Committee therefore recommends that the above article be withdrawn, pursuant to section 15 (1), 2 of the DCSD order.

The Defendant asserts that the Committee has no power to recommend that the article be withdrawn, as the research was privately funded. To this, the Committee notes that, on 23 January 2013, the Defendant confirmed by e-mail that he wanted the merits of the case to be considered by DCSD as per the current rules. In this light, the Committee finds that it does have the requisite powers to recommend that the article be withdrawn.

9 Appeals procedure

This decision cannot be appealed to any other administrative authority, cf. section 34 of act no. 1064 of 6 September 2010 on research consulting, etc.



Ministeriet for Forskning, Innovation
og Videregående Uddannelser

Yours sincerely,

Henrik Gunst Andersen
Chair of the Danish Committees on Scientific Dishonesty

**Styrelsen for Forskning og
Innovation**