

## Supplementary Online Content

Gunsalus CK, Marcus AR, Oransky I. Institutional research misconduct reports need more credibility. *JAMA*. Published online March 12, 2018.  
doi:10.1001/jama.2018.0358

**eAppendix.** Peer Review Form for Research Integrity Investigation Reports

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.



## Peer Review Form for Research Integrity Investigation Reports

<b>Check one:</b>	<b>Yes</b> <small>(cite page #)</small>	<b>No</b>	<b>In Part</b>	<b>Cannot Assess</b>
<b>General Scope</b>				
Does the report include an executive summary?				
Is the report clear and understandable?				
Are the allegation(s) clearly presented?				
Is the charge to the committee clearly described?				
Is the scope of the investigation sufficient to address the scientific integrity issues?				
<b>Investigative Committee</b>				
Is the committee appropriately constituted to carry out its charge?				
Are there any external members on the committee?				
Does the report state whether potential conflicts of interest for committee members were reviewed?				
Did the report indicate that standards of due process and confidentiality were followed?				
Did the respondent have an opportunity to identify conflicts?				
Do you have any concern that the investigative committee lacked access to necessary expertise or resources for a thorough investigation?				
<b>Evidence</b>				
Did the report indicate if evidence was properly sequestered and protected from tampering?				
Is there a description of the evidence considered in the investigation?				
Was the respondent offered an opportunity to respond?				
Did the committee consider and address whether important evidence was unavailable to them?				
If seemingly pertinent evidence was not reviewed, is that explained?				
Is there a need for further evidence or additional analysis?				
Is there a list of individuals who were interviewed?				
Were there others who should have been interviewed?				
Are there additional questions that should have been asked or evidence examined in the report to reach a supportable conclusion?				
<b>Conclusion</b>				
Does the report clearly state its findings?				
Does the report clearly state its conclusions?				



<b>Check one:</b>	<b>Yes</b> <small>(cite page #)</small>	<b>No</b>	<b>In Part</b>	<b>Cannot Assess</b>
Does the evidence fully support the conclusions of the report?				
Does the investigation articulate and apply relevant institutional policies?				
Are the recommendations clear and supported by the report?				
Does the report describe and address requirements of external sponsors regulations and how the requirements are met?				

[Reviewer feedback](#)

In addition to checklist items listed above, authors benefit from receiving qualitative feedback from reviewers. Please comment as appropriate on the quality of the report in following areas:.

1. Is the charge clearly stated?
2. Was the investigation well designed and executed?
3. Are the conclusions of the report justified by the contents of the report?
4. Other comments:

Please provide your overall assessment of this investigation report, taking into account all the elements included in the previous sections. Please check one:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report acceptable as is | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revisions and/or additional investigative actions needed |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revisions needed  | <input type="checkbox"/> Report is not acceptable                                       |