

Precision Health Psychology Research Group Handbook

Current version: 4

Version history:

Version	Date	Lead author	Reviewed by
1	21.04.2026	Charlotte Rönna	Olga Perski, Diana Jiang
2	07.05.2026	Charlotte Rönna	Olga Perski
3	03.07.2026	Charlotte Rönna	Olga Perski
4	12.08.2026	Olga Perski	Charlotte Rönna, Diana Jiang, David Simons

Table of Contents

1. Purpose of This Handbook.....	3
2. Mission Statement.....	3
3. Core Values and How We Put These into Practice.....	4
4. Roles and Expectations.....	5
4.1 Role of the PI.....	6
4.2 Role of Post-Docs.....	7
4.3 Role of PhD Candidates	7
4.4 Role of Technicians and Research Assistants	8
4.5 Role of BSc/MSc Thesis Students and Interns.....	9
4.6 Role of Visiting Researchers	9
5. Meetings and Supervision.....	9
5.1 Individual Supervisory Meetings	9
5.2 Project-Specific Meetings	10
5.3 Weekly Research Group Meetings	10
6. Fostering a Positive Research Group Culture.....	12
6.1 Day-to-Day Interactions	12
6.2 Communication Norms	12
6.3 Being a Good Research Group Citizen	13
6.4 Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	13
6.5 Social Media.....	14

7.	<i>Good Research Practice and Scientific Integrity</i>	14
7.1	Open Science	14
7.2	Pre-Registration	15
7.3	Open Data	15
7.4	Open Code	16
7.5	Publishing	16
7.6	Authorship, Credit, and Ideas Sharing	17
7.7	Citation Practice	17
7.8	Documentation Practice and Data Management	18
7.9	Sensitive Information	18
7.10	Mistakes and Error Correction	18
7.11	Scientific Misconduct	19
7.12	Use of AI	19
8.	<i>Leaving the Research Group</i>	20

1. Purpose of This Handbook

This handbook sets out the mission, core values and practices that underpin what we strive to achieve, how our research group works, what we expect from one another, and the standards that guide our research and professional conduct. As it is often simply assumed that researchers within the same discipline share the same goals, core values and success criteria (rather than this being explicitly stated), this handbook serves as a tool for our research group to continuously cultivate and openly communicate our goals, values, and practices. It is intended for everyone joining the research group (e.g., the PI, PhD candidates, post-docs, research assistants).

You are encouraged to read this handbook within your first month in the research group. After reading it, please sign it and e-mail it to the PI so that they know you have reviewed the contents. The signature serves as an acknowledgement of receipt and reading only; it is not a legal document or contract.

This is a living document. The research group will evolve over time, and this handbook will evolve with it (using version control). All research group members are encouraged to suggest additions, revisions, and clarifications, at any time. In addition, we will review the handbook periodically as a group, during a research group meeting every year, to decide whether updates are needed.

2. Mission Statement

Our group's mission is to advance the science and practice of precision health psychology.

We work to strengthen the field's scientific foundations through the development of more precise theories, construct definitions, measurement approaches, and research methods. Activities include theory development and refinement through formal and computational modelling, construct definition and validation, measurement development and evaluation, and methodological innovation in areas such as Ecological Momentary Assessment, passive sensing, and single-case experimental designs.

We also develop, optimise, evaluate, and seek to scale up adaptive digital and hybrid (human and digital) interventions for health behaviours in general and addictive behaviours in particular. Activities include participatory research and co-design involving diverse interest-holders (e.g., people with lived experience, clinicians, policymakers) and the development, optimisation, and implementation of technology-mediated just-in-time adaptive interventions using qualitative and quantitative methods.

Our work is guided by the principles of scientific integrity and openness. We are committed to open science practices and, wherever possible, seek to openly share research materials (e.g., protocols, data, analytical code, software) to promote reproducibility, collaboration, and

equitable access to scientific knowledge and the resulting psychological support that we develop.

By integrating perspectives and methods from psychology, behavioural science, human-computer interaction, dynamical systems theory, control systems engineering, and artificial intelligence, our interdisciplinary research group seeks to understand how health behaviours unfold within individuals over time and to translate this knowledge into effective, engaging, personalised, and accessible psychological support that can improve the health and wellbeing for all.

3. Core Values and How We Put These into Practice

We aim to build a research group culture that is intellectually rigorous, supportive, collaborative, respectful, and transparent. We are committed to scientific excellence and integrity in all aspects of our work, while fostering personal autonomy, independent thinking, creativity, and innovation. We believe that the best science emerges through teamwork, openness to diverse perspectives, and a shared commitment to continuous learning, curiosity, and mutual respect. For a more precise description of what we understand as a supportive research group and how PIs contribute to positive research environments, we encourage you to read the [10 rules for a supportive lab environment](#). The wellbeing of all team members is critical.

There is no single definition of “success” in our research group. We acknowledge that there are many different valuable contributions in science, whether that is methodological development/innovation, different kinds of publication (see also [section 7.5 on ‘Publishing’](#)), grant funding, teaching, using and advancing open science practices, or shaping the scientific or policy discourse through presentations, blog posts, reports, discussions, or public engagement. At the same time, we recognise that we currently operate within an academic system where some traditional markers of success (e.g., publications, grant funding) remain important and are often necessary for career progression (e.g., PhD candidates at Swedish universities are required to publish several papers to be awarded the PhD degree). We therefore take these requirements seriously and support research group members to achieve this type of success. While doing so, we acknowledge that these indicators do by no means fully capture the range of meaningful contributions to science or individual career goals within or outside of academia. Research group members are encouraged to continuously reflect on what success means for them personally.

Research training and ongoing scientific work can be demanding, and periods of stress, managing journal or grant rejections, burnout, anxiety, or other mental health difficulties are common. If you are struggling and it is affecting your work or wellbeing, you are encouraged to raise this early with the PI. Such conversations will be treated seriously and with appropriate discretion. Where possible, we will work together to think about supportive adjustments to workload, timelines, or expectations. At the same time, the research group is not a substitute for professional mental health care, and in some situations, the appropriate step will be to seek

support through the [university student health service](#), [occupational health care service](#) for employees, or general Swedish [healthcare services](#).

As part of taking health and wellbeing seriously, we do not expect research group members to push beyond their capacities or work while ill. If you are sick, please stay home. This is important both for your own recovery and to avoid infecting others in the lab or wider workplace. Please take the rest you need, and do not feel expected to work while you are ill. Let the PI know as soon as possible that you are taking a sick day or need time away from work. If an illness is prolonged or begins to affect project timelines or shared responsibilities, we should discuss how to adjust expectations and plan accordingly. In addition, a fun, meaningful, and stimulating private life outside the research group is strongly and actively encouraged.

We recognise that building an excellent, innovative, and supportive research culture requires ongoing effort from everyone in the research group. We aim to put our values into practice through our everyday actions and behaviours. These include:

- **Asking important scientific questions** that advance theory, methodology, and scientific practice.
- **Maintaining a strong work ethic** while also promoting sustainable and flexible ways of working.
- **Generating high-quality data** and conducting rigorous, reproducible research.
- **Publishing and communicating our work** through scientific publications, presentations, public engagement, and other forms of dissemination.
- **Embedding Open Science practices** throughout the research process whenever possible.
- **Exploring innovative and creative approaches** to scientific and societal challenges through reading, reflecting, listening, and discussing.
- **Respecting diversity and learning from cultural and disciplinary differences** within the group and our broader collaborations.
- **Recognising that science is a human endeavour and that emotions belong in the lab.** Research involves excitement, uncertainty, disappointment, setbacks, and success, and we strive to create a research environment where these experiences and emotions can be openly and respectfully expressed, shared, and discussed. This also involves addressing disagreements and conflicts constructively and respectfully, recognising that differences of opinion are often an important part of scientific progress.
- **Contributing to a positive research group morale** by participating in social activities, supporting colleagues, and celebrating one another's achievements, including publications, thesis milestones, conference presentations, grant awards, promotions, new positions, and other successes.

4. Roles and Expectations

All members are expected to adhere to the research group standards for documentation, professionalism, and research integrity (see [section 7.1 on 'Good Research Practice'](#)).

Decisions that affect the research group as a whole (e.g., scientific direction, resource allocation, meeting schedule, collaborative activities) are discussed collectively during regular research group meetings. All members are encouraged to contribute, and diverse perspectives are actively sought. At the same time, within individual projects (e.g., PhD projects, specific studies or papers), team members are expected to make decisions in consultation with relevant collaborators and keeping others informed where appropriate. For individual projects, researchers are encouraged to use a [RACI Matrix](#) to enable efficient and transparent project management.

4.1 Role of the PI

The PI is responsible for the overall scientific direction of the lab, for mentorship, modelling “failure” (e.g., how to manage and learn from paper and grant rejections), and for ensuring that research is conducted ethically with integrity and to a high scientific standard. This includes helping team members to define long-term research and career goals, supporting the development of new and ongoing projects, providing timely and constructive feedback, monitoring research integrity, enabling socialising (e.g., organising fika or lunch), maintaining shared research resources (e.g., standard operating procedures and the lab handbook), and making final decisions when needed. The PI should strive to operate in a well-organised manner, help team members understand how science works in practice (e.g., publishing, grant funding, collaboration, peer review, and academic citizenship), and support researchers in identifying priorities and making informed decisions about their projects and careers.

The PI is also responsible for creating a positive and supportive environment in which team members can develop as independent scientists. This means modelling the values and expectations outlined in this handbook, celebrating everyone's successes, encouraging constructive critique but not competition, providing honest and unbiased career guidance (including when trainees are exploring opportunities elsewhere), providing regular feedback on performance and development, enabling research group members to grow their scientific and professional networks, and creating opportunities for learning and advancement. The PI should listen openly to concerns, suggestions, and constructive criticism from research group members, remain willing to adapt and improve, and help resolve conflicts fairly, respectfully, and constructively when they arise. The PI is expected to be resilient and transparent about the inevitable challenges associated with a scientific career, while also encouraging a strong but sustainable work ethic. Over time, increasing intellectual ownership, independence, and decision-making responsibility are expected from trainees.

Trainees can expect weekly one-to-one meetings with the PI (see [section 4.1](#)) in addition to weekly research group meetings with the entire team (see [section 4.2](#)). The PI operates an “open door” policy, where team members are encouraged to ask for direct help in person, via e-mail, or via informal communication channels (e.g., Teams). Responses will be provided within 24 hours. As timely feedback is critical in a scientific career where even short time delays can negatively impact opportunities or outputs, the PI aims to provide feedback on study protocols,

paper drafts, presentations, or job/grant applications within 1 week. The PI will inform team members of any upcoming leave/work travel.

It is important to acknowledge that scientific training (e.g., an MSc, PhD or post-doc) can lead to many different impactful careers, both within and outside of academia. The role of the PI is to support trainees to work towards identifying their “why” (i.e., their reasons for why they are pursuing a specific career goal) and how to achieve their goals (e.g., through skills development, helping to find relevant opportunities). This applies regardless of whether a trainee ultimately intends to remain in academia, provided that they continue to meet the responsibilities and expectations of their current role in the research group.

4.2 Role of Post-Docs

Post-docs are expected to operate with a high degree of independence while remaining engaged members of the research group. In addition to advancing their own research direction and skills, post-docs may contribute to mentoring less experienced team members, supporting collaborative projects, helping to maintain a strong research culture, and shaping the social culture of the research group.

Post-docs should take substantial ownership over the development, execution, analysis, and communication of their work. They are also expected to model good scientific practice and professionalism.

4.3 Role of PhD Candidates

PhD candidates are expected to undertake 4 years of scientific training to become independent researchers. Over time, they are expected to move from needing closer guidance to taking intellectual and operational ownership of their projects and research direction. This includes developing research questions, identifying and engaging deeply with literature, designing studies, analysing data, interpreting findings, and communicating results.

PhD candidates are expected to prepare for meetings, hold supervisors and collaborators accountable by setting deadlines for when feedback is needed, make steady progress, ask questions when needed, document their work carefully, and contribute positively to the intellectual and social life of the research group.

At the same time, a PhD is not simply a period of project delivery, but a period of broader scientific and professional development. PhD candidates can expect to be supported in identifying and pursuing training opportunities that align with their individual development needs, career goals, and training plans. The exact areas of training will vary across individuals and should be reflected in their Individual Study Plan and aligned, where appropriate, with frameworks such as [the Vitae Researcher Development Framework](#).

Areas of development may include:

- **Technical and methodological skills**, including quantitative and qualitative research methods, Ecological Momentary Assessment (EMA), passive sensing, formal and computational modelling, study protocol development and preregistration, scientific writing, Open Science practices, data management, and reproducible research workflows.
- **Subject-specific knowledge**, including addiction science, health psychology, philosophy of science, behaviour change interventions, digital health, clinical trials, implementation science, and the broader scientific context of ongoing projects.
- **Scientific judgement and critical thinking**, including learning how to interpret data, evaluate evidence, assess methodological strengths and limitations, and critically appraise the work of both oneself and others.
- **Communication and collaboration skills**, including asking and refining scientific questions, presenting research, academic writing, networking, collaborating effectively with others, working with supervisors, and giving, receiving, and acting upon constructive feedback.
- **Professional and strategic skills**, including understanding publication and funding processes, identifying appropriate opportunities, navigating collaborations, and developing an understanding of how science functions as a professional and social enterprise.
- **Organisation and project management skills**, including time management, priority setting, maintaining to-do lists, keeping research or modelling logs, documenting decisions, taking effective meeting notes, and managing multiple responsibilities simultaneously.
- **Creativity and innovation skills**, including idea generation, divergent thinking, drawing inspiration from other disciplines, intellectual risk-taking, and developing novel theoretical, methodological, or applied approaches to research problems.

The ultimate goal of PhD training is not only to complete a thesis, but to develop the knowledge, skills, judgement, independence, and professional confidence required to make meaningful contributions to science and society, both within and beyond academia.

4.4 Role of Technicians and Research Assistants

Research assistants and technical staff play an essential role in the success of the research group. Their contributions may include data collection, participant recruitment, project coordination, data management, intervention development, software development and testing, administrative support, literature reviews, technical implementation, and other activities that enable high-quality research. The specific responsibilities associated with these roles will depend on the requirements of the given project and the individual's experience, expertise, and interests.

Unlike PhD candidates and post-docs, research assistants and technical staff are not typically appointed primarily as researchers-in-training. As such, expectations related to developing an

independent research programme, leading scientific projects, publishing as first author, obtaining grant funding, or pursuing an academic research career will differ depending on the individual's role and career goals. However, opportunities for professional development, training, and increased responsibility may be available where aligned with project needs, individual interests, and available PI resources.

Research assistants and technical staff are expected to carry out their responsibilities professionally and reliably, communicate openly about progress and challenges, document their work appropriately, and meet agreed deadlines. They are also expected to uphold the group's values of scientific excellence, integrity, transparency, openness, creativity, innovation, inclusivity, and teamwork.

4.5 Role of BSc/MSc Thesis Students and Interns

Students and interns are important members of the research group. At the same time, their roles are usually time limited (e.g., 3-6 months). Students are expected to engage seriously with their work, communicate clearly, and ask for help when needed. Supervisors (e.g., the PI, post-docs or PhD candidates) should ensure that expectations are explicit and appropriate to the student's training stage and experience. Students are not expected to independently design or conduct studies, but they are encouraged to contribute to defined parts of ongoing projects and share ideas for possible additions or improvements.

4.6 Role of Visiting Researchers

Visiting researchers at different career stages (e.g., PhD candidates, post-docs) are expected to arrive with a clear idea of the purpose of their visit and the activities or goals they wish to pursue. The PI will meet regularly with visiting researchers and provide scientific guidance where appropriate. However, because visiting appointments are typically shorter in duration (e.g., 3-6 months) and supervisory capacity is shared across multiple projects and commitments, visitors cannot expect the same level of structured training and supervision that is provided to PhD candidates, post-docs and other long-term members of the research group.

5. Meetings and Supervision

5.1 Individual Supervisory Meetings

Regular one-to-one meetings are a core part of supervision in the research group. Graduate students and post-docs will usually meet with the PI once a week at an agreed time, although in some periods, meetings may be held less frequently, depending on the stage of the work and what is most useful to each individual. Graduate students and post-docs with a couple of years' experience are also encouraged to mentor colleagues with less experience. The same expectations as those outlined below apply to such supervisory meetings.

The one-to-one meetings are not meant to be passive status updates. You are expected to take an active role in them: to identify what has moved forward, where you are stuck, which decisions need to be made, and what kind of feedback or discussion would be most useful. Over time, you should increasingly set the agenda yourself and take responsibility for the direction of the discussion.

Part of the PI's (or graduate student's/post-doc's) role in these meetings is to help sharpen your thinking and share experiences rather than to prescribe every next step. That may mean responding to your ideas with questions, highlighting relevant studies/theories/methodologies, pushing you to justify choices, or asking you to think through alternatives more carefully. The purpose is to build your capacity for independent scientific judgment.

These meetings are also a place to discuss relevant literature, conceptual problems, study design, analytic decisions, and broader questions about how a project is developing. The PI may recommend readings, but the responsibility for staying on top of the literature ultimately rests with each team member. Developing a strong command of the field requires sustained reading over time, not only reading what is explicitly assigned.

In addition, these meetings are a place to discuss wider academic citizenship and service to the scientific community which sustains research and education (e.g., peer review, grant evaluation, editorial work, committee roles, teaching).

5.2 Project-Specific Meetings

Regular project-specific meetings will be held for those actively involved in individual research projects. These meetings focus on the practical and scientific aspects of project conceptualisation and delivery, including study planning, participant recruitment, data collection, analyses, interpretation, dissemination, and project management. Their purpose is to facilitate collaboration, support decision-making, troubleshoot challenges, and ensure projects progress effectively. Attendance is normally limited to project team members and relevant collaborators whose expertise or responsibilities are directly related to the given project.

5.3 Weekly Research Group Meetings

The weekly meetings are a central part of the intellectual life of the research group. Their primary purpose is to support high-quality scientific research through the discussion of research ideas, papers, projects, methods, and diverse outputs. They also provide opportunities for collaborative problem-solving, academic citizenship, professional development, and learning from one another.

These meetings are open to all members of the research group. Attendance is expected for PhD candidates and post-docs as part of their research training, while participation by research assistants and technical staff is voluntary, although encouraged where relevant and feasible.

Weekly meetings may include:

- Research presentations by team members, collaborators, or visiting researchers.
- Discussion of study protocols, pilot data, statistical analyses, code, data management, and manuscripts.
- Practice presentations for conferences, job interviews, or other scientific events.
- Journal club discussions.
- Scientific methodology, statistics, computational modelling, and theory development discussions.
- Open Science and reproducibility discussions.
- Troubleshooting challenges related to participant recruitment, data collection, data management, analysis, or interpretation.
- Brainstorming new scientific ideas, research questions, manuscripts, and grant proposals.
- Research group logistics and discussions of issues affecting multiple projects or team members.

Although the primary purpose of weekly meetings is scientific, they also provide opportunities to develop important professional skills. These may include:

- Presentation and public speaking skills.
- Giving, receiving, and acting on constructive feedback.
- Academic writing and publication skills.
- Career planning within and beyond academia.
- Networking and collaboration skills.
- Project management, organisation, and productivity.
- Leadership, mentoring, and academic citizenship.

We aim to create a meeting environment that reflects the values of the research group: scientific excellence, integrity, openness, creativity, innovation, inclusivity, autonomy, and teamwork. All members are encouraged to contribute actively, ask questions, share ideas, provide constructive feedback, and engage respectfully with differing viewpoints. The goal is not only to improve individual projects but also to strengthen our collective scientific thinking and support one another's development as researchers.

Responsibility for the schedule, content, and discussions within the weekly research group meetings primarily rests with the long-term group members (but see below for suggestions for short-term members). There should be rotation in responsibility for deciding the content of the meetings and leading the discussions. If long-term research group members are unable to attend a weekly meeting, this should be communicated at least 2 weeks in advance, if possible.

Short-term group members (e.g., interns, thesis students) and collaborators will be invited to attend and contribute to the research group meetings on an ad hoc basis. For example, interns who are visiting the group will be invited to attend the weekly meetings for the duration of their

stay but are not expected to take responsibility for their content. Collaborators, on the other hand, will be invited to attend specific meetings where their input/expertise is sought or they have a particular interest in the topic discussed/presentations from research group members.

6. Fostering a Positive Research Group Culture

6.1 Day-to-Day Interactions

As researchers have different working styles, responsibilities, and constraints, we do not expect identical schedules from everyone. But we do expect people to communicate clearly, follow through on commitments, and take responsibility for the work others depend on. Specifically, be clear about your availability, communicate early when problems arise, and respect other people's time. If you work flexibly or remotely, make sure this does not interfere with supervision, collaboration, participant-related responsibilities, or shared deadlines. Where possible, long-term research group members are encouraged to work from location at least two days per week and to attend shared meetings, such as research group meetings, in person.

There is no formal dress code in the research group for day-to-day work. However, when interacting with research participants, team members are expected to dress in a professional manner. Clothing should be suitable for the research setting and should help create an environment in which participants feel comfortable and able to trust the professionalism of the research team.

6.2 Communication Norms

Different communication channels serve different purposes. Within the research group, we use Microsoft Teams for day-to-day communication. Teams is useful for everyday coordination, but it should not be treated as requiring instant replies. People may be working, teaching, in meetings, collecting data, or away from their desk.

E-mail is usually more appropriate for communication with external collaborators, although the best channel may vary by project/collaborator and should be agreed on an individual basis. When asking for feedback or input, be explicit about when you need a response. For external collaborators, a deadline of around two weeks is often reasonable, unless the matter is genuinely urgent or another timeline has been agreed. If you have not received a response by the agreed deadline, it is appropriate to follow up.

As a general norm, research group members should aim to respond to messages within 24 hours on working days, unless otherwise discussed. This does not mean that the requested work has to be completed within 24 hours; it means acknowledging the message receipt where a response is needed.

For more substantial feedback within the core research group, such as comments on a manuscript or application, a timeline of around one week is usually reasonable, unless another

deadline has been agreed. Please ask for feedback early enough for the other person to have the time needed to respond properly.

Important decisions, project plans, and research-related information should not live only in chat messages. They should be documented in an appropriate shared location.

When you are on vacation or otherwise unavailable for more than a short period, please set an out-of-office message on your e-mail and make your availability clear where needed.

6.3 Being a Good Research Group Citizen

Being a good research group member involves more than progressing on your own projects. It includes contributing to a functional and supportive research environment where everyone's successes are valued and celebrated. To us, being a good research group member means being reliable, respectful, and generous with your time and expertise when appropriate. Examples of generosity includes supporting colleagues by providing constructive feedback on draft documents, assisting with shared responsibilities when team members are under increased workload or time pressure, and helping to ensure that routine but essential tasks (e.g., participant recruitment, data collection, or administrative duties) are distributed fairly across the team. In addition, being a good research group citizen means helping keep shared spaces and systems organised, supporting collective tasks, communicating openly, addressing tensions early and professionally, acknowledging the contributions of others (e.g., through giving credit fairly; see [Authorship, Credit and Ideas Sharing section](#)), and actively participating in the broader life of the research group.

6.4 Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

We are committed to supporting and promoting equity, diversity, and inclusion. Diversity is a major source of strength in science. We recognise that our research group and our field benefit from different backgrounds, perspectives, identities, and approaches. Everyone in the research group should be treated with dignity and respect regardless of race/ethnicity, nationality, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, disability, socioeconomic background, or career stage. We are committed to continuing to learn how to make our research group, institution, and scientific community more equitable and inclusive. If you experience or witness something that concerns you, you are encouraged to raise it with the PI if you feel comfortable doing so. You can also use [the university's formal support and reporting resources on equal treatment](#).

Social activities can help build a positive research group culture, and we believe that they should be organised in ways that make participation easy and comfortable for different people. Where possible, social activities should take place during regular working hours and should not be centred around alcohol or alcohol-related settings. People may of course socialise outside work in other ways, but research group-organised activities should be accessible to those who do not drink alcohol, have caring responsibilities, commute, or prefer not to spend evenings in work-related settings.

Humour can be a valuable part of research group life and can help maintain good spirits, build connection, and make day-to-day work more enjoyable. At the same time, humour can also create tension, especially given individual differences in personality, background, culture, and sensitivity. We therefore ask everyone in the research group to use humour with care and good judgment. If a joke comes at someone else's expense, makes others uncomfortable, or risks undermining a respectful and inclusive atmosphere, it is not appropriate.

6.5 Social Media

When expressing opinions on public platforms such as Bluesky, LinkedIn, or X, team members should keep in mind that they may sometimes be associated with the research group and/or university, even when speaking in a personal capacity. At the same time, each person is responsible for their own public communication, and disagreement within science is normal. Team members do not need to share identical public views. What matters is that public communication remains professional, lawful, and consistent with the standards of respectful conduct expected in the research group, as outlined in this handbook.

7. Good Research Practice and Scientific Integrity

7.1 Open Science

We strive for an open and transparent research culture. This includes a strong commitment to replicability, reproducibility, error prevention, careful documentation, and additional practices that allow others to understand, verify, and build on our work, such as making our work findable and accounting for [FAIRness](#).

We recognise that open science¹ often requires additional time and effort. Even so, we consider it a central part of doing high-quality research rather than an optional extra. We also recognise that no one is immune from making mistakes, which can have more or less severe consequences. We believe that the use of open science practices, whilst being time consuming, is highly cost-effective as it removes the blame from whoever made the mistake to a wider focus on setting up and maintaining robust systems and workflows that help prevent errors from the outset, for which all team members are responsible.

¹ Open Science: "An umbrella term reflecting the idea that scientific knowledge of all kinds, where appropriate, should be openly accessible, transparent, rigorous, reproducible, replicable, accumulative, and inclusive, all which are considered fundamental features of the scientific endeavour. Open science consists of principles and behaviours that promote transparent, credible, reproducible, and accessible science. Open science has six major aspects: open data, open methodology, open source, open access, open peer review, and open educational resources." (directly quoted from the [FORRT glossary](#) on "Open Science")

Useful resources for becoming familiar with open science practices across the research cycle include the [Transparency and Openness Promotion Guidelines](#) from the Center for Open Science, which define core principles for transparent research, and the [Framework for Open and Reproducible Research Training](#) (FORRT) initiative, which provides practical guidance and hands-on resources for responsible and open scholarship. FORRT also includes a [glossary](#) of terms and topics relevant to responsible scholarship and open science, as well as [open science games](#) for those who would like to explore these practices in a more interactive way.

7.2 Pre-Registration

We view pre-registration as an important safeguard against questionable research practices and hindsight-driven decision-making. Where appropriate, we pre-register research plans on openly accessible platforms such as the [Open Science Framework \(OSF\)](#) (and see [Haroz, 2022](#) for a comparison of pre-registration platforms).

Pre-registrations should normally be made public before results are known. However, this may depend on the project. If immediate public release is not appropriate, for example because of sensitive project details or ongoing collaborations, an embargo may be used.

We also recognise that research does not always proceed exactly as planned. Unexpected changes can be necessary and legitimate. When plans change, deviations from the pre-registration should be documented clearly and in a timely manner, including the reason for the change, and reported transparently in the final manuscript or project record. Team members are encouraged to keep track of such changes throughout the study rather than reconstructing them at the end. A useful resource is the reporting template developed by [Willroth and Atherton \(2024\)](#); see also their [downloadable Google doc](#).

7.3 Open Data

We have a strong interest in making data available for verification, reuse, pooling across multiple studies, and further discovery whenever it is ethically and legally possible to do so. Shared data should be well organised, clearly documented, and accompanied by appropriate metadata to enable reuse (see also [section 7. 8 on Documentation practice/ Data management and storage](#)).

At the same time, as our research group focuses on understanding dynamic within-person processes, we typically work with data that may be identifiable or otherwise highly sensitive. Data sharing must therefore be guided by careful de-identification, ethical obligations, participant consent, institutional requirements, and applicable law. For those who would like to become more familiar with these issues, the [Data Privacy Handbook](#) by Utrecht University's Research Data Management Support provides guidance on data minimisation in study design, pseudonymisation, anonymisation, and statistical approaches to de-identification.

7.4 Open Code

We aim to make analytical and software code publicly available whenever possible, for example through [GitHub/Codeberg](#) or other suitable repositories, to support transparency, reproducibility, and reuse.

Code should be documented well enough that another researcher can understand and run it without having to contact the original author for basic clarification. This includes documenting variables, file structures, pre-processing steps, analysis pipelines, and the computing environment, including software versions, packages, and dependencies. For practical guidance, team members can consult this course on how to write clean, readable, and reusable code: [Computational Reproducibility Workshop](#).

At the same time, sharing code, data, and meta-data is often not sufficient on its own to ensure computational reproducibility². Analyses may depend on specific software versions, packages, operating systems, or other aspects of the computing environment. Where appropriate, the use of containers can help preserve these dependencies and make analyses easier to rerun. Useful resources include: those two papers on computational reproducibility and containers, [Clyburne-Sherin et al., 2019](#) and [Moreau et al., 2023](#), and this practical workshop on [creating containers](#).

In line with the [ErrorTight](#) workflow, which encourages research teams to identify the weakest links in a project and build in checks that reduce the likelihood of error, we aim to have analysis code independently run and checked by another team member on another computer prior to publication.

7.5 Publishing

We aim to disseminate research in ways that are accessible to all. As part of this, journal articles are a common output format, but journal publication is not the only way to contribute to science. Pre-prints, datasets, code, protocols, materials, and other citable research outputs are also a valuable part of the scholarly record. More broadly, scientific contribution also includes work that may not itself take the form of a citable publication (e.g., developing methods, building infrastructure, supporting collaborators, improving workflows, teaching, mentoring, reviewing, and engaging with scientific or public debates). In line with our core principles and our view of “success”, we therefore do not treat publication count, h-index, journal impact factor, or venue prestige as indicators of scientific quality.

Yet, we recognise that formal degrees and career requirements still often depend on traditional publication formats. For example, for PhD candidates, publication requirements should be

² Computational reproducibility: “The ability to obtain consistent and verifiable results from a computational experiment or analysis when the same input data, code and software environment are used” ([Moreau et al., 2023](#)).

discussed early in the project, including whether planned papers need to appear in approved publication channels, for example journals or publishers listed in the [Norwegian Register](#).

When choosing where and how to publish, we prioritise scientific quality, fit with the intended audience, accessibility, and alignment with open science values rather than journal prestige. We will pursue open access routes and make use of repositories or other platforms that support broad access and reuse. Where appropriate, we will consider also '[alternative publishing routes](#)', including diamond open access, modular publishing, and other models that may support a more open and sustainable [publication culture](#).

Publication plans should be discussed early in each project, including likely venue, authorship, open access options, costs, and repository plans. Before submission, all co-authors are expected to review and approve the manuscript and all other published outputs (e.g., code, materials).

7.6 Authorship, Credit, and Ideas Sharing

Authorship expectations should be discussed at the beginning of each project and revisited as needed over time. Contributions can evolve, and authorship plans may need to be adjusted accordingly. These conversations should happen early and explicitly rather than being deferred until a manuscript is nearly complete.

Credit should reflect intellectual and practical contributions to the work. We will use the [Contributor Role Taxonomy \(CRediT\)](#) or the [Contribution Matrix Mapping \(CoMMa\)](#) to make contributions explicit – you can read more [here](#) about the differences between Credit and CoMMa.

Research is inherently collaborative, and we encourage an open culture in which team members share ideas, methods, expertise, and constructive feedback. Many of the best research questions and solutions emerge through discussion and collective problem-solving. At the same time, ideas are an important form of scholarly contribution, and researchers build their careers by developing expertise and making distinctive intellectual contributions within their areas of research. We therefore expect team members to treat each other's emerging ideas, research plans, and methodological developments with respect. Before independently pursuing or disseminating an idea that originated with someone else, discuss your plans with them and agree on appropriate involvement, acknowledgement, or collaboration. Open communication helps avoid misunderstandings about ownership, authorship, and future research directions.

7.7 Citation Practice

Mis-citations (i.e., citations that misrepresent a source or use it to support claims beyond what it actually shows) are common and often unintentional (e.g., listen to this podcast to learn more about [the problem of mis-citation](#)). Team members should make themselves familiar with good citation practice, including the basic principles of [APA citation](#). Citations should be used to

support specific claims, not added second-hand or because they are cited elsewhere. As a general rule, only cite work that you have actually read.

Citation practice is also part of responsible scholarship (i.e., citations shape whose work is recognised and whose careers are made more visible). Citation patterns can reproduce existing inequalities, including inequalities related to gender, ethnicity/race, and geography ([see Sauvé et al., 2025](#)). We therefore encourage research group members to cite thoughtfully rather than automatically relying on the most familiar or most frequently cited sources. A useful resource is the [Citation Politics Toolkit](#), developed by the FORRT community, which provides tools for reflecting on potential biases within one's own citation practice.

7.8 Documentation Practice and Data Management

To prevent data loss, confusion (for yourself and others), duplicated work, and avoidable delays, good documentation and data management should be built into a project from the outset. Research data management includes, for example, file-naming conventions, folder structures, version control, storage locations, and backup routines (for a simple metaphor, see "[research data management as a rope](#)"). For each project, regardless of whether the materials or data are yet openly accessible, research group members should keep clear records of where materials are stored, which versions are current, how data have been processed, and what important decisions have been made. Where relevant, datasets should be accompanied by documentation explaining variable meanings, missing values, exclusion decisions, and processing steps. A useful resource is the [FAIR research data management tutorial](#), which provides guidance on data publication, documentation, data organisation, data management plans, and data storage.

Research data and project materials should be stored in approved, secure, and appropriately backed-up locations. Everyone in the research group should have an automated, cloud-based backup system in place for the computer they use for research. Do not rely on a single local device as the only copy of important work.

7.9 Sensitive Information

Most of our research projects involve sensitive information. Research group members are expected to handle such information with care and in accordance with all relevant ethical approvals, institutional policies, and legal requirements. Do not store illegal or illicit material, including documents, images, or data, on work computers or research-related storage systems. If you are unsure whether certain material can be stored, shared, or analysed, discuss with the PI before proceeding.

7.10 Mistakes and Error Correction

Mistakes are part of science. They are not, by themselves, signs of failure or incompetence. What matters is how they are handled. We aim to minimise mistakes through careful work,

transparency, internal checks, and reproducible practices. Even so, errors will happen. When they do, they should be reported promptly, documented clearly, and corrected responsibly. You will never be criticised simply for discovering or reporting an honest mistake. Hiding a mistake and failing to disclose it or allowing others to rely on known errors is a much more serious problem.

7.11 Scientific Misconduct

Research misconduct, as defined by [the Office of Research Integrity \(ORI\)](#) means fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

- (a) *Fabrication* is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- (b) *Falsification* is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- (c) *Plagiarism* is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit.
- (d) Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Scientific misconduct of any kind will not be tolerated in our research group. We are in a privileged position to contribute to knowledge, and that responsibility requires integrity. Any instance of misconduct will be treated very seriously and may lead to severe consequences. See <https://apastyle.apa.org/instructional-aids/avoiding-plagiarism.pdf> on how to avoid plagiarism, and also make yourself familiar with [good research practice and scientific misconduct](#) according to the Karolinska Institutet.

7.12 Use of AI

AI tools may be used in our research group only as limited support tools, and not as substitutes for scientific thinking. Acceptable uses may include proofreading, grammar correction, code suggestion or correction, language polishing, formatting help, or other minor technical assistance that does not change the intellectual substance of the work. AI tools should not be used to do the parts of research and writing that you are here to learn. This includes developing ideas from the literature, formulating research questions or hypotheses, evaluating papers, interpreting findings, building scientific arguments, or drafting the substantive content of manuscripts, theses, or grant proposals. These activities are central to scientific training and must remain your own work.

A useful rule is this: if the task requires scientific judgment, original reasoning, or disciplinary understanding, it should not be delegated to AI.

Research group members must also be cautious about privacy, confidentiality, and intellectual property. Research data, draft manuscripts, participant information, unpublished ideas, reviews,

and other sensitive material should not be entered into AI systems unless this has been explicitly approved and the relevant data-protection conditions are clearly understood.

If AI has been used in any meaningful way in the preparation of a manuscript, this should be disclosed transparently.

For more information, you can make yourself familiar with the [living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research](#).

8. Leaving the Research Group

When a research group member leaves for new pastures, every project they led must be documented in a way that allows the work to be understood and continued if necessary (see earlier [section 6.8 on documentation practice](#)). At a minimum, project materials should be organised and made accessible to the PI through an appropriate platform such as the OSF (or another agreed on repository). This should include relevant documents, protocols, analysis code, data documentation, manuscript drafts, and a clear statement of project status (including next steps and unresolved issues).

If a project is not yet published at the time of departure, the departing team member and PI should agree on how the project will be managed going forward. The PI should have sufficient access to project materials to ensure continuity, responsible data stewardship, and compliance with institutional or funder requirements. At the same time, the departing team member should be encouraged and supported to remain involved in the project where feasible, particularly when they have led the work or made substantial intellectual contributions.

We view membership of the research group as extending beyond formal employment or affiliation. Former group members are warmly encouraged to remain engaged with ongoing collaborations, continue contributing to projects where appropriate, and stay connected through future research, mentoring, and other scholarly activities. We value these long-term relationships and see them as an important part of maintaining a collaborative and supportive research community.