

My initial post covers the ethical complexities faced by Abi due to his research findings challenging the nutritional values of Whizz cereal. Due to the importance of integrity and transparency in research (CEPR, 2021), Abi should present both positive and negative findings to the manufacture so as to uphold ethical standards, like from ACM code 1.3: Be honest and trustworthy (ACM Code 2018 Task Force, 2018), etc. Subsequently, also aligning with ethical principles that dictate accurate and unbiased reporting (Turilli & Floridi, 2009). If Abi fails to fully disclose his findings to the manufacture, he could be faced with legal and financial repercussions, and damage to his professional reputation (Turilli & Floridi, 2009).

To ensure unbiased analysis, involvement of collaborators or third-parties can be considered (Sanjari, et al., 2014). However, it is crucial to first ensure that these collaborators and third-parties follow data privacy regulations, and cybersecurity practices (RCR Administrators, N.D.). If done right, this approach enhances ethical standards, data privacy and promotes informed choices among consumers, manufacturers, stakeholders, and other relevant parties (Grummon, et al., 2020).

Should manufacturers choose to prioritize their interests over ethical considerations like product modification, etc., - Abi should publicize the findings by first been aware of the moral intensity concept and potential risks associated with disclosing sensitive data (Craft, 2012). Therefore, factors like getting consent, data ownership potential intellectual property issues, anonymization and censorship of sensitive details, etc.- should all be considered before publication (User research community, 2018). On the other hand, if it will be too risky for self-publication, following Laura's post, Abi can report

his findings to the Food Standard Agency for an investigation into the manufacturer (Food Standards Agency, 1999).

I would like to thank my peers for reading my post and Laura for her valuable response to it. Additionally, I have greatly benefited from the diverse perspectives shared in my peers' posts and reviews, which have significantly enriched my understanding of the subject matter.

References

ACM Code 2018 Task Force, 2018. *ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics>
[Accessed 21 June 2023].

CEPR, 2021. *Ethics and Disclosure Policy*. [Online]
Available at: <https://cepr.org/research/research-policies/ethics-and-disclosure-policy>
[Accessed 2023 August 10].

Craft, J. L., 2012. A Review of the Empirical Ethical Decision-Making Literature: 2004–2011. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Volume 117, pp. 221-259.

Food Standards Agency, 1999. *Food Standards Act 1999*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1999/28/contents>
[Accessed 16 August 2023].

Grummon, A. H. et al., 2020. *Ethical Considerations for Food and Beverage Warnings*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7321920/>
[Accessed 10 August 2023].

RCR Administrators, N.D.. *Who may access research data?*. [Online]
Available at: https://ori.hhs.gov/education/products/rcradmin/topics/data/tutorial_7.shtml
[Accessed 11 August 2023].

Sanjari, M. et al., 2014. Ethical challenges of researchers in qualitative studies: the necessity to develop a specific guideline. *Journal of medical ethics and history of medicine*, 7(14).

Turilli, M. & Floridi, L., 2009. *The ethics of information transparency*. [Online]
Available at:
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/226497023_The_ethics_of_information_transparency
[Accessed 10 August 2023].

User research community, 2018. *Managing user research data and participant privacy*. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/user-research/managing-user-research-data->

participant-privacy

[Accessed 10 August 2023].