Application for Review of a Research Proposal to the Institutional Review Board of the Faculty of Mathematics and Economics at Ulm University

To be submitted to irb-mawi@uni-ulm.de

General Information

The Faculty of Mathematics and Economics at Ulm University has established an institutional review board (IRB-MAWI) as of May 7, 2025. It is open to all members of the Faculty of Mathematics and Economics at Ulm University.

Application procedure

In the first step of the approval process, please fill out this form.

Name and address of the responsible researcher

Last name, first name:	
Address:	
Telephone number:	
E-mail:	

1. Title of the study:

2. Short summary of the study (up to 300 words, including study purpose, methods, sample size, sample characteristics, and relevant ethical aspects not included in Checklist 1 or 2):

Checklist 1:

		Yes	No
1.	Does the study aim to examine diseases or the structure and function of the human body?	○	○
2.	Is the study a clinical trial or does it involve non-human animals?	○	○
3.	Has the application already been rejected by another IRB or ethics committee?	○	○

Did you answer "Yes" to <u>any</u> of the above questions?

In this case, the IRB-MAWI cannot support you.

If you answered "No" to <u>all</u> of the above questions, please proceed with Checklist 2 (next page).

Checklist 2:

Please complete the following checklist to determine whether your protocol qualifies for exempt status.

		Yes	No	Don't know
1.	Does the study involve subjects that are uninformed about their participation in the study?	○	○	○
2.	Is participation in the study in any way compulsory, conducted without obtaining informed consent, or are participants denied the option to withdraw from the study?	○	○	○
3.	Is the data stored in personally identifiable form, exposed to potential unauthorized access or are participants uninformed about the protection of their data?	○	○	○
4.	Does the study involve subjects from populations that are vulnerable (e.g., minors, people with impaired decision making capacity, prisoners, refugees, homeless people etc.)?	○	○	○
5.	Are the subjects deceived or mislead by the researchers?	○	○	○
6.	Does the study involve coercive financial or non-financial incentives (i.e., incentives that threaten the voluntary nature of a subject's choice)?	○	○	○
7.	Is there a substantial dependency relationship between the subjects and any of the involved researchers?	○	○	○
8.	If students participate in the study: Can student participation affect the assessment of their course performance?	○	○	○
9.	Does the cognitive or psychological burden on participants exceeds everyday levels (e.g., in terms of task duration, stress, mental exhaustion, or intense emotions)?	○	○	○
10.	Could the study negatively influence the subjects' physical integrity (e.g., collection of blood or saliva samples, physical strain through physical exertion)?	○	○	○
11.	Does the study expose participants to any health risks that exceed what is typically expected in everyday life?	○	○	○
12.	Are the subjects asked to provide sensitive personal information (e.g., traumatizing experiences, sexual orientation, drug consumption)?	○	○	○
13.	Is the study likely to significantly influence peoples' lives or real-life behaviors? (e.g., influencing peoples' voting behavior; influencing peoples' job search behavior or outcomes)	○	○	○
14.	Does the study expose any of the members of its research team to threats harming their physical or psychological integrity (e.g., field work in civil conflict region)?	○	○	○
15.	Does any member of the research team have any association that poses or could be perceived as posing a conflict of interest in connection with the results of the study?	○	○	○
16.	Will you violate Ulm University's Statutes for the Assurance of Good Scientific Practice or the German Economic Association's code of good professional conduct for economists regarding research practice (see excerpts below)?	○	○	○

I hereby confirm that all the information given above is correct.

Date, place, name of responsible researcher

Digital signature

Did you answer "No" to all of the above questions? In this case, your protocol may qualify for exempt status. After final evaluation of your application, we will contact you.

Did you answer "Yes" or "Don't know" to any of the above questions, or do you see any additional concern to be discussed? In this case, please provide further details to the IRB-MAWI. Include i) a short motivation describing the goals and relevance of the study, ii) a detailed description of the research design and iii) a discussion of all potential risks regarding good professional conduct (including the precise circumstances involving any items answered affirmatively on Checklist 2). Submit all those documents (i)-iii)) in one PDF file. Additionally (and seperately) submit the completed form.

German Economic Association's code of good professional conduct for economists (Version December 2021)

a) Research Practice

Members of the Verein für Socialpolitik are expected to adhere to the standards of their research field with respect to research procedure, transparency, referencing, and policy deduction.

1. Research should be transparent and verifiable. The underlying assumptions should be clearly stated. Data sets and programs necessary to replicate the results should be made available (e.g., in repositories) within the legal and practical possibilities.

2. Members of the Verein für Socialpolitik should always take adequate precautions to avoid or minimize any harm to research subjects. This applies in particular to research involving vulnerable groups.

3. In scientific papers, the current state of research in the respective field should be addressed and assessed in an appropriate manner. All relevant sources should be listed. This also applies to one's own work.

4. In scientific papers (including discussion papers), all sources of funding, external infrastructure facilities, and other external support used should be indicated.

5. In scientific papers, the authors should state any facts which could potentially lead to conflicts of interest or bias on the part of the authors. This rule also applies to publications in non-scientific media, to the extent possible.

6. When providing economic policy advice or communicating with the media, careful attention should be paid to the difference between factual description and scientific statement on the one hand, and value judgment on the other hand.

7. Third-party funded scientific reports should be impartial, and the underlying research should be conducted in an unbiased way. The interests of the client should not influence the results of the analysis.

8. Whenever a scientific paper, report, or opinion may not be published without the prior consent to the content by a third party, this fact should be clearly indicated in the publication. Individuals with direct or indirect supervisory or evaluative power should support the freedom of research and should not limit the right to publish research results unnecessarily.

9. In their review and evaluation of scientific work and funding applications, reviewers should indicate potential biases and conflicts of interest. Where appropriate, they should abstain from participating in the evaluation.

§ 17 Gesellschaftliche Verantwortung

(1) Die Universität Ulm ist sich als Institution der Wissenschaft ihrer gesellschaftlichen Verantwortung bewusst. Sie erwartet, dass alle Mitglieder und Angehörigen die gesellschaftlichen Folgen ihres Tuns beachten, legt Wert auf wissenschaftliche Unabhängigkeit und lehnt eine Vereinnahmung durch Dritte ab.

(2) Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler berücksichtigen mögliche sicherheitsrelevante Risiken ihrer Tätigkeit. Sicherheitsrelevante Risiken bestehen insbesondere dann, wenn mit dem Forschungsvorhaben erhebliche Risiken für Menschenwürde, Leben, Gesundheit, Eigentum, Umwelt oder ein friedliches Zusammenleben verbunden sind. Dabei können die genannten Risiken bei der Durchführung des Forschungsvorhabens entstehen oder mit der Verwendung von Wissen, Produkten oder Technologien verbunden sein, die aus den wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten hervorgehen.

(3) Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler machen sich die Gefahr des Missbrauchs von Forschungsergebnissen kontinuierlich bewusst. Ihre Verantwortung beschränkt sich dabei nicht auf die Einhaltung rechtlicher Vorgaben, sondern umfasst auch die Verpflichtung, ihr Wissen, ihre Erfahrung und ihre Fähigkeiten so einzusetzen, dass Risiken erkannt, abgeschätzt und bewertet werden können. Dabei berücksichtigen sie insbesondere die mit sicherheitsrelevanter Forschung verbundenen Aspekte.

(4) Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler dokumentieren ihre Risikoabwägung und ihre Maßnahmen zur Reduzierung der Risiken. Liegen Anhaltspunkte dafür vor, dass erhebliche sicherheitsrelevante Risiken bestehen, und sind die Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler bei der Universität Ulm oder dem Universitätsklinikum Ulm entweder beschäftigt oder forschen mit deren Ressourcen, lassen sie sich vor der Durchführung eines Forschungsvorhabens von der Kommission „Verantwortung in der Wissenschaft“ beraten und berücksichtigen deren Empfehlungen bei der Gestaltung des Forschungsvorhabens. In begründeten Ausnahmefällen, beispielweise wenn ein sicherheitsrelevantes Risiko erst während der Projektdurchführung erkannt wird, kann die Beratung zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt erfolgen. Die Beratung ist in jedem Fall unverzüglich nach Bekanntwerden eines sicherheitsrelevanten Risikos zu veranlassen. Wissenschaftlich tätigen Mitgliedern der Universität Ulm, die bei der Universität Ulm oder dem Universitätsklinikum Ulm weder beschäftigt noch tätig sind, wird eine Beratung nach Satz 2 empfohlen.