

English translation of extracts of the Danish evaluation report on Professor Nyborg's research.

Page 1.

Report by the "Committee for the Evaluation of Helmuth Nyborg's Research Project on Sex Differences in Intelligence".

...Guidelines for Research Ethics in the Social Sciences...

Page 10.

"The researcher shall account for the methods, materials and analysis used, so that colleagues and the general public have adequate information to critically evaluate the work."

Page 11.

The researcher shall not only publicise the results but should also make it possible for others to evaluate the validity of the results presented. The data upon which the results are based should therefore be preserved for a reasonable period of time and made accessible to scientific scrutiny. Consideration of the informers' anonymity can restrict outsiders from contact with the informants. For example research on a company's internal relations cannot be made an object for open investigation in the same company. Publication of conclusions or preliminary results prior to the completion of the study and the subsequent appropriate method of dissemination, should only occur under special circumstances.

Page 17.

- I. Undertake an evaluation of the methods applied by Helmuth Nyborg when selecting and managing his data, and thereby evaluate the validity of the results presented.
- II. Undertake an evaluation of the concordance between what Helmuth Nyborg has reported to the public and sent to publishers, and the actual selection and management of data.
- III. Undertake an evaluation of Helmuth Nyborg's adherence to the demands which, according to the committee, apply in the securing and provision of data for ones own published scientific results as they pertain to the type of investigation.
- IV. Undertake an evaluation of Helmuth Nyborg's adherence to other demands of scientific research (as they may arise), including publication of results, which the committee deems applicable to an investigation of this type.
- V. In what way, according to Helmuth Nyborg, does this relate to the data material used? (N=325 data set).
- VI. Is this method (taking reference from the conventional understanding and use of statistical methods) appropriate to the type of data presented.

VII. Is it possible, (maybe with assistance from Helmuth Nyborg), to apply the method of calculation described by Helmuth Nyborg, and the calculation error described by Helmuth Nyborg [7] to reconstruct Table 3 and Figure 7 in [2] from the data material in [9, children 325]?

Page 18.

- VIII. Is it possible (maybe with assistance from Helmuth Nyborg), using the calculation method referred to by Helmuth Nyborg and omitting the aforementioned calculation error, to reconstruct the table material in [5] Table 1 and Figure 1, and in [6] pages 2, 3 and 7, including the brief description of results in [22] p. 506, from the data material in [9, children 119]?
- IX. Is it also possible (maybe with assistance from Helmuth Nyborg), using the calculation method referred to by Helmuth Nyborg, to reconstruct the table in [5]. Table 2 and Figure 1 in [6] pages 5, 6, and 7 and in [22]. Table 1, Table 2 and Figure 1 from the data material in [9 adult 62]. Ref. file *Adult complete data set N=62 with id and sex.sta* on the diskette [8]?
- X. Out of this information can it be evaluated whether the 52 adults are a random sub-sample of the “62 adult sample”?
- XI. Does this method and the way it is administered, according to [10] and the minutes of meetings with Helmuth Nyborg on March 18, 2005 [11] and April 26, 2005 [14] and the following correspondence [15, 16, 17, 19, 20] live up to the demands of objective and neutral selection of sub-samples and to the expectations of transparency when selecting sub-samples?
- XII. Is it plausible when using a standard degree of rigour in the management of the protocol material [8a] and the data material, that one could end up in a situation like the one described by Helmuth Nyborg in the minutes [11, 14] and the following correspondence [15, 16, 17, 19, 20], when he explains how the data for the original 52 adult participants cannot be extracted from the presented data of 62 participants and cannot be recreated in any other way?
- XIII. Is it in accordance with usual scientific practice when correcting a calculation error in publicised results, that one does not carry out and disseminate the correct calculation of the original data material?
- XIV. The committee is asked to evaluate the grounds for the arguments stated in the book [3] section 4.2.10 pages 208-209 and in the manuscript [4], in the material Helmuth Nyborg has made available, including the information he gives in the minutes (11, 14) and in the following correspondence [15, 16, 17, 19, 20].