

## **University of Zagreb School of Medicine: Policy on Academic Integrity**

The Zagreb School of Medicine is firm in its belief that the progress in the scientific understanding of the human health and disease is beneficial for the whole mankind. That progress is founded on the honest publication of scientific research, true and correct representation of research findings, and their critical and responsible interpretation. The School is aware of the fact that the occasional unintentional mistakes and individual differences in interpretation of scientific research findings are parts and parcels of the creative process in science. But the School clearly points out that all forms of fraudulent and inappropriate behavior in science are unacceptable; such as plagiarism, fabrication and falsification of the research results. Such instances of research misconduct are a direct threat to the integrity, reputation and social accountability of science. By the very act of participating in our academic community, all researchers, teachers, assistants and students of the School of Medicine have committed themselves to retaining in all their activities the highest standards of moral integrity and ethical behavior, as well as scientific and professional honesty. The School shall adhere to the common internationally accepted practice by which the prime place of investigation of any fraudulent or scientifically inappropriate behavior in science, shall at the first instance be settled within an institution, or any of its organizational parts in which this research is taking place. Therefore, the School committed itself to produce a clear and detailed set of guidelines regulating appropriate and honest procedures in scientific research, as well as to describe rules of procedure at instances of allegations for inappropriate and fraudulent behavior in science. The School calls upon all its stakeholders who participate in its academic life to continuously use and improve these guidelines.

With regard to the fact that teaching at the Zagreb School of Medicine (as well as at other international institutions of academic medicine) is based on internationally accepted principles of evidence-based medicine, the above principles shall be ipso facto applied to the primary scientific publications, as well as to all others professional publications produced by the School's faculty, having specially in mind the textbooks, teaching materials, seminar and exam essays, and professional and scientific papers produced by students.

The web site of the Zagreb School of Medicine contains the following documents related to the subject of responsible behavior in science:

- Academic Integrity Committee
- General rules in conducting research, professional development and teaching at Zagreb School of Medicine
- Rules of good academic practice for conducting research at the Zagreb School of Medicine
- Rules of good academic practice for writing, reviewing and publishing of the scientific and professional publications
- Rules of procedure for allegations for scientifically inappropriate and fraudulent behavior in research
- Decision of the dean of the Zagreb School of Medicine of 7 December 2006

- Regulations on the Academic Integrity Committee
- Regulations on the Disciplinary Responsibility of Teachers, Teaching/Research Assistants and Students
- Code of Ethics the University of Zagreb
- Extracts from the Law on Authorship and Allied Rights in the Republic of Croatia
- Extracts from the Criminal Law
- Ministry of Science, Education and Sports: Standards in Journal Editorship
- Ministry of Science, Education and Sports: Ethical Procedures for Editors

Pursuant to Article 154 of the Bylaws of the University of Zagreb School of Medicine (hereinafter referred to as the School), the Academic Senate accepted on its sessions held on 17 July 2007 the following:

### **RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR ALLEGATIONS OF SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT AND FRAUDULENT BEHAVIOR IN SCIENCE**

In any academic community there is a constant need for maintaining the highest level of academic integrity both in science and professional behavior.

The Zagreb School of Medicine is firm in its belief that the progress in the scientific understanding of the human health and disease is beneficial for the whole mankind. That progress is founded on the honest publication of scientific research, and correct representation of research findings. The School is aware of the fact that the occasional unintentional mistakes and individual differences in interpretation of scientific research findings are parts and parcels of the creative process in science. However, the School clearly points out that all forms of fraudulent and inappropriate behavior in science are unacceptable, such as plagiarism, fabrication and falsification of the research results. Such instances of research misconduct are a direct threat to the integrity, reputation and social accountability of science. By participating into our academic community, all researchers, teachers, associates and students of the School of Medicine committed themselves to retaining in all their activities the highest standards of moral integrity and ethical behavior, as well as scientific and professional honesty. With regard to the fact that teaching at the Zagreb School of Medicine (as well as at other international institutions of academic medicine) is based on internationally accepted principles of evidence-based medicine, the above principles shall be ipso facto applied to the primary scientific publications, as well as to all other professional publications produced by the School's faculty, having specially in mind the textbooks, teaching materials, seminar and exam essays, and professional and scientific papers produced by students.

The School shall adhere to the common internationally accepted practice by which the prime place of investigation of any fraudulent or scientifically inappropriate behavior in science, shall at the first instance be settled within an institution/or any of its organizational parts in which this research is taking place. Therefore, the School committed itself to produce a clear and detailed set of guidelines regulating appropriate and honest procedures in scientific

research , as well as to describe rules of procedure at instances of allegations for inappropriate and fraudulent behavior in science. In setting and compiling these guidelines and rules of procedure the School has relied on the relevant international sources as follows:

1. International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals. JAMA 277:927-934, 1997. (the latest version of these guidelines at [www.icmje.org](http://www.icmje.org))
2. MRC policy and procedures for inquiring into allegations of scientific misconduct. MRC ethics series, Medical Research Council, London 1997, <http://www.mrc.ac.uk/>
3. ORI Handbook for Institutional Research Integrity Officers. Washington D.C. Office of Research Integrity, 1997, <http://www.ori.dhhs.gov/>
4. Integrity in science. Guidelines of the SAMS for scientific integrity in medical and biomedical research and for the procedure to be followed in cases of misconduct. Swiss Medical Weekly 2003;133:52-58.
5. Responsible conduct regarding scientific communication, First edition. Society for Neuroscience, 1998.
6. Policies and Procedures for Dealing With Allegations of Academic Fraud At Yale University ([www.yale.edu/grants/policies\\_reg/acadfraud.html](http://www.yale.edu/grants/policies_reg/acadfraud.html))

## I Misconduct and Fraudulent Behavior in Science: Types and Definitions

I.1. The following acts are considered as departures from academic integrity: submitting counterfeit documents on purpose (falsification), or deliberate fabrication of false data or results; plagiarism; unacceptable and unethical use of research procedure which deliberately misinterpret the research results; other forms of cheating and deceitful practices in publishing research findings.

I.2. Fraud in scientific research is considered to be an unacceptable form of behavior of researchers, teachers, assistants and students of the School of Medicine. Every form of fraudulent behavior in science significantly compromises the reputation of the School and accountability of all the members of its academic community as a whole, simultaneously hindering and/or preventing the acquisition of the new knowledge.

I.3. All members of the academic community of the School should abide by the highest standards of academic integrity, and should immediately notify the authorized bodies of the School of the instances of alleged or indisputable examples of fraudulent behavior in science and of any forms of academic misconduct. The onus is on the School to ensure that all such allegations are considered with due respect in a justifiable and a timely manner.

I.4. Academic misconduct should be sanctioned both in cases of deliberate departure from academic integrity, or in cases when the negligent action has been evident. Such actions may cause hazard to common interests and fundamental academic values, and jeopardize the very

process of acquisition and publishing of relevant scientific findings, as well as individual interests of researchers.

I.5. When fundamental academic values are jeopardized, the onus is on all the members of the academic community to react to the cases of academic misconduct by duly notifying them to the authorized bodies of the School (see Article II.4.1.).

I.6. In cases when only the interests of an individual are jeopardized (see Articles I.8. and II.4.2.), the School shall as a rule start investigating the possible allegations of academic misconduct only at the request of the individual whose interests are identified as being jeopardized.

I.7. Departures from academic integrity where the process of acquisition of scientific knowledge is being hindered

I.7.1. Departures from academic integrity where the process of acquisition of scientific knowledge is being hindered, thus compromising the fundamental academic interests, are as follows:

- fabrication of research results;
- intentional forgery – falsification of source data;
- manipulating the data, i.e., false representation and misinterpretation of source data needed for analysis without prior notice and any justifiable reasons ;
- deletion of stored source data from the archives prior to expiration of the prescribed term for documentation storage;
- deletion of stored source data from the archives after the third (authorized) persons have asked permission to access these data;
- refusing and preventing the authorized persons to access the source data;
- concealing the source and origin of data.

I.8. Departures from academic integrity compromising the interests of an individual

I.8.1. Departures of academic integrity which compromise the interest of an individual can be grouped into three main groups:

- (a) acts that hamper the research work of an individual (possibly taking ill-founded advantage to himself/herself, or to the third party),
- (b) acts that prevent or hamper an individual to publish his/her research results (possibly taking ill-founded advantage to himself/herself, or to the third party),
- (c) acts in which the position of reviewing (evaluating) the research work of another person is being misused.

I.8.2. Acts that hamper the research work of an individual (possibly taking ill-founded advantage to himself/herself, or to the third party) are as follows:

- unauthorized copying and data piracy abuse and misappropriation of other information created by other researchers, as well as the use of unauthorized research data without prior approval of the project/research coordinator;
- sabotaging the work of other researchers, who are either fellow researchers on the same or another project by intentional damaging the research equipment, materials, source data and other research notes and documents;
- violation of professional secret.

I.8.3. Acts that prevent or hamper an individual to publish his/her research results (possibly taking ill-founded advantage to himself/herself, or to the third party) are as follows:

- plagiarism, i.e., publishing under his/her own name (and without referencing the real source) the texts, experimental findings, methods or ideas taken from other individuals;
- falsely claiming authorship of research papers in which the individual whose name appears as an author has not given any significant scientific contribution (the so called, false authorship);
- intentional omitting from the list of contributors all those collaborators on the project who significantly contributed to the said research;
- granting authorship to individuals who did not play any significant role in the project/work (the so-called honorary authorship);
- intentional not mentioning of a significant contribution of other authors who deal with the problem and who published their research results in other papers/journals;
- intentional citing a source that was never utilized, or attributing work to a source from which the referenced material was not obtained (false citation);
- disclosing inaccurate information on the real status of his/her own publications (eg., falsely stating that the paper is in print, send to print, or under the review process).

I.8.4. Acts in which the opportunity for evaluating (reviewing) of the research paper has been misused are as follows:

- deliberate covering of the existing conflict of interest;
- violation of the professional secret and physician's secret;
- erroneous and/or inappropriate evaluation of a research project, program or unpublished papers, done either deliberately, or due to a flagrant negligence;

- inappropriate and unsubstantiated boastfulness for the purpose of obtaining personal gain, ie., inappropriate and unsubstantiated glorification of his/her acts or alleged contributions and glories of another person with the aim of obtaining personal gain for that person.

## II Procedure on allegations of academic fraud

II.1. The existence of these regulations are absolutely needed not only in the case of protecting the academic community from fraudulent acts, but also to protect individuals who might be unjustly accused of committing such fraudulent acts. These regulations are not intended to be the substitute for the existing Regulations on Disciplinary Procedures, and their purpose is to establish the just process of possible existence of the alleged acts related to academic fraud, prior to the possible commencement of the disciplinary proceedings. Depending on the outcome of this process, it is possible to start the disciplinary measures and procedures prescribed by the Regulations of the Court of Honor, Regulations on Disciplinary Procedures and other governing regulations of the School and the University.

II.2. Each single process started for allegations of academic fraud must be guided by the three basic principles:

1. The School shall be obliged to consider every accusation on academic fraud which is appropriately substantiated and submitted in good faith.
2. Every accused individual shall be deemed innocent, unless it has been proved otherwise.
3. It is the sole responsibility of the School to do as follows: (a) to protect the privacy and reputation of the person who applied for relief (hereinafter referred to as: claimant), as well as person against whom the claim has been lodged (hereinafter referred to as: respondent); (b) to safeguard and maintain the strict confidentiality of the procedure; and, (c) to protect the reputation and/or restore the tainted reputation of the respondent who was found to be accused unjustly and without proper foundation.

## II.4. The first phase of the procedure: Bringing Charges

II.3. Every procedure for investigating allegations of academic fraud shall be carried out in three phases, and can, in the case of the existence of a legitimate reason, be dismissed in each of these phases:

1. Making allegations. The initial phase shall start with making allegations. The charges are brought in the form of a report made in writing to the dean of the School of Medicine, with the note “strictly confidential”, which has to be signed by the claimant. Anonymous accusations shall a priori be dismissed as inappropriate form of behavior which insults the dignity of academic citizens (see Article II.4.5.). In exceptional and justifiable cases, allegations of academic fraud can be communicated to the dean orally, but in such cases the dean shall make a written record of the charges on the spot and in the presence of the claimant. The proceedings can be

dismissed already in the initial stage, if the dean establishes that the charges are trivial, unjustifiable, ill-founded, or, are not brought in good faith.

2. Initial inquiry. The second phase starts with initial inquiry initiated by the dean, if it is established that allegations are made in good faith, and that there is sufficient evidence for additional inquiry, and that further investigation is warranted for establishing evidence for academic fraud. The primary objective of the procedure of initial inquiry is to establish whether the allegations are justified and whether official investigation is warranted. Therefore, the minimal possible number of persons shall be involved in this stage of inquiry, and the dean shall be responsible to ensure the strict confidentiality of the procedure (to the highest extent possible). The case can be dismissed in this stage of inquiry, in case of the negative result of the initial inquiry.
3. Official Investigation into the Fact of Fraud. The third phase of the procedure starts with the official investigation into the fact of fraud, started by the dean, in case the positive findings in the initial inquiry have been established.

II.4.1. Allegation against any member of the School's academic community can be made by every School's faculty, or person outside the School, if this allegation assumes that the general interest of the academic community and the public has been jeopardized by this alleged fraudulent act.

II.4.2. If it is assumed that such an act of academic fraud caused damage to an individual person, the School shall as a rule accept only those allegations that are made against the involved School's faculty by the person that claims to be damaged.

II.4.3. The alleged charges containing a well substantiated argumentation are brought in a written form signed by a claimant, and shall be addressed to the dean of the School of Medicine with the note "strictly confidential".

II.4.4. In exceptional and justifiable cases, allegations of academic fraud can be communicated to the dean orally, but in such cases the dean shall make a written record of the charges on the spot and in the presence of the claimant.

II.4.5. All anonymous allegations shall a priori be rejected by the dean as null and void and improper. In exceptional cases, when these anonymous allegations are supported by the documentation which corroborates the fact that there is a reasonable doubt to assume that the fraudulent act has been committed, and where there is a legal obligation to start the procedure, pursuant to Article 230 of the Criminal Act, and Article 181 of the Criminal Procedure Act, the dean shall be liable to start the initial fact-finding procedure on the basis of the available documentation and by virtue of the powers vested in him/her.

II.4.6. If the dean finds out independently that these allegations are trivial, unsubstantiated and made not in good faith, he/she shall make an official report and drop the case. However, the dean is obliged to communicate his/her decision both to the claimant and the respondent in the shortest possible term, and give them equal access into the official report in which the argumentation to drop the case has been made.

II.4.7. If the dean is not able to independently establish the substantiality of allegations, he/she shall be liable to call upon the respondent to give his/her comments on the claims stated. The dean shall on that occasion inform the respondent of the statement made in the allegation, taking care not to disclose the identity of the claimant. The respondent shall be liable to comment on the facts contained in the allegations within 15 days (this term can be prolonged if necessary), together with presenting all the documentation that he/she finds important for refuting the allegations. If the dean comes to a conclusion that the respondent has successfully refuted the particulars stated in the allegations, the procedure shall be suspended, and the dean shall make an official report about that, informing the claimant on that matter, as prescribed in Article II.4.6.

## II.5 The second phase of the procedure: Preliminary Investigation into the Fact of Fraud

II.5.1. If the dean, after the statements given by the conflicting parties, still believes that there are substantial reasons for continuation of the procedure, he/she shall appoint an ad-hoc Committee for the preliminary investigation into the alleged act of fraud. This Committee shall be comprised of the smallest possible number of members that are capable of performing the entrusted task successfully and in a competent manner. Members of the Committee shall be recruited from the full-time faculty of the School; they shall not include persons who are established to be in a conflict of interest with the claimant or the respondent. The members of the Committee shall be obliged to swear to strict confidentiality in performing the assigned task.

II.5.2. The dean shall be obliged to inform the party charged on the start of the preliminary investigation procedure, on the composition of the appointed ad-hoc Committee, as well as on the facts contained in the allegations, so that the party charged can prepare himself/herself for the interview with the Committee, and possibly lodge a complaint objecting to the composition of the Committee.

II.5.3. If a necessity is felt already in this stage of inquiry, due to the nature and possible implications of the allegations, the dean shall inform the rector of the University of Zagreb on the start of the preliminary investigation, together with other authorized administrative officials (e.g. the representative of the company/legal entity which is financing the research of the party charged), especially when there is a clear interest to protect the health, security, reputation or financial interests of other persons.

II.5.4. The ad-hoc Committee shall immediately proclaim all the relevant materials confidential which it deems relevant for the assessment of the authenticity of the allegations. The Committee shall make an interview both with the claimant and the respondent, so as to get a first-hand impression on all the relevant issues of the dispute. The Committee shall disclose the identity of the claimant to the party charged, if it finds it to be absolutely necessary, but only upon previous consultations with the claimant. The Committee can, if it deems to be absolutely necessary, ask for the additional opinion of other experts. All summoned members of the academic community are obliged to respond to the summons of the Committee, as well to swear on strict confidentiality.



II.5.5. The Committee shall be obliged to keep records on all its actions, discussions, findings and conclusions.

II.5.6. The Committee shall be entrusted with the task to draw up a written report and submit it to the dean at its earliest convenience, and usually within 60 days from assuming responsibility for the task assigned. This report shall be comprised of the clear description of establishing a clear branch of evidence on which the conclusion of the Committee is founded (comprising the summaries of questioning of all the parties involved, such as the claimant, the respondent and other persons questioned). If the Committee fails to deliver its task due to objective circumstances, it shall nevertheless submit its written report to the dean within 60 days, stating the reasons for the prolongation of the procedure.

II.5.7. If the Committee comes to a conclusion that the allegations have been unsubstantiated and that the person charged is innocent, the dean shall submit a copy of this report to the party charged, whereas the claimant shall be informed on the judgement reached by the Committee stating the reasons on which this judgement has been based. If necessary, other persons involved in the work of the Committee as experts or witnesses, shall also be informed on the judgement reached by the Committee. The dean shall also establish whether there is a need for initiating measures needed to restore the reputation of the person charged, and if needed define the nature of these measures.

II.5.8. In case the Committee reaches the conclusion that the allegations have been substantiated, and that the respondent has really committed an act of academic fraud, or acted in an inappropriate way, and that there is enough reason to start the official investigation, than the Committee shall also submit to the dean, along with its report, the official statement describing accurately the nature of the offence and stating the reasons for starting the procedure. The dean shall than submit all these documents (Committee's report and official statement) to the person charged.

II.5.9. If the respondent admits to be guilty and accepts the conclusions of the Committee, the dean shall decide whether there is a need to start some disciplinary measures in relation to the respondent, or should the procedure be stopped, or whether there is a need to start an official investigation. The dean shall than in an appropriate manner (which has been prescribed by the law and other governing regulations) inform all other authorized bodies and persons, such as editors of scientific journals and books, representatives of the University, or institutions involved in financing this research.

## II.6. The third phase of the procedure: Official Inquiry

II.6.1. The dean shall start the official investigation in two cases as follows: (a) if the person charged fails to plead guilty, and (b) if the person charged pleads guilty, but the nature of the procedure requires that official investigation be started, other authorized bodies and persons be informed on the outcome of the inquiry, as well as the public, if necessary, and appropriate disciplinary measures be taken. The decision on starting the official investigation into the act of fraud should be brought by the dean in the shortest reasonable term, and normally not

exceeding 30 days from the receipt of the report and official statement issued by the ad-hoc Committee.

II.6.2. The official investigation into the act of fraud shall be taken, at the request of the dean, by the Committee for Academic Integrity of the School of Medicine

II.6.3. The dean shall inform the person charged on the start of the investigation into the act of fraud, and enable him/her to lodge a complaint against the appointed Committee members (due to the possible conflict of interest). If the dean infers that the complaint lodged by the person charged is justified, well-founded and brought in good faith (i.e., that the complaint has not been lodged just for the sake of obstructing the work of the Committee), the dean shall ask the president of the Committee to suspend temporarily those Committee members ( i.e., for the case in question). The decision of the dean shall be final in such complaint cases.

II.6.4. The dean shall, to an extent justified or prescribed by the law and other governing regulations, inform other responsible administrative officials (such as the rector of the university) on the start of the investigation into the act of fraud.

II.6.5. In order to find out whether the claims stated in allegations were justified, and whether there is reason to believe that academic fraud may have been committed, the Committee for Academic Integrity shall once more gather, examine and analyze all the documentation needed, together with reviewing the branch of evidence. The Committee must be given access to all research or professional relevant materials and data, including the laboratory protocols and research source data which are deemed relevant to an accurate assessment of the charges. The person charged shall be obliged to fully cooperate with the Committee in collecting evidence and supporting materials.

II.6.6. To collect first-hand information relevant for the assessment of the case, the Committee shall make an interview both with the claimant and the respondent. The person charged shall have access to all the materials considered, except in case when there is a need to protect the confidentiality of the source. In such cases the Committee shall inform the respondent of the contents of the relevant case materials without disclosing the identity of the source of information. The Committee shall also give the person charged an opportunity to provide additional relevant documentation with the branch of evidence, as well as to suggest the possible witnesses to the procedure. If these witnesses are questioned in the course of the procedure, the Committee shall decide independently on the possibility of the person charged being present while the witness is giving testimony. If the person charged is deprived of his/her right to be present at the hearing of witnesses, the Committee shall give him/her the right to refute the contents of the testimony, or reply to it.

II.6.7. The Committee shall complete its task in the shortest reasonable term, normally not exceeding the term of 120 days from the date it has been entrusted with that task. If, due to justified reasons, the procedure cannot be completed in the prescribed term, the Committee shall provide the dean with the written report explaining the reasons for the prolongation of the procedure.

II.6.8. The final report of the Committee should be comprised of three parts as follows:

1. Summary of all the documents, witnesses given and other forms of evidence which were relevant for the Committee in making its conclusions.
2. Summary of the findings of the Committee with the conclusions reached on the basis findings inferred from these facts.
3. The possible recommendation of the Committee to the dean regarding further measures and procedures that should be taken. These recommendations may (or may not) be used as the basis for further procedure brought before the Court of Honor. The final report of the Committee shall be adopted by the majority vote of the Committee members present.

II.6.9. The dean shall give the respondent the opportunity to have an insight into the final report of the Committee; the person charged shall also be liable to object in writing, with regards to correction of the allegations and clarification of the report. The respondent shall be liable to comment on the facts contained in the Committee's report within 15 days he/she has been acquainted with the final report. It is the free discretionary right of the dean to make it possible for the claimant to be informed of the final report of the Committee.

II.6.10. If the final report of the Committee establishes that the person charged is not guilty, the dean has the right to ask the Committee for recommendation on which actions to take in order to protect and restore the tainted reputation of the person charged, and to consider is there a need to undertake any disciplinary measures against the claimant (in case it has been established that the allegations were not justified and that they were not submitted in good faith).

II.6.11. On the basis of the final report of the Committee and submitted written reply of the person charged, the dean shall decide whether there is a need to impose some form of disciplinary measures against the person charged, in which case he/she shall forward the case to the Court of Honor which will decide on the measures to be taken. The dean shall inform the person charged on this decision, as well as other authorized officials, if needed. The final decision on disciplinary actions taken shall be brought by the Academic Senate on the motion of the Court of Honor.

## II.7. Appeals

In case the conflicting parties (the claimant and the respondent) believe that the procedures for investigating academic fraud were not regularly and rightly undertaken, they have the right to submit a written appeal to the rector of the University of Zagreb. In considering such appeals the rector shall not as a rule go into the content of the issues disputed, but shall only pay attention to the adherence to the formal side of the procedure in terms of rules and governing standards set.

## II.8. Final Provisions

II.8.1. Every act of retaliation undertaken against the claimant who press charges in good faith shall constitute a crude violation of academic principles and principles of academic chastity, as well as a disciplinary offence. On the other hand, the person who was established to press charges against the respondent in ill faith and in an unseemly manner, must also bear the disciplinary consequences upon the conclusion of the justly completed investigation procedure.

II.8.2. The party charged has the right to appear at the initial inquiry conducted by the Committee escorted by his/her adviser. The advisory role may be entrusted to any member of the academic community of the School who is not in conflict of interest with the stated case (e.g., a person with family or financial bonds to the person charged). However, that advisor cannot be a legal representative, or attorney of the respondent.

II.8.3. The party charged has the right to appear at the official investigation conducted by the Committee escorted by his/her adviser. The advisory role may be entrusted to any member of the academic community of the School, pursuant to Article II.8.2. However, if the person charged has hired a legal representative, i.e. attorney, in that case this attorney may appear as the accompanying person at the hearing of the Committee instead of the faculty representative of the School of Medicine. Having in mind the fact that the official investigation does not equal the judicial process, the attorney representing the party charged shall not be allowed to direct questions or answers, or to submit arguments in the name and for the respondent.

These Regulations shall be effective as of the eighth day from their disclosure at the notice board of the School of Medicine.

No: 01-70/172-2007

Zagreb, 18 July 2007

Dean

Professor Nada Čikeš, MD, PhD

These Regulations were made public at the notice board of the School on 30 July 2007.

