

Research Integrity QC AI - Sample QC Report Template

Editable template for concierge alpha reports, pilot feedback, and future platform report generation.

Report ID	RIQC-SAMPLE-0001
Manuscript title	Synthetic Demonstration Manuscript for Pre-Submission QC Workflow
Review type	Concierge alpha / pre-submission quality-control review
Prepared for	Internal pilot, design partner, and technical co-founder discussions
Generated	2026-06-21
Data policy	Synthetic/non-sensitive demo package only
Required disclaimer This report is an AI-assisted preliminary quality-control review intended for internal author use before manuscript submission. It flags potential issues that may require human review. It does not determine research misconduct, fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, image manipulation, or fraud. Final responsibility for interpretation and correction remains with the authors and institution.	

1. Executive Summary

This sample report demonstrates the intended structure and tone of a Research Integrity QC AI output. It is not a real assessment. The example findings are seeded into the synthetic demo package so potential users can understand the workflow without sharing confidential manuscripts or human-subjects data.

1.1 Sample Category Summary

Category	Info	Low	Moderate	High	Immediate action
Manuscript consistency	0	1	1	0	Review claim strength and terminology.
Figure QC	0	1	0	1	Inspect duplicate/similarity candidate.
Statistical reporting	0	0	1	0	Resolve SD/SEM and n-value inconsistency.
Data alignment	0	0	1	0	Reconcile treatment-group n value.
Reporting/compliance	0	1	0	0	Clarify ethics/data availability language.

2. Scope and Inputs

Files reviewed in this sample:

- Synthetic_Manuscript_Demo.docx
- Figure_1_workflow.png
- Figure_2_synthetic_bar_chart.png
- Figure_3_duplicate_candidate_demo.png
- synthetic_results_data.csv

The report should always state what was reviewed, what was not reviewed, and whether source data were complete enough to support data-to-manuscript checks.

3. Severity and Confidence Definitions

Label	Definition	Typical action
Info	Helpful note; unlikely to affect interpretation.	Improve wording or documentation if convenient.
Low	Minor reporting gap or clarity issue.	Correct before submission if easy.
Moderate	Issue may confuse reviewers or affect clarity.	Author should review and correct before submission.
High	Issue could materially affect trust, interpretation, or submission readiness.	PI/senior author review required before submission.

4. Example Findings

M-001

Finding ID	M-001
Category	Manuscript consistency
Severity / confidence	Moderate / Medium
Evidence location	Abstract conclusion and Results section 3.2
Finding	The abstract states that the intervention restored the biomarker response, while the Results section reports only a partial reduction.
Why it matters	Overstated conclusions can create reviewer concern and may not match the reported data.
Recommended author action	Revise the abstract and discussion to describe the effect as partial unless additional evidence supports the stronger claim.
Human review status	<input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> False positive

F-001

Finding ID	F-001
Category	Figure QC
Severity / confidence	High / High
Evidence location	Figure_3_duplicate_candidate_demo.png, panels B and D
Finding	Two synthetic panels are intentionally near-identical and should be treated as a duplicate/similarity candidate for human review.
Why it matters	Similar figure panels may indicate a labeling, assembly, or source-file error even when unintentional.
Recommended author action	Inspect the original source files, verify labels, and replace or annotate the affected panels as appropriate.
Human review status	<input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> False positive

S-001

Finding ID	S-001
Category	Statistical reporting
Severity / confidence	Moderate / Medium
Evidence location	Methods statistical analysis and Figure 2 legend
Finding	The Methods section describes data as mean +/- SD, while the Figure 2 legend describes bars as mean +/- SEM.
Why it matters	Inconsistent error-bar definitions can mislead readers and reviewers.
Recommended author action	Confirm whether the bars represent SD or SEM and make the Methods and legend consistent.
Human review status	<input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> False positive

D-001

Finding ID	D-001
Category	Data alignment
Severity / confidence	Moderate / High
Evidence location	Results text and synthetic_results_data.csv
Finding	The manuscript states n=8 for every group, but the synthetic source CSV contains n=7 for the treatment group.
Why it matters	Sample-size mismatches can affect interpretation and reproducibility.
Recommended author action	Correct the manuscript text, figure label, or source data after confirming the true sample count.
Human review status	<input type="checkbox"/> Not reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Reviewed <input type="checkbox"/> Corrected <input type="checkbox"/> False positive

5. Recommended Pre-Submission Checklist

Done	Checklist item	Owner
[]	Confirm all figure panel labels match legends and manuscript references.	
[]	Check n values in Abstract, Results, figure legends, tables, and source data.	
[]	Define all error bars and statistical tests consistently.	
[]	Review high-severity figure candidates with the PI or senior author.	
[]	Confirm data availability, ethics, animal/human-subject, and conflict-of-interest statements.	
[]	Save the final QC report in the manuscript folder with the corrected files.	

6. Limitations

- This template does not determine misconduct, image manipulation, falsification, fabrication, or fraud.
- The system should flag candidates for human review, not replace PI, statistician, editor, or institutional judgment.
- Alpha pilots should use only synthetic, public, already-submitted, de-identified, or otherwise non-sensitive materials.
- Vendor terms, API data-use settings, institutional policy, and privacy/security review must be verified before accepting real unpublished data.