



Correction to: Does Proof of Concept Trump All? RRI Dilemmas in Research Practices

Anita Borch¹ · Harald Throne-Holst¹

Published online: 16 August 2021
© The Author(s) 2021

Correction to: Science and Engineering Ethics

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00288-8>

The abstract was missing from this article and should have read:

Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) is described as a new way of doing science that brings science closer to society. Based on a qualitatively oriented case study, this article supports previous research indicating that researchers face a variety of ethical problems and dilemmas when implementing RRI for the first time. These include difficulties with anticipating and controlling future impacts, an asymmetry of power between project partners and an elusive understanding of the RRI concept. The researchers' challenges were rooted in conventional research ethics and could be boiled down to one core dilemma: If RRI had been applied from the very beginning of the project period, the chance of realising proof of concept within the scheduled time may decrease. The researchers' solution to this dilemma was to prioritize proof of concept and postpone RRI activities to later stages of the project. If RRI is expected to live up to its ambition of representing a new way of doing science, more effort is needed at the political level to facilitate change.

The original article has been corrected.

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

The original article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-021-00288-8>.

✉ Anita Borch
anitab@oslomet.no

Harald Throne-Holst
harth@oslomet.no

¹ Consumption Research Norway (SIFO), OsloMet – Oslo Metropolitan University, Stensberggata 26, 0130 Oslo, Norway