

Is it any more ethical for him to suggest analysing correct data in a way that supports two or more different conclusions?

No, as a researcher, any data must be analysed and results reported in an unbiased manner. Going into any research, it is ethical for a researcher to have a hypothesis (in this case, Whizz is nutritious) and a null hypothesis (Whizz has no benefits). The aim of the research should be to discover which of these is more likely, not to prove or argue for either of them.

Is Abi obligated to present both the positive and the negative analyses?

Absolutely, yes.

Is Abi responsible for the use to which others put his program results?

As an independent researcher, Abi is bound by a code of ethics. This includes disputing any biased claims made off of the back of his research. He has a professional obligation to ensure that his name and reputation are not tarnished by people deliberately trying to skew his findings one way or the other.

If Abi does put forward both sets of results to the manufacturer, he suspects that they will publicise only the positive ones. What other courses of action has he?

He could turn whistleblower and contact the Advertising Standards Authority and/or the Food Standards Agency. This would most likely have a negative effect on his career, though, and his future employability. Whistleblowers are meant to be protected by law, but as we have seen many times, this is not always the case.