NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

Case Number: Closeout for A0204 0033

The complainant[1] alleges that the abstract, portions of the introduction, and the experimental design of a recently published research paper[2] are related beyond coincidence to an NSF proposal[3] submitted by the complainant. As stated in the allegation, the complainant (independently of NSF) contacted the subject[4] to solicit an evaluation of a basic idea that evolved into the submitted NSF proposal, subsequently reviewed by panel and not funded. The complainant suggested the subject as a reviewer for the proposal. According to the complainant, the recent research paper was published by associates of the subject, but not by the subject.

The complainant's submitted proposal uses a standard experimental design and well-established models (proposal, page 7). The initial research in this area was accomplished in 1995, and this work is referenced in both the proposal and in the identified research publication.

The subject did not serve as a reviewer of this NSF proposal. None of the panel reviewers of the proposal were found to have a connection with the subject, or to the authors of the identified research publication.

The authors of the identified research publication have been active as a group in the research area of [redacted] for approximately ten years. The proposal of the complainant includes five references to the previous work of this research group. The subject and the authors of the research paper are associates by virtue of joint publication[5].

The identified research publication alleged to duplicate the submitted NSF proposal is a logical iterative effort from past published work of this research group. There is no direct overlap of the text or experimental designs in the research publication to those described in the submitted NSF proposal of the complainant; the procedures seem standard for the field. The basic goal of the proposed research and the research described in the publication is similar, but not especially unique, deriving in both cases from the previous work.

There is no basis for further inquiry, investigation, or action. Accordingly, this case is ***closed***.

---

[1] Redacted
[2] Redacted.
[3] Redacted
[4] Redacted
[5] Redacted

	Agent	Attorney	Supervisor	AIGI
Sign / date	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	