NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

Case Number: A03060033

We were informed[1] of an allegation that a pending proposal[2] contained a false claim about the submission of a manuscript to a scientific journal. The claim appeared in the *Results from Prior NSF Support* section of the proposal. This section described the results of two previous NSF awards.[3] The PIs on these two awards were the first and second PIs on the pending proposal. We therefore considered the first and second PIs on the pending proposal as subjects 1 and 2 of this case. The third PI was not considered a subject.

Through internet and library searches we were able to confirm all the publication claims in the pending proposal's *curriculum vitae* for subjects 1 and 2. In the pending proposal, the two subjects claimed a total of five manuscripts in review or pending publication as the results of their prior NSF awards. In response to our inquiry, subject 1 provided ample documentation to demonstrate that four of the five manuscripts existed. The fifth manuscript, the one that precipitated the allegation, proved problematic. Subject 1 explained that subject 1 was the responsible scientist for the experiments described in the manuscript but was not the submitted author. Subject 1 listed the manuscript as submitted because subject 1 had seen the manuscript. A co-author (also not the submitting author) had informed subject 1 that the manuscript had been submitted. In response to our inquiry, subject 1 asked the co-author about the status of the manuscript. At this point, neither subject 1 nor the colleague have been able to confirm the status of the manuscript with the submitting author. Subject 2 confirmed and concurred with subject 1's information.

Subject 1 has provided sufficient information for OIG to determine that neither subject knowingly made a false statement in the pending proposal, and we therefore have concluded that the allegation is unsubstantiated.

Accordingly, this case is ***closed***.

---

[1] redacted

[2] The proposal, [redacted], entitled [redacted], was submitted by Drs. [redacted] (subject 1), [redacted] (subject 2) and [redacted].

[3] These awards were [redacted]and [redacted].