



NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS

CLOSEOUT MEMORANDUM

Case Number: A-04030012

Page 1 of 1

We received an allegation that the subject (the co-PI) on the NSF proposal¹ listed in his Biosketch a manuscript as submitted to a Journal² that had not been submitted.

We wrote to the subject, who explained he had not submitted the manuscript in question. He explained that at the time he was preparing the NSF proposal he was also working on the manuscript. He said his dissertation advisor, the PI on the NSF proposal, brought this fact to his attention when the advisor reviewed the draft of the NSF proposal. The advisor had told him to change the manuscript listing to "in preparation for submission." However, the subject explained that because he was preparing other proposals for submission to other funding organizations at the same time, he changed it in these other proposals, but failed to change it in the NSF proposal. He said he had not intended to misrepresent this information and apologized. He further admitted to making this same mistake with a second manuscript in the Biosketch in the NSF proposal.³ He said that, similarly, his advisor had told him to change this one as well, which he, likewise, failed to do in the NSF proposal.

The subject's advisor wrote on his behalf explaining that the subject was a young scientist who the advisor had talked to about this oversight of the manuscripts. The advisor said this was an inadvertent error. According to the advisor, the subject and advisor have held several meetings about this matter since the subject received the letter asking for an explanation. Further, with the advisor's assistance, the subject has updated his curriculum vitae.

We determined that this was a departure from accepted practice, but, not significant enough to warrant further actions. We believe the fact that the subject was an inexperienced graduate student and the fact that the subject's advisor personally intervened about this matter to provide better training about these practices are mitigating factors in this case. We wrote to the subject explaining the importance of careful review of all the materials presented in any proposal he submits in the future.

This case is closed and no further action will be taken.

¹ NSF proposal [REDACTED], entitled "[REDACTED]" was submitted by [REDACTED] (PI as well as the subject's advisor) and the subject, [REDACTED] (co-PI), [REDACTED].
² "[REDACTED]" Submitted to [REDACTED].
³ "[REDACTED]" [submitted to [REDACTED]],"