

## Closeout for M00100036

This case was opened in October 2000 when we learned that a reviewer<sup>1</sup> alleged a proposal<sup>2</sup> recently submitted to NSF contained plagiarism. The reviewer alleged the PI (and/or co-PI)<sup>3</sup> had self-plagiarized, i.e., they had included in the introduction of the proposal nearly a page of verbatim text from a publication<sup>4</sup> on which the PI and co-PI were authors. The reviewer also said the PI had plagiarized a smaller amount of text from another paper<sup>5</sup> on which he was not an author.

Regarding the first allegation, self-plagiarism is generally considered to be an ethical breach, but not one that rises to the level of misconduct in science. The copied text associated with the second allegation was about four sentences that represented specific scientific information that was cited to the original authors rather than the authors of the paper from which the text was taken. Additionally, due to the specific nature of the text, it would be difficult to phrase it another way. Because of these reasons, we concluded the second allegation did not rise to the level of misconduct. However, we have cautioned the PI and co-PI that they should more closely follow accepted citation and quotation practices and that continued improper citations could lead to future allegations.

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

cc: Investigation, IG

---

<sup>1</sup> (footnote redacted).

<sup>2</sup> (footnote redacted).

<sup>3</sup> (footnote redacted).

<sup>4</sup> (footnote redacted).

<sup>5</sup> (footnote redacted).