

## CLOSEOUT FOR M01010001

This case came to OIG on January 9, 2001, when a program officer in NSF's Directorate for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences<sup>1</sup> informed us that a proposal reviewer<sup>2</sup> had alleged that a proposal<sup>3</sup> submitted by the subject<sup>4</sup> made unattributed use of hypotheses that had appeared earlier in the published work of another scientist. The reviewer pointed to three publications by the other scientist<sup>5</sup> that he believed the subject should have cited as the source for her hypotheses and alleged that the subject's failure to fully acknowledge her debt to these works constituted plagiarism. The reviewer noted that the subject cited these three works at other points in her proposal, but said that "she should have been aware that her use of the hypotheses required citation as well."

OIG examined the subject's proposal and the other scientist's publications. We noted that in some of the instances in which the reviewer alleged plagiarism the subject had cited the other scientist's work in a way that suggested this work was a primary source for the propositions the subject wished to test. In other instances, the ideas that were allegedly misappropriated were not so distinctive as to permit a conclusion that they derived from the other scientist's work. Some of the uncited hypotheses appeared in footnotes and were presented as components of larger propositions that the subject wished to test and that were not allegedly plagiarized. OIG concluded that there was no substance to the idea that the subject has used the other scientist's work in a way that might constitute plagiarism or otherwise seriously deviate from accepted practices.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] Program in the Division [REDACTED].

<sup>2</sup> Dr. [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED].

<sup>3</sup> [REDACTED], entitled "[REDACTED]"

<sup>4</sup> Dr. [REDACTED] of [REDACTED].

<sup>5</sup> These are Dr. [REDACTED] book, [REDACTED]; an article by [REDACTED] and Dr. [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] entitled "[REDACTED]" that appeared in the [REDACTED] (1994): [REDACTED]; and an article by [REDACTED] entitled "[REDACTED]" that appeared in the [REDACTED] Volume [REDACTED] Number [REDACTED] (September, 1989): [REDACTED]. All of the hypotheses that, according to the reviewer, are taken from the latter article also appear in the book.