

CLOSEOUT FOR M-92040016

On April 8, 1992, [REDACTED] informed OIG that he had received an allegation of misconduct in science. The complainant, [REDACTED] alleged that the subject, [REDACTED] had taken credit for his work described in her NSF proposal, [REDACTED]. The complainant alleged that he had shown the subject his dissertation and a manuscript of one of his papers two years prior to her submission of her NSF proposal and that material from these documents appeared in her proposal. The complainant did not provide the title of his manuscript with his allegation.

When the complainant notified the program director of this allegation, the complainant indicated that he would make a copy of the manuscript that he alleged the subject had seen prior to submission of her NSF proposal. The program director told us he had never received a copy of the manuscript. When OIG contacted the complainant to request additional information including copies of his manuscript and dissertation, the complainant explained that he was reluctant to provide any additional information because he feared possible retaliation by the subject's spouse who was an editor for a professional journal to which the complainant planned to submit papers. He was concerned that, if his allegation of misconduct in science became known to the subject or her spouse, either might guess he had made it, and, as a result, his ability to publish papers in the journal might be jeopardized. In response to his concern, OIG offered the complainant confidential source status and encouraged him to give us copies of his manuscript and dissertation marked to indicate the basis for his allegation. After eight months he still had not provided any additional information.

OIG reviewed the subject's proposal. As a part of her submitted proposal package, the subject included a copy of a manuscript that she co-authored with a colleague. OIG noted that both the subject's proposal and her co-authored manuscript referenced a manuscript by the complainant. The subject's co-authored manuscript describes the complainant's work as closest to their own.

OIG attempted unsuccessfully to identify the complainant's manuscript and whether it had been published.

Over a two-year period, the complainant has not provided any assistance in clarifying the nature of his allegation. He did not specify whether his allegation was plagiarism, either verbatim copying or theft of an idea, or failure to cite his work in the subject's proposal. He

CLOSEOUT FOR M-92040016

has failed to provide the title of his manuscript and the part of his dissertation which are the bases for his allegation. Without his information, resolution of this matter would require a broad and undirected search that is beyond the resources of OIG.

This case was closed.

cc: Staff Scientist, Deputy AIG-Oversight, AIG-Oversight, IG