

CLOSEOUT FOR M93010002

This case was brought to the OIG by [REDACTED], a program officer in the Division of [REDACTED], on [REDACTED] 1993. He had received a review of [REDACTED], a proposal submitted by [REDACTED] of [REDACTED] (the subject) and entitled "[REDACTED] OF [REDACTED]." In his review, [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] (the complainant) alleged that the subject proposed to do work that already had been done and published in articles that the subject cited in his proposal.

OIG wrote to the subject explaining that it had been alleged that he proposed to do work that essentially repeated the work of another researcher cited in his proposal and knowingly or recklessly misrepresented his proposed work as original. In his reply, the subject stated that his work "represent[s] a new approach to the problem" where the parameters have "clear and explicit physical meaning" and the problem becomes much simpler. He claimed that the complainant's work begins with different assumptions and introduces needless complications.

OIG asked an expert from another government agency to evaluate the subject's reply. We requested his judgment as to whether the subject's work actually was original, or whether it was misrepresented as such in his proposal. We also asked, if he believed that the work was not original, that he assess whether it was possible that the subject was unable to recognize it as such. The expert concluded that the proposed work was original, though "closely related" to the work it was alleged to duplicate. He stated that the equations involved, though "formally identical to those derived by" the complainant, were "not derived under the same assumptions or conditions."

OIG notified the subject that we had determined that the allegation lacked substance and that we were closing the case without a finding of misconduct. We also informed the subject that explanations of how his proposed work relates to research already in the literature and clarifications of how his work differs from closely related research on the same topic might help prevent problems such as this from arising in the future.

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

[REDACTED]  
Staff Scientist, Oversight

Concurrence:

*Donald E. Buzzelli* 2/22/94

Donald E. Buzzelli  
Deputy Assistant Inspector General,  
Oversight

*James J. Zwolenik* <sup>noted</sup> 2/23/94

James J. Zwolenik  
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

*L. Nancy Birnbaum* 2/18/94

L. Nancy Birnbaum  
Assistant Counsel to the Inspector General

cc: Signatories  
Inspector General

93010002