

CLOSEOUT FOR 93040023

This case was brought to OIG on April 9, 1993 by [REDACTED] program officer [REDACTED]. He had received a letter from [REDACTED] (the complainant) informing him that two articles had failed adequately to acknowledge the support of NSF grant [REDACTED] entitled [REDACTED]. The articles were [REDACTED] written by [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] by [REDACTED].

OIG determined that the first paper in fact cited NSF support. The complainant states that the paper does not clarify that certain equipment was developed by NSF grantees, rather than by researchers at [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] OIG concluded that authors had no obligation to specify in detail exactly how and where NSF support contributed to their research and that a general acknowledgement of NSF funding was sufficient. We therefore decided not to pursue the allegation regarding the first paper.

OIG wrote to the authors of the second paper asking them whether, in their view, their work had been supported by NSF and asking them to acknowledge NSF support if they had in fact received it. The first author responded. He claimed that his data were obtained in [REDACTED] after the two year NSF grant had ended. He agreed that the second author participated in the NSF project that in [REDACTED] constructed similar or identical instruments to those used to collect the [REDACTED] data, but maintained that the data themselves were collected on instruments provided and funded by others. Thus the first author argued that acknowledgement of NSF would be inappropriate.

OIG concluded that the first author offered a plausible, good faith account of his decision not to cite NSF support. Where an author makes a plausible case that NSF did not support his or her work, OIG generally defers to his or her judgment. Interested scientists may challenge that judgment by requesting that journals correct the record.

The complainant's original letter also alleged that certain NSF funded equipment was modified in potentially damaging ways without the consent of the first principal investigator on the grant. The letter implied that one or more of the authors of the above mentioned articles, one of whom was a co-P.I. on the grant, modified this equipment. Since this issue appeared to concern the

internal administration of the grant and did not raise an allegation of misconduct, we chose not to pursue it.

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

[REDACTED]

10/6/93

Staff Scientist, Oversight

Concurrence:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

cc: Signatories  
Inspector General.