

## CLOSEOUT FOR M-94020004

On February 9, 1994, [REDACTED] brought allegations of plagiarism to OIG's attention. The complainant [REDACTED] (the institution) [REDACTED] alleged that a manuscript of a paper by subject #1, [REDACTED] the institution, and subject #2, [REDACTED], and an unidentified proposal by subject #1, contained ideas from his [REDACTED] NSF proposal, [REDACTED] entitled, [REDACTED]. The complainant claimed that subject #1 had access to his NSF proposal because of her role as institutional coordinator for all [REDACTED] (the group) NSF proposals. In addition, it was alleged that the subjects failed to cite, in seven separate places in the manuscript, work done by the complainant, and, in one place, work accomplished by another group of researchers.

Specifically, the complainant alleged that one figure from his proposal appeared in a proposal written by subject #1. The complainant did not identify subject #1's proposal by number or as one submitted to NSF. Nevertheless, OIG examined all subject #1's relevant NSF proposals to determine if she had used the specific figure indicated by the complainant. This figure was not observed in any of them. OIG was also unable to identify any single proposal as the one indicated by the complainant. This allegation has no substance.

OIG was informed that the complainant had notified the institution of his allegations of plagiarism (intellectual theft) related to the manuscript. As a consequence, the complainant and subject #1 met with appropriate institutional representatives to resolve the situation prior to the manuscript's publication.

In its review of these allegations, OIG examined a copy of the manuscript, the final published paper, e-mail messages and letters from the complainant and subject #1 concerning this situation, and the complainant's proposal.

OIG determined that the information contained in the subjects' manuscript, allegedly taken from the complainant's NSF proposal, was also contained in published abstracts and papers authored by the complainant. OIG determined that the manuscript omitted only one necessary reference to the complainant, and that all the proper citations appeared in the subjects' published paper. OIG noted that, following the complainant's request that additional citations to him be included, the subjects complied. When compared to the subjects' manuscript, the published

## **CLOSEOUT FOR M-94020004**

paper contained: two additional citations to the complainant's work; several passages citing the complainant's past contributions; and two references to other scientists' work.

OIG noted that a manuscript typically undergoes revision prior to the publication of any article which then becomes the public record. Considering all of the circumstances of this case—that only one necessary reference to the complainant's work had been omitted in the unpublished manuscript; that the subject readily agreed to add numerous citations to the manuscript; and that the published paper included all appropriate citations—OIG concluded that this case should be closed.

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