CLOSEOUT FOR M-94040021

On 25 April 1994, [redacted] brought an allegation of misconduct in science to OIG's attention. The complainant was [redacted] The subject, [redacted] was the sole PI on NSF proposal, [redacted] entitled [redacted] (the first proposal). As an *ad hoc* reviewer of the subject's first proposal, the complainant alleged that the subject misappropriated work in the proposal that had been accomplished by others. She claimed the subject failed to cite publications he knew existed[1] that would have shown that some of the work he proposed had been completed. The complainant said the misappropriated work all appeared in the [redacted] (the Report). In addition, the complainant alleged that NSF proposal [redacted] entitled [redacted] (the second proposal), submitted by [redacted] with the subject as a co-PI,[2] contained the misappropriated work of others as well. She explained that, as an *ad hoc* reviewer for the second proposal, she saw similarities between the first and second proposals, and she thought that he had probably misappropriated ideas from others in the second proposal. Finally, the complainant stated that the subject had listed a pending [redacted] (other agency) proposal on his first proposal's Current and Pending Support (CPS) form. She alleged that the subject failed to list the other agency proposal anywhere in his second proposal.

Allegation #1. OIG contacted the complainant who provided the complete citation for the Report that she said contained all the alleged misappropriated work found in the first proposal. She explained that the similarity between the equations in the Report and the proposal were difficult to detect because the subject changed some of the symbols in equations.

OIG was unable to determine what work and equations were common to the Report and the first proposal. The complainant agreed to provide OIG with a copy of the Report with the misappropriated sections and equations identified and cross-referenced to the subject's

[1] According to the complainant, the following citations should have been used by the subject in his proposal: 1) [redacted]

[2] [redacted] was the PI on [redacted] The subject was not listed as a co-PI on the cover page or the certification page. He was not included in the NSF computerized data base as a co-PI.

proposal. However, despite several reminders by telephone and letter during the ensuing year, the complainant failed to supply this information.

OIG learned that the subject had been invited by the Report's sponsors to evaluate and provide a second opinion on some of the Report's research conclusions. The subject was acknowledged in the Report for his contribution. OIG was informed that the subject used some ideas he had developed and included in the Report as the basis for part of his first proposal. OIG's review of the first proposal found no copied material in it from the Report and considered that, even if the subject used ideas and work he had developed and presented in the Report as part of his first proposal, he was presenting his own ideas. The complainant also alleged that the subject had presented work in the first proposal that had already been completed. In this case, several *ad hoc* reviewers commented on the first proposal's lack of novelty and originality, its dated citations, and its inclusion of work already accomplished by the subject. The completed work presented in the subject's first proposal was clearly noted by the reviewers. As a result, the proposal was determined to be non-competitive and was declined.

OIG could find no evidence that the subject had misappropriated work from the Report. There was no substance to the allegation.

Allegations #2 and #3. OIG determined that the subject was not a PI or co-PI on the second proposal. Instead, he was included as a participant. Consequently, he was not responsible for the content of the second proposal and he was not required to submit a CPS form listing his other agency support. The complainant provided no information with respect to the alleged misappropriated work in the second proposal. OIG concluded that there was no substance to either allegation.

This inquiry was closed and no further action will be taken.

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