

## CLOSEOUT FOR M95050019

On April 1, 1995, OIG received a copy of an article written by the complainant, Dr. [REDACTED]. The complainant had forwarded the letter in response to Dr. [REDACTED] request made during an earlier conversation with the complainant for further information about his concerns. In his article the complainant described his unsuccessful attempts to have a reviewer of his 1993 book [REDACTED] retract a statement in a published review about the originality of an idea in the book. The reviewer, Dr. [REDACTED], a faculty member at the [REDACTED] at the University [REDACTED], apparently stated that this idea had already appeared in the published literature. The complainant disagreed with this statement which he viewed as an "error in the literature."

A review of NSF's proposal and award system showed that the complainant had never submitted a proposal to NSF and the reviewer's one award was too old to be applicable to this case. In addition, OIG noted that the complainant's concerns had been evaluated by numerous individuals in several separate organizations.

After contacting the editor of the journal that published the review the complainant published a rejoinder to the review in that journal's forum for rebuttals. He discussed his concern with a variety of officers within the professional society that published the journal. All of these individuals supported the reviewer's position. The complainant contacted a number of officials at the reviewer's institution and these individuals all supported the reviewer. He contacted the ethics committee within a leading scientific society that evaluated the situation as a "tempest in a teapot." The executive director of the society supported the committee's decision.

OIG closed this inquiry without further consideration because the complainant's concerns were not related to any NSF-supported activity, and had been addressed in other forums.

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