

CLOSEOUT FOR M-94060023

On June 24, 1994, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] brought an allegation of misconduct in science to OIG's attention. The complainant, [REDACTED] is a faculty member [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] In his role as an ad hoc reviewer, the complainant alleged that the subject, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED], misrepresented information in an NSF proposal, [REDACTED] (the proposal), [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] submitted by the subject and two co-PIs. Specifically, the complainant alleged that three of the publications listed in the subject's "Results from Prior NSF Support" statement as representing work accomplished with funds from NSF award, [REDACTED] ("the award"), could not have been accomplished under "the award" because the submission dates for the two articles and one abstract, and the publication dates for the two articles, pre-dated the initiation of "the award." The two co-PIs were not considered subjects in this case because neither of them was associated with any of the information provided in the subject's statement.

OIG reviewed information supplied by the complainant, as well as the subject's NSF proposal and his relevant awards and listed publications.

In the subject's "Results From Prior NSF Support" statement in the proposal, he explained that "the award," a three-year continuing grant, provided support for the publications listed, but that "the award" had actually begun a year earlier as another award ("the original award"). Because the subject had changed institutions and transferred "the original award," NSF had closed "the original award," and opened it as "the award" with a new number and initiation date.

OIG found that the two articles and the one abstract questioned by the complainant were published between eight and seventeen months after the beginning of the "original award," and that the two articles acknowledged NSF support. OIG compared the three publications' submission dates with the "original award's" initiation date. The abstract had been submitted nine months, and published seventeen months, after the initiation of the "original award" and therefore could reasonably represent work supported by the "original award." However, one of the articles had been submitted one day after the "original award's" initiation date, and the other article had been submitted three months prior to "the original award's" initiation date.

Review of the subject's NSF PI history revealed that he had received an NSF three-year continuing grant ("the earlier award") that preceded "the original award." "The earlier award"

CLOSEOUT FOR M-94060023

had the same title as "the original award" and "the award," and the three grants provided the subject with a total of six years of NSF support. OIG concluded that, considering the consecutive nature of the three identically titled NSF awards, the subject may not have been careful when identifying the exact NSF grant that provided support for the articles listed in his statement.

OIG concluded that the subject's three publications could reasonably represent work supported with NSF funds from either the subject's "earlier award" or his "original award," and that the subject's apparent failure to differentiate work supported by identically titled NSF research awards published from eight to seventeen months after the inception of the "original award" was not unreasonable in light of the ongoing nature of his same research project. OIG concluded that there was insufficient substance to pursue this case.

At OIG's request the program officer discussed the need to provide accurate information in his "Results from Prior NSF Support" statements with the subject. This inquiry was closed and no further action will be taken in this case.

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