A University[1] notified OIG that it was moving from an inquiry to an investigation into allegations against the subject,[2] the co-PI of an NSF grant.[3] The NSF portion of the University's investigation focused on whether the subject's statements in the proposal and annual project report misrepresent the data. Specifically, the NSF allegations the IC investigated were that the subject misrepresented 1) where he collected his data; and 2) the values of his measurements.

Regarding 1), the investigative committee (IC) found the data mentioned in the proposal were not collected at the subject's University lab. The University concluded the language in the proposal was ambiguous about where the data were collected, so this statement was not a misrepresentation. The subject specifically stated in his NSF annual project report that he collected the reported data at his University lab. The subject did not have a laboratory notebook, but the IC determined the subject did have the capability of collecting that data in his University lab. Thus, the University concluded the statements in the annual report were not misrepresentations. Regarding 2) the IC asked an independent expert to review the subject's data and laboratory. The expert did so, including interviewing the subject's graduate student, and concluded the data reported to NSF was supported.

We contacted the NSF program director[4] to ask if the language in the proposal was misrepresented. The program director did not think where the proposal data were measured was a misrepresentation because 1) the sentences in the proposal don't explicitly state the measurements were taken at the University lab; and 2) the data are accurate; and 3) the subject conducted subsequent measurements in his University lab.

We concur with the University adjudicator that the NSF allegation was not research misconduct. Accordingly, this case is **_closed_** with no further action taken.

---

1 ██
2 ████████████
3 ██
 ████████████████████████
4 ██████████████