

This case was brought to OIG on November 20, 1990 by [REDACTED] in the [REDACTED] program. A proposal reviewer, [REDACTED], had complained that the proposer, [REDACTED] of the University [REDACTED] was offering to do research using a reagent provided by the complainant. The proposal acknowledged that the complainant had prepared the reagent. However, the complainant was planning to do the particular experiment that was being proposed, had not given permission to the proposer to use the reagent for this experiment, and would have liked to be listed as a collaborator in the research and a co-author of future papers.

OIG learned that the reagent had been given to the proposer four years before. Discussions with NSF program officers in relevant fields confirmed that it is accepted that a laboratory may provide a reagent to another laboratory with restrictive conditions as to how it is to be used. However, such an informal agreement would not be expected to remain in effect for four years. Moreover, the complainant admitted that the proposer could have synthesized the reagent again in three to six months.

Accordingly, OIG finds that there is nothing in this case that meets the definition of research misconduct. The complainant was not in fact alleging that there was misconduct. Therefore the case should be closed.

[REDACTED]  
March 7, 1991

Concur: James J. Zimbrick  
3/7/91

ok [REDACTED]

Copy: Inspector General  
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

8 MAR 71