

CLOSEOUT FOR M92090041

This case was brought to the attention of OIG by [REDACTED] a program director [REDACTED], on September 23, 1992. The program director had received a phone call [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] (the informant). The informant declined to review a proposal by [REDACTED] (the subject). The informant said that he had submitted a manuscript to a journal [REDACTED] at which [REDACTED] is an editor. Review of the original and revised manuscripts took over a year, after which the informant withdrew them from consideration [REDACTED]. In his phone conversation to the program director, the informant alleged that the subject incorporated some of the ideas in the manuscripts into his grant proposal.

When contacted by OIG on November 12, 1992, the informant stated that he was not making an accusation against the subject, but that he felt the information in the proposal overlapped the data presented in his own manuscripts. He said that the information had not necessarily been lifted. The informant sent the three manuscripts to OIG on November 18, 1992.

OIG compared the three manuscripts by the informant to the subject's proposal. Both sets of documents address the [REDACTED]. However, the subject proposes to examine [REDACTED] whereas the study by the informant is limited to [REDACTED]. Thus, overlap between the manuscripts and the proposal is quite limited.

To determine whether the subject had independent sources for this overlapping information, OIG examined two published papers cited in the subject's proposal. These papers, which predate the manuscripts by the informant, are by [REDACTED] and describe research carried out by him [REDACTED] is currently at [REDACTED] and is the subject's co-principal investigator on the proposal. OIG's analysis revealed that the Co-PI's papers presented almost all of the overlapping data in the proposal. The data that could not be accounted for was very trivial, may have been described in the text of one paper of the Co-PI's which was [REDACTED] or could come from preliminary unpublished experiments. Moreover, the data in the Co-PI's papers forms a reasonable basis for the related experiments proposed in the subject's grant application.

The Co-PI's laboratory appears to have begun research on the [REDACTED] the same time as the informant's research group. The informant also has a [REDACTED] and they jointly published a [REDACTED] paper covering some of the material in the three manuscripts. This paper by the informant and his [REDACTED] associate came out in [REDACTED] at about the same time that the Co-PI's papers came out. Although citation of the paper by the informant and his [REDACTED] associate in the subject's proposal would have been appropriate, the subject and Co-PI clearly had their own basis for the data presented and experiments proposed. There is no reason to assume that they relied upon the manuscripts by the informant as the basis for their proposal.

92-41
one of two

Therefore, OIG determined that there was not enough evidence to warrant pursuing this allegation further. This case is closed without a finding of misconduct.

[REDACTED]

Concurrence:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

cc: Counsel to the Inspector General
Inspector General

two of two
92-41