CLOSEOUT FOR M93040024

This case came to the attention of OIG when a program officer in the [redacted] informed us of a fax he received from [redacted], a reviewer of a proposal [redacted] by [redacted] and [redacted] (the subjects). The reviewer had received a journal submission for blind review that was similar to the grant proposal and wanted the program officer to advise him about how to let the journal know that he could not do a blind review without compromising the confidentiality of his status as a reviewer for NSF. The program officer, in turn, raised the possibility that the subjects might have submitted a proposal to NSF to do work that they had already performed.

OIG examined the subjects' proposal and the reviewer's message and found that they clearly and consistently distinguished between work already performed and new work for which funding was sought. The reviewer describes the journal submission as containing what the proposal [redacted] labels a "preliminary empirical analysis" of data from 1980-87. Likewise, the proposal cites an unpublished paper containing this analysis. The proposal asks for NSF funds to develop "[redacted] and to perform [redacted] the theory (project summary). The reviewer's message in no way implies that these tasks have already been done. Instead, it unambiguously indicates that the journal submission contains the preliminary work that, according to the proposal itself, had already been done prior to the request for NSF funding.

There is no evidence here to suggest misconduct. This case is closed and no further action will be taken.

[redacted]

Concurrence:

Donald E. Buzzelli 8/31/93

Donald E. Buzzelli
Deputy Assistant Inspector General,
Oversight

93-24

James J. Zwolenik 8/31/93
James J. Zwolenik
Assistant Inspector General for Oversight

8/31/93
L. Nancy Birnbaum
Assistant Counsel to the Inspector General

cc: Assistant Inspector General for Oversight
Inspector General.

93-24
Page 2 of 2