

CLOSEOUT FOR M94100033

This case came to OIG on October 27, 1994, when [REDACTED], a program director in the [REDACTED] Program in the Division of [REDACTED] informed us that a reviewer had alleged that a proposal he reviewed contained verbatim sentences from published papers without giving those papers appropriate credit. The proposal, submitted by [REDACTED] (the subject) of the [REDACTED], was [REDACTED], entitled [REDACTED]

The reviewer who complained, [REDACTED] of [REDACTED], referred OIG to two papers that were the original sources of sentences that appeared in the subject's proposal. OIG discovered a third such paper as well.

When we wrote to the subject, he explained that he did not realize that his action had been inappropriate and that in his proposal he had appropriately referenced all ideas not original to himself. OIG concluded that a scientist reading the sentences in question and believing that the subject himself had written them would not have credited the subject with ideas that were not original to him.

OIG decided that the nature and amount of the material that had been included in the proposal without appropriate attribution were such that the subject's action could not be considered a **serious** deviation from accepted practices and, hence, misconduct in science. We wrote to the subject explaining the appropriate procedures for citing and quoting material drawn from other authors and noting that he should express familiar ideas in language that is original to himself.

This inquiry is closed and no further action will be taken on this case.