



April 25, 2005

[Redacted]

Dear [Redacted]

Re: Allegation of Misconduct in Academic Research-
Papers Published by [Redacted] in [Redacted]

I am writing this letter in accordance with [Redacted] of the Collective Agreement. I am referring to the following papers by [Redacted]:

1. [Redacted]
2. [Redacted]

Copies of the papers are enclosed.

[Redacted]

This paper describes research that has been funded by [Redacted]. It contains materials or data that have been either plagiarized or fabricated. The paper has been accepted for publication through a conference and it appears that it has been edited by the co-editor of the conference who is the corresponding author in the paper. This paper contains significant materials plagiarized from the work of [Redacted]. A substantial part of this paper including results presented in the Tables [Redacted] are shared with another paper published in the [Redacted]. As discussed previously (letters of Feb. 22 and March 22, 2005), the overall integrity of the paper published in [Redacted] is questionable. In the paper published in [Redacted] results [Redacted] These results are equally relevant to the [Redacted] paper. Furthermore, [Redacted] are given in Table [Redacted] in both papers that appear to have been intentionally shifted. The [Redacted] can be found in another paper [Redacted]

This paper also describes research that has been funded by [Redacted]. It contains [Redacted] results that have been self-plagiarized or falsified. This paper has been accepted for publication through a conference and it appears that it has been edited by the co-editor of the conference who is the corresponding author in the paper. The most serious problem in this paper is data falsification. This allegation speaks directly to the question of scientific misconduct. Here, one of the important conclusions of the paper is that [Redacted]

[Redacted] The authors have tried to demonstrate this [Redacted]

[Redacted]

The [redacted] that has been demonstrated in Fig. [redacted] is truly remarkable. [redacted] from the [redacted]

It has come to light now that the authors have intentionally eliminated some of the earlier experimental data from Fig. [redacted] in order to get a [redacted]. Some of the [redacted] that have been eliminated can be found in an earlier publication [redacted]

The authors have selectively eliminated these [redacted] because when included, the [redacted] cannot be claimed any longer. In a paper, which appears on the web-site of [redacted] the authors claim that they have [redacted]

It appears that the authors had more than [redacted] that they could use in Fig. [redacted] but selectively used only those [redacted]. In this case, the selection process is so prejudiced as to constitute data falsification. Similar data falsification is also noted in Figure [redacted]. Some of the [redacted] appear to have been eliminated in order to [redacted] have been changed.

Another conclusion that the authors wish to draw in this paper is that "[redacted] Again, in Figure [redacted] the authors have intentionally eliminated the [redacted]. When these [redacted] are included in Fig. [redacted] one can easily see that in fact [redacted]. The eliminated [redacted] are shown in a previous publication [redacted]

The preponderance of the evidence given here suggests that the author (s) committed scientific misconduct, specifically data falsification, in this case.

Sincerely,

[redacted signature]

Enc.