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**Strictly Confidential**

24 May 2023

School Discipline Committee

**Sent by email to:** [conduct@hw.ac.uk](mailto:conduct@hw.ac.uk)

Dear School Discipline Committee members,

I, Dayanandan Natarajan, received an email from Dr Joe Wells on 17/05/2023 and from Student Conduct on 19/05/2023, on ‘Investigation into Alleged Academic Misconduct’ which I would like to disagree, provided nowhere in this dissertation I have never shown someone’s work as mine nor taken credit for someone’s work. This dissertation is done completely by me with the guidance of Dr Joe Wells and documented by me with reference materials from Dr Joe Wells and other authors, which are appropriately cited.

Before I give my justification or explanation on this allegation, I would like to give a brief introduction about this dissertation which will help members to understand about this dissertation and the allegation. Few years ago, Dr Joe Wells have developed a product called ‘smlnj-script’ which is an enhancement on top of SML/NJ, an SML (Standard Markup Language) implementation. He has added few features and capabilities to SML/NJ and it was maintained as a standalone and not merged with SML/NJ.

My dissertation was focused on merging these capabilities into SML/NJ and work with SML implementors to get this released. With the guidance of Dr Joe Wells, I researched and analysed ‘smlnj-script’ and ‘SML/NJ’, identified the place of entry, made appropriate changes into SML/NJ to merge these capabilities, reached out to SML/NJ implementors and submitted my work to get it merged with SML/NJ. All along this work was monitored by and reviewed with Dr Joe Wells.

*“- Whether you accept or deny the allegation, and your reasons why. “*

In reply to this allegation, I can confirm with full confidence I have not taken credit for someone’s work nor copied someone’s work as mine in this document. Before I go into details, I would like to point out the comments made by complainant, my dissertation supervisor Dr Joe Wells, in his incident report,

“

* *Most (but not all) of the copied text is not very important for explaining the project.*
* *A contributing factor might be that the student has quite a lot of difficulty with English.*
* *The student has been quite careful in other aspects of their work to be clear about the precise boundaries between what the student produced and what is the work of other people.*
* *The student's technical work is reasonably good and the student achieved a reasonable degree of success on a quite technically challenging objective.*

*“*

My supervisor’s comment above itself is evident that I have not claimed someone’s work as mine, and I haven’t committed a serious plagiarism. I see my mistake here as the citations were incomplete or not correctly cited or referenced in the document. I will explain more in detail in the following section.

*“- Explain how you believe the similarity to other source(s) has arisen. “*

The complainant has pointed out four instances, which I would like to explain in detail.

**For instance 1**

**Allegation** - Sections 2.6 and 2.7 from pages 15-19, were copied from git repo “README” file.

**Response** – I have clearly called out in the dissertation in the previous sections prior to 2.6 and 2.7, “smlnj-script” is a work of Dr Joe Wells and the sections 2.6 and 2.7 explains about this product and his work on “smlnj-script”. I have explained about this product based on what Dr Joe Wells verbally explained to me and the materials he shared with me from git repo. The product is owned by Dr Joe Wells and I have only explained about what it does in this section. I tried to use my own words as much as possible to explain this. The biggest challenge I had here is trying to explain in my own words and rephrasing changes the technical meaning of what the product feature does, so wherever I must use the exact words I have cited them appropriately. I see my mistake here is, missing the quotations and not cited in all the sections.

**For instance 2**

**Allegation** -

**Response -**

**For instance 3**

**Allegation** -

**Response -**

**For instance 4**

**Allegation** -

**Response -**

*“- Explain how you have approached your work.”*

Considering the nature of this dissertation and technical challenges, I was in regular meeting with my supervisor Dr Joe Wells, at least one a week i.e., in person at his Riccarton campus office or through Microsoft Teams. In between, for any technical queries or challenges we exchanged emails. Once the dissertation phase started, my task started with understanding the product “smlnj-script”, how it works and what it does. Dr Joe Wells has explained me on numerous occasions about “smlnj-script” and SML. Then I moved on to understand how SML/NJ works. Once I identified where to tap into, I must perform numerous trial and errors and different approaches. All along, I took advice from Dr Joe Wells since I must be very careful in coding standards, good practises and quality and tried not to get rejected by the language implementors.

*- You should also include any supporting documentation if you are claiming any mitigating or extenuating circumstances which you wish the Committee to consider.*

Yours sincerely,

Dayanandan Natarajan,  
H00393941,  
+447778143521 / +919886313572,  
[dn2007@hw.ac.uk](mailto:dn2007@hw.ac.uk)