

Dear Ms. Wallace,

January 30, 2016

Further allegation of institutional non-compliance against Queen's University:

Re: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

As far as I am aware, Queen's University has not addressed the allegation of redundant publication and self-plagiarism against the [REDACTED] author. [REDACTED] This is in non-compliance with the agency policy. I request that the SRCR require the University to conduct an inquiry into specific allegations in a manner consistent with the agency policy.

A copy of the above paper is attached. Many parts are copied without acknowledgement from papers #2, 3, and 4 (listed in Appendix A, below).

Sections copied from the previously published papers are highlighted and include:

Abstract,

Data presented in many graphs and tables.

Text associated with the results.

Experimental and theoretical approach, and

Conclusions

Materials copied from Paper #2 are highlighted in yellow. Materials copied from Paper #3 are highlighted in pink, and materials copied from Paper #4 are highlighted in blue.

Nowhere in the Geotechnical paper have the authors acknowledged the source of the recycled text and data. Quite the opposite; the authors clearly give the impression that the materials presented are all original and have not been published previously. For example, on the first page of the [REDACTED] the authors claim:

[REDACTED]

This claim is not valid: an earlier work published in [REDACTED] by the authors (Paper #2, below) has indeed reported [REDACTED]

In fact, extensive text and data recycled in the [REDACTED] paper are copied from Paper #2 without acknowledgement of the source or justification. The authors could have disclosed the extensive overlap to the editor at any time before publication in [REDACTED]. There is also concern about possible copyright infringements as it appears that the authors failed to seek permission to reproduce copyrighted material.

The federal framework for the responsible conduct of research lists redundant publications as a breach of the rules governing federally funded research. The framework defines redundant publication as "*re-publication of one's own previously published work or part thereof, or data, in the same or another language, without adequate acknowledgment of the source, or justification.*"

The authors have engaged in "self-plagiarism" as defined by Queen's University. According to Section 4f of the Queen's University Senate Policy, research misconduct includes: "*Submission for publication of articles published elsewhere, or parts thereof, or data, in the same or another language, except where clearly indicated to be a republication with appropriate acknowledgement of the source and justification.*"

It is particularly important to note that the finite elements data presented in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] are identical to data presented in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] paper except for the omission of the [REDACTED]

Likewise, [REDACTED] given in [REDACTED] are identical to data presented in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] paper, except for the modification and omission of some labels.

These identical results are unexpected because the profiled [REDACTED] investigated in the two papers are quite different from each other. The [REDACTED] used in the [REDACTED] paper is a [REDACTED] whereas the [REDACTED] used in the [REDACTED] paper appears to be [REDACTED] of the paper #2).

As shown in paper #4, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] This suggests data substitution, in which data sets for distinct physical conditions show unreasonable similarity to each other.

I would like these allegations to be investigated in accordance with Queen's University's Research Integrity Policy and the Tri-Agency Framework: Responsible Conduct of Research (the Framework).

Please let me know if you need further information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M. Shirkhanzadeh".

M. Shirkhanzadeh

Appendix A:

