

Karen Wallace
Senior Advisor
Secretariat on Responsible Conduct of Research
350 Albert Street
Ottawa, ON K1A 1H5

February 11, 2016

Dear Ms. Wallace,

[Allegation of institutional non-compliance Against Memorial University of Newfoundland \(MUN\) , Re:](#) [REDACTED]

This complaint is concerned with the manner in which Memorial University conducted an investigation into the allegations of redundant publication submitted on March 09, 2015.

A copy of the allegations and supporting documents was also sent to Queen's University because the second author was employed at Queen's (attached).

On April 27, 2015, Queen's University confirmed that it had received a letter from [REDACTED] (first author) wherein [REDACTED] explicitly acknowledged that "[REDACTED] submitted the paper to the Journal of Civil Engineering without [REDACTED]'s knowledge". It seems therefore that not only was the paper extensively copied from previous publications without acknowledgement of the source but there is also a problem with the authorship.

As far as I am aware the paper has not been corrected or retracted. The paper is clearly on public display for readers and peer reviewers to see with both authors claiming credit for authorship. The paper gives the false impression that the work is original and that the researchers are more productive than they actually are. The failure to correct the record contravenes the Federal Tri-Agency policies: The Federal Framework lists 'Invalid authorship' as a breach of the rules governing federally funded research.

The Framework defines 'Invalid authorship' as:

"Inaccurate attribution of authorship, including attribution of authorship to persons other than those who have contributed sufficiently to take responsibility for the intellectual content, or"

agreeing to be listed as author to a publication for which one made little or no material contribution.”

The Framework also lists ‘Misrepresentation in an Agency Application or Related Document’ as a breach of the rules governing federally funded research.

Memorial University did not address the issues in a transparent manner. The University did not determine whether a breach of Agency policy had occurred and it did not provide the complainants with an opportunity to be heard as part of the process of determining the validity of an allegation, as required by section 4.3.4 (b) of the Framework. This is in non-compliance with the Agency policies.

I request that the SRCR require the institution to conduct an investigation in a manner consistent with the Framework and correct the record in a transparent manner. The University should take the requirement for transparency seriously. How else can a complainant be sure that his/her concerns have been adequately addressed?

Sincerely,



M. Shirkhanzadeh