

Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists

Carl Taswell
Brain Health Alliance
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org

Abstract

Accountability for integrity in research publishing has been abandoned at some journals and universities. Published reports have proven the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles from the PORTAL-DOORS Principles previously published by Taswell almost a decade earlier. Despite the flagrant plagiarism in this Wilkinson case, it has not yet been retracted by the journals involved. Complaints submitted by Taswell to publishers and integrity offices were disregarded or denied, thereby enabling the plagiarists to spread their plagiarism with impunity. The case study reported here details an account of one of these sham investigations. Investigators aided and abetted the plagiarists by imposing a requirement of confidentiality on the complainant, excluding the documentary evidence submitted by the complainant, and engaging in protracted delays that failed to slow the propagating plagiarism. Investigations of plagiarism should be conducted openly with public debate as done for jury trials in courts of law.

Keywords: Research integrity, publishing ethics, peer-review of peer-review, idea-laundering plagiarism, idea-bleaching censorship.

Plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of Taswell

Craig et al. (2019) and C. Taswell (2024a) have proven the flagrant plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles paraphrased without citation from the PORTAL-DOORS Principles previously published by Taswell almost a decade earlier (C. Taswell, 2007, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a). In an effort to combat this case of plagiarism, an entire body of work has been published in which Brain Health Alliance co-authors have introduced the concepts of equivalent entities (Athreya et al., 2020; Craig et al., 2019), idea-laundering plagiarism, and idea-bleaching censorship (S. K. Taswell et al., 2020), provided our definitions and criteria for mis-information, dis-information, anti-information, caco-information, and

mal-information (S. K. Taswell et al., 2021), and documented the unfairness of the promoters of the FAIR principles (Craig et al., 2019, 2023a, 2023b; C. Taswell, 2024a, 2024b). Despite numerous efforts to persuade the plagiarists to correct the omissions of citation, and to request the publishers to retract the plagiarism, the publishers of the journals involved in this case have abandoned accountability for integrity, and instead, have adopted a permissiveness for willful disregard of publishing ethics by authors and editors (C. Taswell, 2022, 2023).

In addition to the item-by-item comparison analysis done by Craig et al. (2019), the recent report by C. Taswell (2024a) documented the evidence and proved this plagiarism by Wilkinson et al. Due to the plagiarists' persistent refusal to correct the omissions of citation of the original work and original author, and the journals' refusal to retract the plagiarism or otherwise to address the matter in any manner publicly with open scientific discussion of the historical record of published literature, this case of plagiarism has now grown to become the largest case of plagiarism in the modern history of science, engineering, and medicine as measured by citation counts and grant dollars. The appendix [Evidence Summary](#) provides a concise sequence of events and evidence concerning this case of plagiarism. The claim of largest case of plagiarism in modern history will be documented with quantitative numerical data analyzing the citation counts and grant dollars in a separate manuscript in this series of reports with main title Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters. Moreover, to tell the entire story of this failure of peer review over the past 15 years will require more than just the three different chapters already written. Herein, this report documents one of those chapters: a case study with an example account of the complaint investigation misconduct often known as a kangaroo court investigation (C. Taswell, 2024a).

Rebuttal to LUMC Respondent Defense

The analysis by C. Taswell (2024a) was initially prepared and written during the second half of 2019 and the first half of 2020 without knowledge and awareness of the events and information described in important evidentiary documents that had been previously withheld from him. However, on 27 July 2020, the Committee for Scientific Integrity at Leiden University Medical Center sent via email and disclosed to C. Taswell a copy of the letter of defense dated 9 April 2020 from Barend Mons. The copy of Mons' statement of defense included copies of his correspondence from Andrew Hufton dated 3 June 2019 and 3 July 2019, from Mark Musen dated 5 July 2019, and Mons' correspondence dated 12 June 2019 to all co-authors of the Wilkins et al papers. With discussion in response to the Mons-Hufton-Musen correspondence received by C. Taswell on 27 July 2020, this section analyzes their claims with the following numbered observations labeled with R in rebuttal to Respondent defenses:

R1) All material provided by Barend Mons now serves as evidence both supportive and confirmatory of the analysis as documented in the report by C. Taswell (2024a) of their plagiarism followed by their denial of the truth, then further exacerbated by their censorship of Taswell's concerns regarding those who plagiarized, colluded in the cover-up, and then blamed the victim of their plagiarism. There has been a breakdown and failure of the peer-review process with explicit violations of the COPE publishing ethics and rules for academic research integrity because of the personal and political relationships between the individuals participating in the cover-up. The three authors of the email correspondence provided with Mons' defense letter, who are Barend Mons himself, Andrew Hufton and Mark Musen, are all compromised by their conflicts of interest that result from the relationships between Mark Musen at Stanford Biomedical Informatics, two of his former Stanford students Andrew Hufton and Michel Dumontier, multiple other student and fellow alumni of Stanford Biomedical Informatics who have been involved in this matter, and also Barend Mons with the long-standing relationship that has existed between Mark Musen and Barend Mons. As both a graduate and former employee of Stanford University, Taswell himself has experienced the cultures of different departments across the university, and knows many of the persons involved from having spent many years at Stanford University. Mark Musen led the Stanford Biomedical Informatics research group with a culture that was exclusive of others, who were considered outside his inner circle because they were not in his department. Instead, Taswell served in other departments at Stanford where

he obtained a PhD in computational mathematics and where he practiced clinical care in psychiatric medicine.

R2) Mark Musen and his biomedical informatics group at Stanford have received millions of dollars in grant funding for more than the past decade. Unfortunately, Musen's financial conflict of interest has led him to promote only his own funded work and that of his former students and colleagues, while refusing to cite the work of a competitor even though expected by the Nature Publishing requirements, the COPE publishing ethics, and standards of academic and research integrity. Barend Mons has received grant funding related to the plagiarized material in amounts which LUMC could verify from its own university financial records. Grant funding received by Mons creates his financial conflict of interest. Both Mons and Musen, with their financial conflicts of interest and with their powerful influence over their exclusive clique of insiders who only cite each other, continue to refuse to cite Taswell as they have for at least the past decade now since the original publication and presentation of Taswell's work. Initially, this competing and directly related work by Taswell, which should be cited by Musen and his friends, was presented at and published by numerous SNMMI, AMIA, IEEE and W3C conferences, workshops and journals in the years 2006 to 2011, and since that initial 5-year time period, has been continued in the more recent 10-year time period of 2015 to 2024.

R3) All three of the persons, Barend Mons, Andrew Hufton, and Mark Musen, who exchanged the correspondence provided with Mons' defense letter, failed to provide any substantive arguments for the continued refusal to cite Taswell with any rational logical explanations consistent with ordinary use of plain language regarding how or why the concepts, ideas, and principles presented by Wilkinson et al in 2016 were in any way new or different from those same principles previously published by Taswell in 2007, other than to engage in nonsensical sophistry that does not hold up in the court of public opinion and that would never be sustained in a court of law.

R4) The argument written by Barend Mons dated 5 June 2019, and repeated 9 April 2020, claiming non-plagiarism (ie, that plagiarism did not occur) because of a falsely alleged distinction between Wilkinson et al 2016 as "principles" versus Taswell 2007 as "application" remains nothing but irrational nonsense. Taswell 2007 both described principles in his published papers and implemented an application at a publicly accessible website. The fact that Taswell 2007 implemented an application does not invalidate the fact that Taswell 2007 also published his PORTAL-DOORS principles. Here are the facts: All FAIR principles published by Wilkinson et

al 2016 were previously published as PORTAL-DOORS principles by Taswell 2007. Stated conversely, Taswell 2007 described and published all of the principles that were subsequently plagiarized by Wilkinson et al 2016. The fact that Taswell also implemented his principles in his application, whereas Wilkinson et al did not implement the Taswell principles in a Wilkinson et al application, do not invalidate the fact that Wilkinson et al plagiarized all of their principles from Taswell's published work.

R5) The argument written by Andrew Hufton dated 3 July 2019 claiming non-plagiarism failed to provide any rational substantive explanation for his blithe disregard and dismissal of the evidence and analysis provided in the IEEE 2019 ECAI Conference paper available open access at [ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0618.pdf](#) and published by Craig et al. (2019). In addition, Hufton willfully disregarded the evidence submitted to him proving that the Wilkinson et al co-authors did not develop their principles "independently" as they claimed. That's because he disregarded the evidence proving direct communication and interaction in person at conferences between key plagiarizing co-authors (Michel Dumontier, Maryann Martone, Carol Goble, and Timothy Clark) of the Wilkinson et al papers and the plagiarized author Taswell who was the victim of their plagiarism. Thus, disregarding the evidence submitted to him, Hufton chose simply to support his friends and ignore their flagrant plagiarism.

R6) The argument written by Mark Musen dated 5 July 2019 claiming non-plagiarism failed to provide any explanation for his own independent opinion. Musen did not provide any substantive evidence or argument other than to refer to one of the plagiarists, Mark Wilkinson, and claim that Wilkinson "would not have cited... Taswell's paper." Musen's opinion also referred to that of the "editor of Nature Scientific Data" while failing to disclose that this person was his former student at Stanford Biomedical Informatics. Thus, Musen failed to perform his own independent peer review based on actual evidence and analysis substantiated by rational logic. As a consequence, Musen violated peer-review standards, COPE publishing ethics, and colluded in the defamation of one of his competitors in his field of research by repeating the false claims of others with whom he shares a common agenda and obvious conflicts of interest, all of which prevent him from writing an objective impartial peer review. More specifically, in an ironic and hypocritical contradiction of his own published work, Musen failed to address an evaluation of the ordinary use of plain language words in the writing of research papers. This failure of analysis omitted what should have been required by simple examination with the ordinary human ability to recognize synonyms

and equivalent concepts in two similar papers, or alternatively, the more formal scientific methods of word mapping with the mapping correspondence between similar words, concepts, and ideas when comparing two similar papers or two similar ontologies as done in the ontology engineering that Musen himself promotes in his own published work about ontologies. Thus, Musen's biased opinion taking a position against Taswell lacks evidence, reason, substance, and credibility.

R7) However, a plausible rational argument does exist that Mons, Hufton, and Musen could have provided against Taswell's claim of historical priority: Any one of the three could have found and cited a paper published in the literature in some year before 2007 by some author who also similarly collected and described all of the same principles as done by Taswell in 2007 before Taswell's collection was plagiarized by Wilkinson et al in 2016. If such a published paper can be found, then Taswell will correct his omission of citation of this hypothetical paper, and readily cite the some author from some year before 2007 as he has always done throughout his scholarly research career to correct any concerns about missing citations and attributions of authorship for work published in the medical scientific literature. However, neither Mons nor Hufton nor Musen have yet to identify and cite this hypothetical paper from the literature. Unless either Mons, Hufton, or Musen find and provide an appropriate citation for a paper with historical priority before Taswell's paper in 2007, then they should properly cite Taswell's 2007 paper and refrain from plagiarizing it.

R8) Barend Mons also misrepresented Mark Musen's email dated 5 July 2019 to the members of ACMI as "public" when it was distributed to a group of insiders at ACMI within AMIA. However, it was not "public" in the sense that Taswell was excluded, never informed, and never allowed to read what Musen wrote about Taswell to others within AMIA. Taswell never even knew about it in July of 2019, and thus, he was never given the opportunity to defend himself against Musen's attacks on him within AMIA. In fact, Taswell was excluded from receiving copies of any of the correspondence written by any of the colluding primary and secondary plagiarists in June and July of 2019. Taswell was not informed about their cover-up and did not receive copies of their correspondence until he received the documents a year later on 27 July 2020 with Barend Mons' letter of defense. Thus, it appears that in support of their collusionary cover-up with Barend Mons, both Andrew Hufton and Mark Musen violated many of the basic ethical requirements for honorable peer review and for a non-retaliatory and transparent investigation of a concern or complaint from a scholar with honesty and integrity concerned about reporting the truth and

correcting a matter of plagiarism in the published record of scientific literature.

R9) Barend Mons also violated the rules of investigations that should have required him to maintain confidentiality concerning such investigations of plagiarism with his act of publicly announcing Taswell's concerns to all other co-authors of the Wilkinson et al papers, at a time when neither Mons nor Hufton disclosed this action to Taswell. Thus, effectively, Mons and Hufton solicited the cooperation and collusion of all other Wilkinson et al co-authors in aligning them against Taswell before the private confidential investigation was completed and reported as resolved by the initial parties involved and required to maintain confidentiality. Moreover, Taswell never agreed with Andrew Hufton's censorship of the matter and his attempt to cover it up. Andrew Hufton dismissed and ignored Taswell's follow-up correspondence requesting a more appropriate and satisfactory correction of the matter and resolution of the dispute in July of 2019. Taswell also submitted follow-up inquiries to management at Nature Publishing in August of 2019 and in September of 2019 complaining about Andrew Hufton's cover-up and failure to address the problem, but these follow-up inquiries to management were also ignored by the publisher which claims to adhere to the COPE rules. Moreover, just because one person (Barend Mons) broke the rules of confidentiality of an investigation does not excuse nor exempt another person (Andrew Hufton) from also breaking the rules of an investigation that should have remained private and confidential. Both Barend Mons and Andrew Hufton (a) broke confidentiality by soliciting the cooperation of all Wilkinson et al co-authors and other secondary plagiarists such as Mark Musen in June of 2019, (b) without either Mons or Hufton disclosing to Taswell what they were doing at the time with their violation of privacy and confidentiality, (c) without first obtaining Taswell's agreement as a confidential complainant that the matter had been resolved satisfactorily before going public with their announcements as they did to the much larger group of all co-authors of both Wilkinson et al papers, and (d) without either Mons, Hufton or any other administrative investigator at Nature Publishing ever informing Taswell about their disclosures of his complaint to all other Wilkinson et al co-authors and numerous other secondary plagiarists such as Mark Musen. Alternatively, it is necessary to infer that the complaint investigators misled Taswell as complainant to believe that confidentiality was required for all parties and not just the complainant. Therefore, this sequence of events with the resulting situation raises important questions about academic and research integrity and ethics: Q1: Should all co-authors of the Wilkinson et al plagiarizing papers now be named responsible and

held accountable as plagiarizing co-authors in continuing formal complaints and appeals against their collusionary primary and secondary plagiarism, denial, and cover-up? Q2: Should the plagiarism complaint remain limited only to the 3 co-authors Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons, and Mark Wilkinson originally named in this report as the 3 co-authors most responsible and accountable? Q3: Should Andrew Hufton and Mark Musen also be named for contributing to propagating secondary plagiarism because of the manner in which they contributed to the denial and cover-up of the original primary plagiarism?

R10) Integrity and ethics questions persist also about the unprofessional conduct of these 5 persons Dumontier, Mons, Wilkinson, Hufton, and Musen whose actions and written documents have been discussed in this report. If these primary and secondary plagiarists are not guilty of their plagiarism, then why have they remained so invested both in refusing to cite Taswell's published papers, refusing to publish any Letter to the Editor with commentary and discussion from Taswell about the papers which the plagiarists refused to cite, and in attempting to silence, suppress, and censor Taswell's concerns about both the plagiarism and the journal's refusal to allow a competing author to publish an alternative position on a scientific topic? Should the plagiarism of Dumontier, Mons, Wilkinson, Hufton, and Musen be ignored in a scientific field of research inquiry which they appear to consider their own private exclusive domain with de facto control over which investigators receive grant funding? For more than a decade, Musen et al have refused to cite Taswell even though they have known about his work. For the past 5 years since Taswell's formal complaints began in the spring of 2019, these 5 plagiarists have engaged in continuing their secondary propagating plagiarism in which they have repeated, spread, and promoted both their primary plagiarism and now their secondary plagiarism. They have done so shamelessly also by attempting to defame the reputation of Taswell with written libel that first occurred in June 2019 with events about which Taswell did not even discover their occurrence until more than a year later in July 2020. Why have Dumontier, Mons, Wilkinson, Hufton, and Musen refused to cite fairly Taswell as one of their competitors as required by the COPE publishing ethics? Why have they refused to engage in an open public debate of the actual substantive scientific content, concepts, ideas and principles that should be the focus of an honorable debate conducted by competing authors who cite and discuss each other's published work, and by editors who encourage this scientific debate — instead of suppressing and censoring the open scientific debate with a continued refusal to cite while also simultaneously violating the privacy rules that

should govern confidential investigations of misconduct? What do they have to hide if not their own violations of academic integrity, research integrity, and COPE publishing ethics?

Rebuttal to LUMC Committee Defense

The author of the report C. Taswell (2024a), written initially in 2019 and documenting confidentially at that time a flagrant case of plagiarism, received an opinion with a provisional ruling communicated in a letter dated 29 September 2020 from the Executive Board of Leiden University Medical Center (LUMC) based on the report dated 2 September 2020 from the LUMC Committee on Academic Integrity. The provisional ruling by the LUMC Board declared that the submitted report of plagiarism was “unfounded”. However, the LUMC Board ruling remains fundamentally flawed and invalid because of the explanations that have been provided in documented evidence previously submitted for review by the LUMC Committee and Board, but ignored and excluded by them and not even mentioned in their opinion. In response to the LUMC provisional ruling, the author of the report C. Taswell (2024a) provided the following analysis and discussion written in 2020. The numbered observations are labeled with C in rebuttal to Committee defenses:

C1) The LUMC report has not made a good faith attempt to review and present evidence in an impartial and objective manner in an effort to pursue the truth and report the truth. The LUMC report excludes any mention of the extensive documented evidence proving the plagiarism submitted by the complainant. Instead, the report adopts an entirely one-sided argument favorable to the respondent plagiarist, Barend Mons, defending him by supporting his arguments and by misrepresenting the evidence of his violations of academic and research integrity with misleading and falsified arguments (a) that blame Taswell despite the fact that he has been victimized by the plagiarism, (b) that fail to address the definition and criteria relevant to proving or disproving plagiarism, and (c) that ignore, disregard, and/or censor the most relevant facts, evidence and truth of the matter which are not reviewed, discussed, or even mentioned.

C2) The LUMC report misrepresents the evidence by making provably false claims with their incorrect arguments falsely alleging the non-availability of Taswell’s published papers and patents, falsely alleging a lack of communication between Taswell and the plagiarizing authors, and falsely alleging the plagiarizing authors’ lack of knowledge and awareness of Taswell’s previously published papers and patents. Six of the plagiarizing co-authors of the Wilkinson et al FAIR

principles attended a 2009 workshop where Taswell presented his PORTAL-DOORS principles in person with face-to-face conversations with them during his talk which was featured as the hour-long presentation held during the lunch session of that workshop. In addition, Taswell held other one-on-one conversations with at least four of those six plagiarizing authors throughout the day of that workshop. Most notably, Taswell had conversations with Dumontier during the day and also at the dinner of that workshop. There can be no claim by Dumontier, or by any of the other plagiarists who attended this 2009 workshop, which attempts to feign ignorance of Taswell’s published papers, or otherwise attempts to claim any lack of knowledge or awareness of Taswell’s published papers and patents. There can be no false claim that Taswell’s published papers and patents ‘magically and mysteriously’ disappeared between the 2009 workshop and the 2014 workshop. There can be no false claim that Dumontier and the other plagiarists forgot about their conversations and interactions with Taswell during the 2009 workshop, or that somehow they are not intelligent enough to remember those conversations and interactions. At least six of the plagiarizing co-authors of the Wilkinson et al papers cannot falsely claim that they were not aware of Taswell’s published papers and patents.

C3) The LUMC Committee did not act in good faith to discover and report the truth as a consequence of their biased and unfair process, that was neither objective nor impartial, in which they repeatedly favored and defended the respondent while disadvantaging the complainant. It did so by not providing the complainant with a copy of the respondent’s letter of defense until 2020 July 27 more than a month after the date that the hearing was held on 2020 June 10. Thus, the complainant was disadvantaged at the hearing. The LUMC Committee also failed to inform the complainant that the committee had obtained their own LUMC advisor to provide a biased defense of the respondent, failed to provide the complainant with a copy of the LUMC advisor’s report, failed to give the complainant an opportunity to respond to the LUMC advisor’s report, and has not given the complainant an opportunity to submit his own advisor’s report to counter the fallacious arguments of the LUMC advisor. Thus, the complainant was disadvantaged when preparing his rebuttal to the respondent’s letter of defense.

C4) Remarks found in the LUMC Committee report about the LUMC advisor’s report suggest that the advisor’s report contains nothing but irrelevant ‘straw man’ arguments. Noting again that the complainant has not yet been given a copy of the LUMC advisor’s report, based on what has been paraphrased and mentioned in the LUMC Committee report, the complainant does not

consider their advisor an independent “expert” because he has participated in the Committee’s falsification and/or exclusion of the evidence submitted by the complainant. A true independent expert would never participate in such a misguided and mistaken analysis. Moreover, it remains an irrelevant ‘straw man’ argument by any person (regardless of whether labeled an advisor or expert) who wishes to characterize the plagiarism of Barend Mons and the Wilkinson et al co-authors as either “top-down”, “bottom-up”, or any other direction including sideways or diagonally. Such characterizations remain irrelevant to the three most basic and fundamental questions about plagiarism: (a) Is the content of the plagiarizing paper the same as or different from the content of the plagiarized paper, regardless of whether the plagiarized paper has additional content not found in the plagiarizing paper? Note that plagiarizing only part of, even if not all of, a previously published paper nevertheless constitutes plagiarism, especially when everything found in the plagiarizing paper can be found in the plagiarized paper. (b) Did the plagiarism occur, as explained in [Taswell et al 2020](#) “Hitchhiker’s Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity”, intentionally as sophisticated malign idea-laundering plagiarism (also known as purposeful misappropriation of ideas), or unintentionally with a relatively benign form of idea plagiarism such as cryptomnesia or citation amnesia? (c) When confronted about the plagiarism, did the plagiarists respond appropriately to correct the omission of citation or inappropriately with lies and denials of the plagiarism that further attacked and blamed the victim who was plagiarized?

C5) Other sundry arguments made by the LUMC respondent, advisor, and Committee remain just as irrelevant regardless of the item mentioned whether citation counts of the papers, number and size of organizations and their members, nature of publications as research article versus consensus document, or blaming Taswell for not attending the 2014 workshop while not acknowledging and reporting the attendance of six of the plagiarists at the 2009 workshop. None of these arguments, somehow attacking or blaming the victim Taswell, pertain to an evaluation and determination of whether the plagiarists committed plagiarism.

C5a) The numbers argument with regard to citation counts and size of member organizations essentially makes the claim that power, money, grant funding, and ‘might makes right’ to silence the less powerful or less wealthy. Another restatement of that fallacious argument would be to paraphrase it as the immoral and unethical claim that the rich can steal from the poor merely because the rich are rich and the poor are poor without addressing the question of whether the rich have committed the crime of theft from the poor.

C5b) With regard to the matter of attendance at the 2009 and 2014 workshops, what is relevant is the fact that the plagiarists attended the 2009 workshop and spoke in person with Taswell and knew about his published papers. It is not relevant to an evaluation of plagiarism by Wilkinson et al co-authors that Taswell did not attend the 2014 workshop. No fewer than six of the Wilkinson et al co-authors attended the 2009 workshop and knew about Taswell’s published papers. Any of those six plagiarizing co-authors who attended the 2009 workshop could have invited Taswell to their 2014 workshop, but they failed to do so. Certainly, Michel Dumontier, as the self-proclaimed founder of the FAIR principles, spoke at length in person face-to-face with Taswell at the 2009 workshop. So why did Dumontier decline to invite, and otherwise fail to invite, Taswell to their 2014 workshop? Neither Taswell’s potential presence nor his potential absence at the 2014 workshop would have accorded the right to the Wilkinson et al co-authors including Barend Mons and Michel Dumontier to plagiarize from the previously published papers of Taswell regardless of the number of attendees, whether 50 or 500, who participated in their 2014 workshop. In fact, consider the situation where an author can no longer attend any conferences because he is dead. In this scenario, the deceased author nevertheless maintains rights for his published works to be cited properly and correctly according to scholarly traditions and COPE publishing ethics. Thus, even in the situation in which Taswell could have died in the years between the 2009 workshop and the 2014 workshop, or have been unavailable to attend the 2014 workshop for any number of other reasons, his published papers and patents should have been cited without plagiarizing them. No moral, ethical, or legal requirement exists for Taswell to attend any workshop held in 2014 or any later year after Taswell had already published numerous papers and patents in the years 2007 to 2011, all of which were easily searchable and findable via different search tools and databases including of course the most widely and easily available search service at Google. The plagiarizing co-authors cannot claim that they do not know how to use the search service at Google or any of the other search services that have arisen at many different scholarly research paper archive and search sites. The plagiarizing co-authors do not have the right to steal from an author of the original papers and patents, from an author who could have been deceased or otherwise unavailable, merely because they claim that the author did not attend their workshop when they did not invite him to their workshop. In fact, even if an author had become deceased or incapacitated and unable to attend, a complaint about the plagiarism of his published papers could be rightfully pursued by that author’s successor organization, his colleagues and

students, and/or his heirs in the case of a deceased author who is no longer alive to pursue the complaint and defend his or her own published work during his or her lifetime.

C5c) However, a requirement does exist for all publishing authors to cite and discuss the published literature without plagiarizing it, regardless of their venue of meeting and publishing, and regardless of whether they wish to claim to publish something that they call either a ‘consensus document’ or a ‘research article’. Moreover, when the victim who has been plagiarized confronts the plagiarists about the consensus document or research article with the true facts about the history of sources and origins of the content in that paper, then the plagiarizing authors who published the so-called ‘consensus document’ should welcome an open scientific debate that discusses the provable verifiable record of actual quotes with the words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs in the papers and patents published in the scientific literature. Welcoming an open scientific debate and correcting omissions of citation assumes that the plagiarism was unintentional and benign rather than intentional and malign. Instead of welcoming a public open scientific debate, the plagiarists have colluded in an effort to suppress and censor that scientific debate, whether at Nature Scientific Data or at the LUMC Committee investigating the violations of academic research integrity. This continuing attempt to silence and censor a public open scientific debate serves as the evidence that their intentions were, have been, and continue to be malign rather than benign.

C6) The only new idea introduced by the Wilkinson et al 2016 plagiarists was the ‘marketing and sales’ use of the acronym FAIR to rename and rebrand the PORTAL-DOORS principles published previously by Taswell 2007, and to give the deceptive and misleading impression that they were being fair when in fact they were not being fair. Otherwise Wilkinson et al 2016 published nothing new or different from Taswell 2007 as proven in the paper by [Craig et al 2019](#), which itemized in explicit detail as published in Tables III-VI of that paper the lists of comparison quotes proving that all FAIR principles can be found previously as PORTAL-DOORS principles. Restating for emphasis because it seems not to have been appreciated by the LUMC advisor and committee, every one of the FAIR principles plagiarized and published by Wilkinson et al 2016 can be found as a PORTAL-DOORS principle previously published by Taswell 2007. There is no practical, meaningful or substantive difference when the quotes are read and compared with a simple common ordinary interpretation of the natural use of vocabulary words in the English language. There are more than enough quotes, including many more that were not documented in the [Craig et al 2019](#) analysis, which can

be excerpted from the original papers and patents by Taswell and compared with the plagiarizing papers by Wilkinson et al to prove that the LUMC respondent, advisor, and committee have argued falsely without evidence to claim that the plagiarism complaint has been “unfounded”. Continuing attempts by LUMC to argue a difference in content or application and continuing attempts by LUMC to claim that plagiarism did not occur have been motivated and driven by either political and/or financial conflicts of interest in order to deny, cover-up, and whitewash the plagiarism as if it did not occur when in fact it did. If the LUMC Committee had pursued objective truth, then there would be no further debate about whether plagiarism occurred. Instead, the LUMC Committee would and should focus its attention on which co-authors should be held responsible and accountable. If the LUMC Committee wishes to pursue objective scientific truth in the future, and impose and enforce the rules against plagiarism, then there should be analysis and discussion of this moral and ethical question about academic research integrity concerning which of the 54 different co-authors of the two papers by Wilkinson et al (Wilkinson et al., [2016](#), [2018](#)) published in Nature Scientific Data should be held responsible and accountable for the plagiarism.

C7) Instead of responding with a rebuttal to all of the ‘straw man’ arguments found in the LUMC report that the complaint of plagiarism is “unfounded”, it is more ethically and legally relevant to address what the report has failed and refused to address about the sources of the material that Barend Mons plagiarized as explained above in R7. This explanation applies also to Dumontier and Wilkinson just as it does to Mons, Hufton, and Musen.

C8) In summary, the LUMC Committee report presents a biased one-sided argument defending the respondent in a manner that omits and excludes the substantive evidence proving the plagiarism submitted by the complainant. The LUMC report effectively denies the existence of idea plagiarism or else implies that the rules against idea plagiarism exist with enforcement only for LUMC students but not for LUMC professors. The LUMC respondent, advisor, and committee have engaged in a denial of the truth with a sophisticated but deceptive and falsified “smoke-and-mirrors” whitewash and cover-up of this case of plagiarism that has exempted all co-authors of the plagiarism from any duty or obligation to search, cite, and discuss the literature correctly. Instead, the LUMC respondent, advisor, and committee have provided nothing but inappropriate and unacceptable excuses for these plagiarists as if they are uneducated, ignorant, or naive students who have not yet learned how to search, study, review, and cite the literature correctly. Apparently, the LUMC

respondent, advisor, and committee believe that the plagiarists are incapable of doing so in conformance with minimal basic standards, and thus, incapable of serving as academic research scholars who should not only know the literature in their field of expertise, but also know how to search and cite the available and accessible published literature. The LUMC respondent, advisor, and committee cannot have it both ways claiming that their faculty professors such as Barend Mons and Michel Dumontier are “distinguished” professors and self-proclaimed leaders in their field, and yet, these so-called “distinguished” leaders of the field are allowed to feign ignorance, supposedly unaware of the published literature, and then be aided, abetted, and allowed to commit plagiarism? How can that be possible when it constitutes a fundamental inherent contradiction of both ‘fairness’ and ‘FAIRness’ as promoted by the plagiarists who claim to be fair?

As analyzed in this section in rebuttal to the defenses of both the LUMC Respondent and the LUMC Committee, this report has provided both the evidence and the arguments that explain why Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons, and Mark Wilkinson are the plagiarizing authors who should be held most responsible and accountable for the idea plagiarism and misappropriation of ideas published in the Wilkinson et al papers and their failure to search, cite and discuss the literature properly, as well as why Andrew Hufton and Mark Musen should be held most responsible and accountable for their participation in the censorship that blocked, silenced, and censored public open scientific debate at the journal Nature Scientific Data. Per the definitions and criteria for idea-laundering plagiarism and idea-bleaching censorship published in the [Hitchhiker’s Guide for Scholarly Research Integrity](#) S. K. Taswell et al., 2020, Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons, and Mark Wilkinson have committed idea-laundering plagiarism while Andrew Hufton and Mark Musen have engaged in idea-bleaching censorship. This report has not yet clarified a position on whether to identify by name any of the other co-authors of the Wilkinson et al papers who might also be considered ‘formally responsible and accountable’ for the plagiarism that has occurred not only with plagiarism by the primary plagiarists but also with extensive propagating plagiarism by the secondary and tertiary plagiarists. Stated simply, the promoters of the FAIR Principles have not acted in good faith with true scholarship and academic integrity. The International Center for [Academic Integrity](#) “defines academic integrity as a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six [fundamental values](#): honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.” Therefore, it is vital that the academic community be informed of the correct origin from the [PORTAL-DOORS Project](#)

of this collection of concepts, ideas, and principles by C. Taswell (2007, 2010a) renamed as the DREAM Principles by Craig et al. (2019), and that the promoters Wilkinson et al. (2016, 2018) of the so-called FAIR Principles failed to provide proper citation of the original sources from the historical record of published literature.

Conclusion with Recommendations

C. Taswell (2024a) was originally written in 2019. This report herein was originally written in 2020. Both documents were written at the time under the LUMC investigation’s stipulation of presumed confidentiality — which was never respected by the idea-laundering plagiarists and idea-bleaching censors involved with this case. Thus, references to confidentiality in the discussion above were written at the time in 2019-2020 with the assumption of confidentiality as the rules of engagement for debate. In contrast, now in 2024 reviewing this plagiarism case retrospectively, confidentiality benefited only the plagiarists and the censors who sought to engage in denialism and to protect the cashflow earned by their faculty who have made money and continue to make money fraudulently from the plagiarism. Therefore, complainants who are the victims of collusionary plagiarism by citation cartels should never agree to confidentiality for the investigation of any complaint about plagiarism. Nor should any sincere authentic research scholar fear a complaint. If the scholar has nothing to hide, then the scholar should not be afraid to participate in public open scientific debate of the historical record of published literature.

Controlling and curing the plague of plagiarism and other forms of misconduct in academia will require courage on the part of all participants who wish to promote teaching, education, research, and true scholarship. Some have excused their silence and inaction by pleading that they do not wish to be the ‘science police’. Many have engaged in one or more of the four forms of non-response to complaints: the silent treatment, the pass-the-buck treatment, the sham investigation, and the kangaroo court investigation (C. Taswell, 2024a). But what is the meaning, relevance, or value of any professional code of ethics and conduct if it is never enforced? As discussed by C. Taswell (2024b),

“... a new approach must be adopted and implemented by those scientists who remain committed to truth in science and integrity in research. Any such new approach should involve policies and procedures for peer review, and peer review of peer review, with greater openness, transparency, reproducibility, and integrity (Craig et al., 2022). This new approach

must also explicitly prohibit the conduct of sham investigations that require secrecy and confidentiality by the complainant. Investigations should be conducted openly by independent organizations devoid of any financial conflict of interest (C. Taswell, 2023) which necessarily excludes the universities.”

Nonprofit organizations that serve the common good and public interest of a society with participation of professional scientists, citizen scientists, and laypersons may provide such a venue for responding to complaints in a manner devoid of any financial conflict of interest.

References

- Athreya, A., Taswell, S. K., Mashkoor, S., & Taswell, C. (2020). The essential enquiry ‘equal or equivalent entities?’ about two things as same, similar, related, or different. *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences*, 1(1), Article PEDADC885, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.48085/PEDADC885>
- Craig, A., Ambati, A., Dutta, S., Kowshik, P., Nori, S., Taswell, S. K., Wu, Q., & Taswell, C. (2019). DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the semantic web. 2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003>
- Craig, A., Athreya, A., & Taswell, C. (2023a). Example evaluations of plagiarism cases using FAIR Metrics and the PDP-DREAM Ontology. *IEEE eScience* 2023.
- Craig, A., Athreya, A., & Taswell, C. (2023b). Managing lexical-semantic hybrid records of FAIR Metrics analyses with the NPDS Cyberinfrastructure. *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.48085/D5B2734F2>
- Craig, A., Lee, C., Bala, N., & Taswell, C. (2022). Motivating and maintaining ethics, equity, effectiveness, efficiency, and expertise in peer review. *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences*, 3(1), Article I5B147D9D, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.48085/I5B147D9D>
- Jacobsen, A., de Miranda Azevedo, R., Juty, N., Batista, D., Coles, S., Cornet, R., Courtot, M., Crosas, M., Dumontier, M., Evelo, C. T., Goble, C., Guizzardi, G., Hansen, K. K., Hasnain, A., Hettne, K., Heringa, J., Hooft, R. W., Imming, M., Jeffery, K. G., ... Schultes, E. (2020). FAIR principles: Interpretations and implementation considerations. *Data Intelligence*, 2(1-2), 10–29. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_r_00024
- Mons, B., Schultes, E., Liu, F., & Jacobsen, A. (2020). The FAIR principles: First generation implementation choices and challenges. *Data Intelligence*, 2(1-2), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_e_00023
- Musen, M. (2020). Statement for special issue on FAIR principles. *Data Intelligence*, 2(1-2), iii–vi. https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_e_00022
- Taswell, C. (2007). DOORS to the semantic web and grid with a PORTAL for biomedical computing [In the Special Section on Bio-Grid published online 3 Aug. 2007]. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine*, 12(2), 191–204. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861>
- Taswell, C. (2008). Corrections to “DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid With a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing”. *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine*, 12(3), 411. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2008.923764>
- Taswell, C. (2009a). Alternative bootstrapping design for the PORTAL-DOORS cyberinfrastructure with self-referencing and self-describing features. In G. Wu (Ed.), *Semantic web* (pp. 29–37). In-Teh. <http://sciendo.com/books/show/title/semantic-web>
- Taswell, C. (2009b). Biomedical informatics for brain imaging and gene-brain-behavior relationships. W3C Semantic Web HCLSIG F2F Meeting. [https://www.w3.org/wiki/images/9/94/HCLSIG\\$\\$\\$Meetings\\$\\$\\$2009-04-30_F2F\\$W3CHCLS20090430CTaswell.pdf](https://www.w3.org/wiki/images/9/94/HCLSIG$$$Meetings$$$2009-04-30_F2F$W3CHCLS20090430CTaswell.pdf)
- Taswell, C. (2010a). A distributed infrastructure for metadata about metadata: The HDMM architectural style and PORTAL-DOORS system. *Future Internet*, 2(2), 156–189. <https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156>
- Taswell, C. (2010b, September 7). PORTALS and DOORS for the semantic web and grid (U.S. pat. No. US7792836B2).
- Taswell, C. (2014, November 11). Management of multilevel metadata in the PORTAL-DOORS system with bootstrapping (U.S. pat. No. US8886628B1).
- Taswell, C. (2022). Epistemic injustice, open access, and citational justice. *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.48085/x3b678b7a>
- Taswell, C. (2023). Reproducibility, validity, and integrity in scholarly research: What accountability for willful disregard? *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.48085/l3570f30f>
- Taswell, C. (2024a). Unfairness by the FAIR Principles promoters: A case study on the absence of accountability for integrity in research publishing. *Proceedings of the ICATES 2024 Conference*. <https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2024PWT29CT240404twocol.pdf>
- Taswell, C. (2024b). Biomedical informatics needs new nosology for collective, community, social and public health. *Proceedings of the AIME 2024 Conference*. <https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/AIME202424FAIRNNN03CT0614.pdf>
- Taswell, S. K., Athreya, A., Akella, M., & Taswell, C. (2021). Truth in science. *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging and Computing Sciences*, 2(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE>
- Taswell, S. K., Trigg, C., Vayo, J., Dutta, S., & Taswell, C. (2020). The hitchhiker’s guide to scholarly research integrity. 2020 ASIS&T 83rd Annual Meeting, 57, Article e223. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.223>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Dumontier, M., Aalbersberg, I. J., Appleton, G., Axton, M., Baak, A., Blomberg, N., Boiten, J.-W., da Silva Santos, L. B., Bourne, P. E., Bouwman, J., Brookes, A. J., Clark, T., Crosas, M., Dillo, I., Dumon, O., Edmunds, S., Evelo, C. T., Finkers, R., ... Mons, B. (2016). The FAIR guiding principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Scientific Data*, 3, 160018. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18>
- Wilkinson, M. D., Sansone, S.-A., Schultes, E., Doorn, P., da Silva Santos, L. O. B., & Dumontier, M. (2018). A design framework and exemplar metrics for FAIRness. *Scientific Data*, 5, 180118. <https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.118>
- World Wide Web Consortium. W3C Semantic Web HCLSIG F2F meeting program and attendees. In: In W3C Semantic Web HCLSIG F2F meeting program and attendees (April 30, 2009). Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009. <https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/W3CHCLS-F2FMeeting20090430.pdf>

Evidence Summary

1) During the years 2006–2011, Taswell published at least 19 papers, available at www.PORTALDOORS.org, including two issued USPTO patents (US7792836B2 C. Taswell, 2010b filed 17 Jun 2007, issued 7 Sep 2010, and US8886628B1 C. Taswell, 2014 filed 25 May 2010, issued 11 Nov 2014), on the PORTAL-DOORS Project in the fields of open data sciences, interoperable data management, and knowledge engineering on the internet, grid, and web.

2) During the years 2015–2024, Taswell and co-authors at Brain Health Alliance published another several dozen papers, available at www.PORTALDOORS.org, on the same subject matter involving the PORTAL-DOORS Project and Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe (NPDS) Cyberinfrastructure.

3) Wilkinson et al. (2016) co-authors, who include Mark Wilkinson as first author, Michel Dumontier as second author and Barend Mons as corresponding author, in their 2016 Nature Scientific Data article plagiarized the previously published work of Taswell as explained by the carefully detailed analysis of Craig et al. (2019) published in the IEEE ECAI 2019 Conference proceedings (see itemized listings with item-by-item comparisons in Tables III to VI of reference Craig et al., 2019).

4) Wilkinson et al. (2018) co-authors, who include Mark Wilkinson as first author and both Mark Wilkinson and Michel Dumontier as corresponding authors, in their 2018 Nature Scientific Data article propagated the plagiarism of the same material that they plagiarized previously in the original Wilkinson et al 2016 paper, by failing to cite the previously published work of Taswell.

5) Musen (2020), Mons et al. (2020) (including Barend Mons as first author and corresponding author), and Jacobsen et al. (2020) (including Michel Dumontier as ninth author and Barend Mons as corresponding author), and other authors in their 2020 Data Intelligence special issue papers repeatedly propagated the plagiarism of the same material that they previously plagiarized in the Wilkinson et al 2016 paper, by once again failing and refusing to cite the previously published work, papers, and USPTO patents of Taswell.

6) Among the 6 co-authors of the 54 co-authors of the 2 papers Wilkinson et al. (2016, 2018) who also attended the W3C F2F meeting World Wide Web Consortium (2009) in 2009, Taswell spoke with at least 4 of them during conversations after the formal presentation of his papers at the meeting. These 4 co-authors included Michel Dumontier, Maryann Martone, Carol Goble and Timothy Clark. These individuals who participated in the plagiarism of Taswell's work cannot feign ignorance claiming that they were not aware of his published papers. The publicly available document World Wide Web Consortium (2009) provides written evidence of their attendance and presence at his featured lunch-time presentation at that meeting.

7) Andrew Hufton, Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Musen failed to disclose their conflicts of interest in July of 2019 and failed to comply with scholarly research publishing ethics when they disregarded and silenced Taswell's complaint submitted to Nature Scientific Data about the plagiarism. Dinah Spence, the compliance officer at Nature Publishing, failed to inform Taswell as the complainant that Hufton and Musen had covered up their conflicts-of-interest and their involvement with the plagiarism, and failed to disclose to Taswell the existence and contents of their sham peer review. The email dated 5 July 2019 by Mark Musen, which provides written evidence of his involvement in the plagiarism cover-up by his citation cartel,

did not appear until more than a year later when received via intermediary from Mons by Taswell on 27 July 2020.

8) Repeated refusals by Mark Musen and his citation cartel to correct and remediate their omission of citation combined with their continued influence and efforts to exclude the published work of Taswell from open scientific debate at medical and scientific conferences has resulted in the de facto censoring of Taswell's papers and patents from presentation and discussion at major international organizations such as American Medical Informatics Association and Research Data Alliance which continue to promote the plagiarism of Wilkinson et al. (2016, 2018).

9) Musen and his citation cartel, including his former Stanford associates and alumni such as Lucilla Ohno-Machado, have fraudulently obtained millions of US dollars and EU euros in research grant funds, while the original inventor and author Taswell has not been able to obtain approval on a grant application. Funding agency denials have been justified on the basis of existing awards already granted to other recipients. But these other grant fund recipients, ie, Musen and his citation cartel have engaged in plagiarism, collusion, and organized fraud in scholarly academic research in order to obtain their grant funds.

10) Per search on 2024 August 23 at scholar.google.com, the plagiarizing paper by Wilkinson et al. (2016) has received 13,986 citations. In comparison, the original papers by C. Taswell (2007, 2010a) have received 65 and 22 citations, respectively. When the publisher Springer-Nature retracts the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al. (2016, 2018) published in Nature Scientific Data, these citation counts will place this case of plagiarism at the top of the [RetractionWatch.com](https://retractionwatch.com) list of highly cited retracted papers.

11) Per search on 2024 August 23 at the NIH RePORTER database of NIH awarded grants, promoters of the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al. (2016) have obtained approximately \$65,000,000 (sixty-five million) US dollars in NIH funded grants. This estimate does not include amounts awarded to grant recipients by other government funding agencies in America, Canada, UK, EU, and elsewhere around the world. In comparison, the original inventor and author C. Taswell (C. Taswell, 2007, 2010a, 2010b, 2014) has received \$0 (zero) US dollars in government agency funded grants.

12) From ethical and legal perspectives, the relative number of greater citation counts and grant dollars received by the plagiarists and promoters of the plagiarism should never be used as specious and fallacious arguments, unfairly and wrongfully attempted in the misconduct by both complaint respondents and complaint investigators at LUMC in this case of plagiarism, to rationalize that plagiarism while engaging in denialism, and thus to attempt to falsify the historical record of the published literature.