Report BHA-2025-17

Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research*

Carl Taswell†

Abstract

Continuing the series of reports on the unfairness by the FAIR Principles promoters, this third chapter reports the scale and scope of their plagiarism from and ghosting of an entire body of published work on the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe Cyberinfrastructure for meta-science applications and data interoperability. This project has been available freely open access since 2007 spanning almost 2 decades and more than 5 dozen published research reports including several issued USPTO patents. The persistence of continuing scientific misconduct by the plagiarizing persons in positions of power raises questions about the politicization of science that rejects reason and rational logic. The misconduct by the FAIR Principles promoters has now been demonstrated to be the largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the modern history of science, engineering, and medicine. Quantitative numerical evidence is presented using both citation counts and grant funding amounts. These grants were obtained by the plagiarists with fraudulent applications which failed to cite and discuss the historical record of published literature, failed to disclose conflicts of interest, and falsified applications to the public funding agencies in violation of the rules at those agencies.

Keyphrases

Propagating plagiarism, scientific misconduct, research integrity.

Contents

*Document created 2025-01-17, presented 2025-05-02, updated 2025-05-28, in press proceedings of ARSTE ICATES 2025 Conference May 1–4 Trabzon Turkey.

†Correspondence to ctaswell@computer.org; orcid: 0000-0002-9386-4574.

Peer Review of Peer Review

Should the scientific community turn a blind eye and deaf ear to those who engage in the scientific misconduct of fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism (FFP), thus contributing to harming and falsifying the historical record of scientific reports in knowledge engineering, artificial intelligence, data sciences, medical informatics, and related fields of biomedical scientific inquiry? Or should those scientists who prioritize objective *truth in science* (S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. 2021) guided by *integrity in research* (S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al. 2020) provide leadership to maintain standards with *peer review of peer review* (Craig, Lee, et al. 2022) devoid of personal and political bias? Should truthful objective scientists remain silent and complicit when FFP violations occur? Or should these scientists uphold and require enforcement of policies and practices for disallowing FFP in research by imposing penalties and sanctions when these violations occur? Should there be the same or different policies and practices depending on whether the research is privately or publicly funded? What should be imposed for FFP violations by authors when their research is supported by public funds awarded to grant recipients by government agencies when that money was obtained with the trust and faith of the citizens who pay taxes to the government, presumably with the intent to benefit the public good, public safety, and public health?

These questions about integrity in research have been discussed for decades such as those offered in *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process* (NAS et al. 1992):

> "Cases of misconduct in science involving fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism breach the trust that allows scientists to build on others' work, as well as eroding the trust that allows policymakers and others to make decisions based on scientific and objective evidence. The inability or refusal of research institutions to address such cases can undermine both the integrity of the research process and self-governance by the research community."

and in *Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct* (NRC et al. 2010):

> "Recognizing the inconsistency of human behavior, it stresses the important role that research institutions play in providing an integrity–rich environment, citing the need for institutions to provide staff with training and education, policies and procedures, and tools and support systems. It identifies practices that characterize integrity in such areas as peer review

> and research on human subjects and weighs the strengths and limitations of self–evaluation efforts by these institutions. In addition, it details an approach to promoting integrity during the education of researchers, including how to develop an effective curriculum. Providing a framework for research and educational institutions, this important book will be essential for anyone concerned about ethics in the scientific community."

Unfortunately, the "limitations of self-evaluation efforts by these institutions" have worsened over the decades as documented in "Understanding Research Misconduct: A Comparative Analysis of 120 Cases of Professional Wrongdoing" (DuBois et al. 2013), "Research Misconduct and Its Federal Regulation: The Origin and History of the Office of Research Integrity" (Price 2013), and "More than 10,000 Research Papers were Retracted in 2023 — A New Record" (Van Noorden 2023). Nevertheless, some may hope for improvement with continuing education that provides clarification of guidance such as that found in "The Trinity of Good Research: Distinguishing between Research Integrity, Ethics, and Governance" (Kolstoe and Pugh 2023) and in "Defining 'Recklessness' in Research Misconduct Proceedings" (Caron et al. 2023). However, education with clarified guidance will not be sufficient to decrease the rate of FFP violations without the necessary concomitant penalties and sanctions for those violations as explained in "Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?" (C. Taswell 2023) and "Rooting Out Scientific Misconduct" (Oransky and Redman 2024).

Falsifying History

The case of the "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters" (Craig, Ambati, et al. 2019; C. Taswell 2024b; C. Taswell 2024a; C. Taswell 2025) demonstrates an example of the failures with continuing FFP violations over the past decade in this unfairness misconduct case that can be attributed to the "limitations of self-evaluation efforts by these institutions" (NRC et al. 2010). Inquiries and requests to cite the original author's work have been repeatedly submitted directly to the plagiarists and propagating plagiarists including Musen *et al.* and Wilkinson *et al.* who have ghosted the original author and his work (C. Taswell 2007; C. Taswell 2008; C. Taswell 2009a; C. Taswell 2009b; C. Taswell 2010). Complaints concerning this matter have also been submitted to journals, publishers, integrity offices, government agencies, and the research grant applicants and awardee institutions responsible. However, these offices and organizations to date have failed to address this matter with an impartial, public, open, and transparent investigation with fair due process for those persons victimized by the misconduct, fraud, and plagiarism. Therefore, in the most recent presentation of this case on 8 January 2025 with slides, report and publication entitled *Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists*, we concluded that "Investigations of plagiarism should be conducted openly with public debate as done for jury trials in courts of law."

Authors who publish research supported by taxpayer funded grants should adhere to 1) the ethics principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and other international integrity organizations (including Academic Integrity, Coalition for Integrity, Transparency International, Global Integrity) that support the public good, public safety, and public health, 2) the requirements, rules, and regulations of NIH, NLM, NSF, NASA, and other US government agencies that award grants funded by US citizens' taxes, and 3) the principles of many institutions of higher learning, education, research and scholarly publishing: *to anchor scholarly education, research, and publishing in a standard of ethics that prohibits all forms of plagiarism including plagiarism of ideas*. Nature Research publishes its correction and retraction policy concerning both the presence of plagiarism and fabrication and the absence of discussion of published work, the latter defined by Nature Research with the following quote: "When discussing the published work of others, authors must properly describe the contribution of the earlier work. Both intellectual contributions and technical developments must be acknowledged as such and appropriately cited."

Therefore, this report identifies those authors, Mark Musen at Stanford and Lucila Ohno-Machado who was at Stanford then UCSD and now Yale, who have abused their positions of power as research group leaders at their institutions as well as within the American Medical Informatics Association and who are now the most recent grant awardees most responsible for continuing to falsify the historical record of published research in biomedical informatics, data sciences, and knowledge engineering. The collusion ring with plagiarism cartel that originated out of Stanford University Biomedical Informatics[1] with Mark Musen and Lucila Ohno-Machado has now persisted for more than a decade in falsifying the historical record of published research by plagiarizing from and ghosting the work of Taswell with willful disregard in a manner which explicitly contradicts the so-called 'FAIR Principles' that they promote. They continue to propagate the initial plagiarism of the FAIR Principles by Wilkinson et al from the work published by Taswell almost a decade earlier. This initial work by Taswell and then the continuing work by Taswell with his co-authors at Brain Health Alliance has been freely available with unrestricted open access at PORTALDOORS.org continuously from 2007 to the present in 2025. If government funded research group leaders Musen and Ohno-Machado have nothing to hide, then they should have nothing to fear in public open scientific debate of the historical record of published research.

Recent grants awarded to Mark Musen and Lucila Ohno-Machado as Principal Investigators at Stanford University, University of California San Diego and/or Yale University that were submitted by them fraudulently (with plagiarism and ghosting of earlier published work), and that were then reviewed and awarded by US government grant-funding agencies without adequate peer review, are listed herein. Fraudulent grants by Mark Musen in violation of truth in science, integrity in research, fair business practices, and fair publishing ethics include the following grants with $50,752,202 in total funds:

1. Enhancing the RADx Data Hub for Data FAIRness project details: OD 2022 Total Funding $3,000,000 for 1OT2DB000009-01, OD 2022 Total Funding $231,574 for 1OT2DB000009-01S1, OD 2023 Total Funding $10,100,000 for 3OT2DB000009-01S3, OD 2023 Total Funding $31,000,000 for 3OT2DB000009-01S3; Total project funding amount for 4 projects is $44,331,574 (only NIH, CDC and FDA funding data).

2. The Metadata Powerwash - Integrated tools to make biomedical data FAIR project details: NLM 2021 Total Funding $334,847 for 1R01LM013498-01, NLM 2021 Total Funding $236,100 for 3R01LM013498-01S1, NLM 2022 Total Funding $334,475 for 5R01LM013498-02, NLM 2022 Total Funding $274,507 for 3R01LM013498-02S1, NLM 2023 Total Funding $334,475 for

[1]The Department of Biomedical Informatics at Stanford University has recently been renamed the Department of Biomedical Data Science.

5R01LM013498-03, NLM 2024 Total Funding $334,475 for 5R01LM013498-04; Total project funding amount for 6 projects is $1,848,879 (only NIH, CDC and FDA funding data).

3. BioPortal: An Expansive Knowledgebase of Biomedical Entities and Relations project details: NIGMS 2021 Total Funding $1,083,026 for 1U24GM143402-01, NIGMS 2022 Total Funding $1,073,884 for 5U24GM143402-02, NIGMS 2023 Total Funding $1,073,886 for 5U24GM143402-03, NIGMS 2024 Total Funding $1,072,369 for 5U24GM143402-04, NIGMS 2024 Total Funding $214,584 for 3U24GM143402-04S1; Total project funding amount for 5 projects is $4,517,749* (only NIH, CDC and FDA funding data).

Fraudulent grants by Lucila Ohno-Machado in violation of truth in science, integrity in research, fair business practices, and fair publishing ethics include the following grants with $31,686,972 in total funds:

1. A FAIR Bridge2AI Center (FABRIC) project details: OD 2022 Total Funding $1,037,752 for 1U54HG012510-01, OD 2022 Total Funding $1,467,976 for 7U54HG012510-02, OD 2023 Total Funding $2,386,163 for 5U54HG012510-03, OD 2023 Total Funding $610,146 for 3U54HG012510-03S1, OD 2024 Total Funding $2,666,741 for 5U54HG012510-04, NHGRI 2024 Total Funding $174,623 for 3U54HG012510-04S1; total project funding amount for 6 projects is $8,343,401 (only NIH, CDC and FDA funding data).

2. RADx-Rad Discoveries & Data: Consortium Coordination Center project details: OD 2021 Total Funding $5,954,423 for 1U24LM013755-01, OD 2022 Total Funding $5,848,902 for 4U24LM013755-02, OD 2023 Total Funding $5,853,027 for 7U24LM013755-03, OD 2023 Total Funding $5,687,219 for 3U24LM013755-03S2; Total project funding amount for 4 projects is $23,343,571 only NIH, CDC and FDA funding data).

These lists of fraudulent grants by Mark Musen and Lucila Ohno-Machado as Principal Investigators have a combined total of $82,439,174 paid to awardees in violation of the rules that prohibit fraud, misconduct, and plagiarism as a condition for application, receipt, and use of funds awarded by US government agencies with money derived from citizens' taxes. This estimate of fraudulent use of taxpayer money represents a minimal estimate. It does not include grants awarded to recipients in prior years, nor does it include grants awarded to other recipients (ie, recipients other than Mark Musen and Lucila Ohno-Machado who also participated in the plagiarism and ghosting of the work published by Taswell) in the US, England and European Union over the past decade. Numerical data with citation counts for publications by the plagiarists compared with those for the original work published earlier (C. Taswell 2007; C. Taswell 2010) were reported previously in the second chapter (C. Taswell 2025) of this series of reports on unfairness by the FAIR Principles promoters.

Maintaining Standards

In contrast to turning a blind eye and deaf ear to those who engage in the scientific misconduct of falsifying the historical record of scientific reports in the published literature, minimal basic standards for objective truth can and should be maintained. Attention must be directed not only to requiring explicit policies to enforce the rules prohibiting FFP, but also to the associated practices including 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 2024b) — that have enabled FFP to become such a prevalent problem in research publishing. The problems caused by these four forms of non-response to complaints has been further aggravated in academia by the practice of the omerta code of silence by plagiarism cartels analogous to that imposed by mafia-like criminal organizations with the use of intimidation, isolation, exclusion, and ostracism of those who break this code of silence enabling misconduct. These problems cannot be solved to prevent further violations unless all aspects of such mafia-type organized crime behavior are further identified, named, described and studied (Placidi et al. 2025). Therefore, we define academic omerta, termed *amerta* with an 'a' instead of an 'o', as all practices related to the silencing and censoring of complaints about FFP violations against the ethics and codes of conduct for scholarly research publishing. To prevent any appearance of *amerta* by an integrity office at a university or other research institution, complaints about FFP violations must be addressed in public open venues with transparency and fair due process for all parties.

Moreover, in the current era of information wars on the internet and web where publishers such as Springer-Nature impact the entire globe instantaneously, US agencies such as HHS ORI must now recognize the truth of the reality that for the past decade there have been *no physical barriers or geopolitical borders that stop the spread of plagiarism or the theft of intellectual property.* Grant applicants for US taxpayer funds, regardless of where they reside or retain citizenship, must maintain their required duty and obligation,

> "When discussing the published work of others, authors must properly describe the contribution of the earlier work. Both intellectual contributions and technical developments must be acknowledged as such and appropriately cited."

as required by Springer-Nature Publishing's own advertised policies, if they wish to claim to be fair and promote fairness while refraining from both plagiarism and ghosting of other authors' published research.

At Brain Health Alliance, we advocate for restoring trust and faith in American science, technology, engineering, and medicine. We will engage in publicity campaigns to call for new laws in America to support the open, transparent, and public investigation of fraud, misconduct, and plagiarism with penalties and sanctions for those who attempt to falsify the historical record of published research. We express our hope that the HHS Office of Research Integrity and other US government agencies will join us in this public campaign to change hearts and minds and to educate tax-paying American citizens about the real harm caused to public health and public safety by those who engage in research fraud, misconduct, and plagiarism.

Conflicts of Interest

The author has no financial, employment, relationship or any other conflicts of interest to declare.

Citation

Brain Health Alliance Report BHA-2025-17
Title: "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research"
Authors: Carl Taswell
Dates: created 2025-01-17, presented 2025-05-02, updated 2025-05-28,

Contact: ctaswell@computer.org

References

[1] M. M. Caron, S. B. Dohan, M. Barnes, and B. E. Bierer. "Defining "recklessness" in research misconduct proceedings." *Accountability in Research* 32.2 (Sept. 2023), pp. 120–142. ISSN: 1545-5815. DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2023.2256650 (cited p. 2).

[2] A. Craig, A. Ambati, S. Dutta, P. Kowshik, S. Nori, S. K. Taswell, Q. Wu, and C. Taswell. "DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web." In: *2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)* (June 28, 2019). Pitesti, Romania: IEEE, June 2019, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003. URL: https://portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf (cited p. 2).

[3] A. Craig, C. Lee, N. Bala, and C. Taswell. "Motivating and Maintaining Ethics, Equity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Expertise in Peer Review." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 3.1, I5B147D9D (1 June 30, 2022), pp. 1–21. DOI: 10.48085/I5B147D9D (cited p. 1).

[4] J. M. DuBois, E. E. Anderson, J. Chibnall, K. Carroll, T. Gibb, C. Ogbuka, and T. Rubbelke. "Understanding Research Misconduct: A Comparative Analysis of 120 Cases of Professional Wrongdoing." *Accountability in Research* 20.5–6 (Sept. 2013), pp. 320–338. ISSN: 1545-5815. DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2013.822248 (cited p. 2).

[5] S. E. Kolstoe and J. Pugh. "The trinity of good research: Distinguishing between research integrity, ethics, and governance." *Accountability in Research* 31.8 (July 2023), pp. 1222–1241. ISSN: 1545-5815. DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2023.2239712 (cited p. 2).

[6] NAS, NAE, NIM, and CSEPP. *Responsible Science: Ensuring the Integrity of the Research Process Volume I*. National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, National Institute of Medicine, and the Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy. Washington DC: National Academies Press, 1992. 199 pp. ISBN: 9780309047319. DOI: 10.17226/1864. URL: https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/1864/responsible-science-ensuring-the-integrity-of-the-research-process-volume (cited p. 1).

[7] NRC, IOM, and CAIRE. *Integrity in scientific research: Creating an environment that promotes responsible conduct.* National Research Council and Institute of Medicine and the Committee on Assessing Integrity in Research Environments. Washington DC: National Academies Press, 2010. 202 pp. ISBN: 9780309500258. URL: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK208712/ (cited pp. 1, 2).

[8] I. Oransky and B. Redman. "Rooting out scientific misconduct." *Science* 383.6679 (Jan. 2024), pp. 131–131. ISSN: 1095-9203. DOI: 10.1126/science.adn9352 (cited p. 2).

[9] V. Placidi, M. P. Lisi, and S. M. Aglioti. "Explicit and implicit anti-mafia collective action intentions and mafia-related knowledge are predicted by demographics, personality traits, social attitudes and contextual factors." *PsyArXiv Preprints* (Feb. 21, 2025) (cited p. 3).

[10] A. R. Price. "Research Misconduct and Its Federal Regulation: The Origin and History of the Office of Research Integrity—With Personal Views by ORI's Former Associate Director for Investigative Oversight." *Accountability in Research* 20.5–6 (Sept. 2013), pp. 291–319. ISSN: 1545-5815. DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2013.822238 (cited p. 2).

[11] C. Taswell. "DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid with a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing." *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 12.2 (2 Mar. 2007). In the Special Section on Bio-Grid published online 3 Aug. 2007, pp. 191–204. ISSN: 1089-7771. DOI: 10.1109/TITB.2007.905861 (cited pp. 2, 3).

[12] C. Taswell. "Corrections to "DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid With a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing"." *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 12.3 (Mar. 2008), p. 411. ISSN: 1089-7771. DOI: 10.1109/TITB.2008.923764 (cited p. 2).

[13] C. Taswell. "Alternative Bootstrapping Design for the PORTAL-DOORS Cyberinfrastructure with Self-Referencing and Self-Describing Features." In: *Semantic Web*. Ed. by G. Wu. Vukovar, Croatia: In-Teh, 2009. Chap. 2, pp. 29–37. URL: http://sciyo.com/books/show/title/semantic-web (cited p. 2).

[14] C. Taswell. "Biomedical Informatics for Brain Imaging and Gene-Brain-Behavior Relationships." In: *W3C Semantic Web HCLSIG F2F Meeting* (Apr. 30, 2009). World Wide Web Consortium. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2009. URL: https://www.w3.org/wiki/images/9/94/HCLSIG$$Meetings$$2009-04-30_F2F$W3CHCLS20090430CTaswell.pdf (cited p. 2).

[15] C. Taswell. "A Distributed Infrastructure for Metadata about Metadata: The HDMM Architectural Style and PORTAL-DOORS System." *Future Internet* 2.2 (2010), pp. 156–189. ISSN: 1999-5903. DOI: 10.3390/FI2020156. URL: https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/2/2/156/ (cited pp. 2, 3).

[16] C. Taswell. "Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?" *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 4.2 (Dec. 31, 2023). DOI: 10.48085/L3570F30F (cited p. 2).

[17] C. Taswell. "Biomedical Informatics Needs New Nosology for Collective, Community, Social and Public Health." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 5.1 (July 10, 2024). Presented 2024-07-09 at AIME 2024 Workshop on AI and Precision Medicine. ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: 10.48085/W3A8E3D23 (cited p. 2).

[18] C. Taswell. "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing." In: *Current Academic Studies in Technology and Education 2024*. Ed. by T. A. Oliveira and M. T. Hebebci. abstract in Proceedings of the ICATES 2024 Conference. May 3, 2024. Chap. 12, pp. 298–325. ISBN: 978-6256959675. URL: https://www.isres.org/current-academic-studies-in-technology-and-education-2024-74-b.html (cited pp. 2, 3).

[19] C. Taswell. "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists." In: *Proceedings of the HICSS 58th Conference*. Jan. 8, 2025. URL: https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109639 (cited pp. 2, 3).

[20] S. K. Taswell, A. Athreya, M. Akella, and C. Taswell. "Truth in Science." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging and Computing Sciences* 2.1 (1 Dec. 31, 2021), pp. 1–9. DOI: 10.48085/M85EC99EE (cited p. 1).

[21] S. K. Taswell, C. Triggle, J. Vayo, S. Dutta, and C. Taswell. "The Hitchhiker's Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity." In: *2020 ASIS&T 83rd Annual Meeting* (Oct. 22, 2020). Vol. 57. Wiley, 2020, e223. DOI: 10.1002/pra2.223. URL: https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pra2.223 (cited p. 1).

[22] R. Van Noorden. "More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023 — a new record." *Nature* 624.7992 (Dec. 2023), pp. 479–481. ISSN: 1476-4687. DOI: 10.1038/d41586-023-03974-8 (cited p. 2).