Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing

Carl Taswell

Brain Health Alliance, United States

To Cite This Chapter

Taswell, C. (2024). Unfairness by the FAIR principles promoters: A case study on the absence of accountability for integrity in research publishing. In T. A. Oliveira, & M. T. Hebebci (Eds.), *Current Academic Studies in Technology and Education 2024* (pp. 298-325). ISRES Publishing

Introduction

Plagiarism remains prevalent in research publishing. This misconduct has been discussed in a variety of publication formats from brief commentaries to systematic literature reviews for which respective examples include C. Taswell (2010c) and Foltýnek et al. (2020). Plagiarism becomes even more harmful when published as its falsely claimed opposite of publishing with *fairness*. Stated formally, an inherent logical contradiction exists when a data scientist, information scientist, computational linguist, or research investigator who professes to study language, information and data with ethics and integrity, then also chooses to condone idea plagiarism. Indeed, it is an oxymoronic self- contradiction for any research scholar who promotes the use of data sharing, data linking, data management, the semantic web and knowledge engineering with vocabularies, thesauri, ontologies, concept similarity rules, ontology mappings, logical reasoning inferences, and related tools, who then also ignores,

disregards, and/or condones idea plagiarism. Those who wish to encourage *fair* sharing of data and information and join us in ethical research with integrity (Athreya, Craig, et al., 2023) must also refrain from idea plagiarism in both its benign forms citation amnesia or cryptomnesia, and its malign forms including idea-laundering plagiarism (Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020; S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al., 2020). The data sciences, knowledge engineering, and semantic web communities cannot be taken seriously by honorable scientists who respect truth and logic if such a basic self-contradiction is promoted and propagated by idea-laundering plagiarists within these scientific communities who claim to be sharing data, information, and knowledge *fairly* but who do not practice what they preach.

This historical review analyzes the primary idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.* authors in their papers published in Nature Scientific Data (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018), and the secondary propagating plagiarism by Musen (2020), Mons et al. (2020), Jacobsen et al. (2020), and other authors in their papers published in Data Intelligence of the original papers and USPTO patents previously published by Carl Taswell (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014). The plagiarizing authors include Michel Dumontier of Maastricht University, Barend Mons of Leiden University and Mark Wilkinson of Polytechnic University of Madrid who bear the greatest responsibility for the plagiarism published in Nature Scientific Data (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018) as explained herein. Therefore, this review also contains an analysis of the academic integrity violations by Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson according to the criteria specified in Annex 1 of the "Maastricht University Regulations on Academic Integrity" (Maastricht University, 2020).

Definitions of Plagiarism

Definitions of plagiarism can be found in numerous dictionaries and other sources. According to the Wikipedia article on plagiarism (Wikipedia, 2019a), "Plagiarism is the 'wrongful appropriation' and 'stealing and publication' of another author's

'language, thoughts, ideas, or expressions' and the representation of them as one's own original work." The Office of Research Integrity at the US Department of Health & Human Services provides a similar definition (US HHS Office of Research Integrity, 2019) and cites the quote attributed to the American Association of University Professors from 1989: "Taking over the ideas, methods, or written words of another, without acknowledgment and with the intention that they be taken as the work of the deceiver."

Most reputable journals published by professional organizations comply with the COPE principles (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2019) and the principles of many institutions of higher learning, education, research and scholarly publishing: *to anchor scholarly education, research and publishing in ethics that prohibits plagiarism including the plagiarism of ideas*. In particular, IEEE publishes the *Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual* (IEEE, 2019) which devotes Section 8.2.4 to allegations of misconduct and Section 8.2.4.D to guidelines for adjudicating different levels of plagiarism. In an article published by IEEE, authors Dutta, Uhegbu, et al. (2020) named and defined another level of plagiarism, a form of idea plagiarism called *idea-laundering plagiarism*. In a subsequent reportpublished by ASIS&T, authors S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al. (2020) further clarified the criteria for evaluating both idea-laundering plagiarism by authors and idea-bleaching censorship by editors.

With reference to these ethical publishing standards and published definitions of plagiarism, this review analyzes (a) the primary idea-laundering plagiarism found in the papers by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018) with their first paper submitted in 2015 to Nature Scientific Data then published in 2016, and (b) the secondary propagating plagiarism by Musen, Mons *et al.*, Jacobsen *et al.*, and other authors in their papers published 2020 in Data Intelligence (Musen, 2020; Mons et al., 2020; Jacobsen et al., 2020), in comparison with (c) the previously published papers and patents by Carl Taswell (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014) with his first report submitted in 2006 to IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine then published online in 2007. This case of plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.*, Musen, Mons *et al.*, and other plagiarists and promoters of the

collection of conceptual ideas previously published in the papers and patents by Taswell is discussed in this historical review and analysis within a sociocultural context which clarifies a code of conduct and practice *differentiating unintentional omission of citation from intentional exclusion of citation* of the previously published work.

Unintentional Omission of Citation

Scholars who wish to remain good citizens of their research communities with respect for citing the published work of their colleagues should adhere to the metaphorical principle expressed in the famous phrase *standing on the shoulders of giants* (Wikipedia, 2019b) with "creative authenticity and fair citation" (S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al., 2020). Good scholars who respect ethics and integrity not only refrain from plagiarism but also offer apologies for any unintentional omissions of citations when brought to their attention and then correct those omissions in the historical record of the published literature.

When teaching students in the educational research programs of the BHA Virtual Institute, C. Taswell has frequently described several examples of this respectful scholarly practice with the use of two different incidents separated by 40 years and dissimilar research communities. In 1979 long before the modern era of the internet and electronic computerized search on the web, C. Taswell, MacDonald, and Cerottini (1979) published a paper in the field of cellular immunology for cancer research that unintentionally omitted the citation of an unknown colleague's paper. In response to a letter received via physical mail, Taswell *et al.* replied with both a written response apologizing to the colleague and a written Letter to the Editor of the journal where the paper had been published correcting the omission of citation. Forty years later in 2019, a colleague planned to present a conference paper intended to be a systematic survey in the field of brain imaging for dementia research that unintentionally omitted citation of a paper by Taswell *et al.* (C. Taswell, Donohue, et al., 2018). When Taswell alerted the colleague about the omission, an apology was immediately offered, and correction was made in time for proper citation of the Taswell *et al.* paper in the colleague's

presentation of the systematic survey of the relevant literature at the research conference.

As another example not involving C. Taswell's experience, but rather in this case involving IEEE engineering publications, consider the apology and correction offered by Salagean (2010). These examples of correcting omissions of citations in the different research fields of cellular immunology, brain imaging, and information theory raise the following questions: Do different scientific communities maintain different sociocultural standards of adherence to the metaphorical principle of *standing on the shoulders of giants*? If good citation practices are maintained in various other scientific communities, then why not also in the communities of information and data scientists, knowledge engineers, and semantic web researchers who claim to devote themselves and their research field to linking and citing things fairly?

Intentional Exclusion of Citation

In a post-truth era in which ethics, integrity, and truth have been abandoned not only in politics but also apparently in some fields of science, a new form of plagiarism has arisen. Regrettably, too many research scholars and published papers have been victimized by this *post-truth plagiarism of ideas* perpetrated by plagiarizing authors without integrity and respect for publishing ethics. This pattern of plagiarism can be described with the following summary of their sequential tactics:

1. Intentional exclusion of citation with collective refusal by a selective group of insiders, who are known as a 'publishing clique', 'elaborate fiefdom', or 'citation cartel', to cite a publication authored by an outsider who is not considered a member of the insider group. This refusal-to-cite territoriality by citation cartels that knowingly exclude non-members has also been described in other contexts and situations. Plagiarism of the outsider's publicly available and accessible research by the citation cartel insiders.

2. Feigned ignorance of the published research plagiarized by the citation cartel with their false claim of independent development of the plagiarized material

and/or their false claim that the material was common knowledge in the public domain without any necessity to cite the original references and sources.

3. A more complete formal definition for this *idea-laundering plagiarism* has been published by Dutta, Uhegbu, et al. (2020) at the IEEE 2020 ICSC (see also quote below) with further exposition of the criteria necessary to evaluate idea-laundering plagiarism clarified and published by S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al. (2020) at the ASIS&T 2020 Annual Meeting.

DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics

In 2006, Carl Taswell wrote the original manuscript for the PORTAL-DOORS Project (PDP) with a comprehensive collection of design principles. In 2007, this article was published online at IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008). Since 2007, numerous reports, conference papers, and journal articles as well as two USPTO patents related to PDP have all been publicly, continuously, and freely available at www.PORTALDOORS.org. Neither the original nor any of the subsequent papers about PDP have been cited by Musen, by Dumontier and the Wilkinson *et al.* authors, or by Barend Mons and the Mons *et al.* and Jacobsen *et al.* authors, or by any of Musen, Dumontier, Mons, or Wilkinson in their continuing promotion and propagation of the Wilkinson *et al.* plagiarism published in Nature Scientific Data (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018).

Quoting an important sentence about the plagiarism by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018) published in the paper by Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) presented June 28 at IEEE ECAI 2019 Conference in Pitesti, Romania:

"As a result of this item-by-item comparison and analysis, we cannot find any novel idea or concept in [1], [34] that can be described as fundamentally new and/or different from the content, principles, analysis and discussion in [2], [3], [10], [23], [24]."

Quoting another excerpt from Craig *et al.* (2019) in which the PDP and NPDS principles were renamed the DREAM principles:

"In order to address these problems in the literature, we are renaming the NPDS principles previously published in [2], [10], [23], [24] as the DREAM principles with the acronym DREAM for Discoverable Data with Reproducible Results for Equivalent Entities with Accessible Attributes and Manageable Metadata as the comprehensively summarizing phrase to describe collectively all of the PDP and NPDS principles of Taswell [2], [10], [23], [24] that have been unfairly renamed the FAIR principles by Wilkinson et al. [1], [34]."

The omission by Wilkinson *et al.* of any principle relating to *equivalent entities* in their FAIR principles (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018) enabled them, perhaps in their own minds incorrectly and wrongly, to rationalize the plagiarism of Taswell's PDP and NPDS principles (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014). If Wilkinson *et al.* (2016, 2018) had attempted to innovate in an intellectually meaningful and substantive manner, then they could have proposed or otherwise supported some version of an *equivalent entities* principle. But if they had done so, and actually themselves proposed their own versions of the *equivalent entities* principle, and adhered to it with honor and integrity, then presumably they would not or could not have been able to plagiarize Taswell's papers and patents with such blithe indifference and willful disregard for scholarly research publishing ethics, not to mention their disregard for intellectual property laws, and legal due-diligence requirements at for-profit publishing corporations. If Wilkinson *et al.* (2016, 2018), including those authors representing for-profit publishing corporations, had made a reasonable effort to perform their due diligence and to search and cite the literature properly as required by basic standards of quality research scholarship, then they could have and should have *fairly* cited the published work of Carl Taswell (2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014).

Quoting another excerpt from Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) about the importance of *fair* citation:

"As noted in a letter to IEEE Computer Magazine in 2010 by Taswell, 'any discussion of provenance and reproducibility for computational science and engineering that does not also address citation and attribution leads to a contradiction in terms. It is not possible to maintain standards for scholarly peer-reviewed reproducible science without proper citation and attribution' [38]. This principle remains paramount when the professed goal has been 'to improve the infrastructure supporting the reuse of scholarly data' as claimed by Wilkinson et al. [1], [34], but apparently not practiced by them with respect to citing fairly other authors such as Taswell [2], [23]."

Quoting a final excerpt from Craig *et al.* (2019) about the misuse by Wilkinson *et al.* of the acronym 'FAIR' and the word 'fair':

"In order to address this problem in the literature with the misuse of the phrases 'FAIR principles' and 'FAIR metrics' by the Wilkinson et al. [1], [34] authors, we have proposed and published an alternative interpretation of the acronym 'FAIR' with our FAIR family of truly quantitative numerical metrics for maintaining fair standards in scholarly research and publishing [35], [36]. We defined and continue to use 'FAIR' as an acronym for the Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records and Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports [35], [36]."

Further quoting an important paragraph from a paper by Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) presented and published at the IEEE eScience 2019 Conference in San Diego, California:

"Taswell [2] published the PDP principles almost a decade before Wilkinson et al. [7] paraphrased them as the FAIR principles. Key authors of [7] were aware of and knew about [2]. At least six of the fifty-three authors of [7] attended a scientific conference [10] in 2009 where direct face-to-face discussion occurred with conversations between the paraphrasing authors of [7] and the paraphrased author of [2]. Considering the sequence of events with these face-to-face conversations about PDP documented by the W3C 2009 F2F meeting attendance [10] and PDP presentation slides [11], and then the subsequent failure by Wilkinson et al.[7] to cite

Taswell [2], we emphasize that science will be neither reproducible nor fair without recognition, acknowledgment, attribution and citation of equivalent entities regardless of whether those equivalent entities are considered to be scientific hypotheses, scientific experiments, scientific data, scientific results or published articles in the scientific literature."

Finally, quoting from a paper by Dutta, Uhegbu, et al. (2020) presented and published at IEEE ICSC 2020 Conference in San Diego, California:

"The IEEE Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual defines five levels of plagiarism... We describe here another kind of plagiarism called idea laundering, analogous to the concept and practice of money laundering, in which ideas are plagiarized and then the plagiarism is hidden in plain sight. To clarify this analogy, first define money laundering as the act of passing money that was illegitimately obtained through another illegitimate process with the intent of making it appear legitimate, ie, making dirty money look clean. Then define idea laundering as the act of passing ideas that were illegitimately obtained through another illegitimate process with the intent of making it appear legitimate, ie, making dirty ideas look clean."

Authors who publish research work, especially work financially supported by public funding at education and research institutions, including authors such as Musen, Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and Jacobsen *et al.*, should adhere to the COPE principles (Committee on Publication Ethics, 2019) and the principles of many institutions of higher learning, education, research and scholarly publishing as noted above and repeated again here: *to anchor scholarly education, research and publishing in ethics that prohibits plagiarism including plagiarism of ideas*. Nature Research publishes its correction and retraction policy (Nature Research, 2020a) concerning both the presence of plagiarism and fabrication (2020c) and absence of discussion of published work (2020b), 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, the analysis presented in this case study identifies and names the following persons:

1. Mark Musen of Stanford University as author, co-author, editor, and leader of the citation cartel (Musen, 2020) most responsible for aiding, abetting, and promoting in numerous journals and journal papers both the idea- laundering plagiarism by authors of the Wilkinson *et al.* FAIR principles (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018) and the associated idea-bleaching censorship by editors who have excluded any citation and discussion of the previously published Taswell PDP and NPDS principles (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014);
2. Michel Dumontier of Maastricht University as the single individual co-author most responsible for the idea- laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018);
3. Barend Mons of Leiden University as the corresponding co-author most responsible for the idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018) and the propagating plagiarism by Mons et al. (2020) and by Jacobsen et al. (2020);
4. Mark Wilkinson of Polytechnic University of Madrid as the first co-author most responsible for the idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018).

Plagiarism by Wilkinson et al

In a detailed item-by-item conceptual idea comparison analysis by Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) of the *plagiarism of ideas* by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018), the authors Craig *et al.* referred to the research misconduct of plagiarism by the authors Wilkinson *et al.* euphemistically as *paraphrasing without citing*. However, the misconduct of Wilkinson *et al.* does constitute *plagiarism of ideas*, more specifically called *idea-laundering plagiarism*

(Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020; S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al., 2020), for the reasons that have been explained and the questions that have been posed in reports published in past years including: Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019); Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Mehrotra, et al. (2019); Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019); Dutta, Uhegbu, et al. (2020); Athreya, Taswell, et al. (2020); Choksi et al. (2020); S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al. (2020); S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. (2021). In the following analysis, the papers by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018) are considered the *plagiarizing articles* with primary idea-laundering plagiarism, the papers by Mons et al. (2020) and Jacobsen et al. (2020) are considered the *plagiarizing articles* with secondary propagating plagiarism, and all of the Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and Jacobsen *et al.* authors are considered the *plagiarizing authors*; whereas the previously published papers and patents by Carl Taswell (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014) are considered the *plagiarized articles* and Taswell is considered the *plagiarized author*. This section entitled "Plagiarism by Wilkinson et al" summarizes some of the most relevant arguments and concerning evidence for demonstrating their *idea-laundering plagiarism* in the following itemized analysis:

1. Authors Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016), which 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 demonstrated by the carefully detailed analysis with itemized listings in Tables III to VI of Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) published in the Proceedings of the IEEE ECAI 2019 Conference.

2. Analysis of the plagiarism by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016) of the previously published work of Taswell has been reconfirmed with quantitative FAIR metrics which evaluated the fairness with which a document cites prior literature. These FAIR metrics for the Wilkinson *et al.* (2016) plagiarism have been presented at and published in the proceedings of the IEEE 2023 eScience Conference and the IEEE 2023 Guardians Conference (Craig, Athreya, & Taswell, 2023a; 2023b).

3. Authors Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018), which include Mark Wilkinson as first author and both Mark Wilkinson and Michel Dumontier as corresponding authors, in their 2018 Nature Scientific Data article repeated and promoted the plagiarism of the same material that they plagiarized previously in the original Wilkinson *et al.* 2016 paper, by again failing and refusing to cite the previously published work of Taswell.

4. Authors Mons et al. (2020), which include Barend Mons as first author and corresponding author, and authors Jacobsen et al. (2020), which include Michel Dumontier as ninth author and Barend Mons as corresponding author, in their 2020 Data Intelligence papers again repeated, promoted and propagated the plagiarism of the same material that they previously plagiarized in the original Wilkinson *et al.* 2016 paper, by once again failing and refusing to cite the previously published work of Taswell.

5. Because Mark Wilkinson is a first author and/or a corresponding author on one or more of the plagiarizing papers (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018), then review of his plagiarism and his failure to respect the COPE publishing ethics should be admissible and required by a committee convened by an agency mandated to enforce research integrity with a policy that requires such integrity does apply to first authors and/or corresponding authors.

6. Because Michel Dumontier is a corresponding author on one of the plagiarizing papers (Wilkinson *et al.* 2018) then review of his plagiarism and his failure to respect the COPE publishing ethics should be admissible and required by a committee convened by an agency mandated to enforce research integrity with a policy that requires such integrity does apply to corresponding authors.

7. Because Barend Mons is a first author and/or a corresponding author on one or more of the plagiarizing papers (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Mons et al., 2020; Jacobsen et al., 2020), then review of his plagiarism and his failure to respect the COPE publishing ethics should be admissible and required by a

committee convened by an agency mandated to enforce research integrity with a policy that requires such integrity does apply to first authors and/or corresponding authors.

8. Authors Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and Jacobsen *et al.* have continued their *refusal to cite* the published work of Taswell even when brought to their attention.

9. Authors Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and Jacobsen *et al.* have continued their *refusal to correct the omission of citation* even when brought to their attention.

10. Authors Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and Jacobsen *et al.* have continued their false claims in which they wrongfully declare 'independent development' of their work and deny prior knowledge and awareness of the previously published articles and patents of Taswell — even though documented evidence exists with proof of attendance at the W3C 2009 F2F meeting at MIT in Cambridge MA (World Wide Web Consortium, 2009) with an attendance record for 6 of the 53 authors of the initial plagiarizing paper by Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016).

11. The authors, editors, publishers, and promoters of the published FAIR principles as plagiarized by Wilkinson *et al.*, Mons *et al.*, and by Jacobsen *et al.* could have and should have corrected their omission of citation, and thus cited and discussed the original papers and patents of Taswell at the journal Nature Scientific Data with a correction, addendum, Letter to the Editor, or Expression of Concern even if for some misleading reason the publisher proffered a pretextual argument against issuing an actual Notice of Retraction for plagiarism by authors and failure with refusal by editors and publishers to disclose the editors' conflicts of interest. Though repeatedly brought to their attention, all authors, editors, publishers, and promoters involved have continued to ignore, disregard, and/or refuse to correct their omissions of citation. If they had agreed to correct their omissions of citation, then perhaps the matter could have been possibly considered a relatively benign form of idea plagiarism such as citation amnesia or cryptomnesia. Because the plagiarizing

authors, editors, publishers, and promoters have *'doubled down'* with their refusal to cite and discuss the papers and patents published by Taswell and their persistent lies falsely claiming independent development, their plagiarism should be considered the malign form of idea plagiarism called *idea-laundering plagiarism* (Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020).

12. Among the 6 authors of the 54 authors of the Wilkinson *et al.* papers (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016; Wilkinson, Sansone, et al., 2018) who attended in 2009 the W3C F2F Meeting (World Wide Web Consortium, 2009), Carl Taswell spoke with at least 4 of them during conversations after the formal presentation of his papers at the meeting. These 4 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 and patents. The publicly available document for the 2009 W3C F2F. Meeting provides *written evidence* of their attendance and presence at his featured lunch-time presentation at that W3C HCLS F2F Meeting in person at the MIT Campus in Cambridge Massachusetts.

13. Among these 4 authors (Dumontier, Martone, Goble, and Clark), because of the lengthy conversation that Taswell had with Dumontier at the HCLS F2F Meeting dinner on 30 April 2009, and especially because of the manner in which Dumontier stated that he did not believe in searching and citing the published literature and has since promoted himself as "the founder of the FAIR principles", Michel Dumontier should be considered the single individual author most responsible for the plagiarism by the Wilkinson *et al.* (2016, 2018) authors.

14. How is it possible that not a single one of the other 47 of the 53 authors of the initial Wilkinson *et al.* (2016) paper conducted and completed a proper literature search and discussed relevant prior publications as required by the Nature Publishing requirements and the COPE publishing ethics? How is it possible that not a single one of the other representatives of the for-profit

corporations who signed that paper with their names as authors failed to conduct and complete their *legal due diligence* properly and correctly? How is it possible that all 53 of the authors of Wilkinson *et al.* (2016) failed to find, cite and discuss any of the Taswell papers and patents from any of the online searchable databases or the easily accessible online PORTAL-DOORS Project web site?

15. Was it mere coincidence that Dumontier as self-proclaimed "founder of the FAIR principles" chose the acronym FAIR? Or did he choose that acronym as a name purposefully crafted in a deceptive and misleading manner to suggest to readers of the FAIR principles paper (Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al., 2016) that his goal was to be fair in citing other authors' work? While hiding his own plagiarism not only in the sheer number of the 53 co-authors, but also in proclaiming himself to be fair when in fact he was not being fair to the original author Taswell of the previously published collection of PDP principles? The original collection of PDP principles (C. Taswell, 2007; 2008; 2010b; 2010a; 2014), first published online in 2007, have since been renamed in 2019 as the DREAM and PDP-DREAM principles (Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al., 2019; Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020).

16. If the authors of the so-called 'FAIR principles' wish to be considered fair with fairness as publishing research scholars, then they should eliminate the irony and hypocrisy of calling their plagiarized principles 'FAIR' by correcting their intentional exclusion of the citation of Taswell's papers and patents and by stopping their persistent lies in which they feign ignorance of Taswell's work on the PORTAL-DOORS Project.

17. Summary of plagiarism analysis: Documented evidence (World Wide Web Consortium, 2009) for prior awareness of Taswell's IEEE TITB paper on the PORTAL-DOORS Principles (C. Taswell, 2007) exists for at least 6 of the 53 authors of Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016). Documented analysis for a complete item-by-item match of intellectual concepts and ideas between all of the Wilkinson et al. 2016 FAIR principles with a subset of the Taswell 2007

PORTAL-DOORS Principles has been published by Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019). Therefore, research scholars who adhere to the Nature Publishing requirements and the COPE publishing ethics should consider the writing of Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016); Wilkinson, Sansone, et al. (2018) published by Nature Scientific Data, and that of Mons et al. (2020) and of Jacobsen et al. (2020) published by Data Intelligence, not just paraphrasing of ideas without citing Taswell, but actual plagiarizing of ideas from Taswell, and thus nothing other than plagiarism according to any of the definitions of plagiarism (Wikipedia, 2019a; US HHS Office of Research Integrity, 2019; Nature Research, 2020c; 2020b; S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al., 2020).

Further discussion of the PDP-DREAM Principles and the PDP-FAIR Metrics as the original unplagiarized alternatives by Taswell et al. to the plagiarizing FAIR principles by Wilkinson et al., as well as general discussion of research misconduct including idea-laundering plagiarism and idea-bleaching censorship, related to this case of plagiarism can be found in a series of published papers (Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al., 2019; Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Mehrotra, et al., 2019; Dutta, Kowshik, et al., 2019; Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020; Athreya, Taswell, et al., 2020; Choksi et al., 2020; S. K. Taswell, Triggle, et al., 2020; S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al., 2021; Craig, Lee, et al., 2022; C. Taswell, 2022; Craig, Athreya, & Taswell, 2023a; 2023b).

Questions for Agency Committees

Questions for organizations and/or agencies that convene committees mandated to review and issue their own reports on the primary and secondary plagiarism documented in this case study:

1. Assume that the idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.* is not at the level of 100 percent. Then what percent credit should they be given for their sole novel contribution represented by their use of what some have called the *'clever acronym'* FAIR? Should they be given 5, 10 or 25 percent credit reducing their level of idea plagiarism to only 75 percent? What minimum percentage of idea plagiarism is necessary for the agency committee to take

action against the plagiarists? Is more than 50 percent plagiarism enough? And what if it is only 25 percent plagiarism? Why would that amount of idea plagiarism not be enough when there is explicit evidence and proof of direct communication between the plagiarizing authors and the plagiarized author who was victimized by their theft of concepts, ideas, and an entire published collection of principles?

2. Assume that corresponding authors are not responsible for the plagiarism. Then which authors should be responsible for the plagiarism? Should it be first authors who are responsible? Or should it be those authors who plagiarized Taswell after speaking and interacting with him in person with face-to-face conversations? And what about secondary propagating plagiarists, recruited by the primary idea-laundering plagiarists, who then repeat, promote, and propagate the plagiarism of the primary plagiarists? Should these secondary plagiarists also be held accountable?

3. Assume that secondary plagiarists will not be held accountable for repeating and propagating the plagiarism of the primary plagiarists. Assume that journal editors and publishers remain *extremely slow* responding to requests to publish corrections and retractions. Then will the university academic and research integrity offices take the necessary steps to require the plagiarists on their faculty to request the retractions themselves? Will the agency committees require these plagiarists to submit their own letters to the journal editors and publishers requesting retractions?

Violations of Academic Integrity

Analysis of the *violations of academic integrity* as specified in Annex 1 to the "Maastricht University Regulations on Academic Integrity" (Maastricht University, 2020) for the plagiarists should be based on this main quote from the annex:

"The universities categorically reject, actively resist, and will punish with the means available to them the following conduct. Violations of academic integrity are understood to include:"

and more explicitly, these relevant numbered quotes from the Maastricht University Regulations annex:

Violation 3 "Plagiarism of all or part of other people's publications and results. Science works only with the honest acknowledgment of the intellectual ownership of each person's contribution to knowledge. This applies to the entire range from student projects and papers to academic publications and dissertations. This is not confined to the literal appropriation but also includes the paraphrasing, omission of notes or citations, the unacknowledged use of data, drawings, or tables prepared by others. While copyright offers victims the opportunity for redress through the courts, a plagiarist can be prosecuted for plagiarism even if there is (no longer) any direct victim."

Violation 4 "Intentionally ignoring and failure to acknowledge contributions by other authors is a form of misconduct related to committing plagiarism. Willful and flagrant violations which cannot be resolved within the academic community demand the independent judgment of the Committee for Academic Integrity."

Violation 5 "Wrongly presenting oneself as an author. A researcher may only be listed as a publication's author when he has made a demonstrable contribution to it in the form of ideas and expertise incorporated in it, research performed, or theorizing. A researcher who attaches his name to a publication will ascertain the accuracy and integrity of its contents as best as possible."

Violation 7 "Culpable carelessness in carrying out the research. It can be labelled as misconduct only when the researcher goes further than error and sloppiness and does not modify his procedure after serious and well- founded criticism. A Committee for Academic Integrity can investigate whether this is the case."

Violation 8 "Permitting and concealing the misconduct of colleagues. A researcher or director has a duty of due care with respect to the science as a whole and particularly

to the researchers in his immediate circle. It must be acknowledged that hierarchical relationships in science, such as between supervisor and doctoral candidate, do not always make it easy to lodge a complaint against colleagues."

Given these quoted explanations describing violations of academic integrity from the Maastricht University Regulations, this report and the published paper by Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al. (2019) have presented extensive evidence and detailed explanations demonstrating that Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson have violated the academic integrity criteria numbered 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8.

Note also that the Maastricht University Regulations on Academic Integrity as published do not use the phrases *corresponding author* or *first author*. These regulations do not require that an accused violator must be identified as either a *corresponding author* or a *first author*. Nor do the regulations explicitly exempt, excuse or exonerate other kinds of authors or co-authors as innocent or excluded from investigation. In fact, the language used by the Maastricht University Regulations includes the words "everyone", "author", "a publication's author", and a "researcher". Therefore, according to the published Maastricht University Regulations, Michel Dumontier is not exempt nor innocent by default (regardless of his authorship status as a corresponding author, first author, or any other position or descriptive label of authorship), and he should not be excluded from investigation for violations of integrity according to the Preamble which declares that

"Everyone involved in academic teaching and research at Maastricht University shares in the responsibility for maintaining academic integrity. Everyone is expected to adhere to the general principles of professional academic practice at all times."

Retraction of Plagiarizing Papers

Therefore, this matter concerning the plagiarism by Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson of the USPTO patents, scholarly research papers, and publicly available website content published by Taswell, should be investigated by the research ethics and academic integrity committees at Maastricht University, Leiden University and Polytechnic University of Madrid, and at any other organizations and agencies

mandated to investigate this research misconduct with the violations of academic integrity and research integrity documented in this historical review and analysis. The papers written by Wilkinson *et al.* published by Nature Scientific Data and those by Mons *et al.* and Jacobsen *et al.* published by Data Intelligence on the FAIR principles should be retracted for their plagiarism and grave lapses of scholarship and ethics in research publishing. Maastricht University, Leiden University and Polytechnic University of Madrid should require Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson to adhere to the COPE principles, to conduct and complete proper literature searches, to cite and discuss relevant work that has been published previously, to refrain from plagiarizing other authors who have established historical priority on published work, and to stop unfairly promoting the FAIR principles that they plagiarized and stole from the PORTAL-DOORS Project and the papers and patents published by Carl Taswell.

Furthermore, Maastricht University, Leiden University and Polytechnic University of Madrid should require Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson to write their own letters to the respective journal editors and publishers requesting that the Wilkinson *et al.* papers and the Mons *et al.* and Jacobsen *et al.* papers be retracted for their plagiarism and grave lapses of scholarship and ethics in research publishing. Maastricht University, Leiden University and Polytechnic University of Madrid should also require Michel Dumontier, Barend Mons and Mark Wilkinson to send copies of those retraction letters, and proof of receipt by the journal editors for those retraction letters, to the original author victimized by their plagiarism, ie, the author Carl Taswell. *If the plagiarists Dumontier, Mons and Wilkinson refuse to be held accountable or otherwise fail to write these retraction letters to the journal editors, then the corresponding organization or agency committee should write the retraction letters on their behalf.* These statements of culpability assigning responsibility and accountability to Dumontier, Mons and Wilkinson for the idea-laundering plagiarism committed by all 53 authors of Wilkinson, Dumontier, et al. (2016) as documented here in this report, and as supported by additional analysis published elsewhere (Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Kowshik, et al., 2019; Craig, Ambati, Dutta, Mehrotra, et al., 2019;

Dutta, Kowshik, et al., 2019; Dutta, Uhegbu, et al., 2020), *do not absolve the other 50 of the 53 plagiarizing authors from their duty to search and cite the literature appropriately and to correct omissions of citations in the historical record of the published literature when brought to their attention.*

Willful Disregard, Inaction, or DARVO

Has enforcement of rules against research misconduct been abandoned in the current era of information wars? To date, none of the research integrity offices associated with this case of plagiarism have addressed the matter. Instead, all of them so far have demonstrated willful disregard, willful inaction, or a practice known by the acronym DARVO with its characteristic pattern of behavior (Freyd, 1997; Harsey & Freyd, 2020):

"DARVO stands for 'Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender'. The perpetrator or offender may Deny the behavior, Attack the individual doing the confronting, and Reverse the roles of Victim and Offender such that the perpetrator assumes the victim role and turns the true victim – or the whistle blower – into an alleged offender."

The use of DARVO typically occurs in the context of a *kangaroo court investigation* and represents the most harmful of the non-responses to complaints about plagiarism and other misconduct, which can be summarized with the following descriptively named categories:

1. The *silent treatment*: Nothing but silence without any acknowledgement of receipt and without any response whatsoever in reply to the complaint.
2. The *pass-the-buck treatment*: Respond to the complaint but refuse to consider an investigation with the pretext of arguing that the integrity office must defer and deflect responsibility to another office, party, agency or jurisdiction.
3. The *sham investigation*: Consider the complaint, pretend to conduct an investigation, then issue a single sentence judgement declaring "the complaint unfounded" without conducting an actual investigation that reviews the evidence and then issues a report with rational logical analysis of that evidence.

4. The *kangaroo court investigation*: Consider the complaint, conduct an investigation in which all the denials and lies of the plagiarists are accepted and included in the report, while all the compelling persuasive and concrete evidence from the complainant proving the plagiarism is rejected and purposefully excluded from the report, which then further concludes by blaming the victim harmed by the misconduct, instead of finding fault with the perpetrators of the violations.

Will enforcement of rules against research misconduct only be possible when investigated by independent agencies outside of academia rather than academic research integrity offices? Or only when governments establish laws prohibiting such misconduct and mandating financial penalties against offenders?

Conclusion

Contributors to the PORTAL-DOORS Project have completed unpublished experiments conducted with trial participants who are students in high school and college, and to avoid bias, students who are not part of the PDP research group and who do not have any affiliation with Brain Health Alliance. Initial results from these unpublished experiments indicate that the high school and college students participating in the experiments have so far unanimously agreed with the statement that *Wilkinson et al. plagiarized Taswell*.

Therefore, this review concludes with the most important question that must be answered by any agency committee mandated to investigate research misconduct and violations of academic integrity including plagiarism: *Does enforcement of research integrity rules and academic integrity rules against plagiarism — which are intended to prohibit plagiarism and also to reprimand, censure or punish those who commit plagiarism — does this enforcement only apply to high school and college students hoping to receive a degree diploma? Or does enforcement of integrity rules against plagiarism also apply to faculty who are instructors, teachers, professors and investigators at the academic education and research institutions that award those diplomas?*

References

Athreya, A., Craig, A., Taswell, S. K., & Taswell, C. (2023). Opening democratised portals and doors to the free flow of findable facts. *Research Features Magazine*, 54–57. https://researchfeatures.com/opening-democratised-portals-doors-free-flow-findable-facts/

Athreya, A., Taswell, S. K., Mashkoor, S., & Taswell, C. (2020). Essential question: 'equal or equivalent entities?' about two things as same, similar, or different. *2020 Second International Conference on Transdisciplinary AI (TransAI)*, 123–124. https://doi.org/10.1109/TransAI49837.2020.00028

Choksi, S., Hong, P., Mashkoor, S., & Taswell, C. (2020). NPDSLINKS: Nexus-PORTAL-DOORS-Scribe Learning Intelligence aNd Knowledge System. *2020 IEEE 2nd International Conference on Transdisciplinary Artificial Intelligence (TransAI)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/transai49837.2020.00027

Committee on Publication Ethics. (2019, July 28). Principles of transparency and best practice in scholarly publishing. https://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines-new/principles-transparency-and-best-practice-scholarly-publishing

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., Ambati, A., Dutta, S., Mehrotra, A., Taswell, S. K., & Taswell, C. (2019). Definitions, formulas, and simulated examples for plagiarism detection with FAIR metrics. *2019 ASIS&T 82nd Annual Meeting*, *56*, 51–57. https://doi.org/10.1002/PRA2.6

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

Dutta, S., Kowshik, P., Ambati, A., Nori, S., Taswell, S. K., & Taswell, C. (2019). Managing scientific literature with software from the PORTAL-DOORS Project. *2019 IEEE 15th International Conference on eScience (eScience)*. https://doi.org/10.1109/eScience.2019.00081

Dutta, S., Uhegbu, K., Nori, S., Mashkoor, S., Taswell, S. K., & Taswell, C. (2020). DREAM Principles from the PORTAL-DOORS Project and NPDS Cyberinfrastructure. *2020 IEEE 14th International Conference on Semantic Computing (ICSC)*, 211–216. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSC.2020.00044

Foltýnek, T., Meuschke, N., & Gipp, B. (2020). Academic plagiarism detection. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, *52*(6), 1–42. https://doi.org/10.1145/3345317

Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. *Feminism & Psychology*, *7*(1), 22–32. https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/defineDARVO.html

Harsey, S., & Freyd, J. J. (2020). Deny, attack, and reverse victim and offender (DARVO): What is the influence on perceived perpetrator and victim credibility? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *29*(8), 897–916. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2020.1774695

IEEE. (2019). *Publication services and products board operations manual*. https://pspb.ieee.org/images/files/files/opsmanual.pdf

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

Maastricht University. (2020). Maastricht University regulations on academic integrity. Retrieved May 6, 2020, from http://fasos-research.nl/assessment/files/2016/02/Appendix-6.2-Regulation-for-Scientific-Integrity-at-Maastricht-University.pdf

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

Nature Research. (2020a). Correction and retraction policy. Retrieved May 6, 2020, from https://www.nature.com/nature-research/editorial-policies/correction-and-retraction-policy

Nature Research. (2020b). Due credit for others' work. Retrieved May 6, 2020, from https://www.nature.com/nature-research/editorial-policies/plagiarism%5C#due-credit

Nature Research. (2020c). Plagiarism and fabrication. Retrieved May 6, 2020, from https://www.nature.com/nature-research/editorial-policies/plagiarism%5C#plagiarism-and-fabrication

Salagean, A. M. (2010). Apology for citation omission in "an algorithm for computing minimal bidirectional linear recurrence relations". *IEEE Transactions on*

Information Theory, *56*(8), 4180–4180. https://doi.org/10.1109/tit.2010.2050938

Taswell, C., MacDonald, H. R., & Cerottini, J. C. (1979). Limiting dilution analysis of alloantigen-reactive T lymphocytes. II. Effect of cortisone and cyclophosphamide on cytolytic T lymphocyte precursor frequencies in the thymus. *Thymus*, *1*(1-2), 119–131

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. (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. (2010c). Provenance and reproducibility. *Computer*, *43*(12), 8

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., Donohue, C., Mastwyk, M. T., Louey, A. G., Giummarra, J., Robertson, J., Darby, D. G., Masters, C. L., & Rowe, C. C. (2018). Safety of disclosing

amyloid imaging results to MCI and AD patients. *Mental Health in Family Medicine*, *14*(2), 748–756. https://doi.org/10.48085/X661B91A3

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., Triggle, C., Vayo, J., Dutta, S., & Taswell, C. (2020). The hitchhiker's guide to scholarly research integrity. *2020 ASIS&T 83rd Annual Meeting*, *57*, e223. https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.223

US HHS Office of Research Integrity. (2019, July 28). Plagiarism. *US Department of Health & Human Services Office of Research Integrity*. https://ori.hhs.gov/plagiarism

Wikipedia. (2019a, July 28). Plagiarism. Retrieved July 28, 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/plagiarism

Wikipedia. (2019b). Standing on the shoulders of giants. Retrieved June 10, 2019, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standing_on_t he_shoulders_of_giants

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

About the Author

Dr. Carl Taswell has been certified as a diplomate of both the American Board of Nuclear Medicine and the American Board of Psychiatry & Neurology, and serves on the faculty at UCSD with expertise in functional and molecular brain imaging. He received his BA in biochemistry from Harvard College, his MSc in mathematics and MD in medicine both from New York University, and his PhD in scientific computing and computational mathematics from Stanford University. He has completed a post-doctoral fellowship in biostatistics at Harvard School of Public Health, as well as clinical training in psychiatry at UCSD and in nuclear medicine at UCSF. Since receiving a top ten scholarship award in the 1974 Science Talent Search (administered by the Society for Science), he has published numerous research papers spanning the fields of biochemistry, immunology, medicine, statistics, mathematics, informatics and brain imaging. Ever passionate about biomedical computing, he has designed and built software including LDACPA, ELIDA, WavBox, FirWav, GeneScene, PDP-DREAM and NPDS-LINKS. Dr. Taswell is also a member of the IEEE, SIAM, ACM, ASIST, AMIA, ATA, SNMMI, ISTAART, and IPA.

E-mail: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org
ORCID: 0000-0002-9386-457