



Who Watches the Watchers?*

Carl Taswell, Adam G. Craig, Julie A. Neidich, Philip S. Koch, Joshua C. Rubin, Paul de Quant†

Open Peer Review

On behalf of nonprofit Brain Health Alliance (BHA) and its Board of Directors, we write this open peer review to critique the Oransky and Marcus article entitled “Why Universities Should Make Misconduct Reports Public” published in *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* (JLME) 2025:1–5. While we do agree with their assertion, which we ourselves have promoted in our reports and conference presentations advocating for open science with full transparency, we express our concern that they published a *ghosting literature review* which omitted any mention of our work at BHA over the past 2 decades. For definition of ghosting reviews, see discussion in “From the ‘Best of Our Knowledge’ to the ‘Best Available Knowledge’” by [Craig and C. Taswell \(2025\)](#).

We have corresponded extensively with Ivan Oransky dating back more than 5 years to early 2020 and regularly since then through the present year 2025 (see attached copies of several examples dated 22 March 2020, 6 May 2022, 3 February 2025, 26 February 2025, and 11 March 2025). We have attempted to persuade Oransky to address publicly at his RetractionWatch (RW) news service the Wilkinson *et al.* 2016 article published wrongfully in *Nature Scientific Data* because it plagiarized from a series of articles published previously by Carl Taswell beginning in 2007.

This case of plagiarism and ghosting by Wilkinson *et al.* 2016, continued in Wilkinson *et al.* 2018, has motivated all of our advocacy at BHA since 2018 for research publishing ethics with truth in science and integrity in research to promote open science and to combat plagiarism, ghosting, and misconduct in science. We have highlighted this work on research integrity with open public scientific discourse at our annual online [Guardians Conferences](#) which have been free and open to the public since 2022.

We have provided Oransky with extensive documentation and evidence proving the plagiarism and ghosting by Wilkinson *et al.* But Oransky has declined to mention the existence of a dispute or any expression of concern about it at his online news service RW. Meanwhile, he has considered it appropriate to publish other news stories at RW in which he promotes his news service by featuring complaints that allege plagiarism and then he claims success in achieving retraction of those plagiarizing articles at the journals that published the plagiarism.

Why does he discriminate against the plagiarism case in which we at BHA have been victimized? How does he rationalize his selection of some plagiarism cases, but then not other plagiarism cases, in particular, the one that has harmed our work and nonprofit organization?

What are his criteria for publicizing or refusing to publicize news about a plagiarism case online at his RW news service? *To what extent has he himself contributed to the spread of the plagiarism and continued ghosting of our work over the past 5 years by declining as a news journalist to report the matter at RW?* Indeed, he has done the opposite and posted several news stories effectively endorsing the FAIR-branded principles of Wilkinson *et al.* with news articles, such as “misidentify microscopes” dated 27 August 2024 and “temporal crisis” dated 25 January 2025, while failing to mention that these principles were plagiarized by Wilkinson *et al.* from the published work of Taswell, *ie*, the original research reports persistently ghosted as if the extensive body of work on the [PORTAL-DOORS Project](#) had never been published, even though it has been freely available open access since 2007.

Our extensive correspondence with Oransky and RW over the past 5 years has influenced greatly what he wrote in his ghosting review published in the journal JLME this year. Why did he omit any mention of our work at BHA and our repeated requests for him to address our complaint of plagiarism by Wilkinson *et al.*? Should a ghosting review be considered a sufficient violation of publishing ethics that it warrants retraction by the journal that published the ghosting review? How does Ivan Oransky himself answer that question for the readers of JLME who are concerned about journalism, law, medicine, and ethics?

With this open peer review, we also include documentary evidence of our recent correspondence with the Maastricht University President’s Office and with Frontiers Media management including Frontiers special issue editors regarding the plagiarism and ghosting by Wilkinson *et al.* in *Nature Scientific Data* of work published a decade earlier by Carl Taswell in IEEE ([C. Taswell 2007](#)) and MDPI ([C. Taswell 2010a](#)) journals as well as two issued USPTO patents ([C. Taswell 2010b](#); [C. Taswell 2014](#)) for which the first patent was filed 17 June 2007 and issued 7 September 2010. Can Ivan Oransky provide the readers of JLME with a rational explanation clarifying the reasons why he refuses to mention this matter at RW? Can he also explain the reasons why he omitted any mention of our numerous publications on truth in science, integrity in research, and peer review of peer review in his *ghosting review* of the relevant literature for the JLME audience? At BHA, we ask the question: *Who will watch the watchers at RW?*

All those who promote open science with authentic research integrity, and all scientists, engineers, physicians, lawyers and journalists who maintain a commitment to ethics and justice, should develop more tools and methods, more policies and procedures, with accountability to enforce sanctions for violations ([C. Taswell 2023](#)), in order to prevent others from experiencing the same harm suffered by BHA in this cautionary true tale about scientists and journalists in academia who have

* Document created 2025-02-03, updated 2025-12-23, published 2025-12-24.

† Correspondence to ctaswell@bhavi.us.

lost their way. True scientists and ethical journalists should not abandon nor reject their duty to adhere to professional codes of conduct which must require a commitment to respect for collegiality that defends and upholds citational justice (C. Taswell 2022). True scientists and ethical journalists as true scholars, who defend the integrity of science and the integrity of the historical record of published literature (S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. 2021), must not forget the required duty to give credit where credit is due without plagiarism or ghosting. *Authors, editors, publishers, and journalists must adhere to the communications standards that require scientific, journalistic, ethical, and legal due diligence.*

Because citations continue at a high rate even for publications that have been formally retracted (Wang et al. 2022), and because not all publishers retract fraudulent publications in a timely manner responsive to complaints (Craig, Ambati, et al. 2019; C. Taswell 2024b; C. Taswell 2025a; C. Taswell 2025b), we question the transparency and efficacy of the retraction process. Therefore, as demonstrated in this open peer review, we will no longer cite references for which we advocate formal retraction regardless of whether for plagiarism, ghosting, and/or other forms of scientific misconduct that violate the requirements for research integrity. Instead, we will describe any such fraudulent publication with enough information for it to be found in the literature as either retracted or not yet retracted. However, we will not cite these fraudulent documents in any manner that generates an item listed with the references in the bibliography. We assume some publishers who track and report citation metrics do so based on the list of references in the bibliographies of published documents. We call upon all publishers of citation metrics to disclose openly the tools, methods, and algorithms they use to count citations for the metrics that they report.

Citation

Brainiacs 2025 Volume 6 Issue 2 Edoc TD4A9B756

Title: "Who Watches the Watchers?"

Authors: Carl Taswell, Adam G. Craig, Julie A. Neidich, Philip S. Koch, Joshua C. Rubin, Paul de Quant

Dates: created 2025-02-03, updated 2025-12-23, published 2025-12-24, revised 2025-12-27

Copyright: © 2025 Brain Health Alliance

Contact: ctaswell@bhavi.us

NPDS: [LINKS/Brainiacs/Taswell2025WWW](https://links.brainiacs.org/Taswell2025WWW)

DOI: [10.48085/TD4A9B756](https://doi.org/10.48085/TD4A9B756)

Affiliations

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD, ctaswell@health.ucsd.edu, UC San Diego Health, La Jolla California, USA.

Adam G. Craig, PhD, agcraig@hkbu.edu.hk, Hong Kong Baptist University, Honk Kong, China.

Julie A. Neidich, MD, jneidich@wustl.edu, Washington University at St Louis, St Louis Missouri, USA

Philip S. Koch, PhD, MBA, pskoch@mines.edu, Colorado School of Mines, Golden Colorado, USA.

Joshua C. Rubin, JD, MPH, josh@joshcrubin.com, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, Ann Arbor Michigan, USA.

Paul de Quant, paul.dequant@thedirectorsoffice.com, The Directors' Office, Gasperich, Luxembourg.

Appendix

Background references on research publishing ethics featured at our Guardians Conferences:

- S. K. Taswell, Triggles, et al. (2020): The Hitchhiker's Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity, doi [10.1002/pra2.223](https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.223)
- Athreya, S. K. Taswell, et al. (2020): The Essential Enquiry 'Equal or Equivalent Entities?' About Two Things as Same, Similar, Related, or Different, doi [10.48085/PEDADC885](https://doi.org/10.48085/PEDADC885)
- S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. (2021): Truth in Science, doi [10.48085/M85EC99EE](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE)
- Craig, Lee, et al. (2022): Motivating and Maintaining Ethics, Equity, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Expertise in Peer Review, doi [10.48085/I5B147D9D](https://doi.org/10.48085/I5B147D9D)
- C. Taswell (2022): Epistemic Injustice, Open Access, and Citational Justice, doi [10.48085/X3B678B7A](https://doi.org/10.48085/X3B678B7A)
- C. Taswell (2023): Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?, doi [10.48085/L3570F30F](https://doi.org/10.48085/L3570F30F)
- Athreya, Craig, et al. (2023) Opening Democratised Portals and Doors to the Free Flow of Findable Facts, doi [10.26904/RF-148-4826246509](https://doi.org/10.26904/RF-148-4826246509)
- Craig and C. Taswell (2025) From the 'Best of Our Knowledge' to the 'Best Available Knowledge', doi [10.48085/U90B95F7E](https://doi.org/10.48085/U90B95F7E)

References documenting the plagiarism published by Wilkinson et al. who have continued to ghost the original sources by Taswell:

- Craig, Ambati, et al. (2019): DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web, doi [10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003), IEEE article [5983473](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003) in Proceedings ECAI 2019.
- C. Taswell (2024a): Biomedical Informatics Needs New Nosology for Collective, Community, Social and Public Health, in Proceedings AIME 2024.
- C. Taswell (2024b): Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing, Chapter 12 in Proceedings ICATES 2024.
- C. Taswell (2025a): Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists, Pages 6617-6626 in Proceedings HICSS 2025.
- C. Taswell (2025b): 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, Pages 90-97 in Proceedings ICATES 2025.

Additional references on the Wilkinson et al. plagiarism-ghosting case and related topics at the PORTAL-DOORS Project available freely open access since 2007 on the NPDS Cyberinfrastructure, DREAM Principles, FAIR Metrics, bibliometrics, data stewardship, metadata management, information repositories and knowledge engineering.

References

- [1] A. Athreya, A. Craig, S. K. Taswell, and C. Taswell. "Opening democratised portals and doors to the free flow of findable facts." *Research Features Magazine* (148 July 26, 2023), pp. 54–57. ISSN: 2399-1548. DOI: [10.26904/RF-148-4826246509](https://doi.org/10.26904/RF-148-4826246509). URL: <https://researchfeatures.com/opening-democratised-portals-doors-free-flow-findable-facts> (cited p. 2).
- [2] A. Athreya, S. K. Taswell, S. Mashkoor, and C. Taswell. "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, PEDADC885 (1 Dec. 30, 2020), pp. 1–7. DOI: [10.48085/PEDADC885](https://doi.org/10.48085/PEDADC885) (cited p. 2).
- [3] 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](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003). URL: <https://portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf> (cited p. 2).
- [4] 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, 15B147D9D (1 June 30, 2022), pp. 1–21. DOI: [10.48085/15B147D9D](https://doi.org/10.48085/15B147D9D) (cited p. 2).
- [5] A. Craig and C. Taswell. "From the 'Best of Our Knowledge' to the 'Best Available Knowledge'." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 6.3 (Oct. 9, 2025). <https://guardians.bhavi.us/pub/docs/BHAVI20251009Guardians-ACraig.pdf>. ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/U90B95F7E](https://doi.org/10.48085/U90B95F7E) (cited p. 1, 2).
- [6] 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](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861) (cited p. 1).
- [7] 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](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/2/2/156> / (cited p. 1).
- [8] C. Taswell. "PORTALS and DOORS for the Semantic Web and Grid." U.S. pat. US7792836B2. provisional filed 17 Jun 2007, application filed 21 Sep 2007, patent issued 7 Sep 2010. Sept. 7, 2010 (cited p. 1).
- [9] C. Taswell. "Management of Multilevel Metadata in the PORTAL-DOORS System with Bootstrapping." U.S. pat. US8886628B1. provisional filed 25 May 2010, application filed 19 May 2011, patent issued 11 Nov 2014. Nov. 11, 2014 (cited p. 1).
- [10] C. Taswell. "Epistemic Injustice, Open Access, and Citational Justice." *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 3.2 (Dec. 30, 2022). ISSN: 2766-6883. DOI: [10.48085/X3B678B7A](https://doi.org/10.48085/X3B678B7A) (cited p. 2).
- [11] 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](https://doi.org/10.48085/L3570F30F) (cited p. 1, 2).
- [12] 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](https://doi.org/10.48085/W3A8E3D23). URL: <https://brainiacsjournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell12024FAIRNNN> (cited p. 2).
- [13] 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. Hebecci. 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 p. 2).
- [14] 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 p. 2).
- [15] C. Taswell. "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." In: *Proceedings of the ICATES 2025 Conference*. ARSTE, 2025, pp. 90–97. URL: <https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2025-049-Taswell1250502.pdf> (cited p. 2).
- [16] 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](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE). URL: <https://brainiacsjournal.org/links/brainiacs/Taswell12021Truth> (cited p. 2).
- [17] S. K. Taswell, C. Triggie, 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](https://doi.org/10.1002/pra2.223). URL: <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pra2.223> (cited p. 2).
- [18] Z. Wang, Q. Shi, Q. Zhou, S. Zhao, R. Hou, S. Lu, X. Gao, and Y. Chen. "Retracted systematic reviews continued to be frequently cited: a citation analysis." *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 149 (Sept. 2022), pp. 137–145. ISSN: 0895-4356. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.05.013) (cited p. 2).

Correspondence

Copies of the following email correspondence are included with this open peer review:

- Email to Ivan Oransky dated 3/22/2020, 5/6/2022, 2/3/2025, 2/26/2025 and 3/11/2025;
- email exchanged with Frontiers Media editors 12/4/2025 to 12/9/2025;
- email exchanged with Maastricht University President's Office 12/5/2025 to 12/10/2025.

A more complete collection of email correspondence since 2019 with the entities and parties that aided and abetted the spread of the plagiarism by Michel Dumontier, Mark Musen, Lucilla Ohno-Machado, and other faculty and associates from Stanford University Biomedical Informatics, who unfairly promoted the publications by Wilkinson *et al.* on the "FAIR Principles" will be made available as open data in a data repository accompanying a book entitled *Unfairness of the FAIR-branded Principles Promoters* planned for release in 2026. This trove of email correspondence will be made public for ethicists, auditors, meta-scientists, and historians of science to study.

From: [Carl Taswell](#)
To: ["ivan@retractionwatch.com"](mailto:ivan@retractionwatch.com)
Subject: Plagiarism and propagated plagiarism on a large scale
Date: Sunday, March 22, 2020 3:54:00 PM

Dr. Ivan Oransky
RetractionWatch.com

Hi Ivan,

It seems that we have both followed similar paths with undergrad education at Harvard and medical school at NYU. I was in Lowell House as a biochem major with Harvard Class of 1978, and then later graduated medical school from NYU in 1985 after spending several years in Switzerland at a cancer research institute between college and medical school.

In addition to the Harvard-NYU connection that we share, I'd like to introduce myself as a research scholar who does care about ethics and integrity in science and medicine. In recent years, I have turned my attention to developing software for the detection and prevention of plagiarism and intellectual property theft. Sometimes when observing and experiencing what has happened in the last decade, I feel as if I should conclude that I have only become another Don Quixote on a fool's errand tilting at windmills. Nevertheless, I have been pursuing a research agenda with the goal of fighting back against the plagiarism, fraud and misconduct in research.

And organizations such as yours at RetractionWatch.com do give me hope for a better future. So, I would very much appreciate the opportunity to talk with you, either by phone or videoconference, to hear your opinions on some of our recent papers. All of our papers related to the PORTAL-DOORS Project can be found at

<http://www.portaldoors.org/PDP/Site/Papers>

Our most recent paper by Dutta et al

<http://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/ICSC2020PDPDREAM191222.pdf>

includes a paragraph introducing and defining "idea-laundering plagiarism" as follows:

The IEEE Publication Services and Products Board Operations Manual defines five levels of plagiarism [14]. 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.

And another recent paper by Craig et al

<http://www.portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ASIST2019FairMetrics0611.pdf>

describes a different kind of novel metric for idea and concept analysis intended to detect and prevent idea plagiarism when it occurs.

Another paper, also by Craig et al, analyzing the Wilkinson et al plagiarism of my previously published papers and USPTO patents

<http://www.portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf>

may serve to document the largest case of “idea plagiarism” in recent history of scientific publishing?!? Do you know of any other recent case of “idea plagiarism” involving more plagiarists, and more citations repeating and propagating the plagiarism? The current citation count of the Wilkinson et al plagiarism now stands at well over 2000 citations. The citation count on this plagiarism would put it in the number one position on your top-ten leader board except for the frustrating fact that I have not yet succeeded in getting the paper retracted from Nature Scientific Data due to the conflicts of interest there. And I fear that it will take another year or two before I succeed in compelling the retraction.

When would be a good time to call? Or if you prefer videoconference, let me know when and I will send a GoToMeeting invitation. Thanks in advance for your time discussing these questions.

Kind regards, Carl

PS: If you'd like to read a little about my background, there's a mini-bio for me and other BHA Board Directors here:

<https://www.brainhealthalliance.org/BhaHome/Directors>

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD

www.BHAVI.us

www.BrainHealthAlliance.org

Brain Health Alliance, Inc.

(a 501c3 not-for-profit)

8 Gilly Flower Street

Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Tel: 1-949-481-3121

From: [CTaswell \(BHA\)](#)
To: [Ivan Oransky](#)
Cc: [Sanders, David A](#)
Subject: FW: Who are the Guardians of Truth and Integrity?
Date: Friday, May 6, 2022 10:48:00 AM
Attachments: [SpringerNaturePeetersLetter20220505.pdf](#)
[BHA202279WAGTI03CT0504.pdf](#)

Ivan,

I hope you received a copy of the correspondence below with Springer Nature. Note that we included you as an identified cc recipient on the letter to Springer Nature letting them know that we consider everything about the matter fully public and open as it continues to develop. We will soon see whether they attempt to silence the matter again.

I'd like to know whether you are interested in writing a RetractionWatch daily on our continuing saga, or alternatively, on our papers on the Hitchhikers' Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity and Truth in Science. If you are interested, then I will keep you informed of any progress with developments at Springer Nature.

Alternatively, I noticed that you have published guest blog posts, such as the one by Dave Sanders,

<https://retractionwatch.com/2022/01/27/the-authors-plagiarised-a-large-amount-of-text-but-retractions-should-not-be-used-as-a-tool-to-punish-authors%ef%bf%bc/>

writing about his experiences in the ongoing effort to fight against plagiarism, fraud, and misconduct. If you'd prefer that I tell the story of the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al and report on the situation at the journal Nature Scientific Data in a guest blog post written by me for RetractionWatch, then I can do so in the same manner as Dave Sanders for his guest blog post. Though my personal preference would be that one of your reporters write about the story and follow developments in the situation based on information that I share with you as I did below.

Please also see attached the write-up of our workshop entitled "Who are the Guardians of Truth and Integrity?" for ASIST 2022. My own opinion remains that none of the misconduct, including plagiarism, will ever be stopped unless the peer review process transforms to fully open and transparent from start to finish of the entire process. I believe that is the only way to prevent the silencing, suppressing, and censoring of voices speaking the truth. I believe that is the only way to stop the rewriting and falsification of the historical record of published literature.

Thanks, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
(a 501c3 not-for-profit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org

8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: CTaswell (BHA)
Sent: Thursday, May 5, 2022 9:19 AM
To: 'Frank Vrancken Peeters' <frank.vranckenpeeters@springernature.com>
Cc: 'Richard Kempner' <RKempner@hlk-ip.com>; 'Bruce Sunstein' <bsunstein@sunsteinlaw.com>;
'Ivan Oransky' <ivan@retractionwatch.com>; 'John Rosenberg' <john_rosenberg@harvard.edu>
Subject: Who are the Guardians of Truth and Integrity?

Frank Vrancken Peeters, CEO of Springer Nature
frank.vranckenpeeters@springernature.com

Dear Frank,

Please find attached our letter to Springer Nature from Brain Health Alliance dated 5 May 2022. Additional supporting documents will be attached as a zip archive in the next email to follow. We look forward to receiving your reply.

Kind regards, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
(a 501c3 not-for-profit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org
To: ["Adam Marcus"](#); ["Ivan Oransky"](#); ["David Vaux"](#); ["Ferric Fang"](#); ["Miguel Roig"](#); ["Steven Shafer"](#); ["Mary Simmerling"](#)
Cc: ["Joshua Rubin"](#); ["Rebecca Kush"](#); ["Melissa G. Ocepek"](#); ["Kimberly Archie"](#); ["Rashidian, Christopher"](#); ["jneidich@wustl.edu"](#); ["ctaswell@bhavi.us"](#); ["acraig@bhavi.us"](#)
Subject: RE: Largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science
Date: Wednesday, February 26, 2025 3:00:00 PM

Adam, Ivan, and Retraction Watch Board Directors:

According to our email records at Brain Health Alliance (BHA), we first reached out to you at RetractionWatch.com almost five years ago in March of 2020 with an initial email titled "Plagiarism and propagated plagiarism on a large scale" about the misconduct with plagiarism by Wilkinson et al with their so-called "FAIR Principles" plagiarizing our published work, and then the continued propagating plagiarism by the Stanford University Biomedical Informatics plagiarism cartel led by Mark Musen in explicit violation of scholarly research publishing ethics with misconduct that was neither fair nor FAIR despite their calling it FAIR.

At BHA, we continue to wonder why there has been an apparent lack of response at RetractionWatch.com to our email below dated February 3 earlier this month? Meanwhile, today in your RetractionWatch.Com newsletter, there is another example publicized by you wherein RetractionWatch.com promotes its news reporting by claiming "Following our coverage, [yet another professor at some university] is being investigated for plagiarism."

Given the series of reports that we have made publicly available at

<https://www.portaldooors.org/>

proving our claim of largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of science and medicine, do you doubt or disbelieve the evidence that we have made publicly available?

Do you believe that some other case of plagiarism and fraud exists somewhere else that is larger or bigger as measured by some kind of statistic? We believe that it should be in the best interests of RetractionWatch.com, consistent with the declared mission of RetractionWatch.com as a nonprofit news service exposing fraud corruption and misconduct in science and medicine, to address this matter either (1) by proving wrong our claim of largest ever case of plagiarism if you believe that our claim is wrong, or (2) by giving this largest case of plagiarism the publicity that it deserves if you are unable to find and publish the evidence that proves some other case of plagiarism is larger and bigger than the one wherein we at BHA have been victimized.

We hope that you will kindly acknowledge receipt of this inquiry.

Sincerely, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
 Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
 (a US IRS 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org

8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org>

Sent: Monday, February 3, 2025 1:56 PM

To: 'Adam Marcus' <adam.marcus1@gmail.com>; 'Ivan Oransky' <ivan@retractionwatch.com>; 'David Vaux' <david.vaux@unimelb.edu.au>; 'Ferric Fang' <fcfang@uw.edu>; 'Miguel Roig' <roigm@stjohns.edu>; 'Steven Shafer' <Steven.Shafer@stanford.edu>; 'Mary Simmerling' <writewherewebelong.ca@gmail.com>

Cc: 'Joshua Rubin' <josh@joshcrubin.com>; 'Rebecca Kush' <rkush@catalysisresearch.com>; 'Melissa G. Ocepek' <mgocepek@illinois.edu>; 'Kimberly Archie' <kimberlyarchie@icloud.com>; 'Rashidian, Christopher' <crashid@purdue.edu>; 'jneidich@wustl.edu' <jneidich@wustl.edu>; 'ctaswell@bhavi.us' <ctaswell@bhavi.us>; 'acraig@bhavi.us' <acraig@bhavi.us>

Subject: Largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science

Adam, Ivan, and Retraction Watch Board Directors:

On behalf of myself and co-authors at Brain Health Alliance who have contributed to the PORTAL-DOORS Project, which has been publicly accessible with unrestricted free open access for almost 2 decades since 2007 at

<https://www.portaldoors.org/>

we ask you to review our reports on the largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science. We have been documenting this case of plagiarism and fraud for the past decade. We believe that it warrants your attention at RetractionWatch.com.

Kindly review several recent articles published this past year in our series of papers with main title "Unfairness of the FAIR Principles Promoters", in particular:

1. Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing
(<https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/CASTE2024Alanya-ISBN9786256959675-Chapter12.pdf>)
2. Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists
(<https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109639>)

and I have also attached a copy of the slide deck from the presentation given last month at the HICSS 58 Conference 2025 in Hawaii. Also relevant are our annual Guardians Conferences on truth in science and integrity in research which have always been open to the public at

<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2022>
<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2023>
<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2024>

and at

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2022>
<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2023>
<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2024>

Given your expertise in these matters, respectfully, we ask for your helpful comments and criticisms of the attached draft report BHA-2025-17 entitled “Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research”.

More specifically, to which research conference or research journal (other than our own Guardians Conferences and our own Brainiacs Journal) would you advise we submit this report so that it achieves greatest impact, ie, restoring trust and faith in the quality of the historical record of published scientific literature?

Sincerely, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
(a US IRS 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: [Joshua Rubin](#)
To: [Ivan Oransky](#)
Cc: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org; ctaswell@bhavi.us; jneidich@wustl.edu
Subject: Re: Largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science
Date: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 10:18:48 AM

Dear Dr. Oransky,

I am a long-time reader of Retraction Watch since I was introduced to it by the late patient advocate extraordinaire Casey Quinlan. I am a relatively new member of the Heterodox Academy, but was thrilled to see your recent interview on "Heterodox Out Loud with John Tomasi". Today, I am writing to you to inquire as to whether you or a member of your team would be willing to have a 1:1 conversation with me regarding overarching themes raised in Dr. Carl Taswell's email to you.

How I came to meet Dr. Taswell is likely informative. Professionally, I am a Clinical Assistant Professor of Learning Health Sciences at the University of Michigan Medical School Department of Learning Health Sciences that I helped envision and stand up. I also run a philanthropic foundation for the family of a late visionary of Learning Health Systems, pro bono co-founded two small nonprofits related to LHSs, and serve in a pro bono leadership role at a nonprofit organization that empowers survivors of sexual trauma. Following a series of scandals at the University of Michigan in which the President and Provost both abused their power unchecked, a faculty doctor separately was enabled by "Armies of Enablers" to commit a mass sexual predation of over 1,000 students/patients, and open discussion on issues ranging from public health to patients' rights to racism to antisemitism on campus was quashed by those in power, I took action to try to make a difference, especially when I realized the great University of Michigan was not alone among prestigious research universities in dealing with such similar monsters surreptitiously wearing different masks.

Already splitting my time between Ann Arbor, Michigan and Washington, DC, I advocated for and with survivors of some of these atrocities (from the University of Michigan and other universities), including exhausting internal mechanisms as well as going to US Congress and the US Department of Justice Office for Victims of Crime. In parallel, as an academic who works on systemic learning, I sought to inspire researchers spanning diverse disciplines to want to formally study why there seems to be so much resistance to systemic learning in academia vis-a-vis such issues stemming from systemic abuses of power.

I came to meet Dr. Taswell (who studied at Harvard University and NYU School of Medicine like you did) when he submitted a manuscript to a research minitrack I co-organized at an international system sciences conference. The theme of the research minitrack related to combating abuses of power in systems.

As an attorney by training (who also holds synergistic graduate degrees in public health, public policy, and business administration), in addition to being a researcher on learning systems who is concerned and fascinated by "anti-learning systems" that seem endemic in academia vis-a-vis such issues of systemic abuses of power, I seek to better understand what processes are available in which someone like Dr. Taswell would be afforded fair opportunities to present his viewpoint. As a bleeding heart, I want to see Davids in David vs. Goliath struggles be empowered to share their experiences and advocate for such fairness.

One point in your "Heterodox Out Loud" interview that particularly resonated with me was

your statement that science comes with responsibility. Building upon that thread, would you or a member of your team be willing to discuss such themes further with me?

Thank you for the work you do to hold science accountable in Retraction Watch and for taking the time to consider this email.

Best wishes,

Josh

Joshua C. Rubin, JD, MBA, MPH, MPP

Clinical Assistant Professor of Learning Health Sciences | Department of Learning Health Sciences, University of Michigan Medical School

Executive Director and Vice President of the Board of Directors | Joseph H. Kanter Family Foundation

Associate Editor | Learning Health Systems Journal

Founding President and CEO | Learning Health Community

Immediate Past President of the Board of Directors | PAVE (Promoting Awareness | Victim Empowerment)

Co-Founder and Vice Chair of the Board of Directors | Singula Institute

+1.914.393.6740 Mobile

Josh@JoshCRubin.com

On Wed, Feb 26, 2025 at 6:00 PM <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org> wrote:

Adam, Ivan, and Retraction Watch Board Directors:

According to our email records at Brain Health Alliance (BHA), we first reached out to you at RetractionWatch.com almost five years ago in March of 2020 with an initial email titled "Plagiarism and propagated plagiarism on a large scale" about the misconduct with plagiarism by Wilkinson et al with their so-called "FAIR Principles" plagiarizing our published work, and then the continued propagating plagiarism by the Stanford University Biomedical Informatics plagiarism cartel led by Mark Musen in explicit violation of scholarly research publishing ethics with misconduct that was neither fair nor FAIR despite their calling it FAIR.

At BHA, we continue to wonder why there has been an apparent lack of response at RetractionWatch.com to our email below dated February 3 earlier this month? Meanwhile, today in your RetractionWatch.Com newsletter, there is another example publicized by you wherein RetractionWatch.com promotes its news reporting by claiming "Following our coverage, [yet another professor at some university] is being investigated for plagiarism."

Given the series of reports that we have made publicly available at

<https://www.portalddoors.org/>

proving our claim of largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of science and medicine, do you doubt or disbelieve the evidence that we have made publicly available? Do you believe that some other case of plagiarism and fraud exists somewhere else that is larger or bigger as measured by some kind of statistic? We believe that it should be in the best interests of RetractionWatch.com, consistent with the declared mission of RetractionWatch.com as a nonprofit news service exposing fraud corruption and misconduct in science and medicine, to address this matter either (1) by proving wrong our claim of largest ever case of plagiarism if you believe that our claim is wrong, or (2) by giving this largest case of plagiarism the publicity that it deserves if you are unable to find and publish the evidence that proves some other case of plagiarism is larger and bigger than the one wherein we at BHA have been victimized.

We hope that you will kindly acknowledge receipt of this inquiry.

Sincerely, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD

ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org

Brain Health Alliance, Inc.

(a US IRS 501-c-3 nonprofit)

www.BHAVI.us

www.BrainiacsJournal.org

www.BrainHealthAlliance.org

8 Gilly Flower St

Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org>
Sent: Monday, February 3, 2025 1:56 PM
To: 'Adam Marcus' <adam.marcus1@gmail.com>; 'Ivan Oransky' <ivan@retractionwatch.com>; 'David Vaux' <david.vaux@unimelb.edu.au>; 'Ferric Fang' <fcfang@uw.edu>; 'Miguel Roig' <roigm@stjohns.edu>; 'Steven Shafer' <Steven.Shafer@stanford.edu>; 'Mary Simmerling' <writewherewebelong.ca@gmail.com>
Cc: 'Joshua Rubin' <josh@joshcrubin.com>; 'Rebecca Kush' <rkush@catalysisresearch.com>; 'Melissa G. Ocepek' <mgocepek@illinois.edu>; 'Kimberly Archie' <kimberlyarchie@icloud.com>; 'Rashidian, Christopher' <crashid@purdue.edu>; 'jneidich@wustl.edu' <jneidich@wustl.edu>; 'ctaswell@bhavi.us' <ctaswell@bhavi.us>; 'acraig@bhavi.us' <acraig@bhavi.us>
Subject: Largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science

Adam, Ivan, and Retraction Watch Board Directors:

On behalf of myself and co-authors at Brain Health Alliance who have contributed to the PORTAL-DOORS Project, which has been publicly accessible with unrestricted free open access for almost 2 decades since 2007 at

<https://www.portaldoors.org/>

we ask you to review our reports on the largest case of plagiarism and fraud in the history of modern science. We have been documenting this case of plagiarism and fraud for the past decade. We believe that it warrants your attention at RetractionWatch.com.

Kindly review several recent articles published this past year in our series of papers with main title “Unfairness of the FAIR Principles Promoters”, in particular:

1. Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing
(<https://www.portaldoors.org/pub/docs/CASTE2024Alanya-ISBN9786256959675-Chapter12.pdf>)
2. Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists

(<https://hdl.handle.net/10125/109639>)

and I have also attached a copy of the slide deck from the presentation given last month at the HICSS 58 Conference 2025 in Hawaii. Also relevant are our annual Guardians Conferences on truth in science and integrity in research which have always been open to the public at

<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2022>

<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2023>

<https://www.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2024>

and at

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2022>

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2023>

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/Guardians/Program2024>

Given your expertise in these matters, respectfully, we ask for your helpful comments and criticisms of the attached draft report BHA-2025-17 entitled “Falsifying the Historical Record of Scientific Reports in Knowledge Engineering versus Maintaining Standards for Objective Truth in Publicly Funded Research”.

More specifically, to which research conference or research journal (other than our own Guardians Conferences and our own Brainiacs Journal) would you advise we submit this report so that it achieves greatest impact, ie, restoring trust and faith in the quality of the historical record of published scientific literature?

Sincerely, Carl

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD

ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org

Brain Health Alliance, Inc.

(a US IRS 501-c-3 nonprofit)

www.BHAVI.us

www.BrainiacsJournal.org

www.BrainHealthAlliance.org

8 Gilly Flower St

Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org
To: "Jim Procter"; "Inke Nathke"; "David Murray"; "Jiban Pal"; "Sankar Pal"; "Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay"
Cc: "Kamila Markram"; "Fred Fenter"; "Amandine Masson"; "Brittney Abernathy"; "Lia Noce"; "Chaomei Chen"; "Zaida Chinchilla"; "Ben Daniel"; "Siluo Yang"; "Yi Zhang"; "Yuya Kajikawa"; "Liz Bowley"; "Grazia Savini"; "Andrew Dickinson"; "Margaux Dreyer"; "Chaomei Chen"; "Dietmar Wolfram"; "Joshua Rubin"; "Adam CRAIG"; "Julie Neidich"; "Carl Taswell"; "ctaswell@bhavi.us"
Subject: RE: Request to refrain from propagating the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles
Date: Tuesday, December 9, 2025 1:44:00 PM
Attachments: [ECAI2019DREAMFAIR.pdf](#)

To Jiban Pal,
Guest Editor for Frontiers Special Issue on FAIR data management

Thank you for your reply, shared openly here with all cc recipients on this email thread in support of open science. If you wish to promote open science and FAIRness, then please consider advocating for open public scientific discussion and debate publicly and "openly" without hiding, suppressing, disregarding, or otherwise ghosting the work of competing scholars --- especially when it involves the historical record of published literature available freely since 2007 at

<https://www.portaldooors.org/PDP/Reports>

with numerous publications that remain directly relevant to this topic of open science and FAIRness. Moreover, if your "professional curiosity [... as ...] a researcher of FAIR data management" is sufficient to serve as an editor for an issue devoted to open science and FAIRness, then you should devote the time to read, study, and learn about the history of this topic, the original sources for it published in the scientific literature, and the different uses of the acronym FAIR for interpretations of FAIRness, both plagiarized and non-plagiarized.

True open science must debate publicly not just the problem represented by the FAIR Principles plagiarized by Wilkinson et al from the published work of Taswell (originally written in 2006 and published by IEEE in 2007), but also the FAIR Metrics published by Craig et al in 2018 and 2019 with their design and use intended to combat and fight against this plagiarism propagated by the promoters of the Wilkinson et al FAIR-branded principles. In this regard, you must not forget your duty and responsibility as a scholar to read and think critically for yourself as a scientist, to consider contrast and compare the work of competing investigators, and in this situation, competing collections of FAIRness principles, and most importantly, to cite the original sources of the original authors if you wish to promote FAIRness of any kind.

The initial email in this thread included a pdf file attachment for our most recent report entitled "When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?" now available publicly and freely open access at

<https://brainiacsjournal.org/arc/pub/Craig2025WOAPYW>

Please take the time necessary to read this most recent report as well as the references cited therein. You will find extensive documentation with answers to all of your email questions with careful evidence-based documentation that explains both the past history and current situation in detail in numerous reports over the past 6 years that we have published since the IEEE 2019 ECAI paper by Craig et al (see attached pdf file).

In a book planned for publication next year, we will include appendices with copies of extensive correspondence exchanged over the past 6 years with the for-profit publishers which facilitated the propagation of this plagiarism by Wilkinson et al. As a "cautionary tale"

about the corruption in publishing and some academic centers, we will include all of the correspondence exchanged with the initial publisher Springer-Nature, which refused to publish any expression of concern about this case of plagiarism. That refusal by Springer-Nature should be a “flashing red light and warning siren” that serves to dramatize the monetization and profits in scientific publishing with publishers and editors who prioritize those profits over truth and integrity. This refusal by Springer-Nature also demonstrates an explicit contradiction of open science, FAIRness, and open public scientific debate with full transparency. The past misconduct and violation of publishing ethics by the for-profit publishers, such as Springer-Nature and MDPI, explains why this case has grown to become the largest case of plagiarism in the modern history of scientific publishing.

We will continue to report openly and publicly with full transparency at our annual Guardians conferences on progress in scientific publishing which attempts to reduce the troubling prevalence of this idea-laundering plagiarism by authors and idea-bleaching censorship by editors. We will continue to extend our work on the FAIR Metrics by Craig et al with new families of quantitative metrics that measure the manner in which publishers “practice what they preach” in support of open science and non-plagiarizing FAIRness for citational justice with quality peer review.

Sincerely, Dr Taswell

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
 Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
 (a US 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
 8 Gilly Flower St
 Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
 Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: Jiban K. Pal <jibankpal@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, December 5, 2025 2:19 AM

To: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org

Subject: Re: Request to refrain from propagating the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles

Dear Dr. Carl Taswell,

As I understand, it is a concern (only) to the publisher of the journal in which Wilkinson *et al.* published their conceptual paper on the [FAIR Guiding Principles](#) in 2016. These principles, regardless of who published them; have become fundamental to scientific communities across disciplines, helping open science practices to grow and evolve. The paper has been cited more than [19404](#) times in Google Scholar.

Therefore, as a researcher, I firmly believe it would be appropriate to convey your concerns directly to *Scientific Data* (Springer Nature) rather than addressing those who simply cite the source of the FAIR Principles. What else you expect from a researcher or academic communities.

However, due to my professional curiosity (and being a researcher of FAIR data management): I would be happy to learn more about the alleged plagiarism (made by Wisconsin et al) you claimed in reference to your work published a decade earlier. I would also like to understand the history and outcome of any communication or claims you may have made to the publisher, along with the supporting documents and evidences (consequential progress of your claim with responses from the

publisher).

If you have thoroughly documented this information, please share the details in a clear, point-wise and chronological format so that your position can be understood and assessed rationally.

Warm regards
Jiban

Jiban K. Pal, PhD

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata

Email: jiban@isical.ac.in; Ph: 9433161580

<https://vidwan.inflibnet.ac.in/profile/547381>

[ORCiD](#) | [SCOPUS](#) | [Researcher-ID](#) | [Google-Scholar](#) | [Linked-In](#) | [Twitter](#)

On Thursday, December 4, 2025 at 12:41:34 PM GMT+5:30, ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org> wrote:

Re: Frontiers Media Special Issue on FAIR data articles at

<https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/75294/showcasing-fair2-data-articles-unlocking-trustworthy-ai-ready-scientific-data-for-reuse-and-impact>

with the special issue call for a FAIR product, service, and collection of reports that continues to propagate the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles wrongfully published by Nature Scientific Data.

To: Frontiers Special Issue Editors Jim Procter, Jiban Pal and colleagues at the University of Dundee and the Indian Statistical Institute.

On behalf of nonprofit Brain Health Alliance, we caution you to refrain from further participation in continued promotion, publicity, and propagation of the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles that were plagiarized from prior work previously published almost a decade earlier.

We have documented and proven this case of plagiarism now in numerous reports that have explained in detail with clear evidence the violations of multiple different publishing ethics, including the COPE guidelines as well as Springer-Nature's own advertised policies and procedures. Therefore, we will continue to advocate for the formal retraction of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles published by Nature Scientific Data.

We encourage you to review the extensive body of published scientific and engineering literature that has been freely available open access at

www.PORTALDOORS.org

since 2007, as well as from the annual Guardians conferences since 2022 at

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/>

where we will continue to report publicly on this plagiarism case and other matters related to the essential importance of truth in science and integrity in research with respect for the historical record of published literature.

Please find attached our most recent report entitled "When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?" now available publicly and freely open access at

<https://brainiacsjournal.org/arc/pub/Craig2025WOAPYW>

with pdf file copy also attached to this email. We anticipate additional manuscripts related to this plagiarism case that will appear in Brainiacs Volume 6 Issue 3 before the end of this month.

We remain available to answer your questions about the critically important difference between the wrongful use of the acronym FAIR with the "FAIR Principles" by the plagiarists in Wilkinson et al 2016 for their unfair plagiarized collection of principles, and the rational logically consistent use of the acronym FAIR from the phrases Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports and Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records with the "FAIR Metrics" by Craig et al 2018 at ASIS&T and Craig et al 2019 at IEEE.

Again, we will continue to advocate for the formal retraction of the Wilkinson et al "FAIR Principles" published by Nature Scientific Data and derivative works that both (1) propagate the Wilkinson et al plagiarism and (2) ghost the original work of Taswell published during the years 2007 to 2010.

We trust that you will respect the professional code of conduct that requires you to complete both legal and scientific "due diligence" in your activities related to this field of inquiry involving data management and knowledge engineering for scientific research.

Sincerely, Dr Taswell

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
(a US 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: [Rector's Office \(UM\)](#)
To: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org
Subject: RE: Complaint re plagiarism by Michel Dumontier FW: Request to refrain from propagating the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles
Date: Wednesday, December 10, 2025 5:55:06 AM

To Dr Taswell,

Thank you for your e-mail. Our Rector Magnificus will be looking into this case.

Kind regards,

Debby Hewitt



Debby Hewitt

Executive Assistant to the Rector Magnificus

debby.hewitt@maastrichtuniversity.nl
www.maastrichtuniversity.nl

Minderbroedersberg 4-6, 6211 LK Maastricht
P.O. Box 616, 6200 MD Maastricht, The Netherlands
+31 6 3913 8500

[Disclaimer](#)



Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail.

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org>
Sent: vrijdag 5 december 2025 02:06
To: President's Office (UM) <President-office@maastrichtuniversity.nl>
Cc: 'Neidich, Julie' <jneidich@wustl.edu>; 'Joshua Rubin' <josh@joshcrubin.com>
Subject: Complaint re plagiarism by Michel Dumontier FW: Request to refrain from propagating the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles

Prof. dr. Rianne Letschert
President Maastricht University
president-office@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Dear Prof. Letschert:

We bring to your attention the misconduct at your university of Michel Dumontier and his practice of perpetuating and propagating plagiarism combined with ghosting of original sources that he plagiarized in violation of the code of conduct at Maastricht University.

We will continue to advocate publicly for the formal retraction at Nature Scientific Data of the publication that he co-authored with Wilkinson et al and for which he falsely claims to be the “co-founder of the FAIR Principles” as detailed in email below to Frontiers Media and in the attached commentary that we have published at our journal Brainiacs. Further details that document the story of this case of plagiarism can be found in our series of published articles with main title “Unfairness of the FAIR Principles Promoters” available at www.portaldooors.org with numerous reports dating back to 2007.

We encourage the Maastricht University administration to sanction Michel Dumontier and to submit a request to Nature Scientific Data for the formal retraction of his plagiarism. We will continue to report publicly on this case of plagiarism at our annual Guardians conferences at

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/>

Sincerely, Dr Taswell

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
 Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
 (a US 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
 8 Gilly Flower St
 Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
 Tel: 1(949)481-3121

From: ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org <ctaswell@brainhealthalliance.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 3, 2025 11:10 PM
To: 'Jim Procter' <j.procter@dundee.ac.uk>; 'Inke Nathke' <i.s.nathke@dundee.ac.uk>; 'David Murray' <d.h.murray@dundee.ac.uk>; 'Jiban Pal' <jiban@isical.ac.in>; 'Sankar Pal' <sankar@isical.ac.in>; 'Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay' <sanghami@isical.ac.in>
Cc: 'Kamila Markram' <kamila.markram@epfl.ch>; 'Fred Fenter' <Frederick.Fenter@frontiersin.org>; 'Amandine Masson' <amandine.masson@frontiersin.org>; 'Brittney Abernathy' <brittney.abernathy@frontiersin.org>; 'Lia Noce' <lia.noce@frontiersin.org>; 'Chaomei Chen' <chaomei.chen@cis.drexel.edu>; 'Zaida Chinchilla' <zaida.chinchilla@csic.es>; 'Ben Daniel' <ben.danielmotidyang@unbc.ca>; 'Siluo Yang' <58605025@qq.com>; 'Yi Zhang' <Yi.Zhang@uts.edu.au>; 'Yuya Kajikawa' <kajikawa@ifi.u-tokyo.ac.jp>; 'Liz

Bowley' <elisabeth.bowley@frontiersin.org>; 'Grazia Savini' <grazia.savini@frontiersin.org>; 'Andrew Dickinson' <andy.dickinson@frontiersin.org>; 'Margaux Dreyer' <margaux.dreyer@frontiersin.org>; 'Chaomei Chen' <cc345@drexel.edu>; 'Dietmar Wolfram' <dwolfram@uwm.edu>; 'Joshua Rubin' <josh@joshcrubin.com>; 'Adam CRAIG' <agcraig@hkbu.edu.hk>; 'Julie Neidich' <jneidich@wustl.edu>; 'Carl Taswell' <ctaswell@health.ucsd.edu>; 'ctaswell@bhavi.us' <ctaswell@bhavi.us>

Subject: Request to refrain from propagating the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles

Re: Frontiers Media Special Issue on FAIR data articles at

<https://www.frontiersin.org/research-topics/75294/showcasing-fair2-data-articles-unlocking-trustworthy-ai-ready-scientific-data-for-reuse-and-impact>

with the special issue call for a FAIR product, service, and collection of reports that continues to propagate the plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles wrongfully published by Nature Scientific Data.

To: Frontiers Special Issue Editors Jim Procter, Jiban Pal and colleagues at the University of Dundee and the Indian Statistical Institute.

On behalf of nonprofit Brain Health Alliance, we caution you to refrain from further participation in continued promotion, publicity, and propagation of the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles that were plagiarized from prior work previously published almost a decade earlier.

We have documented and proven this case of plagiarism now in numerous reports that have explained in detail with clear evidence the violations of multiple different publishing ethics, including the COPE guidelines as well as Springer-Nature's own advertised policies and procedures. Therefore, we will continue to advocate for the formal retraction of the Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles published by Nature Scientific Data.

We encourage you to review the extensive body of published scientific and engineering literature that has been freely available open access at

www.PORTALDOORS.org

since 2007, as well as from the annual Guardians conferences since 2022 at

<https://guardians.bhavi.us/>

where we will continue to report publicly on this plagiarism case and other matters related to the essential importance of truth in science and integrity

in research with respect for the historical record of published literature.

Please find attached our most recent report entitled “When Other Authors Plagiarize Your Work, Will the Journal Stand with You?” now available publicly and freely open access at

<https://brainiacsjournal.org/arc/pub/Craig2025WOAPYW>

with pdf file copy also attached to this email. We anticipate additional manuscripts related to this plagiarism case that will appear in Brainiacs Volume 6 Issue 3 before the end of this month.

We remain available to answer your questions about the critically important difference between the wrongful use of the acronym FAIR with the “FAIR Principles” by the plagiarists in Wilkinson et al 2016 for their unfair plagiarized collection of principles, and the rational logically consistent use of the acronym FAIR from the phrases Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports and Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records with the “FAIR Metrics” by Craig et al 2018 at ASIS&T and Craig et al 2019 at IEEE.

Again, we will continue to advocate for the formal retraction of the Wilkinson et al “FAIR Principles” published by Nature Scientific Data and derivative works that both (1) propagate the Wilkinson et al plagiarism and (2) ghost the original work of Taswell published during the years 2007 to 2010.

We trust that you will respect the professional code of conduct that requires you to complete both legal and scientific “due diligence” in your activities related to this field of inquiry involving data management and knowledge engineering for scientific research.

Sincerely, Dr Taswell

Carl Taswell, MD, PhD
ctaswell@BrainHealthAlliance.org
Brain Health Alliance, Inc.
(a US 501-c-3 nonprofit)
www.BHAVI.us
www.BrainiacsJournal.org
www.BrainHealthAlliance.org
8 Gilly Flower St
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694
Tel: 1(949)481-3121