# INQUIRY REPORT CHECKLIST[1]

**Office of Research Integrity**
**Division of Investigative Oversight**

**DIO # _____**

1. Summary or background information

2. Name, position, and contact information of respondent(s) and complainant(s) and contact information for respondent's attorney, if applicable

3. Allegations received and examined by the institution, including the complainant's comments and the date the institution received the allegations

    a. Description of the allegation(s) of research misconduct – each allegation should be framed with:

        1) Respondent's name, if known
        2) Where the falsified/fabricated/plagiarized (f/f/p) data/information were included (paper, grant application, etc.)
        3) Which specific figure, text, and/or data were f/f/p
        4) What the alleged f/f/p was and what the actual experimental results were, if known

    b. Any additional research misconduct allegation(s) that arose during the inquiry, including:

        1) Other papers or manuscripts submitted but not accepted for publication
        2) Other PHS grant applications submitted for funding or awarded
        3) Progress reports, presentations, posters, or other research records

    c. Any additional respondents identified during the inquiry

4. PHS support/ORI jurisdiction

    a. Grant, grant application, or contract number(s), designated Principal Investigator(s) (PI[s]), and date(s) of application submission or award (with project dates)

    b. List of paper(s), abstract(s), poster(s), or presentation(s) affected and the PHS support for each

    c. List of any grants or contracts that were withdrawn or publications that were corrected or retracted

[1]The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide clarity to the public regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.

d. If the alleged research misconduct occurred more than six years before the date the institution received the initial allegation of research misconduct, identification of the respondent's subsequent use, if any, that meets the requirements of 42 C.F.R. § 93.105(b)(1).

5. Composition of the inquiry committee (names, degrees, departmental affiliation, and expertise) and the charge to the committee

6. Notice to the respondent of the inquiry, with allegation(s) identified

   a. Respondent's response to the notice

   b. If relevant, admission statement from the respondent

7. Attachments/Exhibits of evidence and other relevant documents sequestered during the inquiry

   a. Annotated inventory of sequestered records/evidence and chain of custody document(s)

   b. Description of how sequestration was conducted

8. Transcripts or recordings of interviews of the respondent(s), complainant(s), and witness(es) with their names, degrees, and departmental affiliation

9. Institutional policies and procedures[2]

10. Timeline, process, and procedural history

11. Inquiry committee's analysis

   a. Assessment of all relevant information

   b. Conclusions or recommended findings and institutional actions

12. Description of any factors that may have affected the inquiry (non-responsive or cooperative respondent, complainant, or witnesses; difficultly in sequestering or examining evidence; institutional procedural issues, etc.)

   a. Any institutional action(s) administered during or as a result of the inquiry

[2]In accordance with 42 C.F.R. § 93.301, the responsible institutional official must assure on behalf of the institution that the institution: has written policies and procedures in compliance with this part for inquiring into and investigating allegations of research misconduct; and complies with its own policies and procedures and the requirements of this regulation. Institutions maintain their assurance by submitting an Annual Report on Possible Research Misconduct (Form PHS-6349): https://ori.hhs.gov/sites/default/files/2020-01/PHS-6349_2019.pdf to: ORI_Assurance@hhs.gov

13. Respondent's (and if applicable, complainant's) response to draft inquiry report

    a. Inquiry committee's response to the comments

14. Written decision from the responsible institutional official with the determination to initiate (or not initiate) an investigation

15. Notice to the respondent (and if applicable, the complainant) of the institutional decision