

5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Datum: 5.1.2e 08:48

5.1.2e <5.1.2e@law.leidenuniv.nl>

Cc: 5.1.2e <5.1.2e@LAW.leidenuniv.nl>

5.1.2e Fraud in thesis: 5.1.2e

Dear 5.1.2e

In the thesis by 5.1.2e student 5.1.2e (attached), the thesis supervisor 5.1.2e and the second reader 5.1.2e found a number of problematic references. Discussing this with the student, it emerged that most of the problems relate to careless or unprofessional dealing with actual and relevant sources. We can deal with these issues ourselves, taking them into account in the grading.

However, in addition to this, there is also the use of non-existing academic material in the footnotes, which we consider a case of fraud. This, we wish to report to the Exam Commission.

Here is what it is about – first our message to the student on the matter (1), then the student's answer to us (2) and finally our response (3):

5.1.2e and 5.1.2e to the student (e-mail of 5.1.2e):

"I am afraid that we have difficulties in understanding some of your referencing, i.e. your footnotes. Here are five examples, which we ask you to explain to us: [...]"

Footnotes 23 and 28 5.1.2e: these articles do not seem to exist; at least the relevant pages in the journal that you indicate contain no such contributions (there are entirely different articles instead). How do you explain this? Have we overlooked something? Note that this is a particularly serious issue since the indication of non-existent academic material by a student in written work is a form of fraud and will have to be reported to the Exam Commission.

Please send your answers to these questions to us by this upcoming Monday 5.1.2e 5.1.2e, before midnight."

Student [REDACTED] 5.1.2e to the professors (e-mail of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e):

“Footnote 23&28: I apologize for my mistake here. I am aware that this is a very serious and academically significant issue, and I am especially grateful for the opportunity to correct it. First of all, as I mentioned earlier, I think I have experienced the biggest mistake of working with different files here. [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

([REDACTED] 5.1.2e) is the author of several articles I read online to understand the general framework, particularly in the first chapters. (I am also including the links I added to my own list

here: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e and [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e Actually, I intended to make a note of the author’s name in case I might later use one of [REDACTED] 5.1.2e articles in the thesis. However, I mistakenly added it to my footnote file. Similarly, instead of keeping a separate list of articles that I had not yet used but was considering including, I placed them in the same file. As I failed to double-check this afterwards, those articles ended up being mistakenly cited in the final version. This was a mistake that should never have happened, and although it is not valid, it was an unintentional mistake I made due to time constraints, as I mentioned earlier. I apologize again to both of you for this. I am sending the correct versions below:

Footnote 23(updated):

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e

The paragraph I particularly refer to is: [REDACTED] 5.1.2e

[REDACTED] 5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Footnote 28(updated):

5.1.2e

The paragraph I particularly refer to is:

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

and

5.1.2e

to the student

5.1.2e

:

“We note your explanations, dear 5.1.2e which 5.1.2e and myself have discussed.

We find, based on your explanations, that some of the mistakes “simply” reflect a lack of sufficient care in dealing with sources. That is, of course, a problem but then one we can deal with ourselves by taking it into account in the grading.

However, the issue of the articles by 5.1.2e is a wholly different story: true, the author as such does exist and 5.1.2e has written pieces that, in terms of their

topic, can be relevant for your work. However, the fact remains that [5.1.2e] wrote nothing with the titles and in the journal that you indicated in your footnotes. In fact, various other people in other places have written pieces the title of which contains part of what you ascribe to [5.1.2e] in other places than the journal that you indicate. It is therefore our clear impression that you relied on AI here without then checking what it presented to you. The unfortunate, and highly problematic result of this is that your footnotes refer to non-existent academic material. That, we will have to report to the Exam Commission.”

Following the Adv LLM rules, we request the Exam Commission to look into this matter and to decide on a sanction.

Best regards,

[5.1.2e]

[5.1.2e]

Leiden University, [5.1.2e]

[5.1.2e]

NL - 2300 RA Leiden

(office address: Steenschuur 25, 2311 ES Leiden)

Tel. +31-7 [5.1.2e]

Fax +31-7 [5.1.2e]

e-mail [5.1.2e] [@law.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:[5.1.2e]@law.leidenuniv.nl) and [5.1.2e]

[5.1.2e]