

To: 5.1.2e [5.1.2e @umail.leidenuniv.nl]
From: LAW - Examencommissie
Sent: Thur 5.1.2e 1:16:22 PM
Subject: 5.1.2e decision Board of Examiners
Received: Thur 5.1.2e 1:16:00 PM

Dear 5.1.2e

On 5.1.2e, you submitted your thesis for the master's programme 5.1.2e Your thesis supervisor/examiner has found irregularities in your thesis that have given rise to a suspicion of fraud (use of artificial intelligence), because several references cited in the text do not correspond to the arguments attributed to them and several sources referred to in the thesis do not exist. In accordance with the provisions contained in Article 6.2 of the [Rules and Regulations](#) (R&R), the supervisor on 5.1.2e reported 5.1.2e findings to the Board of Examiners. The supervisor notified you of the suspicion and of the fact that 5.1.2e reported this to the Board of Examiners.

The Board of Examiners has studied your thesis and the information given by the examiner and on 5.1.2e gave you an opportunity to state your views on the matter and its possible consequences. On 5.1.2e you responded to this request via email. You write:

"First of all, I would like to sincerely apologize for the concerns you have raised regarding my thesis. I deeply regret the issues with my paper and would like to provide a detailed explanation.

I fully acknowledge that there were errors in my thesis caused by my own oversight. Throughout the process of writing the paper, I focused primarily on revising the content and refining the arguments, while neglecting a thorough check on formatting and citation details. This led to my failure to re-confirm the accuracy of the citation format, resulting in several mistakes caused by my carelessness. I feel deeply guilty about these errors and sincerely apologize for the confusion and inconvenience they may have caused. I must clarify that I have not engaged in any form of academic fraud or misconduct; these errors were entirely due to my negligence and were not intentional. Please refer to Attachment 1.

5.1.2e
5.1.2e I made several mistakes during the review process. I feel deeply regretful and self-critical about these errors.

5.1.1d,5.1.2e

Furthermore, I would like to share more about my personal situation. 5.1.2e
5.1.2e

For these mistakes, I feel deeply regretful and sincerely apologize. I understand that academic writing requires a high degree of accuracy and rigor. I will definitely learn from this experience and hold myself to higher standards to ensure such issues do not occur again. As 5.1.2e I fully recognize my mistakes and impulsiveness, and I sincerely take responsibility for my negligence.

Nevertheless, I still hope the Board of Examiners will consider granting me the opportunity to resubmit my thesis. I understand that 247453 my graduation is almost inevitable, but I still hope to minimize the duration of this delay as much as possible. 5.1.2e0059

Furthermore, since I need to re-register for courses by 5.1.2e, I request the Board of Examiners to make a decision as soon as possible, so that I can handle the related matters in a timely manner.

Once again, I sincerely thank you for your understanding and support, and I appreciate the opportunity to provide further clarification."

Attached to this e-mail is a document titled "Explanation and apology", in which you write:

"I have addressed each of the concerns you raised, and I sincerely apologize for the mistakes. Regarding the citation issues, I realize there were indeed some discrepancies. This may have been due to a misunderstanding of the content of the articles, which led to citations that did not fully align with the arguments in my paper. While there are similarities or closeness in some parts, I failed to accurately convey the original meaning, which may have caused some confusion, for which I deeply apologize.

As for the citation format errors, this was due to my own oversight. Before submitting the paper, I did not thoroughly check the application of footnotes, nor did I carefully verify whether the page numbers were accurate or if there were any issues with the title or publisher information. These issues were entirely caused by my own lack of attention when organizing and proofreading, and I take full responsibility for them. I deeply regret this and acknowledge it as my fault.

I want to make it clear that none of these issues stemmed from any intent of academic dishonesty. I have not engaged in any form of academic fraud or deliberate misrepresentation. I place great importance on academic integrity, and all of these errors were due to my own carelessness and lack of attention, rather than any intentional wrongdoing. I deeply regret these oversights and I promise to pay more attention to detail and accuracy in my future academic writing to prevent similar issues from arising."

In this document you further address the incorrect references that gave rise to the suspicion of the use of AI, attributing these to carelessness, honest mistakes, unintentional errors, and/or lapses in your citation process. You also now provide the references as you say they should have been.

On 5.1.2e you sent a second email, writing:

"I am writing to provide further clarification regarding the concerns raised about my thesis and the use of AI detection tools. I understand the importance of academic integrity and would like to address any misunderstandings surrounding this matter.

In order to better explain the situation, I have located the AI detection report I previously used to check my thesis. The report shows that the AI similarity rate of my thesis is within a reasonable range, well below any thresholds that would suggest improper use of AI-generated content. The similarity detected primarily comes from properly cited academic sources and is in line with the expected standards for academic writing.

I want to emphasize that any issues regarding the citations and format of my thesis were caused solely by my own oversight. While I used an AI tool to help with reference management and formatting in order to comply with 5.1.2e guidelines, I unfortunately failed to carefully verify the accuracy of the references after they were adjusted by the tool. This was a lapse on my part, and I sincerely apologize for not double-checking the results. I assure you that this mistake was not intentional and was purely due to my own negligence.

I hope this explanation, along with the AI detection report, can help clear up any confusion. I remain fully committed to academic integrity and take full responsibility for the errors in my thesis.

Thank you for your time and understanding. I am more than happy to provide any further information or clarification you may need. I sincerely hope this will resolve any concerns and that the situation can be understood in the context of a genuine oversight on my part."

Attached to this email is the AI detection report referred to in your email.

The Board of Examiners considers as follows.

Pursuant to Article 6.1 R&R, insofar as relevant here, fraud is understood to mean "any action or omission that renders proper judgment of someone's knowledge, insight, skills, (professional) attitude or reflection entirely or partially impossible. This includes in any event the possession of unauthorised communication equipment, software such as unauthorised AI software", "making use of fictitious research data, graphs, literature and literature references". Pursuant to the same article, plagiarism is a form of fraud and includes in any event "[u]sing or copying someone else's texts, data or ideas without complete and accurate source referencing".

It follows from this definition that for there to be fraud, the intention of the student is irrelevant.

There can be no doubt that you are guilty of fraud as defined in Article 6.1, because there are several references to sources that do not exist and because in a number of cases, the argument in the text cannot be found at the indicated place in the source referred to. To name but a few examples, the pages cited in footnotes 51 and 52 do not correspond with the statement; the same goes for footnotes 70 and 75; footnotes 85 and 91 refer to sources that do not exist; and the same goes for footnotes 97 and 125.

What you say in your emails of 5.1.2e and in the document attached to the first email does not alter this and cannot excuse or justify it. Neither does the AI report attached to your second email. In this regard, the Board also notes that you were warned against using generative AI by your supervisor and the thesis coordinator, who according to information provided by the supervisor:

“When 5.1.2e submitted 5.1.2e final draft, I had a meeting with 5.1.2e and the thesis coordinator, 5.1.2e during the review of this piece, I found some inconsistencies in the footnotes and sources, among others, by textually citing quotes from sources that did not exist in the cited piece. In this sense, we reminded 5.1.2e that 5.1.2e could not use AI to write the thesis and also reminded the student of the need to be careful with the sources and citations used in the final submission.”

The Board of Examiners further considers that you signed the following Declaration of Authenticity when you submitted the thesis:

“I hereby certify that this is an original work, that this thesis does not contain any materials from other sources unless these sources have been clearly identified in footnotes and any and all quotations have been properly marked as such a full attribution made to the author(s) thereof.

I further certify that this work is the product of my own skills and abilities, that it does not contain any part that was produced via the aid, support or assistance of artificial intelligence, including translation systems, or other third parties, including natural persons.”

There can be no doubt that you acted contrary to this declaration, because by your own admission you did use artificial intelligence for your references. There can also be no doubt that you did so consciously. This means that you did not take the Declaration seriously. It also means that you signed the declaration knowing that you had acted contrary to what it said.

With regard to the question of whether a sanction should be imposed and, if so, which sanction is appropriate, the Board of Examiners notes that fraud is regarded by the university as a serious offence, which in principle must be dealt with strictly. In the words of the Examination Appeals Board: “The starting point of the Board, as well as of the university, is that fraud in any form or scale is not tolerated within an academic environment.” “The academic ‘company’ exists by virtue of trust in the integrity of the scholar. A (prospective) scholar must therefore refrain from fraud at all times (...)”.

The Board of Examiners endorses this point of view, also in the light of the task assigned to it by law to guarantee the quality of the exams and examinations.

The Board of Examiners is of the opinion that you are guilty of serious fraud, by submitting a master thesis containing a number of references to sources that do not exist or that do not correspond to the arguments attributed to it, and by signing a declaration of originality that you knew in your case to be contrary to the truth. You have thus demonstrated a serious lack of academic integrity. Therefore, the Board is of the opinion that an official warning and declaring the result of your thesis invalid would not do justice to the facts and that there is no reason to give you an opportunity to repair the defects. What you say in your emails and the information contained in the attachments is no reason for the Board to decide otherwise.

Therefore, the Board, by virtue of Article 7.12b paragraph 2 of the Higher Education Act (*Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek, WHW*) and Article 6.6.3 sub b. and c. *R&R*

- declares the result of your thesis invalid; and
- excludes you from the opportunity to resubmit your thesis.

This means that your thesis will not be graded and that you have to write a new thesis.

Your supervisor and the thesis coordinator have been informed of this decision.

A note of this decision will be added to your electronic file (i.e. uSis), which will not be shared with other persons.

On behalf of the Board of Examiners of Leiden Law School,

An [appeal](#) against this decision lies with the Examination Appeals Board, c/o Rapenburg 70 , PO Box 9500 , 2300 RA Leiden or via email: cbe@bb.leidenuniv.nl. An appeal must be lodged within six weeks after the decision having been emailed to you.