

To: LAW - Examencommissie[examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl]
From: 5.1.2e
Sent: Mon 5.1.2e 6:40:53 AM
Subject: reply: 5.1.2e : suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views
Received: Mon 5.1.2e 6:41:52 AM
[Turnitin AI Writing Overview.pdf](#)

Dear 5.1.2e and Members of the Board of Examiners,
Thank you for your email for the opportunity to respond to the concerns raised. I take these allegations very seriously and would like to address them point by point:

I fully appreciate the gravity of this investigation and the additional work my mistakes have created for my supervisor and the Board of Examiners, and I offer my sincere apologies.

This is my first citation-related breach at Leiden. It arose from an ill-judged use of an AI formatting tool and from my own inexperience—not from any intention to deceive.

Explanation for citation error

After meeting my supervisor on 5.1.2e I received extensive comments, especially on Chapter 5, yet had only one week to rewrite the entire chapter. To save time I asked GPT to convert my footnotes into 5.1.2e style instead of using the usual reference-manager plug-in. I believed this fell within Level 3 “AI-assisted editing” permitted by the University’s [guidance Scale of AI Use at Leiden University \(version 5.1.2e, p. 3\)](#), which allows AI for language or formatting so long as the output is checked and cited. Regrettably, some citations were altered in the process, and, under deadline pressure, I failed to run a final manual verification.

I accept full responsibility for these referencing errors, welcome any educational measures the faculty considers appropriate, and

stand ready to rewrite Chapter 5 in its entirety. I respectfully ask the Board to weigh these circumstances with care.

For example :

footnote30:



The reference in footnote 30 is genuine: it should read

5.1.2e

as shown in

the original article. During my conversion of citations into

I asked GPT to format footnote. Because

5.1.2e

work appears repeatedly in that thesis, the AI auto filled

name and invented a matching journal entry; pressed for time, I failed to catch the hallucination.



footnote186 :

This case exists. The correct authority for the statement on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] cases is [REDACTED] [REDACTED], which confirms that [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

[REDACTED] I have replaced the citation accordingly and verified all other [REDACTED] case references. The error was a citation-management oversight, not an attempt to invent sources. After reading the case, I then asked GPT to format my footnote in accordance with [REDACTED], but I did not anticipate that this would introduce formatting errors.

Explanation for English level

In my original thesis draft, produced under significant time pressure, I inadvertently included numerous spelling and grammar mistakes that were all caught and corrected via detailed in-text annotations by my supervisor during our one-on-one meetings.

5.1.2e

I then applied each correction to produce the polished final manuscript. Although I am naturally introverted and speak English with a noticeable accent, my written English consistently meets Leiden's academic standards—as demonstrated by my exam grades this semester in three courses:

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

I would like to explain the discrepancy between the Introduction and Chapter 5 concerning

5.1.2e

. After our first

supervisory meeting, I chose

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

Eager to deepen the analysis, I then independently expanded my scope in the second draft to

5.1.2e

5.1.2e

—and added detailed reasons for each selection. In our second meeting, my supervisor pointed out that some cases were based on older data and urged me to update them again.

5.1.2e

I immediately revised the Introduction to reflect this new plan and fully intended to adjust Chapter 5 accordingly. Unfortunately, with only one week left before submission, I ran out of time and overlooked the mismatch: Chapter 5 still lists the earlier examples, while the Introduction shows my intended final selection. This

inconsistency was a genuine mistake born of extreme time pressure and a sincere desire to improve the thesis—not an attempt to mislead. I deeply regret the confusion it caused and, should I be allowed to resubmit, I will correct this fully and transparently.

5.1.2e

My writing process started with identifying key concepts related to 5.1.2e and then searching these keywords through the Leiden University Library catalogue and Google Scholar. When I found relevant articles or books, I carefully reviewed their citations and footnotes, which enabled me to discover additional academic sources and deepen my understanding.

I fully recognize the seriousness of my mistakes, particularly my failure to manually verify the citations after using AI formatting assistance, which constitutes a significant oversight on my part. I deeply regret this lapse in judgment and sincerely assure the Board that I am determined to improve my academic rigor and strictly adhere to all referencing guidelines in the future. I am ready and willing to accept any corrective measures or penalties deemed appropriate by the faculty to reinforce my commitment to academic integrity.

--

5.1.2e

5.1.2e LAW - Examencommissie <examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl>

5.1.2e 21:49

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

5.1.2e : suspicion of fraud - invitation to state your views

Dear 5.1.2e,

Your thesis supervisor has found irregularities in your thesis that you submitted two weeks ago, irregularities that have given rise to a suspicion of fraud (use of artificial intelligence). The reasons for this suspicion are:

1. several sources mentioned in your thesis do not exist; and
2. your level of spoken English differs significantly from the language used in the thesis.

In accordance with the provisions contained in Article 6.2 of the [Rules and Regulations](#) (R&R), the supervisor 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.

Please find attached your thesis, which shows the comments of your supervisor.

The Board of Examiners will initiate an investigation into what happened and, once it has been completed, will take a decision about whether to impose a sanction. Before it does so, you are hereby invited to state your views on the matter and on its possible consequences. The Board would like to hear your views (via e-mail) on this on Monday, 5.1.2e 12:00 hrs. at the latest.

Yours kindly, on behalf of the Board of Examiners,

5.1.2e

5.1.2e



Universiteit Leiden | Faculteit der Rechtsgeleerdheid | Steenschuur 25 | 2311 ES
Leiden | examencommissie@law.leidenuniv.nl