Gmail

On Academic Misconduct of Dr Maligranda

3 messages

Natasha Samko <nsamko@gmail.com> Thu, Nov 12, 2020 at 5:00 PM
To: triebel@minet.uni-jena.de, Dorothee Haroske <dorothee.haroske@uni-jena.de>, "Hans G. Feichtinger" <hans.feichtinger@univie.ac.at>, pick@karlin.mff.cuni.cz, mastylo@amu.edu.pl, "María J. Carro" <mjcarro@ucm.es>, Leszek Skrzypczak <lskrzyp@amu.edu.pl>, adam.nowak@impan.pl, Irina Asekritova <irina.asekritova@liu.se>, natan.kruglyak@liu.se, Norbert Euler <euler199@gmail.com>, kufner <kufner@math.cas.cz>, Lars-Erik Persson <larserik6pers@gmail.com>, astash@samsu.ru, "Dr. Amiran Gogatishvili" <gogatish@math.cas.cz>, stepanov@mi-ras.ru, eiichi.nakai.math@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp, Katsuo MATSUOKA <katsu.m@nihon-u.ac.jp>, turowska@chalmers.se, sorina.barza@kau.se, seulydia@yandex.ru, Ryskul Oinaruly <o_ryskul@mail.ru>, varosans@math.hr, Giorgi Tephnadze <giorgitephnadze@gmail.com>
Cc: Lech Maligranda <Lech.Maligranda@ltu.se>

Dear Colleagues,

I am sorry to disturb you but I find it relevant to let you know about the shocking actions of our colleague Dr. Maligranda who seems to have lost his feeling of reality.

I am Natasha Samko, http://www.nsamko.com/

Let me draw your attention to a most outrageous situation that is difficult to believe in. At the end of my message you can also find my letter to Dr. Maligranda, which makes my letter to Dr.Maligranda open.

To describe the situation I start with the following.
Having applied to an open position at LTU (Sweden), I got it in 2013. There I met Dr. Maligranda. I did not understand the reason for his ill disposition, but this is his right to be as he wants. However, once I had to stop him. Dr. Maligranda submitted to AMS Reviews his review to my (with co-authors) paper with a wrong remark written in an offensive way. After my letter to AMS Reviews, Dr. Maligranda was obliged to change the review (MR3471305).

But what Dr. Maligranda has allowed himself now to do with respect to me, goes beyond any limits.

Below follows a brief description of Dr. Maligranda's "supervision" of a PhD student. This so-called supervision takes place in the atmosphere of corruption and academic misconduct in various forms in LTU, which I also have to touch on below. I never met academic misconduct in the form of such a false supervision in mathematical circles.

What happened at LTU could have been regarded as a personal adventure of Russian female E.Burtseva who used love relations to induce the chief P.Wall to abuse his power in order to provide her with full time employment as PhD student. However, it was not just the case of love affairs; it had serious consequences which have led to that four most successful researchers (L.E.Persson (LEP), N.Euler, M.Euler and me) of the small division of Mathematics were forst to leave the university.

In 2015 E.Burtseva (EB) who finished her PhD study in Russia, but was unable to have a thesis and a published paper, asked me for help. The help was arranged in the frameworks of an agreement between the Department of LTU and the department of EB's ex-supervisor in Russia. She came to LTU twice and initiated love relations with the chief P.Wall (PW). Violating the recruitment rules PW arranged a contract for PhD study for EB, without announcing an open position. So EB got power over the chief, P.Wall got EB's availability for love relations, while I had to do research papers for EB's thesis. EB's knowledge was weak and I had to work a lot with her.

After I had done enough papers for EB's thesis, the couple EB-PW decided to replace me as supervisor by PW, in order to prolong EB's contract.

So, the chief PW became the supervisor for his girlfriend. However they decided that her thesis would consist of the papers done by me (or me with co-authors). PW is not at all familiar with the topic of my papers. He is also known as a false co-author in at least 15 published papers where he did nothing.

Very soon EB became also co-author in the paper of PW with other colleagues from the engineering division in the topic where EB never studied even basic courses.

* The paper A.Almqvist, E.Burtseva, F.Pérez-Ráfols, P.Wall. **New insights on lubrication theory for compressible fluids. International Journal of Engineering Science, 2019.**

*** As I can see now from the advertisement about EB's PhD defence, see http://ltu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1477224&dswid=-5635, E.Burtseva again changed supervisor.

*** EB's new supervisor is Dr. Maligranda, but the "Bibliographically approved" consists of two of my (with co-authors) papers, which were published in 2018 when I was supervisor.

***** But for some (clear) reason Dr. Maligranda didn't include the above mentioned last paper of 2019, where EB is a co-author, into the "Bibliographically approved", although this paper was done after I left LTU. Why?!

As I can see in http://ltu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1477222&dswid=-4601, there also is submitted paper Burtseva,E., Maligranda,L. and Matsuoka,K. Boundedness of the Riesz potential in central Morrey-Orlicz spaces..

Ok, what a problem, let them continue and do a thesis with papers written under supervision of Dr. Maligranda.

****** But in the thesis under supervision by Dr. Maligranda, as the main published papers there are the papers done by me (with co-authors), where the statements of all the problems belong to me and the methods were suggested by me. Moreover, the paper [2] was realized by another PhD student S.Lundberg before EB appeared at LTU. EB's name appeared (by demand of the chief P.Wall) in the version when the research there was in fact completed.

*** I wrote at least twice my official declaration to the faculty board and rector that I do not agree that the research I had done, may be included into EB's thesis with another supervisor. But It is ignored due to the actions of Dr. Maligranda, by which he misleads people using misinformation.

Let me note that according to Swedish rules, https://www.ltu.se/cms_fs/1.2870!/5edf25e9.pdf, "A scientific paper that is included in a summary of thesis and that the doctoral student has written jointly with another person is only considered to the extent that the doctoral student's contributions can be distinguished".

In my declaration I asked "do not forget to let us know when we, all the authors of the papers, should present a detailed description of proper "contribution" of E.Burtseva, to which extent it existed if it was". The answer I got on Oct 16 was "Your email will not lead to any actions on behalf of the University at this stage". Soon after that I found that despite my protest Dr. Maligranda included my (with co-authors) papers as done under his supervision.

Thus,
(i) E.Burtseva was a first time full time PhD student in SFedU, Russia (2010-2013). **0 published papers; no thesis**.
(ii) E.Burtseva was a second time full time PhD student, in LTU, Sweden (2015-Aug. 2018), supervisor N.Samko. **6 published papers; a writing introduction to the thesis was started**.
(iii) E.Burtseva asked to change supervisor N.Samko by P.Wall (EB's partner in love relations) in Aug 2018. Soon EB became a co-author in the paper in "Engineering Science", 2019. It's remarkable that EB never studied even basic courses in the topic of this paper. **1 published paper in engineering science.**
(iiii) E.Burtseva got a new contract (third time for PhD study) at LTU (Aug 2019 - ?). Now there is an announced defence of PhD thesis with L.Maligranda as supervisor. **1 submitted paper**.

But despite my protests, Dr. Maligranda included my papers (with co-authors) into EB's PhD thesis with L.Maligranda as supervisor. And moreover, again violating rules Dr. Maligranda doesn't want to be scientifically honest and take into account the contribution to my papers (or with co-authors) of E.Burtseva only to that extent to which it was if it was.

***** In fact Dr. Maligranda as the supervisor provided the opponent and members of the grading committee with false information. Unfortunately, the opponent being misinformed and misled by L.Maligranda, is not aware of the real contribution of the candidate E.Burtseva for the title of PhD.

***** It is not correct that the opponent being misinformed will evaluate the thesis using the documents with false information concerning the candidate's contribution.

The case of corruption in LTU is publicly known. It was described by a journalist at https://forbetterscience.com/2019/08/07/the-darkness-of-lulea/

*** I will certainly continue my protest.

With my best regards,
Natasha Samko

Open letter to L.Maligranda

Dr. Maligranda,
Could you please explain the following?

* What was your contribution as E. Burtseva's thesis supervisor into the papers [2] and [1] mentioned in http://ltu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1477224&dswid=-5635 as "Bibliographically approved"?
"List of papers
1. Necessary and sufficient conditions for the boundedness of weighted Hardy operators in Hölder spaces
2. Multi–dimensional Hardy type inequalities in Hölder spaces "

* Who approved this "bibliography" for the thesis where you are appointed as supervisor after the papers were published?

* How can you know who and how did these papers if there is no information on the contribution of each author?

* Do you know that before I started to work on these two papers, I was already the author of 15 published papers in the topic of Hölder spaces (see MathSciNet)? Moreover, did you know that my PhD thesis topic was "Singular Integral Operators with Discontinuous Coefficients in Generalized Hölder Spaces", long ago?

* Can you assert that there in these two papers was a scientific contribution of your PhD student E.Burtseva who had never studied Hölder spaces before?

* Do you know that after I was scientifically robbed and in protest left LTU, I officially declared more than twice that I will never agree with an inclusion of the work done by me to EB's thesis with another supervisor?

Yes, Dr. Maligranda, you know all this very well, but you decided to take part in the shameful actions of academic misconduct. You decided to use this opportunity to get your "piece of cake" as you liked to say.

*** Moreover, you misinformed and misled the opponent and involved him into your immoral adventure of in fact academic misconduct.

***** I strongly refuse to allow you as supervisor that in EB's thesis anything done by me would be presented as her contribution. None of the papers I have done as supervisor for EB's thesis contains her scientific contribution. EB only digested what was done by me and my other then she co-authors. The only contribution of EB was that she typed parts of my and LEP's texts. But it was only about 15 such pages for all 6 papers mentioned above. Just in order to better understand what was done in the papers, EB did some simple exercises by analogy with what was already done or just by straightforward calculation. But such exercises have nothing to do with research.

I saw the information about the submitted paper Burtseva, E., Maligranda, L. and Matsuoka, K. Boundedness of the Riesz potential in central Morrey-Orlicz spaces. This is what you may include in EB's thesis under your supervision.

***** In all the mentioned 6 papers with the name of EB before the fall of 2018, there is neither yours nor EB's scientific contribution.

Do you know, Dr. Maligranda, what robbery/theft is? As the daughter of a lawyer, I will explain it to you. Theft is taking something that does not belong to you without the permission of the owner.

Sincerely,
--
Natasha, www.nsamko.com

Natasha Samko <nsamko@gmail.com> Mon, Nov 23, 2020 at 9:42 PM
To: triebel@minet.uni-jena.de, Dorothee Haroske <dorothee.haroske@uni-jena.de>, "Hans G. Feichtinger" <hans.feichtinger@univie.ac.at>, pick@karlin.mff.cuni.cz, mastylo@amu.edu.pl, "María J. Carro" <mjcarro@ucm.es>, Leszek Skrzypczak <lskrzyp@amu.edu.pl>, adam.nowak@impan.pl, Irina Asekritova <irina.asekritova@liu.se>, natan.kruglyak@liu.se, Norbert Euler <euler199@gmail.com>, kufner <kufner@math.cas.cz>, Lars-Erik Persson <larserik6pers@gmail.com>, astash@samsu.ru, "Dr. Amiran Gogatishvili" <gogatish@math.cas.cz>, stepanov@mi-ras.ru, eiichi.nakai.math@vc.ibaraki.ac.jp, Katsuo MATSUOKA <katsu.m@nihon-u.ac.jp>, turowska@chalmers.se, sorina.barza@kau.se, seulydia@yandex.ru, Ryskul Oinaruly <o_ryskul@mail.ru>, varosans@math.hr, Giorgi Tephnadze <giorgitephnadze@gmail.com>, ryszard.pluciennik@put.poznan.pl, Liselott.Floden@miun.se

Dear Colleagues,

Let me continue the discussion of the case of misconduct.

The information about the members of the grading committee was hidden but we succeeded to get it. Now we know who are the members of the grading committee, who is the chairman of the meeting of the PhD defence, and other information.

I attach the protocol which is translated to English, with my comments. I also attach the file with my description of the situation in more detail.

According to the protocol L.Maligranda, being the so called main supervisor, will also be the chair of the so called public defence. There in the room will be only the candidate, the supervisor and the chair in one face (Maligranda), P.Wall and two members of the grading committee: one from the same department, another one from the department of didactics, both are absolutely not familiar with the topic of the thesis. But they will vote for attributing the degree. So L.Maligranda together with P.Wall will conduct the process of the PhD defence of P.Wall's girlfriend with the PhD thesis containing the papers which have neither candidate's nor supervisor´s scientific contribution.

Below I keep my previous letter.

With my best wishes,
--
Natasha, www.nsamko.com

On Thu, Nov 12, 2020 at 5:00 PM Natasha Samko <nsamko@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear Colleagues,
>
> I am sorry to disturb you but I find it relevant to let you know about the shocking actions of our colleague Dr. Maligranda who seems to have lost his feeling of reality.

Gmail

In addition to the Open Letter "On a corruption case in LTU" of Aug 16

registrator <registrator@ltu.se> Mon, Feb 14, 2022 at 2:39 PM
To: N S <nsamko@gmail.com>

We have received your request. However, having checked, there are no such documents.

No further actions.

Kind regards

Från: N S <nsamko@gmail.com>
Skickat: den 7 februari 2022 14:53
Till: Erica Scott <erica.scott@ltu.se>; rector@ltu.se; Birgitta Bergvall-Kåreborn <Birgitta.Bergvall-Kareborn@ltu.se>; registrator <registrator@ltu.se>
Ämne: Re: In addition to the Open Letter "On a corruption case in LTU" of Aug 16

Dear Erica,

Could you please be so kind and help me with the information I need with regards to the issue of the robbery I was/am subjected to in LTU?

The issue I initiated concerns the matter which I regard as a series of phenomena of certainly criminal nature, committed by prior conspiracy by a group of officials from LTU as part of an organized international criminal group with the involvement of accomplices from Poland.

In the attached file there is my response to the Science Ethics Commission of Polish Academy of Science concerning the Polish corrupt group employed by LTU to award the doctoral degree for the PhD thesis with stolen my intellectual property.

* In the attached file with my response, there is the nailed file with Maligranda's explanations, where I found a number of statements which need to be clarified by LTU. For instance the following:

I. L.Maligranda stated there: " ***28 years in Sweden as an academic, most recently as a competence professor (the equivalent of the title of professor in Poland, conferred in the name of the King of Sweden)***."

* However, on my request to various Swedish Professors from UU, about the title "***conferred in the name of the King of Sweden***", I got the reply:
"Nej, det existerar inte efter 1991 då fullmaktsprofessur ernå togs bort.", translated to English as "No, it does not exist after 1991 … ". Moreover, L.Maligranda was promoted as professor much later than 1991 and never was Chair Professor.

*** **Could you please send** me a document confirming Maligranda's statement that he was appointed ***as a competence professor with the title conferred in the name of the King of Sweden***? Otherwise his officially written false information may be interpreted as nothing else but a purposeful vain mentioning of the name of the Swedish King.

2021-04-22

Natasha Samko

Personnummer: 510070401
www.nsamko.com

orcid.org/0000-0002-8595-4326

To: **Prof. A. Górski**, Chairman of the Science Ethics Commission of the Polish Academy of Science.
To: **Prof. J. Duszyński**, President of the Academy.
To: **Prof. Dr hab. Roman Micnas**, Chair of the council: Division III: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry and Earth Sciences of the Academy.
To: **Prof. M. Witko**, Chair of the council of Division Provosts: Division III.

Copy to: **Prof. Sanna-Kaisa Spoof**, Chair of ENRIO Board

Subject: On violations of the "Code of Ethics in Science" and committing international corrupt actions by prior conspiracy, by the organised group of the following mathematicians from Poland:

Dr. Maligranda (the organizer of the group), Poznań University of Technology, https://sin.put.poznan.pl/people/details/lech.maligranda_1

Dr. L. Skrzypczak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, http://lskrzyp.home.amu.edu.pl/en/index.html

Dr. R. Pluciennik, Poznań University of Technology, https://sin.put.poznan.pl/people/details/ryszard.pluciennik

Dr. A. Nowak, Institute of Mathematics of Polish Academy of Sciences, https://www.impan.pl/~anowak

Let me introduce the following issue to your investigation. The issue concerns egregious research and/or academic misconducts committed by the above-mentioned organized group. Namely, the members of the group each participated in one way or another in

*** robbing the owners of intellectual property and transferring it to others**;

*** awarding PhD for the thesis containing robbed scientific results**, to the girlfriend of **Meligranda**'s ex-boss in LTU, Sweden (the ex-boss and his girlfriend married to each other, in 5 days after the PhD defence);

*** supporting other research and/or academic misconducts.**

MORE IN DETAIL ABOUT THE MATTER IN THE SUBJECT

I. On the Maligranda's "performance" as supervisor of the PhD thesis of E.Burtseva

Let me first refer to the "CODE OF ETHICS FOR RESEARCH WORKERS", enacted by the General Assembly of the Polish Academy of Sciences:

3.5 TRAINING NEW SCIENTISTS:

"***The supervisor should perform his or her duties reliably, in particular do his or her best to ensure that research conducted under his or her supervision meets all the requirements of scientific work and that dissertation is free from unacknowledged borrowings from other authors***".

"***The supervisor should ensure that his or her research student is familiar with ethical values in conducting research, and above all, should be a role model for his or her student***".

Now, on how L.Maligranda, as Polish researcher, "followed" the above rules.

I worked at the same department with **L.Maligranda** at LTU, Sweden, to October of 2018. Around the same time he got retired there.

As I have enough reasons to say, **L.Maligranda** is liar and jealous of the success of others. Once I even took action to stop him when he, in order to mislead the readers, submitted to AMS Reviews his review to my (with co-authors) paper with a wrong remark written in an offensive way. After my letter to AMS Reviews, **Dr. Maligranda** was obliged to change the review (MR3471305) by removing his lie.

But L.Maligranda essentially increased the level of his immorality; and his adventure of the fall of 2020, with participation of the above-mentioned colleagues, can be regarded by me as nothing else but a criminal action committed by this organized group by prior conspiracy.

So, on Dec 14 of 2020, there was PhD defence of **E.Burtseva** with the PhD thesis supervised by L.Maligranda, affiliated with Polish university, see the announcement in http://ltu.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1477224&dswid=-62

The thesis consists of Introduction, Acknowledgements, Abstract and 4 papers [**A**], [**B**], [**C**] and [**D**].

I don't know when and how **L.Maligranda** became supervisor of this PhD thesis of **E.Burtseva**.

* But up to Aug 28 of 2018 I was her supervisor and after that, i.e. from Aug 29 of 2018 the boss, to whom she served in love relations, was appointed as her new main supervisor. The papers [**C**] and [**D**] were published before that day and **L.Maligranda** had no relation at all to these papers. Moreover, the original paper (it will be mentioned as [**BS**]) from **which the paper [A] was plagiarized**, was done by me (E.Burtseva only digested/learned what I did there) and it was published in 2016.

L. Maligranda as the supervisor did, as I can see it, the following:

* He helped **E.Burtseva to plagiarize** the material including my methods, approaches and all ideas and arguments from the mentioned above the original paper [**BS**] done by me (in some places the text even is just copied), and compile it with some evident changes concerning the replacing r^p by the Young function $\Phi(r)$ under the natural conditions on Φ. See the description of plagiarism concerning the paper [**A**], in the **Appendix_A**.

* He as supervisor helped **E.Burtseva to lie concerning the papers** [**A**], [**C**] and [**D**] (and other papers done by me for Burtseva's PhD thesis) and my supervision, in the Acknowledgements and Introduction. See the description of plagiarism in the thesis, concerning the papers [**C**] and [**D**], in **Appendix_C** and **Appendix_D**, respectively.

* The paper [**B**] is the only one where **L.Maligranda** and **E.Burtseva** are co-authors together with the known expert in the topic of the paper Prof. K.Matsuoka. It is enough to look at the references and methods of that paper to understand to which extent there can be Burtseva's "contribution".

***** The full text of the thesis was purposefully hidden up to the moment when the PhD defence would went into the past; it appeared in 3 days after the PhD defence went into the past.** So it was organized by the team of the husband of the candidate (**Maligranda**'s ex-boss) and **L.Maligranda**, in violation of all the well-known and officially published rules required to be followed for a public PhD defence.

* **Thus the hiding of the thesis was mostly done in order to hide the paper [A], since the paper [A] is undeniable plagiarism**.

II. On the Skrzypczak's "performance" as opponent appointed for the PhD defence of E.Burtseva

Let me first refer to the "CODE OF ETHICS FOR RESEARCH WORKERS":

4.1 GROSS VIOLATIONS OF ETHICS IN SCIENCE:

"***Other examples of serious violations of principles include misconduct in reviewing research projects, doctoral and post-doctoral dissertations***".

"***Unjustified quoting of works of others or one's own as well as deliberate omitting of citations is an activity reprehensible and unworthy of a scientist***".

L. Skrzypczak was appointed as opponent for careful reviewing the thesis in detail. And opponent sure must carefully evaluate candidate's contribution. This task is the task of high responsibility and this is the work for which opponent receives a good honorarium.

Dr. **L. Skrzypczak** was beforehand informed by me that he was involved in an unsightly and in fact criminal situation by being appointed as the opponent for Burtseva's PhD defence. So he had a chance to investigate the situation and take his decision either to continue to accept participation or reject it after the investigation.

Moreover, both my colleague Prof. Persson (he was co-supervisor before Aug. 28 of 2018) and I informed the opponent **L.Skrzypczak** about the lack of scientific contribution of **E.Burtseva** in the papers [**C**] and [**D**], and later he also was informed by me about the plagiarism in the paper [**A**]. However, having got such information he didn't want to check the true situation with the thesis in order to take the right decision concerning his participation in the PhD defence with such a PhD thesis.

Several times I contacted the opponent **L.Skrzypczak** concerning the thesis. After ResearchGate informed me that **L.Skrzypczak** read the mentioned above original paper [**BS**] (from which the paper [**A**] was plagiarized), I sent a letter to him suggesting to provide detailed information to him, on how that paper was written, since E.Burtseva was co-author being my PhD student at that time. I also asked **L.Skrzypczak** to send the thesis to me, which in violation of rules was hidden from public. I didn't receive any response from him and that time I didn't know at all about the paper [**A**].

L.Skrzypczak is more than enough qualified to see the evident plagiarism and manipulations in the thesis. But he didn't want to take into account and ignored the true information of candidate's contribution provided to him by the real authors of the papers constituting the PhD thesis, despite the fact that the opponent got authors' letters with a quote from the rules concerning evaluation of candidate's contribution.

*** Natural questions arise: would an honest opponent behave the way **L.Skrzypczak** did, and participate in such a procedure for defending a PhD thesis, when all the rules were deliberately violated?! Could an honest opponent who had been entrusted with evaluating the PhD thesis and who should feel responsible for awarding the PhD, ignore the candidate's true contribution to the PhD thesis?!

***** In violation of all the ethical principles, the opponent L.Skrzypczak in fact credited** E.Burtseva **with the scientific results of the other authors of the papers. I regard this as a corruption and crime.**

III. On the Pluciennik's "performance" as member of the grading committee appointed for the PhD defence of E.Burtseva

Dr. R. Pluciennik was the only a member of the grading committee who at least was familiar with the topic of the thesis. No doubt that he was invited by **L.Maligranda** and his ex-boss (the husband of the candidate for PhD). Other members were purposefully chosen among those who are "experts" to the same extent to which **L.Maligranda** is the professional Ballet Dancer at the Metropolitan Opera.

Despite being aware of the situation concerning the thesis, **R.Pluciennik** supported the PhD thesis **as deserving the award of a doctoral degree to the candidate E.Burtseva** who presented it as her own work done under the supervision by **L.Maligranda**.

However, all the three individuals, i.e. E.Burtseva as the candidate for PhD, L.Maligranda as supervisor and L.Skrzypczak as the opponent, blatantly cheated society.

IV. On the violation of ethical principles, by A.Nowak as Editor of the journal where the paper [A] is published despite of being undeniable plagiarism

As mentioned, the PhD thesis appeared available only on Dec 17 of 2020, i.e. 3 days after the PhD defence went into the past (it was on Dec 14 of 2020).

The paper [**A**] was indicated there as “Accepted”. Of course it could be accepted only in one of the following cases, either if the referees were chosen from absolutely not experts or if the referees were chosen among dishonest friends of **L.Maligranda**. Also may be another case which I will mention later after presenting here a description of my email correspondence with **A.Nowak** as the managing editor.

In mid of January of 2021, I got information from colleagues that the paper is published on-line in the journal “COLLOQUIUM MATHEMATICUM”, https://www.impan.pl/en/publishing-house/journals-and-series/colloquium-mathematicum/online/114038/weighted-fractional-and-hardy-type-operators-in-orlicz-morrey-spaces

I was not surprised that it was in a Polish journal, but soon I got very much surprised when I found **A.Nowak** among the editors and contacted him. Below I explain why.

I regarded **A.Nowak** as an honest person and scientist of principles. He was in my list of addresses among other Mathematicians to whom I sent the information about the issue in the subject when the PhD defence was just announced. I regarded all the colleagues from that list as never compromising with misconducts. I received a very supportive reaction from those from whom I expected it. I didn’t receive any reaction from **A.Nowak** but I didn’t expect it because we personally were never familiar.

So **A.Nowak** well knew about the real situation with the thesis and the paper. But since not each editor naturally is aware about the procedure of each paper in the journal, I asked **A.Nowak** about the Editor-in-Chief of this journal. He replied that he is one of two managing editors.

Attached there is the file “**Appendix_NS_AN**” with my email correspondence with **A.Nowak**. According to that correspondence,

* on 09.02.2021 at 14:35, I sent the description of the plagiarism, and

*on Feb 10, 2021 at 8:39 AM, i.e. early morning of the next day, I received the reply which I regard as either absolutely strange or just shows that the editor is not familiar at all with publishing ethics and such a concept of misconduct as plagiarism.

Let me react to the editor’s reply “***Our experts have compared the two papers in question. According to the experts, the paper published online in Colloquium [A] extends the results from the previous work [BS] and formally cannot be considered as plagiarism***.”

First of all, does the Editor **A.Nowak** want to say that if one paper in a sense “extends” another one, then it is not necessary to cite it and mention at all?!

But in the case of the paper [**A**] there is evident and undeniable plagiarism by copying all the ideas, methods and arguments, and even copying the text and specific notations from the paper [**BS**]. And all this was done to produce an impression that the paper [**BS**], from which [**A**] is plagiarized, did not exist at all. Sorry to say, but **A.Nowak** should feel ashamed for such a response. He himself as an expert in harmonic analysis is able to compare the papers and see that "***formally***" and also informally by its content, the paper [**A**] is nothing else but a shameful plagiarism as is presented in the description in the attached file "**Appendix_A**".

* I would also draw attention of **A.Nowak** to another absurdity of his conclusion.

***** What would have been a reason to hide** information about the paper [**BS**] if Maligranda's PhD student would become so higher qualified under his supervision that she **could be able to extend and improve my results?! L.Maligranda** would even put his name to the paper if there was at least some new extension or improvement. **The plagiarism and only was the reason** of not mentioning the original paper [**BS**] from which the paper **[A**] was plagiarized, and **additionally writing such a lie** in the Acknowledgements about the "original supervisors".

Let me finally express my extreme surprise at the very strange readiness of **A.Novak** to lose his own reputation in order to support **L.Maligranda**, who organized this absurd robbery in order to make more money from Sweden, and **L. Skzypczak**, who also participated in the robbery and deception of the public for a good honorarium?!

I also attach my comments to the protocol of the organization of the PhD defence, see it in the attached file "**Appendix_Protocol**".

Thank you for your attention to the case! I am open to send to you, besides the attached documents, any other documents including correspondence concerning the matter, upon your request.

Looking forward to hearing about the results of your investigation,

Natasha Samko