

On the fraudulently awarded PhD. Issue 2: LTU case of deliberately violating all rules when awarding PhD for doctoral thesis mostly consisting of stolen and/or plagiarized results.

Natasha Samko

email: nsamko@gmail.com

Abstract: Irrefutable **facts and evidence of fraudulence** while awarding PhD to Evgeniya Burtseva at Luleå University of Technology (LTU) in Sweden, **are presented.**

Although it may be hard to believe, but what is presented here is the **true case of research/academic fraudulence committed by a group of colluding accomplices.**

In particular, the presented case can be characterized by the following keywords/phrases: **thefts** and **plagiarism** in Burtseva's PhD thesis, as well as **forgery** committed by E.Burtseva; the lying and thieving **impostor-supervisor** L.Maligranda; **opponent-marionette** L.Skrzypczak; **dummy-co-supervisors** S.Ericsson and I.Söderqvist; **dummy-experts-evaluators** T.Tossavainen, A.Holmbom and P.Jonsén; **illegitimate** member of the **grading committee** R.Pluciennik; **concealment of the PhD thesis** before the defence, during the defence and even **up to 3 days after its fraudulent defence**; keeping **secret** the link to the **so-called public** PhD defence procedure online; **chairperson** of the PhD defence act **and** the so-called **supervisor** (both **illegitimate**) **rolled into one**; PhD student position **as gift for voluntarily providing** certain **services of non-professional character to the boss**; the practice of robbing true authors in order to **appoint the boss as his girlfriend's** principal supervisor in the articles he had nothing to do with.

All this is not a Kafkaesque or Orwellian dystopian scenario, this is **the real case with evidence issued** in this presentation and supported by documents.

What's **hard to miss** about the essence of the award of PhD under discussion, is **the legitimization of not following** the rules and laws, such a model of "rule of law".

According to the rules, **Opponent is the central figure in evaluation process of the thesis** and **candidate's contribution to research**.

The appointed as **opponent L.Skrzypczak** confirmed in his letters that he acted quite **consciously**, taking **himself on the role of a guarantor** of the successful implementation of the **procedure full of fraud**, instead of performing the functions of appointed opponent. L.Skrzypczak deliberately **inverted** the procedure of awarding PhD according to the rules clearly defined in the relevant regulatory documents, **into a dystopian scenario** where the imposed **lie becomes truth**.

Skrzypczak's inherently monstrous **know-how consisting of mocking the law and cancelling the rules**, is not just immoral and/or maybe in a sense criminal, but it is disastrous by its consequences/influences. This contributes to the accumulation of entropy energy, the energy of **decay of true academic/research values**. Let me also refer to **Issue 1**, <https://zenodo.org/records/8370541>, concerning false authorship in

scientific articles and violation of publishing ethics,

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374113627>.

Since the **fraudulence concerns awarding PhD** to E.Burtseva for the thesis, where **3 out of 4 articles** are **my scientific results**, let me dwell in more detail on both **the content of the thesis** and the process of its **evaluation** at LTU.

I. Briefly on the content of the PhD thesis of E.Burtseva.

As mentioned, Burtseva's PhD thesis consists of **4 articles**: [A], [B], [C] and [D].

* Two of them, [C] and [D] are **my articles**, where there is **no at all Burtseva's contribution** as well as of the so-called supervisors fraudulently assigned in the protocol for the PhD defence act. **Evidence** of Burtseva's **lack of contribution** in the articles [C] and [D] can be found in **the Remarks** provided in <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/360790688> and <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375747198>, respectively. There are provided **pdf files** with the **Remarks**.

* The article [A] is a **plagiarism of two papers written by me** when I was the supervisor of Burtseva's PhD studies. Those two papers were specially **done to introduce E.Burtseva to a new for her area** of research. All ideas, methods, and arguments in the article [A] **were stolen and some parts were even rewritten verbatim by E. Burtseva** from those two papers of mine, without appropriate references. My article "**A Note on the article [A] as evident plagiarism**" is to **appear**.

* The article [B] is the only one not related to my work. The authors are E.Burtseva, L.Maligranda and K.Matsuoka. However, any expert in the field can easily see that there cannot be found Burtseva's contribution. For instance, in MathSciNet there is the following review: "**Based on the boundedness of the maximal operator and the Calderón-Zygmund singular integral operators, the authors obtain the boundedness of the Riesz potential in central Morrey-Orlicz spaces, and they also establish the corresponding weak type estimators.**"

** Note that the authors of the two mentioned articles on which the article [B] was based, are **only the two** Burtseva's co-authors from [B], i.e. **L.Maligranda and K.Matsuoka**. The question is what K.Matsuoka, as **the main author of the two mentioned papers could learn from E.Burtseva having nothing to do** with the two mentioned papers? How could she contribute to a paper that she simply did not understand? Moreover, E.Burtseva herself **confirmed lack of her contribution by not providing its description** in PhD thesis **although such a description is mandatory**.

* Moreover, there also is a "miracle" concerning **the matter of authorship** in this paper. At Maligranda's Google scholar account I discovered an article with **the same title as in [B] but by only two authors**, namely, **E.Burtseva and L.Maligranda**. Since the paper was not published, it means that the information **was manually posted** to the account. **By whom and what for** the main expert and author **K.Matsuoka was removed?** I had taken screenshots, wherefrom one can see that the only two authors there were in the paper under discussion. The screenshot and printed page can be found in the "**Appendix_screenshots**", page 7.

The inclusion in Burtseva's PhD thesis of the articles [C] and [D] contrary to the protests of the true authors, and article [A] which is plagiarism, makes Burtseva's PhD thesis plagiarism in relation to 3 of the 4 constituent articles.

** Ignoring the rule stating: "*In case of a compilation thesis where one or more articles have more than one author, the doctoral student's contributions to the various articles must be described in the summary text*", E.Burtseva **did not describe her contribution**. The rule can be found in Chapter "Doctoral thesis" ¹⁾.

*** Moreover, in acknowledgments in her PhD thesis, E.Burtseva **purposely wrote strikingly malicious falsehood** about the true authors: "*my original supervisors made my study conditions unsustainable, and I was close to drop out of my studies*".

* E.Burtseva **did not describe her contribution** just because **there was not her contribution**. Moreover, she wrote such a **defamatory lie** in the acknowledgments **to produce an impression** that **the true authors did not contribute to their own articles**, where **the true authors, as supervisors** for her PhD studies, kindly included her as co-author after spending a lot of time and energy to teach her by explaining everything in detail.

** Since PhD thesis is in fact **publication in open access**, Burtseva's **fraudulent actions** may also be classified as **fraudulently re-publishing the papers under discussion without permission** of **the true authors** and **denigrating their role in the published papers**.

With such actions, E. Burtseva **engaged in fraud/thefts/plagiarism**, presenting **the research of others** as belonging to her and her so-called supervisors who had nothing to do with the research.

* Burtseva's **lies were deliberately aimed at assigning** to herself and the false supervisors **the right of ownership** to the results of the research of the true authors. Indeed, **if nothing is written** about the candidate's contribution, what, according to the principal rules, **must be described** in the PhD thesis, **then by default** this means that the candidate is the main author of ideas, methods and implementations, and **the others are just idle authors** who have nothing to do with the research. All this, together with such a shameful and deceitful acknowledgement, as written in Burtseva's thesis, seems a **criminal fraudulence**.

** The role of each of the participants of **the fraudulently awarding PhD**, namely, **impostor-supervisor**²⁾ **L.Maligranda** and other assigned **dummy-supervisors**³⁾ as well as the appointed **opponent-marionette**⁴⁾ **L.Skrzypczak** and **dummy-members**⁵⁾ of the grading committee is disclosed in the **next part "II."** and in the attached appendices.

¹⁾ Regulations Handbook, <https://www.ltu.se/research/Utbildning-pa-forskarniva/Handbok-for-utbildning-pa-forskarniva/Doktorsexamen?l=en>

²⁾ According to responses I received from LTU to my requests, **there are no documents confirming that L.Maligranda was appointed as the supervisor**. See the relevant correspondence on pages 15-20 in the "**Appendix_protocols**".

³⁾ They are not at all aware of the research field in the PhD thesis. See the relevant information on pages 1-2 in the "**Appendix_protocols**".

⁴⁾ See the relevant **Skrzypczak's own acknowledgement** in "**Appendix_opponent**", pages 1 and 5.

⁵⁾ See the relevant information on page 2 in the "**Appendix_protocols**".

II. Important information about the fraudulence committed by E.Burtseva and accomplices involved in awarding PhD for the thesis containing stolen and/or plagiarized results.

In the following description there are provided **the main issues regarding the quality of evaluation of the thesis and violation of rules in the procedure** of the PhD defence. Therefore, we have to discuss **actions of accomplices involved in fraudulently assigning ownership of our research results to E.Burtseva and her so-called supervisors**, that is actions of **the appointed Opponent, Grading Committee and Chairperson**.

What is presented hereby **is not a scenario for a "dystopia"**, but a real story **presented with evidence in facts and documents. There are all signs of fraudulent offense committed by a group of accomplices by prior conspiracy.**

It's important to touch some relevant background issues.

In 2015-2018, L.E.Persson and I were supervisors for Burtseva's doctoral study. From **2016**, when she got regular **doctoral student position as gift** for providing sexual services **to the boss P.Wall**, we had, under threat of dismissal, **to provide** her with co-authorship. As soon as after **having provided enough (6) articles for Burtseva's thesis**, I **refused to continue** providing the couple Burtseva-Wall **with gift authorship** in my further works, the couple convinced the dean to replace us as supervisors, **with P.Wall; so the boss was assigned** as the main supervisor for his girlfriend E.Burtseva. The **mostly shocking** was that I was noted that **all research done by me** for Burtseva's thesis **would be regarded as done by E.Burtseva with P.Wall**. **I protested**, and as the result, L.E.Persson, I, and two other professors, Norbert and Marianna Euler, who also **did not appreciate corruption, were forced** to leave the university. Note, **E.Burtseva is known to use knife to put pressure** in cases **when someone did not satisfy** her wills. By Burtseva and her mother acknowledgements, E.Burtseva injured her father, and he committed suicide; she also is known to use **knife to put pressure on the boss P.Wall**, her sexual partner.

***** About the accomplices in fraudulently awarding PhD.**

In Oct 19, 2020, at the university site appeared announcement about Burtseva's PhD defence with **Supervisor L.Maligranda and Opponent L.Skrzypczak**. The thesis contained **only two papers; both are my papers**, see "**Appendix_screenshots**", pages **1-2**. I reacted to such say a Kafkaesque "vaudeville" by sending **Open Letter** to colleagues including the appointed opponent L.Skrzypczak and so-called supervisor L.Maligranda. The letter is attached in the "**Appendix_OL**".

• On the so-called supervisors:

In the thesis there are mentioned **three supervisors: S.Ericsson, L.Maligranda and I.Söderqvist**, see the "**Appendix_protocols**", pages **1-2**. None of them had relation to the project of the thesis and my papers included there. However, as known, **from Aug 2018** by Burtseva's request **P.Wall and I.Söderqvist** were assigned as supervisors instead of L.E.Persson and me, see the "**Appendix_protocols**", pages **13-14**. Both had nothing to do with the project of the thesis and the papers constituted it.

A relevant remark: as informed, L.E.Persson and I were **supervisors up to having provided enough papers** for Burtseva's PhD thesis. At the last stage of starting to prepare the final file of the compilation thesis based on our papers and writing Introduction **with help of L.E.Persson, E.Burtseva suddenly came to Prof. Persson at his home** (note, he had recently undergone surgery after a massive myocardial infarction), and **started to put pressure on him**. It was a **strikingly hooligan action** of E.Burtseva.

* From Persson's letter: "**she came (together with Peter) to my home and claimed in very aggressive way**".

* **Having known that E.Burtseva injured her father by knife and frightened with knife** her sexual partner the boss P.Wall, I decided that **I must inform** the dean about the situation in order to be not responsible for such inadequate Burtseva's behaviour. On request I can provide the original correspondence with the dean. Anyway, **the full story** about the **fraudulently awarded PhD** will be published.

*** **When and how S.Eriksson and L.Maligranda became supervisors, is an open question.** It looks they were **assigned only in the protocol** for the PhD defence.

* As for the **last officially appointed** supervisors of Burtseva's PhD thesis, it seems that there exists the only document, sent at request of the journalist **in 2019**, where states that **P.Wall was appointed as the principal supervisor** of his sexual partner E.Burtseva **in Aug 2018**. See the "**Appendix_protocols**", pages **13-14**. Concerning such appointment let me refer to: "**The relation between the candidate and his/her principal supervisor(s) is always considered a conflict of interest**" ⁶⁾

* **Anyway**, although L.Maligranda claims that he is not a "so-called", as I call him, but the real supervisor, **this is a much doubtful fact**. Note, to my several requests of a "**document on appointing L.Maligranda as main/principal supervisor for Burtseva's PhD thesis**", the last registrar's response of **Oct 13, 2023**, was "**We have contacted HR and they have answered to us that they don't have any other documents regarding the question you sent**".

** Before that I also asked about **prolongation of Maligranda's contract after Aug of 2020**. Response was the same concerning both the matters. Moreover, according to Maligranda's contract as Retired Prof. Emeritus he **may not be a principal supervisor**. **The evidence** can be found **in the second sticky note** on page **20** of the correspondence provided in the "**Appendix_protocols**", pages **15-20**. Thus, **L.Maligranda lied** about his supervisorship; he is **illegitimate** principal supervisor.

- **On the cheatings committed by the opponent L.Skrzypczak:**

According to the Sweden's rules, **Opponent is the central figure in evaluating the thesis and candidate's contribution to research.**

*"The role of the opponent is **to scrutinise all parts** of the thesis, **both the introductory part** where the essays are introduced and discussed and **the scientific essays included**, and also **to discuss them in depth** with the candidate at the public thesis defence act." ^{1),6)}*

⁶⁾ Summary of Procedures and Rules of the actors involved to public thesis defence, https://www.ltu.se/cms_fs/1.199989!/file/Information%20to%20members%20of%20the%20grading%20committee%2C%20the%20external%20reviewer%20and%20the%20chairperson%20of%20the%20public%20defence%20of%20doctoral%20thesis.pdf

Thus, the opponent L.Skrzypczak **must “scrutinise all parts”**, i.e. **Introduction and the scientific articles** included in the thesis, and the **thesis defence act must be public**. However, **due to the opponent**, all this was **fraudulently** violated.

* Let's analyse **how his scrutinizing met the requirements that are mandatory to be fulfilled** for PhD thesis and defence act.

Let us refer to **Regulations Handbook**¹).

“The summary text integrates the various articles and clarifies the doctoral student's work effort. In case of a compilation thesis where one or more articles have more than one author, the doctoral student's contributions to the various articles must be described in the summary text”.

In the thesis under discussion, such a **summary** is presented as **Introduction**.

* The thesis contains 4 papers, **in each of 3 of them there are 3 or 4 co-authors**. In the **summary (Introduction)** there **deliberately was not described candidate's contribution**, although it is **mandatory to be described by the rules**.

?!: **May a PhD thesis be considered legitimate** if **the most essential part that is mandatory required is intentionally/deliberately not included there?!**

* **Certainly, may not and cannot in a society of integrity/honesty!**

** In his response to me the opponent wrote: ***“I can only do what I am asked for by the faculty and I can do it based on the material they sent me. This is my only duty”***. See the email correspondence in the **“Appendix_opponent”**, page 1.

*** Does it mean that **the faculty asked L.Skrzypczak to ignore the mandatory rules?** If so, then was L.Skrzypczak a **mindless marionette participating in the fraudulence within the group of accomplices by prior conspiracy?**

Whether he just **consciously pretended to be mentally retarded, just for money?!**

** Does this **comply with the tasks assigned by rules to Opponent?!**

*** **What did the opponent-marionette L.Skrzypczak evaluate then?!** Quality of the published articles of **the known experts L.E.Persson and N.Samko? To whom the doctorate was awarded? To us?!**

* Note, we **provided Rector and the opponent with our protests against the “violation of the rights of the original authors to their intellectual outputs” by the liars and thieves E.Burtseva and the so-called supervisors, S.Ericsson, L.Maligranda, I.Söderqvist, P.Wall or any other one they would include**. Some of the protest letters can be seen in the **“Appendix_protocols”**, pages 21-24.

* Note also, the **opponent-marionette L.Skrzypczak well appreciated the defamatory lie** written by E.Burtseva in her PhD thesis as Acknowledgement: ***“My studies at Luleå University of Technology (LTU) could have started better. In short, my original supervisors made my study conditions unsustainable, and I was close to drop out of my studies”***, although **he knew that it was the strikingly defamatory lie**.

* **Compare it with the following, written by E.Burtseva when her studies “started”:**

“First of all I want to thank my main supervisor Professor Natasha Samko for involving me into a new mathematical field and opening a new exciting and fascinating world for me. I am eternally grateful to Natasha for her total support and

encourage which inspires and gives me a lot of energy and enthusiasm to work. Her careful and persistent help contributed enormously to the production of this thesis. I am sincerely thankful to Professor Lars-Erik Persson for the successful collaboration, exclusive support and his truly fatherly care."

<https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1034257/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

* Note, the above was **written concerning**, in particular, the paper later included in Burtseva's thesis as the paper [C], and also the papers from which the paper [A] in the thesis was plagiarized. A note on the paper [A] as plagiarism together with all details concerning the original papers in true documents, will also be published.

In his letter L.Skrzypczak acknowledged that he **was aware** also of this. He wrote: "*I have not doubts that you influence Burtseva's career and investigations. ... It is neither my duty nor my right to judge what happened at LTU few years ago that influence today situation". See it in the "Appendix_opponent", page 8.*

* What generous condescension on the part of **one of the main accomplices**, in fact the main one, in **the fraudulent theft and appropriation** of my intellectual property **to others!**

** I think some writers would certainly be inspired by **Skrzypczak's personality** as the potential **character** of their best essay about a **dystopian future** of a society **devoid of conscience, integrity, and reason**.

*** What was he talking about? **Who asked him to judge other things than the quality of the candidate's contribution to the research included in the thesis?**

** Whether he really **does not understand well written in ^{1), 6)} duties of Opponent?**

It's **unclear what he judged** but it's well clear that he **didn't judge what was required** from him as **the appointed opponent**. L.Skrzypczak did not evaluate **Burtseva's contribution** to research included in her PhD thesis, as well as **ignored** the rules **mandatory while awarding** PhD. It seems that he really decided to **consciously pretend** to be **mentally retarded by** writing the above provided quote.

* **Compare also above provided Burtseva's acknowledgements** with ones from her correspondences from **the stage** her studies "**have started**" until the day a week before **her aggressive hooligan visit** to Prof. Persson to "**claim**" him. See the correspondence in the "**Appendix_letters**". Note that out of **many hundreds** of correspondences **showing how deceitful E. Burtseva is**, only a few are given. Upon request I'll provide more.

*** Let me note that **Skrzypczak as Opponent** should understand that Summary of a PhD thesis is a kind of **reviewing and reporting** the candidate's original research, in writing. **Thus, giving no proper references to the used original source**, that is **authors' contribution** in the papers, is "**violation of the rights of the original authors to their intellectual outputs**". Therefore, according to ALLEA, Ch 3.1, it is **plagiarism in the thesis**.

** The **responsibility** for awarding PhD for this thesis is **on the part** of the **opponent-marionette L.Skrzypczak**, who **consciously** participated in such a **cheating/fraud** and **convinced** the evaluation committee to award E.Burtseva PhD.

* Let me provide more of **relevant facts/details concerning** my **communications with the opponent**.

Since I knew some of **Skrzypczak's co-authors from Jena** and had high respect for them, I accepted **my suspicion** that he agreed to be opponent in such a fraudulent event **only because he was deceived** by L.Maligranda. I sent him a letter where I explained the true situation, **noting that he may be involved in a criminal event**. His reaction surprised me. Apparently, **he was confident that thanks to the names of his famous co-authors from Jena, he was granted an absolute indulgence**.

* However, although everything indicated that he understood the true situation, but perhaps wanted to receive opponent's honorarium, **I a priori approached expectations with my usual presumption of respect**. I tried to explain giving reasons and continuing to call for the supported by hard facts truth to be heard, expecting that one day he would choose the side of honesty. **I had such hope until I became convinced that he consciously participated in the fraudulent act to guaranty its success in awarding doctoral degree for results stolen from us**. The relevant correspondence can be found in the "**Appendix_Opponent**".

* The opponent Skrzypczak **knew** and in fact **supported all violations of the rules of the PhD defence act**. Namely, he knew that **the thesis was publicly unavailable even during the defence**, although **by the rules it must be available at least three weeks before the defence**; note, the thesis appeared available **only three days after the defence**. See the details in the "**Appendix-screenshots**", pages 3-6.

** I, as the **known main author** of all ideas and methods in two articles **included in the thesis despite my protests**, asked him to send me the file of the thesis, but he refused. See the "**Appendix_Opponent**", page 6.

** **On the day of the defence**, I asked him **to send me the unavailable link** to access the announced as **public event** of PhD defence act, but **he refused with a ridiculous motivation**. See the "**Appendix_Opponent**", page 7.

*** Such a ridiculous **conspiracy** of the opponent Skrzypczak took place while the rule states: "***The doctoral thesis shall be defended orally at a public thesis defence act. The public thesis defence act shall be open to all...***"⁶).

* Below I provide the dialog concerning **the request** of my colleague to LTU's authorities in email correspondence (translated to English by Google Translate) of **Dec 2**; there were **only 12 days left** until the PhD defence act.

LTU: "***We have now received feedback from the Department of Engineering Science and Mathematics (TVM). The doctoral thesis is not yet available as a result of the confidentiality process not being completed.***

Sincerely, Registrar at Luleå University of Technology

E-mail: registrator@ltu.se Telephone: 0920-493369"

The interested one: "***Thanks for reply! I would like feedback on why the thesis is not publicly available, as the regulations for doctoral thesis at LTU say it must be 3 weeks before the PhD defence.***"

*** Only after that, **thanks to my colleague, I could see the thesis**. However, it still was not publicly available, and as mentioned the full text of the thesis appeared only **three days after the defence act was over**.

* Meanwhile, next day after the above correspondence had place, on Dec 3, there at the university site **were added two more articles** included in the thesis. See the "**Appendix_screenshots**", pages 1-3.

* After **looking at the thesis**, I **understood** why it was hidden and **why the opponent Skrzypczak cared on making sure that it was not available before the defence**. Besides the absence of the mandatory description of candidate's contribution, there were more **reasons to hide it especially from me**. Not only I, but also **the opponent Skrzypczak immediately discovered** that the thesis includes the **article [A] by the sole author Burtseva**, which is **undoubted plagiarism of my published articles**, the first one prepared by me for Burtseva's PhD studies as a learning material.

* Concerning this I also refer to the "**Appendix_Opponent**", page 6, where I drew attention of L.Skrzypczak to the fact that the article [A] seems to be **plagiarism**.

- **On the intentional forgery committed by E.Burtseva.**

Let us refer to the following rules in ¹⁾.

"The doctoral student is responsible for:"

* **"that the thesis is printed and published at the latest 3 term weeks before the public defence"; "sending the web address of the electronic version of the thesis to those concerned, external and internal, and interested parties"**.

* A reasonable question can be raised: **whether the authors of the papers included in the thesis are not among "those concerned"**? We several times in writing showed that we are among **"those concerned"** and asked to provide us with an opportunity to present our arguments. However, there was **just more conspiracy** as shown in the ridiculous response to the **colleague asking about availability of the thesis**.

** **As mentioned**, Burtseva's thesis **was deliberately hidden** and became publicly available only **three days after the defence**.

Moreover, **in order to cheat public**, 4 working days before the announced defence, **purposely deceitful information** was posted on the site "**diva-portal.org**" with the link "**fulltext**" with the reference to the "**full text**" of the thesis.

* However, the located file "**FULLTEXT04.pdf**" (File size 512 KB) contained **only 38 pages** with Summary/Introduction and Acknowledgement to the thesis, while the full text of the thesis is **134 pages**. **The part containing the articles was intentionally removed**. That may not be regarded as omitted by mistake, because one had to break the originally printed file to remove the part of the thesis. Thus, the part containing the articles **was deliberately removed and it could be done only by E.Burtseva** (maybe with help of some corrupt authorities) as the author responsible for "*the thesis was printed and published*" in accordance with the rules.

*** In fact, this was **falsification of the true document**, which may be classified according to Sweden's law Ch.14 Sec.1 of the Criminal Code (1962:700), **as a forgery of the document in a way by producing a modified document where the essential part of the true document was removed in order to mislead and deceive public**.

Three days after the defense, on the same site “**diva-portal.org**” with the same link “**fulltext**” to the **full text** of the thesis, there was already located **different file** “**FULLTEXT03.pdf**” (File size 1554 KB) containing **134 pages**.

Isn't it a kind of double forgery and fraud?! My answer is – certainly yes!

** The concerning **screenshots** are in the “**Appendix_screenshots**”, pages **4-6**.

*** To take such in fact looking criminal actions, there **had to be some purpose**. The purpose clearly was **to hide the full text**, where **E.Burtseva included** articles of others, **presenting them as her contribution to the research**, and **defame the true authors**.

* Indeed, E.Burtseva as well as the **impostor- / dummy- supervisors** and the appointed **opponent-marionette L.Skrzypczak**, perfectly knew that **E.Burtseva did not and could not contribute to the research in our articles** included in her thesis despite our protests.

* However, their idea was that **without seeing the full text of the thesis**, people would not be able to suspect that **there was plagiarism concerning the essential part of the thesis**. Note, all this was done under **Skrzypczak's** awareness.

*** Note also that drawing his attention to the rules and providing true facts, **I gave him opportunity to stop**. He **could at any time refuse** to participate in the **shameful fraudulent event**. However, even the fact that **shadow of his fraudulent acts could slip over the names of his significant co-authors** did not stop him.

* It seems that such personal characteristics as a **sense of conscience and honour**, as well as **truthfulness in general**, were **completely killed at the rudimentary stage** of the formation of the personalities of all those involved in this shameful and fraudulent event.

- **The Chairperson and Conflict of Interest (CI):**

“The chairperson **leads the public thesis defence act**. At least three weeks before the public thesis defence act, **the candidate shall send** the printed thesis to the **chairperson.**” ⁶⁾

* “The **chairperson** at the public defence **must** have a Degree of Doctor, **be a representative of the University** and lead the dissertation act. The **chairperson must not be the doctoral student's principal supervisor** or any of the **co-supervisors**” ¹⁾.

** Above there are the rules from the **regulation documents** ^{6), 1)}; the following shows how the rules were **not followed**:

*According to the **third sticky note** on **page 20** in the “**Appendix_protocols**”, concerning Maligranda's contract as Retired Prof. Emeritus, **his contract was** from Sept.1, 2019, to Aug.31, 2020. Note, according to the mentioned responses I received from the university, there is **no document about prolongation** of the contract. The **PhD defence** was on **Dec.14, 2020**, three and half months after his contract having been expired. Thus, **L.Maligranda being not a representative of the University was illegitimate** chairperson on the PhD defence.

In addition, as mentioned, according to the **second sticky note** on **page 20** in the “**Appendix_protocols**”, L.Maligranda as Retired Prof. Emeritus was **illegitimate principal supervisor**.

Moreover, according to the rule from the **Regulations Handbook**¹⁾ provided above, “**chairperson must not** be the doctoral student’s **principal supervisor** or any of the **co-supervisors**”.

*** However, the **illegitimate principal supervisor** L.Maligranda was **illegitimately** assigned as the **chairperson** (also **illegitimate**) at the PhD defence. These **illegitimatises as negations** have nothing to do with the third law of dialectics, the law of the negation of negation, as well as with the **concept of dialectical negation** and Hegel's logic.

Of course, even **if the appointments** of L.Maligranda as supervisor and chairperson **were legal**, there would be **undoubted conflict of interest** according to the cited rule from the document ¹⁾.

One more rather ridiculous fact of the dystopian miracles: **the document** stating **the absence of a “conflict of interest”** was signed by P. Wall, Burtseva’s sexual partner, on behalf of the **illegitimate** main supervisor L.Maligranda.

All these **absurd negations** represent the reigning model of “**rule of law**” that **denies** rules and laws. These negations of negations are **know-how of liars** from LTU with their **accomplices** from Poland, that are nothing more than **absurdity and fraudulent robbery by prior conspiracy**. All happened in relation to Burtseva’s PhD award has nothing to do with legal rights and ethics norms.

- **On the grading committee:**

In the “**Appendix_protocols**”, on pages **1-3**, I have provided **some description of the protocol** to the PhD thesis defence act; **the original document** (Swedish version) with my sticky notes follows the description. There **contains some information** about the **grading committee and other relevant things**.

* **3 of 4 members** of the grading committee, including deputy one, were **purposely chosen** among people **not familiar at all** with the research field of the thesis.

* Only the **unique** member of the grading committee **R.Pluciennik** (the **member1**) was to some extent familiar with the research field of the thesis. However, he **could not be regarded as a legitimate** member because he was “**from the same Division as the supervisor**”. This is considered as a **conflict of interest** and is **not allowed** by the following rule stating that **even deputy for a regular member** of the grading committee **should not be “from the same Division as the doctoral student, principal supervisor or supervisors”** ¹⁾. See **links** to their affiliation in the “**Appendix_protocols**”, page **2**.

** Such a choice of evaluators was **very striking**, since the PhD defence act was online event and **many internationally known experts directly in the topic** of the thesis, were **easily available online**.

* Obviously, such a choice can be explained by the fact that Burtseva’s PhD defence act was a part of a series of the **a priori fraudulent acts committed by the organized group of accomplices by prior conspiracy**.

* **Note**, the **opponent** and **member1** of the grading committee **participated** in the defence act **online**. Only one regular member (expert in didactics) and the deputy for

regular member (expert in mechanical engineering) of the grading committee presented in-person, both are from **LTU**. **Both are not familiar at all with the research area** in the thesis.

* A rather strange **substitution trick** happened to another ordinary member of the grading committee, **L.Flodén**. The protocol concerning this fact is dated by Dec 8, it was 5 working days before the defence act. This protocol can be found in the file "**Appendix_protocols**", pages **9-12**. According to the attached application for the substitution, it **was handled by L.Maligranda as the so-called supervisor and P.Wall (Burtseva's sexual partner) as chief of the division**. There is not written on how the substitution was motivated, but **A.Holmbom, the friend of P.Wall became** the new regular member of the grading committee although he was **not familiar at all with the research area** in the thesis, as the other two mentioned above members.

As later became known to me, **L.Flodén refused** to participate in **the fraudulent act of awarding PhD**, after having understood the true situation concerning the **stolen results in the thesis**.

As for **A.Holmbom**, he died of illness, somewhen after the fraudulent act of the awarding at LTU was already completed. So, we cannot know his motivation of participation.

* However, there among them **was at least one honest colleague, L.Flodén**, for whom **morality is not just an abstract** category.

In contrast, **L.Skrzypczak** and **R.Pluciennik** from Poland, well knowing the fraudulent nature of the event, could not deny themselves the **pleasure of mocking the honesty/integrity**. As for **L.Skrzypczak**, unlike all members of the grading committee, he well **understood the fact of plagiarism** in the thesis in relation to 3 out of 4 papers, as well as the deeply dubious Burtseva's possible contribution to the 4th paper **[B]**.

- **Regarding "the role of the grading committee" ⁶⁾:**

"The **grading committee shall assess the thesis** and **the public thesis defence** as regards to:

* The **candidate's discussion with the opponent** and ability to respond to questions and to **discuss the significance of his or her results** within the field of research.

* For a compilation thesis, **the quality of the introductory chapter and the content in the scientific essays included in the thesis.**"

- Let's analyse **how assess of the thesis and the public thesis defence** by the grading committee **met the requirements that are mandatory to be fulfilled** for PhD thesis and defence act.

Note, in violation of the principal rules, **there was no "public thesis defence"!** **Neither thesis** was available **nor a link to access** the defence act was provided. Not only we but **also other colleagues familiar** with concerning university services tried to find it out but could not.

* Concerning **assessing “the thesis”**:

** **Two of three members** of the grading committee **were not aware at all** of the research field in the thesis. Only one of them, **R.Pluciennik could be** considered as qualified. **However**, as mentioned on the previous **page 11** he **may not be considered legitimate** member.

* Meanwhile, concerning the assessing **“content in the scientific essays included in the thesis”**, all the **grading committee** members **were aware of our protests** against the use of our intellectual property as belonging to those who have nothing to do with it.

* In addition, all of them certainly discovered the **lack of description of candidate's contribution** in the essays, which is **the mandatory requirement**, see it in Chapter **“Doctoral thesis”**¹⁾; also, all of them could see **the strikingly shameful defamatory lies** concerning the real authors of the papers included in the thesis.

* Concerning **assessing “candidate’s discussion of the significance of his or her results with the opponent”**:

As described in the **Regulations Handbook**¹⁾ and **Summary of Procedures and Rules of the actors involved to public thesis defence**⁶⁾ *“The role of the opponent is to scrutinise all parts”*.

During the **public** discussion with the candidate, the opponent **must / is mandated to make clear the significance of the candidate's own results, “his or her results”** to the public and evaluation committee.

* However, **using the factor of non-publicity** of the PhD defence procedure and **inaccessibility** of the thesis to the public, **the opponent L.Skrzypczak** in fact presented **other people’s results as the candidate’s own ones**.

* In fact, the opponent **L.Skrzypczak intentionally misled** the grading committee by **abusing their trust to Opponent’s mission in principal**; L.Skrzypczak also **abused their incompetence** in the research field of the thesis.

** With such a choice of the grading committee, when the opponent **L.Skrzypczak being well aware** of the violations of the rules **and misconduct in the thesis** a priori **decided to deliberately cheat** society, and the **chairperson L.Maligranda** being at the same time **the so-called supervisor** of the thesis (evident **CI**) had all the **procedure in his hands**, it was easy to manipulate it. Moreover, according to Maligranda's acknowledgement, it was him who was **responsible for providing the link** to the defence act.

In response to my letter to **Science Ethics Commission of the Polish Academy of Science**, see it in the **“Appendix_OL”**, pages **6-11**, I received a big file with **Maligranda’s lies** including strikingly defamatory ones. A special issue based on true documents will be published. Here I just mention his **ridiculous lie** about his title of professor presented in the **“Appendix_OL”**, page **5**.

* The use by me of the term **“dummy members”** in relation to the evaluation committee was **not intended** to insult them personally, but to draw their attention to the fact that **they were used** as dummies. They were **a priori chosen** in order to put

them in a situation where, not being specialists, and besides being deceived by the dishonest opponent, they actually found themselves in the role of dummies.

** So, in a sense, the **members** of the grading committee **excluding** R.Pluciennik, may be considered **not so guilty in the fraudulently awarding PhD to the liar and thief E.Burtseva** by LTU, as R.Pluciennik and **the opponent L.Skrzypczak**.

Let me recall the **high responsibility assigned to Opponent** in Sweden's system. Opponent in Sweden is hired with a good honorarium for **highly responsible** work. **In addition to documents** ¹⁾ and ⁶⁾ mentioned earlier, let me refer to an **essay by Professor from USA** about **his experience** as Opponent in Sweden. I won't dwell on this too much, except to say that **he also noted the exclusive importance of Opponent's integrity / honesty**, see "*The "opponent" system: my experience at a Swedish PhD defence*" in <https://scientistseessquirrel.wordpress.com/2016/06/16/the-opponent-system-my-experience-at-a-swedish-phd-defence/#comments>

* As for **Skrzypczak's in fact fraudulent** actions, it seems that he is unfamiliar at all with such concepts as honesty and integrity.

Concerning **Skrzypczak's know-how** in the field of **fraudulence**: it essentially **contributes** to the accumulation of entropy energy, the energy of **decay of true academic and research values**. Some of quick results can be seen in my presentation in RG, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374113627>

* Moreover, Skrzypczak's know-how is **dangerous** because as a result of his in fact fraudulent actions, **a precedent has arisen**; a precedent of **cancellation of rules**, that has a certain prospect of becoming a **valuable argument for case law**.

*** Such a **know-how** as the **secret-public pseudo-defence act of awarding PhD** for the **hidden from public PhD thesis** with stolen results, took place in **Sweden's university LTU**. It was realized **by the corrupt group of accomplices** from Poland **by prior conspiracy**, namely, **Lech Maligranda (liar and cheat, and impostor-supervisor of the PhD thesis with stolen results)**, **L.Skrzypczak (opponent-marionette)** and **R.Pluciennik (illegitimate member of Evaluation Committee)**!

- The next issue will present even more striking facts and original correspondence with relevant bodies, from where it may become clear **why research/academic fraud is so fearless and daring** nowadays.

Thank you for your attention!