

Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists

Carl Taswell

Brain Health Alliance, Ladera Ranch, California USA

HICSS 58 Conference 2025, Waikoloa Hawaii
Minitrack on Combating Abuses of Power in Systems



The Unfairness of Propagating Plagiarism by Promoting the Wilkinson et al 2016 Plagiarism while Ghosting the Original 2007 Taswell Publication

HICSS-58-8336 Abstract: Accountability for integrity in research publishing has been abandoned at some journals and universities. Published reports have proven the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles from the PORTAL-DOORS Principles previously published by Taswell almost a decade earlier. Despite the flagrant plagiarism in this Wilkinson case, it has not yet been retracted by the journals involved. Complaints submitted by Taswell to publishers and integrity offices were disregarded or denied, thereby enabling the plagiarists to spread their plagiarism with impunity. The case study reported here details an account of one of these sham investigations. Investigators aided and abetted the plagiarists by imposing a requirement of confidentiality on the complainant, excluding the documentary evidence submitted by the complainant, and engaging in protracted delays that failed to slow the propagating plagiarism. Investigations of plagiarism should be conducted openly with public debate as done for jury trials in courts of law.

The 6P Problem of the Predatory Practice of Plagiarism by Persons in Positions of Power (PPPPPP)

- The 6P problem of the Predatory Practice of Plagiarism by Persons in Positions of Power (PPPPPP) involves teachers, professors and other persons who control the levers of power and money at universities, integrity offices, journals, publishers, and funding agencies
- *This 6P problem of plagiarism involves teachers against other teachers, and it has nothing to do with students* — but also involves the gaslighting and ghosting of victims without power who have been abused by those persons with power
- This 6P problem exploits a “Deny Attack Reverse Victim Offender” (DARVO) strategy with tactics that blame the victim of both initial plagiarism and propagating plagiarism in a manner which censors the plagiarism complaint and ghosts the existence of the original author and the entire body of published work by the original author

Use of the Word 'Plagiarism' is Not Taboo

- Use of the word 'plagiarism' cannot, and never should be, a taboo word that is prohibited from open public discussion at conferences including HICSS 58 that advertise the slogans of "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" and "Where Ideas Meet and Science Speaks"
- But HICSS 58 witnessed a 'tutorial' with presentations by 'tutors' who attempted to exclude the topic's history from the tutorial and exclude an author from participating in the discussion even though it was that author's work which was victimized by the propagating plagiarism
- Teachers and professors must stop feigning 'false ignorance, insult, and injury' as manipulative and misleading wrongful pretext to refuse to discuss and debate plagiarism, while also censoring and excluding true scholars committed to citational justice and research integrity
- If the unfair and uneducated promoters of propagating plagiarism have nothing to hide, then they should have nothing to fear in public open scientific debate of the historical record of published literature

Impossible to 'Have It Both Ways'

- FORCE11, Go-FAIR, RDA, MCBK, AMIA, IEEE, and other organizations and conferences that promote the propagating plagiarism of the Wilkinson et al 2016 FAIR Principles plagiarism cannot 'have it both ways' while claiming 'fairness' at same time
- A logical self-contradiction exists when promoting the FAIR principles while ironically hypocritically and unfairly contradicting those principles by propagating the plagiarism of Wilkinson et al 2016 and simultaneously ghosting the original work of Taswell 2007
- Why have the plagiarists refused for 16 years since 2009 to engage in public debate about the historical record of the published literature?
- Why have they failed to cite and discuss this published literature, instead promoting themselves as 'distinguished professors' while refusing to do their *due diligence*, instead engaging in *willful disregard* of an extensive body of scholarly research that has been available open access to the public without any paywalls since 2007?

No Accountability for Willful Disregard

- If the unfair promoters of the FAIR principles wish to promote true authentic findability, accessibility, interoperability, and reproducibility, then they must learn they *cannot have it both ways at the same time* by refusing to cite and discuss the historical record of published literature that includes the easily *findable and accessible* body of work at [PORTALDOORS.org](https://portaldoors.org) by C Taswell 2007 and Brain Health Alliance plagiarized by Wilkinson et al 2016 for their FAIR principles
- Taswell 2022 Epistemic Injustice, Open Access, and Citational Justice. doi:[10.48085/X3B678B7A](https://doi.org/10.48085/X3B678B7A)
- Taswell 2023 Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard? doi:[10.48085/L3570F30F](https://doi.org/10.48085/L3570F30F)
- Taswell 2024 Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: Questions Seeking Answers. doi:[10.48085/C9438K35Z](https://doi.org/10.48085/C9438K35Z)

Idea-Laundering Plagiarism by Authors: Definition

Dutta *et al.* 2020 definition (doi:[10.1109/ICSC.2020.00044](https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSC.2020.00044)):

- a “kind of plagiarism called *idea laundering*, analogous to the concept and practice of money laundering, in which ideas are plagiarized and then the plagiarism is hidden in plain sight. To clarify this analogy,”
- “first define *money laundering* as the act of passing money that was illegitimately obtained through another illegitimate process with intent of making it appear legitimate... *making dirty money look clean.*”
- “Then define *idea laundering* as the act of passing ideas that were illegitimately obtained through another illegitimate process with intent of making it appear legitimate... *making dirty ideas look clean.*”

Idea-Laundering Plagiarism by Authors: Criteria

- A majority, plurality, or other non-trivial percentage of similar content exists between the plagiarizing paper and the plagiarized paper as measured by similarity metrics that correlate and quantify equivalent entities, similar concepts, and identical ideas
- Not accidental with benign citation amnesia, or falsely-claimed independent development, or falsely-claimed public domain information; evidence of copyright, trademark, patent violations; meeting attendance records for conferences where plagiarists met and spoke with victims who were plagiarized; refusal to correct the exclusion of citation of the plagiarized publication when requested
- Deliberate with evidence of malign intent; continued promotion with secondary and tertiary plagiarists to propagate the spread of the plagiarism; collusion with journal editors to censor the response with commentary submitted by the victim of the plagiarism

Idea-Bleaching Censorship by Editors: Definition

Taswell *et al.* 2020 definition (doi:[10.1002/prs.2223](https://doi.org/10.1002/prs.2223)):

- “In extension with analogy to idea-laundering plagiarism by authors, we define idea-bleaching censorship by editors as any act that aids and abets the plagiarists by ignoring and silencing inquiries or requests from readers who report the plagiarism.”
- “With or without an apparent conflict of interest between authors and editors, these acts of idea-bleaching censorship by editors may be those of either omission or commission.”

Idea-Bleaching Censorship by Editors: Criteria

- Ignoring the report or inquiry and never responding to the reader-reporter who alleges plagiarism, thus maintaining the non-responsive posture of 'blind eyes and deaf ears'
- Refusing to publish a Letter to the Editor, Opinion, Debate, Commentary, or Response from the reader-reporter who seeks to cite and discuss the previously published research that was plagiarized
- Acting in collusion with the plagiarizing authors by allowing the plagiarists to claim false pretexts while they continue to publish repeated derivative works based on the plagiarism
- Conducting sham investigations, whether by ignoring and/or excluding evidence, or by failing to issue an evidence-based report
- Refusing to conduct investigations into allegations of misconduct and otherwise ghosting the original work of the victim who was plagiarized

Definition of False Information Types

Taswell *et al.* 2021 definitions (doi:[10.48085/M85EC99EE](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE)):

	Aware of falsehood?	Conduct is benign?	Description
Mis-information	not aware	benign	mistaken publication of false information while agreeable to correct the content
Dis-information	aware	benign	publication of false information while agreeable but unable to correct the content until a later time
Anti-information	not aware	not benign	mistaken publication of false information, but refusal to correct the content due to political, financial, social, and/or psychological factors
Caco-information	aware	not benign	intentional and malicious publication of false information with explicit willful refusal to correct the content

Comparison of False Information Types

Taswell *et al.* 2021 comparison (doi:[10.48085/M85EC99EE](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE)):

	Benign	Not benign
Aware	Dis -information	Caco -information
Not aware	Mis -information	Anti -information

Wilkinson et al 2016 Plagiarism of Taswell 2007

- Key articles by original author:
Taswell 2007 [10.1109/TITB.2007.905861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861), Taswell 2010 [10.3390/FI2020156](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156)
- Key articles by idea-laundering plagiarists and idea-bleaching censors:
Wilkinson et al 2016 [10.1038/sdata.2016.18](https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18), Wilkinson et al 2018 [10.1038/sdata.2018.118](https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2018.118), Mons 2020 [10.1162/dint_e_00023](https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_e_00023), Musen 2020 [10.1162/dint_e_00022](https://doi.org/10.1162/dint_e_00022), Musen 2022 [10.1038/s41597-022-01815-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-022-01815-3)
- Violations by plagiarizing authors and censoring editors:
initial plagiarism, propagating plagiarism, refusal to correct omission of citation, failure to disclose conflicts of interest between authors and editors at Nature Scientific Data where the plagiarism was published, willful disregard of historical record of published literature with ghosting of all work published by original author
- Ethics, procedural, and substantive failures by integrity offices:
silent treatment, pass-the-buck treatment, sham investigation, kangaroo court investigation, latter often done with *DARVO*
- The idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson et al, and propagating plagiarism by Musen et al, have *not yet* been retracted by the journal Scientific Data
- The idea-bleaching censorship by Scientific Data editors has *not yet* been corrected by Springer-Nature publishers

BHA 2019 Response: DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics

- In response to the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of Taswell's publications from the [PORTAL-DOORS Project](#) (PDP), we coined a new name with acronym and summarizing phrase for the collection of PDP principles and new quantitative analytic methods to evaluate scientific reports for the presence of both plagiarism and fair citation of published literature in science, engineering, and medicine
- DREAM Principles with acronym DREAM for *Discoverable Data with Reproducible Results for Equivalent Entities with Accessible Attributes and Manageable Metadata*
- FAIR Metrics with acronym FAIR for *Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records and Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports*

Use of Acronym 'FAIR' and Words 'Fair' and 'Metrics'

- FAIR Principles of Wilkinson et al 2016 with acronym 'FAIR' for the principles they called "Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reproducible" are a subset of the collection of principles from the PORTAL-DOORS Project of Taswell 2007 plagiarized by Wilkinson et al without mentioning, citing or discussing the prior work of Taswell
- FAIR Metrics of Wilkinson et al are used with the word 'metrics' in a manner that is not consistent with its usage in most fields of science
- FAIR Metrics of Craig et al 2019 are used with acronym 'FAIR' for "Fair Acknowledgment of Information Records and Fair Attribution to Indexed Reports" and the word 'metrics' in a manner consistent with both the meaning of the word 'fair' because it is a recursive acronym, and usage of the word 'metrics' with its meaning as a quantitative numerical value for the measure of something

Taswell 2010 Letter to IEEE Computer

Craig et al 2019 (doi:[10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003)) on the importance of *fair* citation:

“As noted in a letter to IEEE Computer Magazine in 2010 by Taswell, ‘any discussion of provenance and reproducibility for computational science and engineering that does not also address citation and attribution leads to a contradiction in terms. It is not possible to maintain standards for scholarly peer-reviewed reproducible science without proper citation and attribution’ [38]. This principle remains paramount when the professed goal has been ‘to improve the infrastructure supporting the reuse of scholarly data’ as claimed by Wilkinson et al. [1], [34], but apparently not practiced by them with respect to citing fairly other authors such as Taswell [2], [23].”

Nature Research Policy: Correction and Retraction

Nature Research publishes its [correction and retraction policy](#) concerning both the presence of [plagiarism and fabrication](#) and absence of [discussion of published work](#), the latter defined with the following quote:

“When discussing the published work of others, authors must properly describe the contribution of the earlier work. Both intellectual contributions and technical developments must be acknowledged as such and appropriately cited.”

These Nature Research policies against plagiarism have been willfully disregarded by the editors and publisher in the case of Wilkinson et al 2016 plagiarizing from the work of Taswell 2007 IEEE TITB, Taswell 2010 Future Internet, and all other work on the PORTAL-DOORS Project.

Idea-Laundering Plagiarism by Wilkinson et al

Craig et al 2019 (doi:[10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003)) on the idea-laundering plagiarism by Wilkinson et al 2016:

“As a result of this item-by-item comparison and analysis, we cannot find any novel idea or concept in [1], [34] that can be described as fundamentally new and/or different from the content, principles, analysis and discussion in [2], [3], [10], [23], [24].”

Idea-Bleaching Censorship by Springer-Nature Publisher

- Failed to require the 53 co-authors of Wilkinson et al 2016 to search, cite and credit the historical record of published literature to avoid infringement of intellectual property rights on prior published work
- Failed to disclose the conflicts of interest between the editor and co-authors and the absence of independent objective peer review when they published the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al 2016
- Refused to publish any correction for omission of citation, expression of concern about the plagiarism, or commentary citing the original work by the original author victimized by the plagiarism
- Instead of correcting the mistakes consistent with its own advertised policies for publishing research, and instead of engaging in open public scientific debate about the research, Springer-Nature sent threatening letters intended to intimidate and silence the victim of the plagiarism

Sham Investigations that Aid and Abet Plagiarists

- For this case of plagiarism by Wilkinson et al, complaints submitted to journals, publishers, and integrity offices were ignored or denied, and then censored without allowing public commentary, thereby enabling the plagiarists to spread their plagiarism with impunity
- Investigators aided and abetted the plagiarists by imposing a requirement of confidentiality on the complainant, excluding the documentary evidence submitted by the complainant, and engaging in protracted delays that failed to slow the propagating plagiarism
- Lesson learned: *Investigations of plagiarism should be conducted openly with public debate as done for jury trials in courts of law*
- If authors editors and publishers as scholars have nothing to hide, then these persons should not be afraid to participate in public open scientific debate of the historical record of published literature

What Enforcement of Integrity Rules?

C. Taswell (2024) on enforcement of integrity rules against plagiarism:

“Does enforcement of research integrity rules and academic integrity rules against plagiarism — which are intended to prohibit plagiarism and also to reprimand, censure or punish those who commit plagiarism — does this enforcement only apply to high school and college students hoping to receive a degree diploma? Or does enforcement of integrity rules against plagiarism also apply to faculty who are instructors, teachers, professors and investigators at the academic education and research institutions that award those diplomas?”

Propagating Plagiarism Persists with Censorship of Review

- Recent example at IEEE eScience 2024 Sep 16-20 Osaka Japan
- Conference Program Chairs were alerted months in advance during peer review about problems with persistent propagating plagiarism, ghosting, and refusal to cite previously published work
- Conference Program Chairs declined to address the concerns brought to their attention about plagiarism and ghosting despite repeated attempts over months via email correspondence
- Multiple conference papers, including those by Conference Program Chairs, citing the Wilkinson et al 2016 FAIR principles were presented and published without mention of the original work by Taswell 2007
- This recent example at IEEE eScience 2024 demonstrates:
 - Idea-laundering plagiarism by authors and idea-bleaching censorship by editors who were the same persons, ie, the Conference Program Chairs
 - Explicit violation of COPE publishing ethics and IEEE member conduct rules prohibiting plagiarism and requiring citation of original authors

Persuasive Storytelling to Compel Respect for Integrity

- Comedy, comics, and cartoons?
- Parodies, parables, and fairy tales?
- Humor, short stories, and novels?
- Theater performances and cinematic movies?
- Analogies to fair play during competitions in sports?
- Analogies to fair campaigns during elections in politics?
- Publicity with storytelling via social media?
- Is $2 + 2 = 4$ or is it 3 or 5? What happened to what used to be called the self-correcting nature of science?
- How to rebuild and restore a code of professional conduct which requires scientists to admit and correct mistakes?

Morals, Ethics, Integrity, and Character Matter

- “Many people say that it is the intellect which makes a great scientist. They are wrong: it is character.” – Albert Einstein
- Quoted in “Integrity in Scientific Research: Creating an Environment That Promotes Responsible Conduct”, 2002, US National Academies Press, available at www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK208712
- For more information and resources on ethical standards in scholarly research and publishing, refer to the work of COPE (the Committee on Publishing Ethics) at publicationethics.org and other organizations that promote integrity including [Academic Integrity](#), [Coalition for Integrity](#), [Transparency International](#), [Global Integrity](#)
- For inspiration from the satirist and mathematician [Tom Lehrer](#), watch the videos 1953 Lobachevsky aka Plagiarize (with lyrics) youtu.be/gXlfXirQF3A and 2023 Epic Song Compilation youtu.be/9p5kY4UjGdk

Plague of Prevalent Plagiarism by Protected Professors

- Controlling and curing the plague of prevalent plagiarism by professors with power and money in academia, who are protected as tenured faculty without fair due process for their victims, will require courage on the part of all participants who wish to promote moral ethical teaching, education, and research with true scholarship
- Some have excused their silence and inaction by pleading that they do not wish to be the 'science police'. Many have engaged in one or more of the four forms of non-response to complaints about abuses of power: *the silent treatment, the pass-the-buck treatment, the sham investigation, and the kangaroo court investigation* (C. Taswell 2024)
- But what is the meaning, relevance, or value of any professional code of ethics and conduct if it is never enforced due to the presence of willful disregard and the absence of accountability? Investigations should be conducted openly by independent organizations devoid of any financial conflict of interest (C. Taswell 2023) which necessarily excludes the academic universities

Retraction of Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles for Plagiarism

- Wilkinson et al FAIR Principles 2016 and 2018 should be retracted for their plagiarism of Taswell 2007 and 2010 and their continued ghosting of an entire body of work from the original author easily findable and freely accessible at PORTALDOORS.org
- Musen et al 2020 and 2022 should be retracted for their propagating plagiarism of Taswell 2007 and 2010, and their continued attempts to falsify the historical record of published literature with their collusion ring that has operated as a citation cartel ghosting other authors
- Investigators who wish to cite the relevant concepts, ideas and vision of fairness should cite the original collection of PDP Principles from Taswell 2007 doi: [10.1109/TITB.2007.905861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861), Taswell 2010 doi: [10.3390/FI2020156](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156), re-named as the DREAM collection of principles in Craig et al 2019 doi: [10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003)

For More Info

- Craig et al. (2019) DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web
- C. Taswell (2024) Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research
- PORTALDOORS.org, BrainHealthAlliance.org
- BrainiacsJournal.org, BHAVI.us, and ctaswell@bhavi.us
- Social engineering, with appropriate incentives and disincentives, remains as important as software engineering for a solution to the continuing problems of idea-laundering plagiarism by authors and idea-bleaching censorship by editors
- We welcome scholars interested in collaborating on projects that prevent author plagiarism and editor censorship, promote ethics and integrity, and support public open scientific debate

Abstract for HICSS-58-8336

Accountability for integrity in research publishing has been abandoned at some journals and universities. Published reports have proven the plagiarism by Wilkinson et al of their FAIR Principles from the PORTAL-DOORS Principles previously published by Taswell almost a decade earlier. Despite the flagrant plagiarism in this Wilkinson case, it has not yet been retracted by the journals involved. Complaints submitted by Taswell to publishers and integrity offices were disregarded or denied, thereby enabling the plagiarists to spread their plagiarism with impunity. The case study reported here details an account of one of these sham investigations. Investigators aided and abetted the plagiarists by imposing a requirement of confidentiality on the complainant, excluding the documentary evidence submitted by the complainant, and engaging in protracted delays that failed to slow the propagating plagiarism. Investigations of plagiarism should be conducted openly with public debate as done for jury trials in courts of law.

[Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on Misconduct by Complaint Investigators Who Aid and Abet Plagiarists](#), 2025-01-07 C. Taswell and Brain Health Alliance, per CC 4.0 license from HICSS 58 pages 6617–6626 with public access url hdl.handle.net/10125/109639

References

- C. Taswell (2007) DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid with a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing
- C. Taswell (2010) A Distributed Infrastructure for Metadata about Metadata: HDMM Architectural Style and PORTAL-DOORS System
- Craig et al. (2019) DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web
- S. K. Taswell, Triggler, et al. (2020) The Hitchhiker's Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity
- Athreya et al. (2020) The Essential Enquiry 'Equal or Equivalent Entities?' About Two Things as Same, Similar, Related, or Different
- S. K. Taswell, Athreya, et al. (2021) Truth in Science
- C. Taswell (2024) Unfairness by FAIR Principles Promoters: Case Study on Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Publishing

References



Athreya, Anousha et al. (Dec. 30, 2020). "The Essential Enquiry 'Equal or Equivalent Entities?' About Two Things as Same, Similar, Related, or Different". In: *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 1.1, PEDADC885 (1), pp. 1–7. DOI: [10.48085/PEDADC885](https://doi.org/10.48085/PEDADC885).



Craig, Adam et al. (June 2019). "DREAM Principles and FAIR Metrics from the PORTAL-DOORS Project for the Semantic Web". In: *2019 IEEE 11th International Conference on Electronics, Computers and Artificial Intelligence (ECAI)* (June 28, 2019). Pitesti, Romania: IEEE, pp. 1–8. DOI: [10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003](https://doi.org/10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042003). URL: <https://portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ECAI2019DREAMFAIR0612.pdf>.



Taswell, Carl (Mar. 2007). "DOORS to the Semantic Web and Grid with a PORTAL for Biomedical Computing". In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine* 12.2 (2). In the Special Section on Bio-Grid published online 3 Aug. 2007, pp. 191–204. ISSN: 1089-7771. DOI: [10.1109/TITB.2007.905861](https://doi.org/10.1109/TITB.2007.905861).



— (2010). "A Distributed Infrastructure for Metadata about Metadata: The HDMM Architectural Style and PORTAL-DOORS System". In: *Future Internet* 2.2, pp. 156–189. ISSN: 1999-5903. DOI: [10.3390/FI2020156](https://doi.org/10.3390/FI2020156). URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1999-5903/2/2/156/>.



— (Dec. 31, 2023). "Reproducibility, Validity, and Integrity in Scholarly Research: What Accountability for Willful Disregard?" In: *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging And Computing Sciences* 4.2. DOI: [10.48085/L3570F30F](https://doi.org/10.48085/L3570F30F).



— (May 3, 2024). "Unfairness by the FAIR Principles Promoters: A Case Study on the Absence of Accountability for Integrity in Research Publishing". In: *Proceedings of the ICATES 2024 Conference*. URL: <https://www.portalddoors.org/pub/docs/ICATES2024PWT29CT240404twocol.pdf>.



Taswell, S. Koby, Anousha Athreya, et al. (Dec. 31, 2021). "Truth in Science". In: *Brainiacs Journal of Brain Imaging and Computing Sciences* 2.1 (1), pp. 1–9. DOI: [10.48085/M85EC99EE](https://doi.org/10.48085/M85EC99EE).



Taswell, S. Koby, Christopher Triggle, et al. (2020). "The Hitchhiker's Guide to Scholarly Research Integrity". In: *2020 ASIS&T 83rd Annual Meeting* (Oct. 22, 2020). Vol. 57. Wiley, e223. DOI: [10.1002/pr2.223](https://doi.org/10.1002/pr2.223). URL: <https://asistdl.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/pr2.223>.