

**RE: Embargoed MSc Thesis**

Anne Scott(Library)

**Sent:**Tuesday, 20 September 2016 5:56 p.m.**To:** Richard Holdaway; Ian Wright; Travis Horton**Cc:** david.hawke@ara.ac.nz; Stuart Broughton

Kia ora koutou

In summary the full thesis was not downloaded because Dr Rawlence clicked on the wrong link by mistake when he requested it. We can't tell who accessed the file but we do know where the access comes from. The only access made was by someone at Otago to the Use of Thesis form not the thesis. They did however have full open access to the abstract which contained a lot of detail.

See a fuller explanation below from Stuart. The abstract is also provided for your information.

Regards

Anne

Kia ora Anne,

The answer to Richard's question ("...can UC library confirm from IT that the thesis was indeed never downloaded?") is that, from the Repository records we are almost certain that the thesis wasn't downloaded. We believe Dr Rawlence received the Use of Thesis form.

We know Dr Rawlence didn't request the abstract - he didn't need to because the abstract, title, keywords and author are all available publically online for embargoed theses.

On 7 March 2016 Nic Rawlence clicked on the 'request a copy' feature for embargoed theses, which generates an email the library then passed on to Olivia Johnston. We have a copy of that sent email (See p4 of this document). There were two documents available to Dr Rawlence - the thesis, and the Use of Thesis form. We know he selected the Use of Thesis form (see Repository report below), but it is clear from the email that his intention was to request the thesis itself.

(The Repository report shows that a user in Dunedin clicked two links on the thesis page - one was requesting the Use of Thesis form and the other link didn't go anywhere - we know this because we tested the link. We can also see that the thesis link was not clicked.)

The wording in the email that went to Ms Johnston, particularly the direct request from Dr Rawlence, would have caused her to think that he was requesting the thesis. She then clicked a link in that email to release the document he requested to Dr Rawlence. She thought she was releasing the thesis, but, while we don't have evidence from the repository that shows which was released, it is most probable that it was the Use of Thesis form, as that was the document he selected.

Dr Rawlence claimed he requested the thesis but instead received the Use of Thesis form. Any evidence we have backs this up without proving it for certain.

Cheers,  
Stuart

A comparison of the stable isotopic ecology of eastern, western, and pre-human forest ecosystems in the South Island of New Zealand

Johnston, Olivia Rose

Abstract

New Zealand forests have been reduced and degraded by gross removal, logging, and the effects of mammals introduced by Polynesian and European settlers. These changes increase the value of the remaining forests, so information on the effects of these disturbances will be useful to inform the management of forest protection. Integrated measurements of C and N cycling within forests can be obtained using foliar stable isotope ratios, which may detect differences between forests resulting from natural or anthropogenic disturbances. This thesis characterises the stable isotopic composition distribution and likely drivers of isotopic variation of vegetation in several central South Island forests, and provides a baseline for future ecological New Zealand studies of present and pre-human vegetation. The largest detected stable isotope variation in modern leaf material was that of  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values between the eastern and western podocarp-broadleaf forests. This variation was probably controlled by the lower soil N availability associated with the high rainfall of western forests causing low  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  values ( $-8.5 \pm 3.5 \%$ ) relative to an eastern forest ( $+1.6 \pm 1.3 \%$ ) and global temperate forests (average  $-2.8 \pm 2.0 \%$  (Martinelli et al. 1999)). The significant but slightly higher mean  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  ( $0.6 \%$ ) of a historically selectively logged forest (Saltwater Forest) in comparison to the mean in an unlogged forest (Okarito Forest), on the West Coast, could be attributed to either alteration to N cycling from logging, site differences in topography, or local soil N differences between the forests. Although  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  showed no significant geographical variation, the well-described 'canopy effect' was observed in all modern forests, manifested as a positive covariation between  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and vegetation height. Similarly, large taxon-specific differences were observed between  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values in both modern and fossil leaves. Well-preserved fossil leaves, from sediments c. 4500 years B.P in Pyramid Valley, North Canterbury, had higher  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  ( $4.2 \%$ ) and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  ( $2.5 \%$ ) values than modern vegetation from Riccarton Bush, Christchurch. The difference between ecosystems spanning several millennia probably reflects ecosystem-scale changes in C and N cycling within New Zealand forests following human arrival, particularly from the degradation caused by invasive animals.

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Holdaway  
Sent: Sunday, 18 September 2016 12:17 p.m.  
To: Ian Wright <ian.wright@canterbury.ac.nz>; Travis Horton <travis.horton@canterbury.ac.nz>; Anne Scott (Library) <anne.scott@canterbury.ac.nz>  
Cc: david.hawke@ara.ac.nz  
Subject: RE: Embargoed MSc Thesis

Dear Ian

Thank you for forwarding this response.

Before I comment further, can UC library confirm from IT that the thesis was indeed never downloaded?

Regards

Richard

---

From: Ian Wright  
Sent: Sunday, 18 September 2016 11:17 a.m.  
To: Richard Holdaway; Travis Horton; Anne Scott (Library)  
Subject: FW: Embargoed MSc Thesis

Kia ora Richard, Travis, and Anne,

I have had further correspondence from UO (as attached), in which Nic Rawlence provides a rebuttal to my letter to Prof Richard Blaikie - Otago DVC.

Given Nic's response I have indicated that UC will not take any further action and I do not now propose to write to the QSR Editors.

I think we all have to draw a breath here, accept Nic's responses, and move on.

Regards

Ian W.

Professor Ian Wright  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) University of Canterbury Te Whare  
Wananga o Waitaha Private Bag 4800 Christchurch 8140 New Zealand  
Phone: +64 (3)369 3773  
ian.wright@canterbury.ac.nz  
<http://www.canterbury.ac.nz>

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Blaikie [<mailto:richard.blaikie@otago.ac.nz>]  
Sent: Saturday, 17 September 2016 4:13 p.m.  
To: Ian Wright <ian.wright@canterbury.ac.nz>  
Cc: Gerard Closs <gerry.closs@otago.ac.nz>  
Subject: [SPAM: 10.411] FW: Embargoed MSc Thesis

Kia ora Ian,

Through the HoD Zoology, Assoc Prof Gerry Closs, Nic Rawlence has provided the attached explanations in relation to the concerns you raised in your recent letter.

As you can see, Nic will be sending an apology directly to Ms Johnson and co-authors, but has also provided explanation and clarification on other matters that were raised.

I trust that this satisfies the concerns about the integrity of Nic's responses to the QSR editor and reviewers, such that any subsequent correspondence with the journal will not be necessary now.

With best regards,

Richard Blaikie

-----Original Message-----

From: Gerard Closs  
Sent: Friday, 16 September 2016 12:43 p.m.  
To: Richard Blaikie  
Cc: Nic Rawlence; Jonathan Waters  
Subject: Re: Embargoed MSc Thesis

Dear Richard

Attached is a detailed response to the issue raised in the letter from Professor Ian Wright re the use of an embargoed MSc thesis.

In short, Nic is happy to apologise directly to Ms Johnson and her associated UC colleagues re the citation of the MSc thesis. He acknowledges that this was due to a genuine misunderstanding as to what could or couldn't be cited.

Nic refutes the suggestion that he received a full copy of thesis, but only referred to the information available in the publicly available abstract, as per the link that was provided by the UC library (provided in the attached letter). He has also provided the editor's and reviewers' comments on the paper that confirm the editor and reviewers did not refer directly to the thesis.

I am satisfied with Nic's response, and acknowledge and confirm his regret over this incident.

Please advise as to how you would like us to proceed from here.

All the best

Gerry