

**From:** Cathy Harwood **On Behalf Of** Rory Collins

**Sent:** 21 May 2014 15:11

**To:** [FGodlee@bmj.com](mailto:FGodlee@bmj.com)

**Subject:** FW: Papers for the panel considering the retraction of papers misrepresenting the evidence on statin side-effects

Dear Fiona

In case Iona Heath has not forwarded the additional material that I sent her on Monday evening, I'm forwarding my email to you.

Best wishes,

Rory

**From:** Cathy Harwood **On Behalf Of** Rory Collins

**Sent:** 19 May 2014 18:52

**To:** [iona.heath22@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:iona.heath22@yahoo.co.uk)

**Subject:** RE: Papers for the panel considering the retraction of papers misrepresenting the evidence on statin side-effects

Dear Dr Heath

In light of some of the statements in the BMJ's Editorial dated 17 May 2014, I am submitting additional materials for consideration by the panel.

1. The detailed set of slides that I went through with Dr Godlee on 2 December 2013, which refutes the assertion that the extent of the problems with these two articles was not drawn to the attention of the BMJ before March 2014 (leaving aside the reviewers' comments and the letters from Huffman et al and Takhar). I have added notes to these slides in order to indicate what points were being made about which parts of the 2 articles.
2. A supplementary note which includes:
  - Comments about the peer review process since, by contrast with what was written in the Editorial, it has now become clear that the peer reviewers never saw the reference to Zhang et al and its misinterpretation in the paper by Abramson et al, although they did draw attention to other serious errors that were not corrected during the subsequent editorial process. (As previously requested, it would be useful to have the reviewers' comments on the paper by Malhotra made available for public scrutiny in order to determine whether similar problems occurred with respect to that paper.)
  - An additional comment about the misrepresentation of the evidence on the efficacy of statin therapy in the papers by Abramson et al and by Malhotra, which appears to have occurred as the result of much the same failure to reflect necessary caveats that led to retraction of the misleading claims about side-effects based on the paper by Zhang et al.
3. Annotated copies of the two papers with notes linking my notes and the slides with particular parts of each of the papers in order to help the panel identify the extent of the problems with both of these papers.

Best wishes,

Rory