

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

Sent: 30 May 2014 11:23

To: 'Iona Heath'

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

Dear Dr Heath

I should be most grateful if, as requested previously, you would make available for public scrutiny the peer reviewers' comments on the paper by Malhotra. (As indicated in the email accompanying my supplementary note, the release of the peer reviewers' comments for the paper by Abramson et al has already highlighted serious failures in the editorial process.) If, however, the BMJ's previous statement that it was peer reviewed is not correct then please could you confirm now that that is the case?

With regard to all of the materials that I have submitted to the panel for review (including the set of slides that I went through with the Editor at my meeting with her on 2 December in order to explain the extent of the problems with these two papers, a fact which has been denied in the editorial of 15 May), I would wish to await the conclusion of this review process – which is supposed to be independent of the BMJ – before these materials are made public. In particular, for the reasons that I repeatedly made to the Editor (i.e. that it would provide an opportunity for the authors of these misleading claims to repeat them and cause further confusion and harm to public health, which the BMJ did indeed allow to happen), I do not wish these materials to be placed on the BMJ website as Rapid Responses. Nor does it seem at all appropriate if, as is said to be the case, this review is truly independent of the BMJ and its Editor.

Best wishes,

Rory