Dear Roger,

My colleague Todd is on holiday in the week commencing July 15th. Would the following week (commencing July 22nd) suit you?

Safe travels,
Charles

From: Whalley, Charles
Sent: 02 July 2018 09:25
To: 'Roger McClellan' <[redacted]@att.net>
Subject: RE: CRT Supplement now published Note the extensive DOI

Dear Roger,

Thanks for your email, and indeed for your voicemails. I've been leaving the office promptly of late as I'm moving house (from Oxford to Abingdon), so have not been around for your calls. I enjoy our chats too much to purposefully avoid them.

I do think it would be quicker to tie all this up on the phone with my colleagues Todd and Sarah. **Please can you give me an idea of which mornings this week and next you would be free?** Todd is travelling between London and New York this week, and then of course the 4th July holiday approaches, but I will do my best to get us all on the phone together as soon as possible.

I'd of course be grateful to hear any input from the Editorial Board.

Best wishes,
Charles

From: Roger McClellan [mailto:r[redacted]@att.net]
Sent: 02 July 2018 01:44
To: Whalley, Charles <[redacted]@tandf.co.uk>
Subject: Fw: CRT Supplement now published Note the extensive DOI

Charles:
I was doing some work this evening reconstructing all the events associated with the negotiations to publish, the review of the papers and the final acceptance of the papers for the special Glyphosate Supplement. I a remain very proud of this issue and appreciate your assistance in bringing it to fruition. I remain impressed by the Declaration of Interest statements, including the one included with my foreword. Most importantly, the five papers are scientifically sound and it is clear the papers were prepared with financial support from Monsanto.

My position remains unchanged. Yes, there were some mistakes made along the way with these papers. Some by Taylor and Francis, some by me, some by the coordinator (Ashley Roberts) and some by the authors. However, I remain convinced that the five papers reflect the independent views of the 16 authors. They have all offered independent verification of that in their own words. Do you not give any validity to these statements and the reputations of those 16 scientists?

I urge you to agree to my recommendation to publish corrected and expanded Declaration of Interest statements and abandon the "we gotcha" approach with Retraction of the papers. I can assure that

approach likely to be viewed by many including the courts as arbitrary and capricious and will likely do great harm to the authors, Taylor and Francis, the future of Critical Reviews in Toxicology, the readership of CRT, the public and to me. I have served as Editor in Chief of CRT for 30 years reviewing over 1000 papers and bringing CRT to a leadership position in the Taylor and Francis portfolio of Journals. I have at the same time earned a solid reputation as a scientist and editor who sets high standards and deals with my scientific peers and others in a fair manner. I will not allow my well-earned reputation to be tarnished by arbitrary and capricious actions by others.

Does some one within Taylor and Francis hold a view that the only successful outcome is retraction or they will not have done their job.? If so I will remind them that successful managers operate using a " management by objectives" approach not count the beans approach . In this case , we need to collectively attempt to reach agreement on an equitable outcome that is FAIR to the authors, the publisher, CRT readers, the public and me as the Editor -in Chief and the CRT Editorial board. We must not take an approach that determines
winners and losers in legal cases based on what is allowed to appear in the peer reviewed literature. That is clearly the position of some of the critics.

As I have repeatedly noted, I am willing to fly to England at my expense to meet with you, your advisors and the senior most Taylor and Francis officials that I can be given access to during my visit. This is a very serious matter that needs to be resolved at an early date.

One question for you that was raised by one of the CRT Editorial Board members -- Has anyone within Taylor and Francis or any external parties raised any questions as to the scientific validity of the five inter-related reviews and the conclusions drawn? *I HAVE HEARD NONE-- THE PAPERS ARE SCIENTIFICALLY SOUND!!*

A second question to you is can you provide me any single paper or collection of papers published by Taylor and Francis that contain Declaration of Interest statements that equal or begin to approach those included with my foreword and the five papers? I take full responsibility for providing the directions for their preparation. As you know, Taylor and Francis did not then or does it provide today a set of clear directions to authors for preparation of Declarations of Interest! If you and your associates wish to be helpful to prospective authors and to me you could provide clear succinct directions to authors for preparation of DOIs. I do not want some oblique references to Conflicts of Interest, I envision explicit directions that scientific authors can follow. Please let me know if you think this is a reasonable expectation and, if it is, when would be a reasonable target date for me to receive a draft for me to review along with members of the CRT Editorial Board.

Conversations with Editorial Board members have raised other issues that I will bring to your attention in a separate e-mail. One question is the issue of dealing fairly with authors. Taylor and Francis personnel. including you, seem to have focused on dealing with the external critics and journalists. Perhaps, you assumed I would provide periodic updates to the authors. If so, I have been negligent. Should not those accused of misdeeds receive the same courtesies as those who level the accusations?

With best regards,
Roger

On Thursday, September 29, 2016 8:54 AM, Roger McClellan <[redacted]@att.net> wrote: