

**Roger McClellan**

---

**From:** Roger McClellan <[REDACTED]@att.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, July 23, 2018 10:45 AM  
**To:** Mildred B. Morgan  
**Subject:** Fw: CONFIDENTIAL Glyphosate supplement -- teleconference  
**Attachments:** Context for Decision on Glyphosate Papers.pdf

Mildred:

Please retain in Glyphosate file. Thanks, Roger

On Wednesday, June 27, 2018 1:20 AM, "Whalley, Charles" <[REDACTED]@tandf.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Roger,

Thank you again for your detailed memo regarding the glyphosate supplement. I have now fully digested it and consulted with colleagues. You raise several points which I shall try to address.

By way of this email, I'd first like to introduce my colleague **Sarah Robbie** (CCed), our Head of Peer Review Policy & Research Integrity. Sarah leads our in-house team on publication ethics, and has worked together with COPE for many years. I'd also like to introduce **Todd Hummel** (CCed), the Editorial Director for Medicine & Health Journals. Although we have also involved legal counsel and others, both Todd and Sarah have been my main advisors on this matter. We would like to have a teleconference with you soon. Are you available either at the end of this week or early next? Please let me know your availability over the rest of this week and the next, and I'll do my best to schedule something with us all.

As you know well, this has been a complex and unusual matter, and one in which we have worked carefully to abide by industry standards. We are confident that the outcome proposed is in line with both our policies and with COPE guidelines.

To summarise, the authors of this supplement submitted their manuscripts with Declarations of Interest statements. We have since learnt, most importantly from the authors themselves, that for 3 of the manuscripts these statements were not correct. Specifically, the involvement of the ultimate sponsor and its representatives was misrepresented rather than simply omitted: the original Declarations of Interest explicitly contradicted what we now know to be the case. This can only be categorised as misconduct and a breach of publishing ethics. Taylor & Francis' applicable policies here are quite clear: "Retractions for misconduct are made when there has been an infringement of publishing ethics or a breach of author warranties". Similarly, COPE Guidelines on Retractions state: "Retractions are also used to alert readers to [a] failure to disclose a major competing interest likely to influence interpretations or recommendations."

There is certainly a need to better establish a mutual understanding of the expectations around declarations of interest for *CRT*, amongst all involved. I would emphasise, however, that the breaches of publication ethics that we have identified in this case are clear breaches of fundamental and clearly defined standards, and not attributable to misunderstandings of detail or nuance.

Finally, I want to reassure you that another clear outcome of the investigation is that the peer review process of these manuscripts was entirely consistent with the high standards of the journal. There's