

Roger McClellan

From: Roger McClellan <[REDACTED]@att.net>
Sent: Sunday, August 5, 2018 1:11 PM
To: Kathleen McClellan; Mildred B. Morgan
Subject: Fw: CONFIDENTIAL Glyphosate supplement

On Friday, May 18, 2018 9:26 AM, "Whalley, Charles" <[REDACTED]@tandf.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Roger,

I'm sorry we didn't get much of a chance to speak. Let me summarise my points by email, and then we can hopefully catch up on the phone on Thursday. I think 8am Albuquerque will be 5pm Bucharest, so I should be free to speak.

In reviewing the results of our investigation, how we will communicate this externally, and how it relates to our policies, we have decided that the only tenable outcome is to retract 3 of the articles; specifically, the summary, epidemiology and genotoxicity papers. In the investigation, John Acquavella and Larry Kier made us aware they were on contract with Monsanto when the manuscripts were prepared, and we were informed that Monsanto staff (either William Heydens or other clerical staff) were involved in drafting or editing the manuscripts in some form. This directly contradicts both parts of the following key statement from the initial Declaration of Interest:

The Expert Panelists were engaged by, and acted as consultants to, Intertek, and were not directly contacted by the Monsanto Company. [...] Neither any Monsanto company employees nor any attorneys reviewed any of the Expert Panel's manuscripts prior to submission to the journal.

In our earlier discussions, I had thought that, as these concerns are with how the authorship rather than with the content, we would be able to resolve them by publishing corrections; however, in considering what would be consistent with the policies of the journal, the only appropriate response is retraction. Failing to disclose the contractual status of two of the authors, or the involvement of Monsanto staff in drafting the manuscripts, represents a breach of publishing ethics; the journal would be remiss not to notify its readers of this, for which purpose publishing corrigenda would not be sufficient.

For the remaining 2 articles, the exposure and carcinogenicity papers, we don't have the same evidence of misconduct, so instead we will publish 'expressions of concern' to notify readers of those articles about the broader context. This is to protect against a future when readers may come to the single articles directly, without being aware of the situation with the other papers.

After (very lengthy) consultation, I believe that this is the correct response, and is necessary to demonstrate how seriously CRT takes these matters. Any communications to authors, and the notices of retractions themselves, would be on behalf of the publisher and you, so I'm grateful for your support, as ever, in this. As such, please let me know if you have any concerns or questions about the above.