Roger McClellan

From: Roger McClellan <roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 6, 2018 10:56 AM
To: Charles Whalley
Cc: Roger McClellan; Mildred B. Morgan
Subject: Fw: CONFIDENTIAL Glyphosate Review Retraction Request

Charles:

In reviewing correspondence between you and Nathan Donley I have observed a situation that is extremely disturbing to me. Nathan Donley on his e-mails to you has regularly included by cc copy a number of individuals from the media. I have been informed by indivduals more knowledgeable of these matters than I that this is an approach regularly used by individuals very knowledgeable and savy of interactions with the media.

It is quite clear to me that Mr Donley and his organization have a vested interest in having the five papers published in the 2016 Special Supplement of CRT removed from public view and access. Part of their campaign is to undermine the credibillity of the Journal and me as the Editor. This is not a particularly well veiled attempt if you carefully read his e-mail which are filled with innuendos . He has also skillfully made use of e-mails that were released related to litigation in California on alleged health effects related to exposure to Glyphosate. I suspect the validity of the statements made in many of those e-mails will ultimately be challenged in the court. For now, in my opinion they are hearsay.

By responding to Mr Donley and including all his addresses you are assisting him in raising concerns as to my scientific and editorial abilities and the credibility of Critical Reviews in Toxicology as a reliable source of scientific information. I am sure you have responded in good faith to Mr Donley and may not have recognized how you were being used by him to achieve his goals. Ms Devine fell in to the same trap. I am surprised because she is in the T an F PR group and those individuals should be aware of this common ploy.

In any event, I am asking you to NOT include any cc recipients when you respond to Mr Nathan when the e-mail contains any reference to me or Critical Reviews in Toxicology. I have invested thousands of hours over the last 30 years in advancing CRT as a leading scientific journal in the field of toxicology and risk analysis. Moreover, my hard earned scientific credibility and reputation is at stake. I am confident you and the senior most personnel at Informa and Taylor and Francis understand this symbiotic relationship and do not want to see any party damaged by Mr Donley's skillful manipulation of these issues. That includes the scientific authors of the Glyphosate papers and any other papers published in CRT. I am confident I need not remind you that without those authors CRT can not exist to serve the public interest by communicating sound science.

On a related matter, I request that you and other Taylor and Francis personnel share with me in advance of their release any proposed media releases related to my foreword and the five papers in the special Glyphosate supplement to CRT.

I would appreciate your sharing this memo with Boyd and more senior individuals at Informa and with the T and F PR personnel.

PLease acknowledge in writing that you have received this e-mail and understand my concerns.

Best regard.

Roger

On Thursday, July 5, 2018 1:21 AM, "Whalley, Charles" <Charles.Whalley@tandf[redacted]> wrote:

Dear Nathan,

I'm not able to give you a timeline on this as our emphasis is always to complete any investigation thoroughly and to the highest standard, ensuring we have gathered all relevant information. This does mean timelines can and do change as we move through any case, as I'm sure you can appreciate.

Best wishes,
Charles

From: Nathan Donley [mailto:NDonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]
Sent: 03 July 2018 15:37
To: Whalley, Charles <[redacted]@tandf.co.uk>; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Cc: Bill Freese <BFreese@CenterforFoodSafety[redacted] Caroline Cox <Caroline@ceh[redacted] Emily Marquez <emily@panna[redacted] jrosenblatt@bloomberg[redacted] pwaldman@bloomberg[redacted] carey@usrtk[redacted] Krimsky, Sheldon <sheldon.krimsky@tufts[redacted] McHenry, Leemon B <leemon.mchenry@csun[redacted] Lisa Song <Lisa.Song@propublica[redacted] hakim@nytimes[redacted]
Subject: RE: Glyphosate Review Retraction Request

Thank you for your response Charles. Do you have an idea of when this investigation might conclude? About four months ago you had mentioned that it would be "concluded in the coming weeks." I'm curious as to the sudden change in timeline.

Nathan

From: Whalley, Charles [mailto[redacted]@tandf.co.uk]
Sent: Tuesday, June 26, 2018 9:53 AM
To: Nathan Donley; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Cc: Bill Freese; Caroline Cox; Emily Marquez; jrosenblatt@bloomberg[redacted] pwaldman@bloomberg[redacted] carey@usrtk[redacted] Krimsky, Sheldon; McHenry, Leemon B; Lisa Song; hakim@nytimes.c[redacted]
Subject: RE: Glyphosate Review Retraction Request

Dear Nathan,

Thank you for getting in touch regarding 'An Independent Review of the Carcinogenic Potential of Glyphosate', published in *Critical Reviews in Toxicology*.

As you know, the ethical investigation into this supplement has been on-going since 2017. We are fully aware of the number of months this has taken but this is a complex case with a number of authors and papers. It is our responsibility as the publisher to ensure we have been thorough in our review, following both Committee on Publication Ethics guidance and our own corrections and retractions policy in our approach and decisions (which you have also referenced).

As the publisher, we take this responsibility very seriously and while the investigation is on-going we cannot provide you with more detailed updates, which we appreciate is frustrating. We will however be in touch with

you as soon as this process has reached its conclusion, so you are fully aware of the outcome and the ultimate decisions reached. Thank you for your on-going interest in this case.

All best wishes,
Charles

Charles Whalley - Managing Editor, Medicine & Health Journals
Taylor & Francis Group
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN, UK
Direct line: [redacted]
Switchboard: [redacted]
[redacted]@tandf.co.uk
www.tandfonline.com

From: Nathan Donley [mailto:NDonley@biologicaldiversity.org]
Sent: 25 June 2018 15:22
To: Whalley, Charles <Charles.Whalley@tandf[redacted]>; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Cc: Bill Freese <BFreese@CenterforFoodSafety.org>; Caroline Cox <Caroline@ceh[redacted] Emily Marquez <emily@panna[redacted] jrosenblatt@bloomberg[redacted] pwaldman@bloomberg[redacted] carey@usrtk[redacted] Krimsky, Sheldon <sheldon.krimsky@tufts[redacted] McHenry, Leemon B <leemon.mchenry@csun[redacted] Lisa Song <Lisa.Song@propublica[redacted] hakim@nytimes[redacted]
Subject: Glyphosate Review Retraction Request

Hello Charles and Roger,

I am writing to inquire a third time on the status of our request for retraction of the article entitled "An Independent Review of the Carcinogenic Potential of Glyphosate." It has been 10 months since Dr. McClellan indicated in an interview that this investigation had begun and eight months since Taylor and Francis received our request for retraction laying out definitive evidence of ethical misconduct in the publishing of this review article. *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* has had similar requests for retraction by concerned scientists that have received no response and had no corrective action taken (2013 letter regarding false conflict of interest disclosures in asbestos safety review here). It is my sincere hope that this is not becoming a pattern or practice for this journal.

In response to allegations of favoritism towards industry-funded studies (here and here), *Critical Reviews in Toxicology* often touts its "Declaration of Interest" section as an effective and transparent cataloguing of potential conflicts that the authors possess. However, if the conflict of interest disclosure contains false statements or significant omissions (or both, as in this case), it is no longer effective or transparent – it is meaningless.

In the last couple of weeks, two peer-reviewed papers have been published that have detailed this issue in the scientific literature. I have attached both in this email. The reason this case has received, and will continue to receive, so much attention is because these ethical violations are so blatant and so egregious.

I ask you both to please consider the standards to which you are willing to hold scientists who publish in your journal, if not for the reputation of the journal itself, then for the regard of science in general. When the public keeps reading of instances where industry manipulates "independent" scientific research, it erodes trust in the

scientific process at a time when that trust is needed more than ever. Bad actions must have consequences or else those actions will keep occurring.

It is Taylor and Francis's policy to issue retractions for misconduct "when there has been an infringement of publishing ethics…." A corrigendum is not appropriate in this instance because this was not the result of an author's error or mistake. As outlined in our retraction request, public records show that Dr. McClellan told the corresponding author specifically what information should be included in the Declaration of Interest and at least some of the authors were aware or should have been aware that information contained in that declaration was false. Retraction is the appropriate course of action in this case.

Please let us know at your earliest convenience the status of your investigation and your plans for action regarding this matter.

Thank you,

Nathan Donley, Ph.D
Senior Scientist, Center for Biological Diversity
[redacted]
ndonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]

From: Whalley, Charles [mailto[redacted]@tandf.co.uk]
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2018 2:27 AM
To: Nathan Donley; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Cc: Bill Freese; Caroline Cox; Emily Marquez; Stecker, Tiffany; jrosenblatt@bloomberg[redacted] pwaldman@bloomberg[redacted]
Subject: RE: Retraction request

Dear Nathan,

Thanks for your email. I'm pleased to confirm that we are near the end of the investigation, and hope to have concluded in the coming weeks. I'll be sure to notify you and any other interested parties at that time.

Best wishes from a chilly Oxfordshire,
Charles

Charles Whalley - Managing Editor, Medicine & Health Journals
Taylor & Francis Group
4 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN, UK
Direct line: [redacted]
Switchboard: [redacted]
charles.whalley@tandf.co.uk
www.tandfonline.com

From: Nathan Donley [mailto:NDonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]
Sent: 26 February 2018 19:49
To: Whalley, Charles <[redacted]@tandf.co.uk>; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Cc: Bill Freese <BFreese@CenterforFoodSafety[redacted] Caroline Cox <Caroline@ceh[redacted] Emily Marquez <emily@panna[redacted] Stecker, Tiffany <tstecker@bloombergenvironment[redacted]>; jrosenblatt@bloomberg[redacted]

pwaldman@bloomberg[redacted]
Subject: Retraction request

Hello Charles and Roger,

I am inquiring once again about the status of the investigation into scientific misconduct that occurred in the 2016 supplemental issue of Critical Reviews in Toxicology entitled "An Independent Review of the Carcinogenic Potential of Glyphosate."

It has been more than six months since this investigation began. I have attached the letter that was sent to you both on October 12th, 2017 by scientists from four national environmental-health organizations. I have also CC'd the 3 reporters who broke this story and whose initial inquiries sparked your investigation.

https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-08-09/monsanto-was-its-own-ghostwriter-for-some-safety-reviews

Please let us know at your earliest convenience the status of your investigation.

Thank you,

Nathan Donley, Ph.D
Senior Scientist, Center for Biological Diversity
[redacted]
ndonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]

From: Nathan Donley
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 9:04 AM
To: Whalley, Charles; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Subject: RE: Retraction request

Great, thanks Charles

Nathan

From: Whalley, Charles [mailto:[redacted]@tandf.co.uk]
Sent: Wednesday, November 1, 2017 12:49 AM
To: Nathan Donley; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Subject: RE: Retraction request

Dear Nathan,

Thanks for your email. I can confirm that we have received your letter. Our investigation into these matters is still ongoing. I'll be happy to update you in due course.

All best wishes,
Charles

From: Nathan Donley [mailto:NDonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]
Sent: 31 October 2017 23:53

To: Whalley, Charles <[redacted]tandf.co.uk>; roger.o.mcclellan@[redacted]
Subject: Retraction request

Hello Charles and Roger,

Just checking in to make sure you got our retraction request. I want to thank you both for looking into this issue.

Nathan

From: Nathan Donley
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2017 7:56 AM
To: 'Whalley, Charles'
Subject: Retraction request

Hello Charles,

Please find the attached letter from scientists from four national environmental-health organizations calling for a retraction of the summary review article that was published in the 2016 supplemental issue of Critical Reviews in Toxicology entitled "An Independent Review of the Carcinogenic Potential of Glyphosate."

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions and please keep me updated on your investigation.

This letter was also sent to Roger McClellan and this matter forwarded to the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE)

Nathan Donley, Ph.D
Senior Scientist, Center for Biological Diversity
[redacted]
ndonley@biologicaldiversity[redacted]