

Sholto David

12 October 2023

Dear Mr David,

Allegations of research misconduct QMRI-08 and QMRI-09

I am writing with regards to two formal complaints you have recently submitted alleging research misconduct. As we received these around the same time, I will deal with both in this letter.

At Queen Mary University of London, we take allegations of research misconduct extremely seriously. Therefore, your complaints were triaged and assessed rigorously in accordance with our policy. As a result of this assessment, we will not be pursuing further investigation. I will explain the reasons for this below.

In your complaint QMRI-08, you suggest there has been *possible* fabrication. This appears to be based on a view formed about the indications in the data. However, no further substantiation nor analysis is provided. As a result, we do not have sufficient evidence to examine this claim further.

You also raise questions about the ethical approval for the study. This has been granted by Atharva Multispecialty Hospital and Research Centre and Tulsi Hospital in India. It is our understanding that they are the legal sponsors of the study and are thus responsible for the ethical approval.

With regards to the Funder and Competing Interests statements in the journal article, we have raised these with the researcher who is seeking advice from the journal as to whether these statements should be revised for clarity.

Your other complaint, QMRI-09 is comprised of links to comments posted on the PubPeer website. This does not amount to a completed and substantiated complaint that we can review. We do have a procedure for following up on information provided outside the formal complaints process. I am aware that you have already sent us these links by email, and they were dealt with in accordance with this procedure. While we acknowledge communications of this nature, we cannot provide information about outcomes in the interests of confidentiality.

For future reference, I would encourage you to read our webpage, '[Making an allegation of research](#)'

[misconduct](#)'. This clarifies the information we require from those making allegations of research misconduct and what they, in turn, can expect from us. I hope this is helpful.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Andrew Livingston', written in a cursive style.

Professor Andrew Livingston
Vice Principal, Research and Innovation