

**From:** Cathy Harwood **On Behalf Of** Rory Collins  
**Sent:** 03 July 2014 15:56  
**To:** 'Iain Chalmers'  
**Cc:** Jane Armitage; [klim.mcpherson@obs-gyn.ox.ac.uk](mailto:klim.mcpherson@obs-gyn.ox.ac.uk); Fiona Godlee  
**Subject:** RE: statins

Dear Iain

I quite understand Fiona's reluctance to meet while the BMJ's panel is considering what to do about the papers by Abramson et al and Malhotra (and the incorrect statements in their related Rapid Response correspondence). However, as I indicated to both you and Klim, I would be happy to meet with any and all of you at any time in order to help resolve this issue because of the potential adverse impact of misleading information on public health.

In the meantime, it would be most helpful if the BMJ would make public the peer reviewers' comments on both papers. Public access to information about the review process for the paper by Abramson et al has helped to explain how some things went wrong with that paper. It is stated in the BMJ that the paper by Malhotra was also peer reviewed, but (despite previous requests) the reviewers' comments for that paper have not been made available.

It may well be, of course, that the Malhotra paper was not peer reviewed and that it was merely mistakenly said to have been. If that is the case, it would be useful to know, since that might also help to explain how errors in that paper slipped through the editorial process.

I'm copying this email to Fiona so that she can let us know whether or not Malhotra's paper was peer-reviewed and, if so, to encourage her to make the peer reviewers' comments public now.

Best wishes,

Rory