**Panel meeting investigation committee, case Guillaume Vetter**

Date: 26.04.2012

Place: Campus Limpertsberg, University of Luxembourg

The data were published in the paper:

Vetter G, Saumet A, Moes M, Vallar L, Le Bechec A, Laurini C, Sabbah M, Arar K, Theillet C, Lecellier CH, Friederich E. miR-661 expression in SNA11-induced epithelial to mesenchymal transition contributes to breast cancer cell invasion by targeting Nectin-1 and StarDlO messengers. Oncogene. 2010 Aug 5; 29(31):4436-48

The panel were sent all the relevant documents. Dr. Vetter was invited twice to be interviewed by registered mail. However he did not reply and was not interviewed. He is no longer employed by the University of Luxembourg.

### General issues:

The internal Luxembourg ERP handled the case appropriately, it uncovered all the relevant information and produced a very good report (to which there is not much to add) and took correct action.

### Conclusions:

* The paperwork and the interviews leave very little if any doubt that the manipulation of the data, in particular the nectin data, was done by Dr Vetter without the involvement of others. In fact he avoided answering a number of critical questions about the data from his collaborators.
* The laboratory is to be commended for its efforts to get to the bottom of this issue by repeating experiments and collecting new data. This shows that the basic conclusion of the paper stands with the exception of the nectin data. In particular it is recommended that Figure 4 should be checked, Figure 5a (nectin data) should be changed, that Figure 5b should be modified and the experiment reported in Figure 5c be repeated. All nectin data should be dropped. There was no evidence of data manipulation in other publications.

#### Recommendations:

1. The article published in Oncogene has to be retracted or corrected.

1. In order to limit the damage to the co-authors they should contact the Oncogene editor to try and obtain a correction of the paper, removing the manipulated data and adding the new data. It should be made clear why the corrections are necessary and that it is an isolated case of data manipulation by Dr. Vetter. All authors should agree on the corrections. Dr Vetter should not be involved and his name should be absent from the correction.
2. In case the journal does not accept a correction, the paper should be retracted with a clear statement as to the manipulations carried out by Dr Vetter without any involvement of any of the co­ authors and a statement that the basic conclusion of the paper is upheld. A new manuscript without Dr Vetter should then be produced with the corrected and new data to be submitted for a new publication.
3. No action should be taken against any of the co-authors, in fact they should be commended for their diligence to rectify the situation.
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