

I strongly dispute the conduct of the University of Oxford (“OU”) investigation, the internal Panel and all accusations of misconduct in research. My requests to the OU for an external independent Panel member were repeatedly rejected. My grievances are now awaiting review at the Office of the Independent Adjudicators (“OIA”). I had made honest errors which I was unaware of during the preparation of the papers as a student under supervision. I feel very sorry to have made the errors which have led to much insight and self-reflection. The errors were unfortunately not picked up during internal reviews; the papers were submitted after final approvals from the corresponding author. The alleged data manipulation was not done by me. My position is supported by third-party senior academic and barrister opinions.

The Journal of the American College of Cardiology (“JACC”) editorial board initially suggested an erratum and withdrawal of figures. This decision was later subjected to a U-turn and changed to retraction after a JACC ethics board vote. It is understood that the University of Oxford may have been involved during the process leading to the U-turn; I was left out of the process. My later enquiries to JACC for information on the process that led to the U-turn were rejected. My request to JACC to wait for the official OIA review before publishing the retraction notes was also rejected. The retraction notes were written in coordination with the University of Oxford. I had expressed concerns to JACC regarding inaccuracies in the retraction notes, but I was denied any opportunities to correct the retraction notes before publication. I maintain that these retraction notes are inaccurate and the details of my position are not reflected, which are as follow:

In relation to “Gadolinium-Free Cardiac MR Stress T1-Mapping to Distinguish Epicardial From Microvascular Coronary Disease” [J Am Coll Cardiol 2018], my position, as supported by senior academic opinions, is that:

- the T1 data in the central illustration distinguishing epicardial obstructive coronary artery disease and coronary microvascular dysfunction were not manipulated by me, but by a third party whereby spreadsheet formulae appear to have been overridden with different values in multiple spreadsheets at the very last stages of analysis which jeopardised the integrity of my work;
- “the number of control subjects, their age and statistical tests” were miscalculated due to honest errors, including p-values between controls and patients which did not affect main study conclusions and were unfortunately not picked up during internal reviews; and
- figure 2 is an illustrative figure created by a honest mix up of images from different subjects, when many single-subject options were available.

In relation to “Diagnosis of Microvascular Angina Using Cardiac Magnetic Resonance” [J Am Coll Cardiol 2018], my position, as supported by senior academic opinions, is that:

- I made an honest mistake in mixing up per-vessel and per-subject analyses resulting in an error in the number of subjects and vessels. I was trained by one of the senior authors to perform per-vessel data analysis during multiple iterations of an earlier paper, when later preparing this manuscript for the corresponding author which required per-subject analysis, in hindsight I became confused and performed the analysis on a per-vessel basis; the per-vessel analysis itself was performed accurately. I was highly disappointed by this error. Unfortunately it was not picked up during internal reviews. I did not know there was double counting of vessels at the time, which was an honest mistake: there were many other vessels I could have used;
- 5 controls with discrepant ages were included by an honest mistake, which did not change study conclusion and were not picked up during internal reviews;
- 25 controls were available in total, 20 controls were required for final analysis, therefore 5 controls were excluded, which did not affect study conclusions;

- a small number of volunteers were not completely healthy and were included by honest error, which did not change the study conclusion and were not picked up during internal reviews; and
- figure 5 was an illustrative figure created by a honest mix up of images from different subjects when many single-subject options were available. This error was made in the same manner as figure 2 in the other paper, likely due to needing to operate different software to extract different types of images.