

The students who performed the reactions and characterization have left the group/ Institute, and I cannot contact them as none of them is responding to my emails; that is the most unfortunate part of my life.

I humbly state that during the planning and discussion of the work, I check the NMR of the products and suggest to students to go ahead with the planned work. However, during the manuscript preparation, students prepare the supporting information, which provides all the characterization data, including NMR. During the manuscript submission, I uploaded the supporting file that I received from them. Therefore, I never realized they manipulated the data while preparing supporting information. I sincerely apologise and accept my mistake that I should check and re-verify the data before submission.

After receiving comments on Pubpeer and RSC investigation emails, I checked the supporting files and matched them with the original NMR spectra available to me. I agree with the indicated manipulations and sincerely apologize, as I was utterly unaware of this unethical act by the students. I replied to each query that I received from RSC on my publications. I also submitted the original NMR spectra of the recent articles and the responses. I requested that RSC allow me to re-perform the reactions, perform product analysis, and submit the new NMR spectra. They did not consider it because any kind of manipulation is against their publication ethics, which I respectfully agree with and accept.

Some of the articles were retracted due to the submission of insufficient data during the submission and publication of the work at that time. As the work was carried out in 2010 or before, Due to the students' non-traceability, I could not arrange to provide the raw data, so the articles were retracted. I wish reviewers/ editors had asked me during the manuscript submission because it is just impossible to trace the 14-15-year-old data from the analytical facility operators.

Regarding the recent articles, students accepted that they had prepared the supporting information and took responsibility for retractions. The students' responses are published in the retraction notices as well.

As I checked the original NMR, all the reactions went well, therefore I am pretty sure that the work is reproducible and students removed the undesired peaks of solvents, unreacted substrates and other impurities that is entirely unethical and was not in my knowledge.

I am very sorry for my valuable collaborators and contributing authors who are innocent and got defamed owing to this.

As I requested to RSC after the retraction, I will re-submit each work as a new publication with all the raw data to save my integrity, and they agreed and suggested that the resubmission would be handled as per the author guidelines and peer-review process.

Regarding the comments on the papers on Pubpeer, I am afraid to respond on Pubpeer. However, for some of the work, I have reproduced and submitted the correct GC-MS and NMR (as asked in comments) directly to Journals. In some cases, they have acknowledged and are satisfied with the reproduced results, and some are under consideration.

For the rest of the work, I will re-perform the reactions (where issued rose) with the help of new students as soon as possible and resubmit the data to the concerned journals in future.

Dear Lori, please believe me. I was completely unaware of these manipulations during the manuscript submission. I could never imagine that students whom I helped a lot during their PhD did this to me, and now, they are not even responding. I feel cheated by the dirty and manipulative students who, just for their selfish purpose, created this trouble for me. I am highly depressed and do not know how to come out of all that. This situation is an eye-opener for me for the future. I will be extremely careful in data handling from now onwards.