

On 3/8/2012 4:42 PM, Resnik, David (NIH/NIEHS) [E] wrote:

Dear Helene:

Thank you for submitting your paper. Unfortunately, I do not think it is the type of manuscript that would be appropriate for publication in *Accountability in Research* (AIR). I have two concerns. First, the paper is criticizing research published in other journals. The most appropriate venue for this type of work would be the journals that published the research you are criticizing. Second, the paper is alleging that certain individuals committed misconduct. AIR is not a forum for such allegations. These would be best handled by the journals in which the research appeared that you are criticizing. I'm sorry that I can't be more supportive of your submission. I know you have invested a lot of work in this. If you would like another assessment, you can pursue the matter with Adil Shamoo, AIR editor in chief, who I have copied on this email.

Sincerely,

David B. Resnik, JD, PhD, Bioethicist and IRB Chair
National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences
National Institutes of Health
Box 12233, Mail Drop CU 03
Research Triangle Park, NC, 27709 USA
resnikd@niehs.nih.gov
Office: 919 541 5658 Cell: 919 370 2702
Fax: 919 541 9854

From: Helene Hill [mailto:hzhill@verizon.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 08, 2012 4:21 PM
To: Resnik, David (NIH/NIEHS) [E]
Subject: scientific integrity

Dear Dr Resnik,

You may remember that in May, 2008, at the recommendation of Dr Sam Wilson, I sent you 3 documents regarding a *qui tam* case in which I was the relator, at the time I was looking for expert witnesses. The case is now finished and, not surprisingly, I lost -- both in the District Court and on appeal. The judges' decisions were based on timing and other considerations irrelevant to the science. I have obtained a huge amount of information since then as a result of Discovery. The attached paper by me and Dr Joel Pitt, the statistician who served as my expert, analyzes the experiments that were made available to us.

I feel that it is imperative to get this paper published. The scientific community deserves to be aware of this analysis because grant monies were expended on what one may conclude on reading this paper was worthless research. Standards for exposures to radioactive materials and calculations in nuclear medicine pertaining to diagnostic and therapeutic exposures may be based on erroneous conclusions arising from this questionable research. But most of all, it is just plain morally wrong. If you are interested in looking up the case, it is 03-cv-4837 DMC. The appeal is 10-4364. A successful motion to quash (10-4837) was filed by a prominent member of the Radiation Research Society.

I hope you will do me the courtesy of reading this paper. I would like to submit it to *Accountability in Research*. I would hope it would receive fair consideration there. An earlier draft was rejected by *Science*. *Nature* did not want a submission based on the abstract. *PLoS ONE* has rejected it saying "We recognize that this paper addresses a controversial topic. PLoS ONE is not averse to publishing original research studies which are critical, or controversial, with r

I have appealed but have not received any ruling as yet.

I sent a hard copy for preliminary review to the Editor-in-Chief of the journal *Radiation Research*, as suggested by the *PLoS ONE* editor -- 4 of the 8 questionable papers were published there. I have not received any response although I have confirmation that it was delivered. I do not consider that it is at this time "submitted simultaneously for publication elsewhere" as it has not yet been sent out for review anywhere. I believe that if it is sent out for review, it will have a fair chance of success, and I will withdraw it from preliminary considerations and/or appeal.

Sincerely yours,

Helene Z Hill, PhD
Professor of Radiology
NJ Medical School