

Summary Report

1. Respondent(s)

- Professor Pasquale Maffia - Professor of Cardiovascular Immunology, School of Cardiovascular & Metabolic Health

2. Allegations

- <https://pubpeer.com/publications/69D27CCD8D7E8D0725939BCCF97408#>
- <https://pubpeer.com/publications/4C43EB75BC446A170FBB9921D3D713>
- <https://pubpeer.com/publications/7979D10F593BCF8D1FF2871CE20A72>

3. Receipt of allegations and pre-screening

The allegation was originally communicated to research-integrity@glasgow.ac.uk by an external source on 25 February 2025. This was then communicated to the Integrity Council on 25 February 2025.

The Integrity Council reviewed the allegations and the supporting evidence. Following this review, the Integrity Council was content that:

- The allegations pertain to research misconduct as defined in Section 2 of the Research Misconduct Policy AND
- The allegations appeared to be supported by some initial evidence AND;
- The allegations did not, at face value, appear to be wholly mistaken, frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious.

The Integrity Council had no evidence on which to dismiss the allegations, and so concluded under the outcomes available to them, at Section 3.4 Receipt of Allegation stage of the Research Misconduct Policy, that the allegation(s) was sufficiently serious and had sufficient substance to advance to the Initial Investigation Stage.

4. Investigator Findings

Evidence reviewed:

- Allegations and comments on PubPeer
- Published Papers
- Original images
- Statement report and email from respondent

Allegation 1: According to PubPeer: *"Figure 2: scanning electron microscopy of (B) unmodified nanotags and (C) pegylated nanotags, but the two micrographs are identical (blue boxes)."*

<https://pubpeer.com/publications/4C43EB75BC446A170FBB9921D3D713>

For this allegation the explanation from the respondent is comprehensible. The respondent has shown in the report that a new figure has been generated, and they have contacted the journal to correct the published work. Though this allegation shows poor practice in reviewing and editing the article, it does not change the conclusions of the paper, nor does it seem to show any malicious intent. As such, no further investigation is required.

Allegation 2: According to PubPeer: *"Figure 1: micrographs (d) and (e) overlap (green boxes) but are supposed to represent control mice and mice receiving unpolarized cells."*

<https://pubpeer.com/publications/69D27CCD8D7E8D0725939BCCF97408>

For this allegation the explanation from the respondent is comprehensible. The respondent has shown in the report that they have located and checked the original data, with a new figure being generated. They have contacted the journal to correct the published work. Though this allegation shows poor work practice in reviewing and editing the manuscript, it does not change the conclusions of the paper, nor does it seem to show any malicious intent. As such, no further investigation is required.

Allegation 3: According to PubPeer: *“In Figure 1B. Two actin bands from the Western Blot are considered much more similar than expected.”*

<https://pubpeer.com/publications/7979D10F593BCF8D1FF2871CE20A72>

For this allegation, after checking the figure in question and following the extra information and details provided by the respondent, the Investigator classed the allegation as a poor work practice not as a malicious action. The respondent went through their backup data and provided the original western blot, providing further evidence on the fact the western blot bands are indeed very similar but not a duplication of each other. The western blot in question, according to the respondent, looks like it was inadvertently published in the wrong orientation. The journal should be contacted to correct this issue.