From:	Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
Sent time:	11/20/2021 10:59:14 AM
To:	Hoau-yan Wang
Subject:	[EXTERNAL] Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114

Dear Dr. Wang:

I write regarding your article, Wang et al., (2017) PTI-125 binds and reverses an altered confirmation of filamin A to reduce Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis. Neurobiol. Aging, 55, 99-114, for which you serve as corresponding author. A reader has brought to our attention credible concerns that, as Editor-in-Chief of the journal, I must take seriously.

The specific substance of the concerns is copied below:

1. Figure 12:

- **All blots in this figure contain 13 bands, corresponding to the 13 different conditions indicated at the bottom. However, the NR1 normalization blot shown at the top contains only 12 bands.**
- **The right-most four bands of the NR1 blot appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
- **The right-most three bands of the PLCgamma1 blot (and other blots) appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**

Editor's Note: Consistent with this description, each of the 7 blots in Fig. 12 in your originally submitted manuscript (NBA 16-1080) includes two separately selectable items, one of 3 or 4 lanes on the right, and a second panel with the remaining lanes.

2. Figure 3:

- **One of the bands representing a 10-month sample, in the right blot, appears to be surrounded by a rectangle of a different background than the rest of the blot.**

3. Figure 6:

- **the same area appears to be visible both in the 6 month old HP panel as well as the 10 month old HP panel, albeit rotated and perhaps distorted.**

Please provide a full response to these complaints of figure manipulation, ideally including uncropped copies of the blots or photomicrographs used to configure Figs 3, 6, and 12. I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience, within 30 days. Consistent with COPE guidelines, we anticipate informing the complainant regarding the response.

Please note that, in the absence of a satisfactory timely response, the journal may be obligated to pursue other corrective action.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue, and for supporting the accuracy and integrity of data published at Neurobiology of Aging.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

From: Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
Sent time: 11/21/2021 05:17:16 PM
To: Hoau-yan Wang
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114

Dr. Wang:

One additional issue needing attention in your report, the primary antibody from Santa Cruz listed in your Methods against nicotinic alpha7 receptor (i.e., SC-65844) appears to bind a different subunit, not the alpha7 subunit reportedly examined.

Again, I appreciate your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

On Sat, Nov 20, 2021 at 10:59 AM Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com> wrote:

> Dear Dr. Wang:
>
> I write regarding your article, Wang et al., (2017) PTI-125 binds and reverses an altered confirmation of filamin A to reduce Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis. Neurobiol. Aging, 55, 99-114, for which you serve as corresponding author. A reader has brought to our attention credible concerns that, as Editor-in-Chief of the journal, I must take seriously.
>
> The specific substance of the concerns is copied below:
>
> **1. Figure 12:**
> - **All blots in this figure contain 13 bands, corresponding to the 13 different conditions indicated at the bottom. However, the NR1 normalization blot shown at the top contains only 12 bands.**
> - **The right-most four bands of the NR1 blot appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
> - **The right-most three bands of the PLCgamma1 blot (and other blots) appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
>
> *Editor's Note: Consistent with this description, each of the 7 blots in Fig. 12 in your originally submitted manuscript (NBA 16-1080) includes two separately selectable items, one of 3 or 4 lanes on the right, and a second panel with the remaining lanes.*
>
> **2. Figure 3:**
> - **One of the bands representing a 10-month sample, in the right blot, appears to be surrounded by a rectangle of a different background than the rest of the blot.**
>
> **3. Figure 6:**
> - **the same area appears to be visible both in the 6 month old HP panel as well as the 10 month old HP panel, albeit rotated and perhaps distorted.**
>
> Please provide a full response to these complaints of figure manipulation, ideally including uncropped copies of the blots or photomicrographs used to configure Figs 3, 6, and 12. I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience, within 30 days. Consistent with COPE guidelines, we anticipate informing the complainant regarding the response.
>
> Please note that, in the absence of a satisfactory timely response, the journal may be obligated to pursue other corrective action.
>
> Thank you for your attention to this important issue, and for supporting the accuracy and integrity of data published at Neurobiology of Aging.
>
> Sincerely,
> Peter R. Rapp
> Peter R. Rapp, PhD
> Editor-in-Chief
> Neurobiology of Aging

From: Hoau-yan Wang
Sent time: 11/22/2021 10:20:10 AM
To: Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
Cc: Beidel, Jennifer L. <jennifer.beidel@saul.com>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114

Dear Dr. Rapp,

We will provide a full response to your inquiries as soon as possible. The primary antibody from Santa Cruz against nicotinic alpha7 receptor should be **SC-65607** as indicated below. My laboratory has never worked on alpha1 nicotinic receptors so that we do not possess and use SC-65844. We will also include this correction in our full response.

Anti-Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor alpha 7/CHRNA7 Antibody (319): sc-58607

Thank you.

Best regards,

Hoau-Yan Wang

From: Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 21, 2021 5:17 PM
To: Hoau-yan Wang
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114

Dr. Wang:

One additional issue needing attention in your report, the primary antibody from Santa Cruz listed in your Methods against nicotinic alpha7 receptor (i.e., SC-65844) appears to bind a different subunit, not the alpha7 subunit reportedly examined.

Again, I appreciate your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

On Sat, Nov 20, 2021 at 10:59 AM Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com> wrote:

> Dear Dr. Wang:
>
> I write regarding your article, Wang et al., (2017) PTI-125 binds and reverses an altered confirmation of filamin A to reduce Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis. Neurobiol. Aging, 55, 99-114, for which you serve as corresponding author. A reader has brought to our attention credible concerns that, as Editor-in-Chief of the journal, I must take seriously.
>
> The specific substance of the concerns is copied below:
>
> **1. Figure 12:**
> - **All blots in this figure contain 13 bands, corresponding to the 13 different conditions indicated at the bottom. However, the NR1 normalization blot shown at the top contains only 12 bands.**
> - **The right-most four bands of the NR1 blot appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
> - **The right-most three bands of the PLCgamma1 blot (and other blots) appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
>
> *Editor's Note: Consistent with this description, each of the 7 blots in Fig. 12 in your originally submitted manuscript (NBA 16-1080) includes two separately selectable items, one of 3 or 4 lanes on the right, and a second panel with*

the remaining lanes.

2. Figure 3:

- **One of the bands representing a 10-month sample, in the right blot, appears to be surrounded by a rectangle of a different background than the rest of the blot.**

3. Figure 6:

- **the same area appears to be visible both in the 6 month old HP panel as well as the 10 month old HP panel, albeit rotated and perhaps distorted.**

Please provide a full response to these complaints of figure manipulation, ideally including uncropped copies of the blots or photomicrographs used to configure Figs 3, 6, and 12. I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience, within 30 days. Consistent with COPE guidelines, we anticipate informing the complainant regarding the response.

Please note that, in the absence of a satisfactory timely response, the journal may be obligated to pursue other corrective action.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue, and for supporting the accuracy and integrity of data published at Neurobiology of Aging.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

From: Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
Sent time: 11/22/2021 07:07:03 PM
To: Hoau-yan Wang
Cc: Beidel, Jennifer L. <jennifer.beidel@saul.com>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Re: Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114

Dear Dr. Wang:

Thank you very much for this quick reply. I look forward to resolving the issues raised.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

On Mon, Nov 22, 2021 at 10:20 AM Hoau-yan Wang <hywang@med.cuny.edu> wrote:

> Dear Dr. Rapp,
>
> We will provide a full response to your inquiries as soon as possible. The primary antibody from Santa Cruz against nicotinic alpha7 receptor should be **SC-65607** as indicated below. My laboratory has never worked on alpha1 nicotinic receptors so that we do not possess and use SC-65844. We will also include this correction in our full response.
>
> # Anti-Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor alpha 7/CHRNA7 Antibody (319): sc-58607
>
> Thank you.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Hoau-Yan Wang
>
> ---
>
> **From:** Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com>
> **Sent:** Sunday, November 21, 2021 5:17 PM
> **To:** Hoau-yan Wang
> **Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Wang et al. (2017), NBA, 55, 99-114
>
> Dr. Wang:
>
> One additional issue needing attention in your report, the primary antibody from Santa Cruz listed in your Methods against nicotinic alpha7 receptor (i.e., SC-65844) appears to bind a different subunit, not the alpha7 subunit reportedly examined.
>
> Again, I appreciate your attention to these matters.
>
> Sincerely,

Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging

On Sat, Nov 20, 2021 at 10:59 AM Peter Rapp <peter@nbaging.com> wrote:

Dear Dr. Wang:

I write regarding your article, Wang et al., (2017) PTI-125 binds and reverses an altered confirmation of filamin A to reduce Alzheimer's disease pathogenesis. Neurobiol. Aging, 55, 99-114, for which you serve as corresponding author. A reader has brought to our attention credible concerns that, as Editor-in-Chief of the journal, I must take seriously.

The specific substance of the concerns is copied below:

1. Figure 12:

- **All blots in this figure contain 13 bands, corresponding to the 13 different conditions indicated at the bottom. However, the NR1 normalization blot shown at the top contains only 12 bands.**
- **The right-most four bands of the NR1 blot appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**
- **The right-most three bands of the PLCgamma1 blot (and other blots) appear to show a different background than the left lanes of that blot**

Editor's Note: Consistent with this description, each of the 7 blots in Fig. 12 in your originally submitted manuscript (NBA 16-1080) includes two separately selectable items, one of 3 or 4 lanes on the right, and a second panel with the remaining lanes.

2. Figure 3:

- **One of the bands representing a 10-month sample, in the right blot, appears to be surrounded by a rectangle of a different background than the rest of the blot.**

3. Figure 6:

- **the same area appears to be visible both in the 6 month old HP panel as well as the 10 month old HP panel, albeit rotated and perhaps distorted.**

Please provide a full response to these complaints of figure manipulation, ideally including uncropped copies of the blots or photomicrographs used to configure Figs 3, 6, and 12. I would appreciate a response at your earliest convenience, within 30 days. Consistent with COPE guidelines, we anticipate informing the complainant regarding the response.

Please note that, in the absence of a satisfactory timely response, the journal may be obligated to pursue other corrective action.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue, and for supporting the accuracy and integrity of data published at Neurobiology of Aging.

Sincerely,
Peter R. Rapp
Peter R. Rapp, PhD
Editor-in-Chief
Neurobiology of Aging