

Appendix 1. Design discrepancies [posted as supplied by author]

Discrepancy ID	Discrepancy summary	Paper 1	Detail from Paper 1	Paper 2	Detail from Paper 2	Paper 3	Detail from Paper 3	Paper 4	Detail from Paper 4
t07/101	Contradiction whether randomized or acceptor-rejecter	t07r1	Definitely randomized between cell therapy and control, e.g. pages 53, 67	t07r10	Patients refusing cell therapy acted as the control group, p723	t07r6	Same document describes it both as randomized and non-randomized		
t07/102	Contradiction whether placebo (i.e. blinded) or open control	t07r1	Describes randomization, but not the use of Placebo	t07r10	Describes a controlled acceptor rejecter study. No Placebo mentioned	t07r3	BMCs vs. Placebo		
t07/103	Contradiction if cells were cultivated overnight or not	t07r10	No	t07r1	Yes (publications' references 6 and 8)	t07r6	Yes		
t08/101	Contradiction whether acceptor-rejecter or randomized	t08r2	Appears to be acceptor-rejecter but this is contradicted by 4 Publications from same group	t08r3	Randomly Allocated	t08r4	Randomized controlled studies	t08r6	10 randomly allocated to the stem cell therapy and 10 as controls
t08/103	Possible concealed dual therapy	t08r3	Fourth column: 21 chronic ischaemic and 3 DCM patients treated in Dusseldorf a second time, 3-12 months after the first treatment	t07r1 t07r10 t08r2 t49r3	Not clear whether the 21 double-treated patients were counted once, twice, or not at all in the other reports				

t09/101	Contradiction in the number of patients randomized (leading to 19 patients per group)	t09r3 p.172 Abstract	38 patients were randomized	t09r2 p.30 Figure	41 patients included for randomization				
t09/102	Contradiction between number of patients randomized vs. number of patients in randomized controls and recipients	t09r2 p.30 Figure	41 patients were randomized	t09r2 p.30 Figure	Each group (controls and recipients) contained 21 assigned patients (2x21=42)				
t13/101	Discrepancy between the total number and the sum of patients excluded from control group for the assessment of changes in max oxygen consumption	t13r2 Figure 1	4 excluded	t13r2 Figure 1	Reasons given for 3 patients (1 for transplant, 1 for LVAD placement and 1 for no show)				
t21/101	Contradiction if control group existed or not	t21r12 t21r3	No, No	t21r5 t21r7	Yes (1:1), Yes (1:1)	t21r11 t21r10	Yes (Non 1:1), Yes (Non 1:1)	t21r9	Yes

t21/102	Acceptor-rejecter (3 publications by group) ..	t21r5	Accepters versus Rejecters	t21r7	Accepters versus Rejecters	t21r8	Same document describes it both as randomized and non-randomized		
t21/102 continued	.. versus Randomized (7 publications by same group regarding what seems to be the same study)	t21r13 (author's response)	RANDOMIZED: "all our chronic patients (n=36) (t21) fulfilled the same inclusion criteria (e.g. randomization...)"	t21r4	Table 1: states IACT is: "RANDOMISIERT E, kontrollierte Studie"	t21r11	in the RANDOMIZED control group no significant changes were observed...	t08r3	RANDOMIZED Study
t21/102 continued		t21r8	RANDOMIZED control group	t21r9	while in the RANDOMIZED control group no significant changes were observed	t07r6	while in the RANDOMIZED control group no significant changes were observed		
t21/103	Seems to be an undeclared duplicate publication	t21r5		t21r7					
t21/104	The whole is less than the sum of the parts	t21r1	n=70 divided to 80 recipients and 35 controls						
t21/105	Contradiction if patients received inotropes or not	t21r5	No dobutamine infusion	t21r1	Dobutamine infusion for 8 hours after cell therapy. Possibly a duplicate publication but protocol appears different.				

t21/106	Contradictory statin usage between reports	t21r5	First publication reported 94% (35/36) had been on statin therapy.	t21r11	Subsequently 100% (195/195) had statin before and after therapy.		
t27/101	The clinical trials number given is for an unrelated, smaller, intraMYOCARDIAL study; the paper is a larger, intraCORONARY study	t27r1 Methods	"intracoronary transplantation"	t27r1 Methods	NCT01350310	t27r3	"Intramyocardial stem cell therapy"
t41/101	Inconsistency of whether the 44 patients were randomized or acceptor-rejecter	t41r1	0 randomized, 44 acceptor-rejecter	t41r3	44 randomized, 0 acceptor-rejecter		
t41/102	Inconsistency of whether the first 20 patients were randomized or acceptor-rejecter	t41r2	65 randomized, 20 acceptor-rejecter	t41r4	85 randomized, 0 acceptor-rejecter		
t44/101	Inconsistent number of controls	t44r1 Abstract page 1775	n=11	t44r2	n=10		
t44/102	Inconsistent number of recipients	t44r1 Abstract page 1775	n=9	t44r2	n=10		
t49/101	Contradictory number of follow-ups	t49r3		3 t49r5		2	

t49/102	Contradictory time of second follow-up investigations	t49r3	12 Months	t49r5	15 Months
t49/103	Contradictory whether accepter-rejecter or randomized	t49r3	Acceptor-rejecter	t49r1	Randomized
