

Appendix 2. Methods and baseline characteristics 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
t01/201	Inconsistent total number of recipients	t01r1 Table 3	The cohorts contain 5+5+6=16. The total number of treated patients is 15 and includes 1 case of acute stent thrombosis	t01r1 Table 2	All treated n=15	t01r1 Table 1	Treated pooled n=16	t01r1 Results	"One treatment group subject died soon after cell infusion from ventricular fibrillation ... Another treatment group subject was withdrawn because of acute stent thrombosis before cell infusion"
t01/202	Apparent change of gender amongst patients in 1st 2 treatment cohorts	t01r1 Table 1	The first 10 patients were 8 men + 2 women (as the recipients were sequentially recruited to escalating doses)	t01r2	The first 10 patients were 9 men + 1 woman				
t01/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for Hypertensive 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1		20% t01r1 Table 1	1/6=16.7%				

t01/204	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for Hypertensive pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1	33% t01r1 Table 1	5/16=31%
t01/205	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for aspirin in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	5/6=83.3%
t01/206	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for aspirin in pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	15/16=94%
t01/207	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for angiotensin antagonists in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	5/6=83.3%
t01/208	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for angiotensin antagonists in pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1	87% t01r1 Table 1	13/16=81%

t01/209	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for aldosterone antagonists in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1	7% t01r1 Table 1	1/16=6%
t01/210	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	5/6=83.3%
t01/211	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers in pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	15/16=94%
t01/212	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for clopidogrel in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	5/6=83.3%
t01/213	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for clopidogrel in pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1	100% t01r1 Table 1	15/16=94%

t01/214	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for statin in 15 million cells recipients	t01r1 Table 1		100% t01r1 Table 1	5/6=83.3%				
t01/215	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for statin in pooled recipients	t01r1 Table 1		100% t01r1 Table 1	15/16=94%				
t02/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers at 2-3 weeks in recipients	t02r1 Table 1		98% t02r1 Table 1	50/50=100%				
t02/202	Impossible % of Target vessel PCIs in recipients and percentage incompatible with ratio	t02r5 Table 1	50 patients, therefore odd percentages are impossible	t02r5 Table 1	11% t02r5 Table 1	11/50=22%			
t02/203	Contradicting number of BMC recipients receiving beta-blockers at baseline	t02r1 Table 1	50 of 50 BMC (100%) recipients received beta blockers	t02r1 Results section p710.e5	All patients received beta blockers at both time points	t02r3 Table 1 and t02r4 Table 1	49 of 50 (98%) BMC recipients received Beta-Blockers at Baseline	t02r2 Table 1	50 of 50 BMC (100%) recipients received beta blockers

t02/203 continued		t02r5 page 674	All patients were treated with beta-blockers	t02r6	50 out of 50 BMC (100%) recipients received beta blockers
t03/201	Impossible % of recipients with NYHA Class 2	t03r1 Table 1	54.6% of 11 is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 6 (54.5%) and 7 (63.6%).		
t03/202	Impossible % of recipients on beta-blockers	t03r1 Table 1	54.6% of 11 is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 6 (54.5%) and 7 (63.6%).		
t04/201	Impossible % infarct related artery in controls	t04r1 Table 1	95.7% of 49 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 46 (93.9%) and 47 (95.9%).		

t04/202	Impossible % infarct related artery in recipients	t04r1 Table 1	91.8% of 52 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 47 (90.4%) and 48 (92.3%).
t04/203	Impossible % TIMI flow 2-3 after PCI in recipients	t04r1 Table 1	97.9% of 52 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 50 (96.2%) and 51 (98.1%).
t04/204	Impossible % Killip class 1 or 2 in controls	t04r1 Table 1	93.3% of 49 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 45 (91.8%) or 46 (93.9%).
t04/205	Impossible % Killip class 1 or 2 in recipients	t04r1 Table 1	95.8% of 52 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 49 (94.2%) and 50 (96.2%).

t04/206	Impossible % Killip class 3 or 4 in controls	t04r1 Table 1	6.7% of 49 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 3 (6.1%) and 4 (8.2%).		
t04/207	Impossible % Killip class 3 or 4 in recipients	t04r1 Table 1	4.2% of 52 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 2 (3.8%) and 3 (5.8%).		
t04/208	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with LVEF<30%	t04r1 Table 1	85.10%	t04r1 Table 1	40/49=81.6%
t04/209	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for recipients with LVEF<30%	t04r1 Table 1	82%	t04r1 Table 1	41/52=78.8%
t04/210	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls on diuretics	t04r1 Table 1	28.0%	t04r1 Table 1	12/43=27.9%

t04/211	Discrepant number of recipients at 3 months follow-up	t04r1 Table 1	n=47	t04r1 Figure 1	n=48	
t06/201	Change in SEM of age between publications requires a patient with age above the exclusion limit of 70 years old	t06r1 Table 1, High dose	SEM 5 in 22 patients. Thus the SD must be at least $4.5 \cdot \sqrt{22} = 21$	t06r3 Table 1, High dose	SEM 2 in 20 patients. The two patients dropped since the other publication would have had to have ages very far apart, one being >120 years old	
t06/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls	t06r2 Table 1	38%	t06r2 Table 1	14/16=39%	
t06/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for nonresponder group	t06r2 Table 2	16%	t06r2 Table 1	4/24=17%	
t06/204	Gender reclassified	t06r1 Table 1	22 out of 22 low-dose recipients were men	t06r3 Table 1	1 of the 20 low-dose recipients selected for follow-up was a woman	
t07/201	Time since infarct	t07r10	8.5 years + 3.2 years all 391 patients	t08r5	Describes the same study, t07r1, as having 10 ± 3 years (16 years maximum) after AMI in recipients	t07r6 Chronic myocardial infarction 6 months to 8.5 years old in recipients (n=35)

t07/202	Number of stem cell recipients	t07r1	289 t07r10		191 t07r2		231 t07r6	35 consecutive patients
t07/203	Number of controls	t07r1	289 t07r10		200 t07r2		231 t07r6	20 patients (a consecutive enrolled representative control group)
t07/204	Overall number of patients	t07r1	578 t08r5		702 t07r10		391 t07r6	55
t07/205	Date of enrolment	t07r1	5yr follow-up by 1 Oct 2009 means cells given to 289 patients before 1 Oct 2004	t07r8	Cells of only BMC aspirates 217 patients had been processed by 2006			
t07/206	Fractional gender	t07r10	171 males (89.53%)	t07r10-ESC-2010	>170, <171 males: 89.3% of 191			
t07/207	15-fold discrepancy in number of cells used	t07r1	Mean 64 million cells, but a subgroup of n=37 received between 100-140×10 ⁶ cells, which "led to a recommendation of high cell numbers up to 160-180 × 10 ⁶ under clinical conditions"	t08r4	1015 cells	t07r6 t07r7	102 million cells	t07r10 6.6 × 10 ⁷ cells

t07/208	Reported that fewer chronic coronary disease patients treated, than claimed in other reports	t07r10	Reported in 2010 that 191 patients had been treated by stem cell therapy between 2003 and 2005	t07r5	Reported in 2006 that only 30 patients had been treated	t07r1	Reported in 2009 that 289 patients had been treated by stem cell therapy (no later than 30th Sept 2004)
t07/209	Probable duplicate publication but with contradictory sample size and methods	t07r9	Perfusion defect: baseline of 59.5 ± 17 , and final of 53.1 ± 17.7 (no dipyridamole during stem cell administration)	t07r1	Identical baseline of 59.5 ± 17 , and final of 53.1 ± 17.7 (However very different number of patients, and dipyridamole used during stem cell administration)		
t07/210	Contradiction of sample size	t07r9	45 patients	t07r1	150 patients (perfusion cohort)		
t07/211	Fractional patients in control group	t07r4	89.3% of 137 patients male, i.e. >122 but <123				
t07/212	Contradiction of sample size	t07r4	342 patients	t07r1	578 patients		
t07/213	Apparently different drugs used: variation in practice or only in description?	t07r1	Dobutamine iv	t07r9	Dobutamine iv Dipyridamole ic Macroalbumin aggregates ic	t07r4	Dobutamine iv Dipyridamole ic Macroalbumin aggregates ic
t07/214	Impossible % on ACE Inhibitor	t07r4 (Table 2)	81% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 27 (79%) or 28 (82%)				

t07/215	Impossible % on diuretic	t07r4 (Table 2)	95% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 32 (94%) or 33 (97%).
t07/216	Impossible % on digitalis	t07r4 (Table 2)	39% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 13 (38%) or 14 (41%).
t07/217	Impossible % on Beta Blocker	t07r4 (Table 2)	89% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 30 (88%) or 31 (91%).
t07/218	Impossible % Diabetes	t07r4 (Table 2)	7% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 2 (6%) or 3 (9%).
t07/219	Impossible % Hyperlipoproteinemia	t07r4 (Table 2)	33% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 11 (32%) or 12 (35%).
t07/220	Impossible % smokers	t07r4 (Table 2)	5% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 1 (3%) or 2 (6%).
t07/221	Impossible % obese	t07r4 (Table 2)	52% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 17 (50%) or 18 (53%).

t07/222	Impossible % Arterial hypertension	t07r4 (Table 2)	5% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 1 (3%) or 2 (6%).
t07/223	Impossible % on ACE Inhibitor	t07r9 (Table 1)	95% of 45 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 42 (93%) or 43 (96%).
t07/224	Impossible % on Beta Blocker	t07r9 (Table 1)	95% of 45 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 42 (93%) or 43 (96%).
t07/225	Impossible % on ACE Inhibitor	t07r4 (Table 2)	83% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 28 (82%) or 29 (85%)
t07/226	Impossible % Hyperlipoprotein emia	t07r4 (Table 2)	30% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 10 (29%) or 11 (32%)
t07/227	Impossible % Smokers	t07r4 (Table 2)	7% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 2 (6%) or 3 (9%)
t07/228	Impossible % obese	t07r4 (Table 2)	49% of 34 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 16 (47%) or 17 (50%)

t08/201	Investigator mixing up own hospital's study with another with similar name?	t08r5	Claims "[t08r2]" recruited 64 Patients	t08r7	44 patients	t08r2	20 recipients and 20 controls	t08r3	t08r7 = 44; separate from t08r2 = 20
t08/201 continued		t08r1	27 recipients and 27 controls						
t09/201	Impossible SEM for Killip class (which can only be 1, 2, 3 or 4) in control group	t09r3 Table 2	SEM of Killip class for 19 controls given as 0.9 but maximum SEM (using 10 patients with Killip class 1 and 9 patients with Killip class 4)=0.4						
t09/202	Impossible SEM for Killip class (which can only be 1, 2, 3 or 4) in recipients	t09r3 Table 2	SEM of Killip class for 19 recipients given as 0.6 but maximum SEM (using 10 patients with Killip class 1 and 9 patients with Killip class 4)=0.4						
t10/201	Medically impossible NYHA in excluded recipient	t10r1 Table 1	35 patients: 22 class II and 13 class III patients gives a mean of 2.37	t10r1 p1534 NYHA Functional Classification	Baseline NYHA for 34 recipients is 2.6		The excluded patient must have had (with best-case rounding) NYHA=(22*2+13*3)-2.55*34= -3.7 This is a negative NYHA.		

t12/201	Inconsistent direction of rounding of 0.5	t12r2 Table 1	31/40=77.5% given as 77%	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 3%	
t12/202	Inconsistent direction of rounding of 0.5	t12r2 Table 1	27/40=67.5% given as 67%	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 3%	
t12/203	Inconsistent direction of rounding of 0.5	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 2%	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 3%	
t12/204	Inconsistent direction of rounding of 0.5	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 2%	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 3%	
t12/205	Inconsistent direction of rounding of 0.5	t12r2 Table 1	25/40=62.5% given as 62%	t12r2 Table 1	1/40=2.5% given as 3%	
t13/201	Discrepancy in number of recipients with NYHA class IV at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)		0 t13r1 (page 18)	At least 1 t13r1 (page 15)	0
t13/202	Discrepancy in number of recipients with CCS class IV at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	1 (1.85%)	t13r1 (page 19)		0
t13/203	Discrepancy in number of recipients with CCS class I at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	13 (24.07%)	t13r1 (page 19)		0.109

t13/204	Discrepancy in number of recipients with CCS class III at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	16 (29.63%)	t13r1 (page 19)	0.4
t13/205	Discrepancy in number of recipients with CCS class II at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	24 (44.44%)	t13r1 (page 19)	0.491
t13/206	Discrepancy in number of controls with CCS class I at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	10 (40%)	t13r1 (page 19)	0.067
t13/207	Discrepancy in number of controls with CCS class II at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	10 (40%)	t13r1 (page 19)	0.467
t13/208	Discrepancy in number of controls with CCS class III at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	5 (20%)	t13r1 (page 19)	0.467
t13/209	Discrepancy in number of controls with NYHA class I at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	2 (6.45%)	t13r1 (page 18)	0.409

t13/210	Discrepancy in number of controls with NYHA class II at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	14 (45.16%)	t13r1 (page 18)	0.409	
t13/211	Discrepancy in number of controls with NYHA class III at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	15 (48.39%)	t13r1 (page 18)	0.182	t13r2 (Text "...and 47% of patients in the placebo group were NYHA class III at baseline"
t13/212	Discrepancy in number of recipients with NYHA class I at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	6 (9.84%)	t13r1 (page 18)	0.181	
t13/213	Discrepancy in number of recipients with NYHA class III at baseline	t13r2 (Table 1)	23 (37.70%)	t13r2 (Text "Forty percent of patients in the BMC group"..."were NYHA class III at baseline"		
t13/220	Discrepancy in number of recipients with SPECT reversible defect assessment at 6 months	t13r2 (Figure 2)	52 patients	t13r2 (Figure 1)	50 patients "assessed changes in perfusion defect by SPECT"	t13r3 (Study Results) 50 Patients

t13/221	Discrepancy in number of patients that had an implanTable cardioverter-defibrillator	t13r2 (Text page 1719) "Most (76%) patients had an implanTable cardioverter-defibrillator."	t13r2 (Table2)	3 recipients (4.92%) and 2 controls (6.45%) had an "ImplanTable cardioverter-defibrillator"		
t16/201	Subgroups incompatible with size of whole group	t16r1 Page 4/3/12 with 1/2/3 vessel disease	t16r1 Page 10	n=20		
t16/202	Subgroups incompatible with size of whole group	t16r1 Page 6/5/7 with 1/2/3 vessel disease	t16r1 Page 10	n=19		
t16/203	Discrepancy in the number of patients assigned to the high-dose shock wave group	t16r1 page 11 40 patients	t16r4	43 patients	t16r2-2012 p.47 40 out of the 103 patients	t16r3 43 patients
t16/203 continued		t16r5 40 patients Figure 1				
t16/204	Discrepancy in the number of patients assigned to the low-dose shock wave group	t16r1 page 11 42 patients	t16r4	39 patients	t16r2-2012 p.47 40 out of the 103 patients	t16r3 39 patients
t16/204 continued		t16r5 42 patients Figure 1				

t16/205	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for men in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	77% t16r5 Table 1	17/21=81%
t16/206	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for hypertension in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	77% t16r5 Table 1	17/21=81%
t16/207	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for diabetes in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	50% t16r5 Table 1	11/21=52%
t16/208	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for smoking in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	64% t16r5 Table 1	14/21=67%
t16/209	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for hypercholesterol aemia in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	77% t16r5 Table 1	17/21=81%

t16/210	Subgroups incompatible with size of whole group for low-dose shock wave recipients, for NYHA class	t16r5 Table 1	1/13/8	t16r5 Table 1	n=21
t16/211	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for previous bypass surgery in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1		18% t16r5 Table 1	4/21=19%
t16/212	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for antiplatelet therapy in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1		100% t16r5 Table 1	22/21=104%
t16/213	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for angiotensin receptor blockers in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1		91% t16r5 Table 1	20/21=95%

t16/214	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	82% t16r5 Table 1	8/21=38%
t16/215	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for statins in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	96% t16r5 Table 1	21/21=100%
t16/216	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for aldosterone antagonists in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	55% t16r5 Table 1	12/21=57%
t16/217	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for diuretics in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	77% t16r5 Table 1	17/21=81%
t16/218	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for digitalis in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1	27% t16r5 Table 1	6/21=29%

t16/219	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for pacemaker/ICDs in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1		36% t16r5 Table 1	8/21=38%
t16/220	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for cardiac resynchronization therapy in low-dose shock wave recipients	t16r5 Table 1		9% t16r5 Table 1	2/21=10%
t16/221	Subgroups incompatible with size of whole group for low-dose shock wave recipients, for number of diseased vessels	t16r5 Table 1	9/7/6	t16r5 Table 1	n=21
t19/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for hypertensive recipients	t19r1 Table 1		44% t19r1 Table 1	10/23=43%
t19/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for smoking recipients	t19r1 Table 1		44% t19r1 Table 1	10/23=43%

t19/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for male controls	t19r1 Table 1	90%	t19r1 Table 1	17/19=89%				
t21/201	Number of patients	t21r5	36	t21r4	35	t21r7	36	t21r11	195
t21/201 continued		t21r10	195						
t21/202	Single or multicentre	t21r5	Single-centre, Düsseldorf	t08r4	MULTICENTRE: "Multizenterstudien"				
t21/203	Reclassification of sex?	t21r5	All 18 male	t21r3	17 male + 1 female	t21r11	123 male + 27 female	t21r7	All 18 male
t21/204	Neuter subjects	t21r8	12 recipients (9 male and 1 female) 12 controls (8 male and 1 female)						
t21/205	VO2 means different but SDs same, and still rise by 11%	t21r5	1602±533 and 1776±523	t21r11	1465±533 and 1630±523				
t21/206	Many CPK means are 1000 apart ...	t21r5	1504 and 1489	t21r11	2504 and 2489				
t21/206 continued	... but SDs are identical	t21r5	979 and 952	t21r11	979 and 952				
t21/207	Impossible % diabetes	t21r6 (AMI patients)	10% of 13 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 1 (8%) or 2 (15%).						

t21/208	Impossible % hypertension	t21r6 (AMI)	88% of 13 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 11 (85%) or 12 (92%).		
t21/209	Impossible % hyperlipidemia	t21r6 (AMI)	65% of 13 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 8 (62%) or 9 (69%).		
t21/210	Impossible % smoking	t21r6 (AMI patients)	86% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 10 (83%) or 11 (92%).		
t21/211	Impossible % Positive Family History	t21r6 (CIHD)	20% of 32 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 6 (19%) or 7 (22%).		
t21/212	Contradictory sample size but identical results	t21r11		195 t21r2	50
t21/213	Impossible % diabetes	t21r6 (AMI patients)	15% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 1 (8%) or 2 (17%).		
t21/214	Impossible % diabetes	t21r5	16% of 18 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 2 (11%) or 3 (17%).		

t21/215	Impossible % diabetes	t21r6 (CIHD patients)	15% of 32 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 4 (13%) or 5 (16%).
t21/216	Impossible % diabetes	t21r6 (CIHD patients)	13% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 1 (8%) or 2 (17%).
t21/217	Impossible % hypertension	t21r6 (AMI)	90% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 10 (83%) or 11 (92%).
t21/218	Impossible % hypertension	t21r6 (CIHD patients)	95% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 11 (92%) or 12 (100%).
t21/219	Impossible % hyperlipidemia	t21r6 (AMI)	60% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 7 (58%) or 8 (67%).
t21/220	Impossible % hyperlipidemia	t21r6 (CIHD)	87% of 12 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 10 (83%) or 11 (92%).

t22/201	Percentage incompatible with number of patients, for sex in recipients	t22r1 Table 1, p164	66%	t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients
t22/202	Percentage incompatible with number of patients, for diabetes in recipients	t22r1 Table 1, p164		33% t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients
t22/203	Percentage incompatible with number of patients, for hyperlipidaemia in recipients	t22r1 Table 1, p164		33% t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients
t22/204	Percentage incompatible with number of patients, for hypertension in recipients	t22r1 Table 1, p164		33% t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients
t22/205	Percentage incompatible with number of patients, for smoking in recipients	t22r1 Table 1, p164		32% t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients

t22/206	Percentage of controls do not fit with a consistent number of patients	t22r1 Table 1, p164	90%, 25%, 40%, 40%	t22r1 Table 1, p164	10 or 16 patients				
t22/207	Inconsistent reports of numbers in each arm	t22r1 Abstract	"control or bone marrow cell groups (each including 16 patients)"	t22r1 Methods, p163	"20 had the inclusion criteria and were randomly allocated in a 1:1 ratio" so 10 in each group	t22r1 Table 1, p164	"control group, n=16" and "case group, n=16"	t22r1 Discussion, p165	"bone marrow were aspirated from 10 patients"
t25/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers in controls	t25r1 Table 1	93%	t25r1 Table 1 stated percentage	15/16=94%				
t25/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for beta blockers in recipients	t25r1 Table 1	93%	t25r1 Table 1 stated percentage	15/16=94%				
t25/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for prior history of MI in recipients	t25r1 Table 1	75%	t25r1 Table 1 stated percentage	11/16=69%				
t26/201	Discrepant age of patients between reports	t26r2 Table 1	55.8	t26r1 Table 1	55				

t26/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for recipients who are current smokers	t26r2 Table 1	51%	t26r2 Table 1	17/33=52%
t27/201	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for LVEF even allowing for rounding	t27r1 Table 1	55 recipients with mean 24.3 and 55 controls with mean 25.7, giving overall mean 25	t27r1 Table 1	110 patients with mean 25.2
t27/202	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for sodium even allowing for rounding	t27r1 Table 1	55 recipients with 138 and 55 controls with mean 136, giving overall mean 137	t27r1 Table 1	110 patients with mean 136
t27/203	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for NT-proBNP even allowing for rounding	t27r1 Table 1	55 recipients with mean 2322 and 55 controls with mean 2431, giving overall mean 2376.5	t27r1 Table 1	110 patients with mean 2390

t27/204	Subgroups incompatible with whole group, for male gender	t27r2 Table 1	26 male recipients and 23 male controls	t27r2 Table 1	27 male patients
t27/205	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for male gender	t27r2 Table 1	79%	t27r2 Table 1	27/55=49%
t27/206	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for LVEF even allowing for rounding	t27r2 Table 1	28 recipients with mean 25.6 and 27 controls with mean 26.7, giving overall mean 26.1	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 25.9
t27/207	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for sodium even allowing for rounding	t27r2 Table 1	28 recipients with mean 139 and 27 controls with mean of 136, giving overall mean 138	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 136
t27/208	Subgroup means incompatible with whole group mean for NT-proBNP even allowing for rounding	t27r2 Table 1	28 recipients with mean 2069 and 27 controls with mean of 2531, giving overall mean 2296	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 2290

t27/209	Subgroup means t27r2 incompatible Table 1 with whole group mean for TNF- alpha even allowing for rounding	28 recipients with mean 4.62 and 27 patients with mean 4.02, giving overall mean 4.33	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 4.21
t27/210	Subgroup means t27r2 incompatible Table 1 with whole group mean for IL-6 even allowing for rounding	28 recipients with mean 3.96 and 27 controls with mean 4.12, giving overall mean 4.04	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 4.06
t27/211	Subgroup means t27r2 incompatible Table 1 with whole group mean for QTc even allowing for rounding	28 recipients with mean 475 and 27 controls with mean 481, giving overall mean 478	t27r2 Table 1	55 patients with mean 479
t28/201	Percentage t28r2 incompatible Table 1 with ratio, for controls with diabetes	20.30%	t28r2 Table 1	5/24=20.8%
t28/202	Conflicting t28r2 average time Abstract Holter monitoring performed	"on average 6 days after MI"	t28r1	"on average 5 days"

t31/201	Impossible % controls on ACEI	t31r1 Table 1	65.9% of 93 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 60 (64.5%) and 61 (65.6%).
t31/202	Impossible % recipients on ACEI	t31r1 Table 1	66% of 90 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 59 (65.6%) and 60 (66.7%)
t31/203	Impossible % controls on ARB	t31r1 Table 1	24.2% of 93 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 22 (23.7%) and 23 (24.7%).
t31/204	Impossible % recipients on ARB	t31r1 Table 1	22.3% of 90 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 20 (22.2%) and 21 (23.3%).
t31/205	Impossible % controls on Hydralazine	t31r1 Table 1	4.4% of 93 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 4 (4.3%) and 5 (5.4%).
t31/206	Impossible % recipients on Hydralazine	t31r1 Table 1	5.3% of 90 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 4 (4.4%) and 5 (5.6%).

t31/207	Impossible % controls on Furosemide	t31r1 Table 1	89.0% of 93 is not an integer number of patients. Could be 82 (88.2%) and 83 (89.2%).
t31/208	Impossible % recipients on Furosemide	t31r1 Table 1	92.6% of 90 is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 83 (92.2%) and 84 (93.3%).
t31/209	Impossible % controls on Spironolactone	t31r1 Table 1	86.8% of 93 is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 80 (86.0%) and 81 (87.1%).
t31/210	Impossible % recipients on Spironolactone	t31r1 Table 1	91.5% of 90 is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 82 (91.1%) and 83 (92.2%).

t31/211	Impossible % controls on Hydrochlorothiazide	t31r1 Table 1	27.5% of 93 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 25 (26.9%) and 26 (28.0%).
t31/212	Impossible % recipients on Hydrochlorothiazide	t31r1 Table 1	28.7% of 90 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 25 (27.8%) and 26 (28.9%).
t31/213	Impossible % controls on Digoxin	t31r1 Table 1	72.5% of 93 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 67 (72.0%) and 68 (73.1%).
t31/214	Impossible % recipients on Digoxin	t31r1 Table 1	62.8% of 90 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 56 (62.2%) and 57 (63.3%).

t31/215	Impossible % recipients on Amiodarone	t31r1 Table 1	57.4% of 90 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 51 (56.7%) and 52 (57.8%).
t31/216	Impossible % controls on Carvedilol	t31r1 Table 1	65.9% of 93 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 61 (65.6%) and 62 (66.7%).
t31/217	Impossible % recipients on Carvedilol	t31r1 Table 1	69.1% of 90 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 62 (68.9%) and 63 (70%).
t31/218	Impossible % controls on other beta blockers	t31r1 Table 1	6.6% of 93 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 6 (6.5%) and 7 (7.5%).

t31/219	Impossible % recipients on other beta blockers	t31r1 Table 1	3.2% of 90 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 2 (2.2%) and 3 (3.3%).			
t32/201	Discrepant average baseline EF by LV-gram	t32r1 Table 3	$((35.2*30)+(36.5*10))/40=35.5$	t32r1 text p430		35.7
t32/202	Discrepant average baseline EF by echo	t32r1 Table 3	$((38.9*30)+(37.4*10))/40=38.5$	t32r1 text p430		38.7
t34/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with single vessel disease	t34r3 Table 1	5%	t34r3 Table 1		3/54=6%
t34/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with 2 vessel disease	t34r3 Table 1	5%	t34r3 Table 1		3/54=6%
t34/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with 3 vessel disease	t34r3 Table 1	90%	t34r3 Table 1		48/54=89%

t34/204	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for recipients with single vessel disease	t34r3 Table 1	3% t34r3 Table 1	2/55=4%
t34/205	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls who had previous PCI	t34r3 Table 1	29% t34r3 Table 1	16/54=30%
t34/206	Impossible baseline NYHA class in controls	t34r3 Table 1	No combination of integer values can produce a mean that can be rounded to 3.5 whilst having a standard deviation that can be rounded to 0.1	
t34/207	Impossible baseline NYHA class in recipients	t34r3 Table 1	No combination of integer values can produce a mean that can be rounded to 3.3 whilst having a standard deviation that can be rounded to 0.2	

t35/201	Method of injecting cells into the septum with a 3-5 mm long needle and diagnostic transducer outside the heart.	t35r1 p1637	"Author: There were injections into the septum, as I described in the article, but these were actually left side of the heart catheterizations. Therefore that is why I said the septum that is biopsied is from the left side of the heart, where the injections are."	t35r1	"Questioner: So epicardially you injected cells into the septum. How was that done? Author: With transesophageal echocardiography."
t35/202	Injections limited to 5 mm from external surface of heart, yet also covered the septum	t35r1 p1633	"Author: The injections were 3 to 5 mm in depth"	t35r1	"Author: There were injections into the septum, as I described in the article"

t35/203

Confusion
whether control
group underwent
marrow harvest

t35r1
p1632

Only recipients
underwent harvest:
"Patients in the
OPCAB-only group
had a standard
sternotomy and
OPCAB performed
with both apical
suction and
pressure stabili-
zation of the heart
(Guidant Corp).
Patients in the
stem cell therapy
group were placed
prone, and bone
marrow was
harvested from the
iliac bone in a
sterile fashion after
achievement of
general anes-
thesia. "

t35r1
p1637

Both groups
underwent harvest:
"Questioner: Are
you saying that
these patients
were blinded to
their treatment
group?
Author: Yes.
Questioner:
Therefore the
patients who did
not have stem cells
injected still had a
bone marrow
aspirate?
Author: They had
an aspirate that
was just frozen."

t35/204

Confusion on
whether control
group underwent
any injections

t35r1
p1632

Only recipients are
described as
having undergone
injections.

t35r3 Time
22:00 to
23:00

Controls definitely
received saline
injections

t38/201	Discrepancy between total number of injections performed and average number of injection per patient	t38r1 Abstract - Methods and Results section	Total number of infusions: 422	t38r1 Abstract - Methods and Results section	Average number of injection per patient: 14.6 (total number of patients: 28) => 408.8 injections and not 422 injections
t38/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for male controls	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	88%	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	7/9=77%
t38/203	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with diabetes mellitus	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	63%	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	5/9=56%
t38/204	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with hypertension	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	75%	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	6/9=67%
t38/205	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls who are current smokers	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50%	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%
t38/206	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with percutaneous coronary intervention	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	88%	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	7/9=78%

t38/207	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with coronary artery bypass surgery	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	63% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	5/9=56%
t38/208	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with ACEi or ARB at baseline	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%
t38/209	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with beta blockers at baseline	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	88% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	7/9=78%
t38/210	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with calcium channel blockers at baseline	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%
t38/211	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with nitrates at baseline	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%

t38/212	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with ACEi or ARB at 6 months	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%		
t38/213	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with beta blockers at 6 months	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	75% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	6/9=67%		
t38/214	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with calcium channel blockers at 6 months	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%		
t38/215	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with nitrates at 6 months	t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	50% t38r1 Table 1 page 3001	4/9=44%		
t40/201	Disparity in numbers in flowchart showing enrolment and follow-up analysis	t40r1 Figure 1	Randomised n=70 t40r1 Figure 1	Flow chart shows 70 splitting into 42 and 20, 8 patients not accounted for	t40r1 Methods	"62 patients with AMI who met inclusion criteria were randomly allocated".

t40/202	Impossible % of recipients with hypertension	t40r2 Table 1	60% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 22 (57.9%) and 23 (60.5%).
t40/203	Impossible % of recipients with hyperlipidaemia	t40r2 Table 1	60% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 22 (57.9%) and 23 (60.5%).
t40/204	Impossible % of recipients smoking	t40r2 Table 1	80% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 30 (78.9%) and 31 (81.6%).
t40/205	Impossible % of recipients with diabetes	t40r2 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).

t40/206	Impossible % of recipients with family history	t40r2 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).
t40/207	Impossible % of recipients on aldosterone antagonists	t40r2 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).
t40/208	Impossible % of controls with hypertension	t40r2 Table 1	65% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 11 (61.1%) and 12 (66.7%).
t40/209	Impossible % of controls with hyperlipidaemia	t40r2 Table 1	65% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 11 (61.1%) and 12 (66.7%).

t40/210	Impossible % of controls smoking	t40r2 Table 1	80% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 14 (77.8%) and 15 (83.3%).
t40/211	Impossible % of controls with diabetes	t40r2 Table 1	25% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 4 (22.2%) and 5 (27.8%).
t40/212	Impossible % of controls with family history	t40r2 Table 1	10% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 1 (5.6%) and 2 (11.1%).
t40/213	Impossible % of controls on aldosterone antagonists	t40r2 Table 1	20% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 3 (16.7%) and 4 (22.2%).

t40/214	Impossible % recipients with hypertension	t40r3 Table 1	60% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 22 57.9(%) and 23 (60.5%).
t40/215	Impossible % recipients with hyperlipidaemia	t40r3 Table 1	60% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 22 57.9(%) and 23 (60.5%).
t40/217	Impossible % recipients smoking	t40r3 Table 1	80% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 30 (78.9%) and 31 (81.6%).
t40/218	Impossible % recipients with diabetes	t40r3 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).

t40/219	Impossible % recipients with family history	t40r3 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).
t40/220	Impossible % recipients on aldosterone antagonists	t40r3 Table 1	20% of 38 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 7 (18.4%) and 8 (21.1%).
t40/221	Impossible % controls with hypertension	t40r3 Table 1	65% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 11 (61.1%) and 12 (66.7%).
t40/222	Impossible % controls with hyperlipidaemia	t40r3 Table 1	65% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 11 (61.1%) and 12 (66.7%).

t40/223	Impossible % controls smoking	t40r3 Table 1	80% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 14 (77.8%) and 15 (83.3%).
t40/224	Impossible % controls with diabetes	t40r3 Table 1	25% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 4 (22.2%) and 5 (27.8%).
t40/225	Impossible % controls with family history	t40r3 Table 1	10% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 1 (5.6%) and 2 (11.1%).
t40/226	Impossible % controls on aldosterone antagonists	t40r3 Table 1	20% of 18 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 3 (16.7%) and 4 (22.2%).

t40/227	Impossible % recipients with hypertension	t40r1 Table 1	65% of 42 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 27 (64.3%) and 28 (66.7%).
t40/228	Impossible % recipients with hyperlipidaemia	t40r1 Table 1	65% of 42 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 27 (64.3%) and 28 (66.7%).
t40/229	Impossible % recipients with diabetes	t40r1 Table 1	25% of 42 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 10 (23.8%) and 11 (26.2%).
t40/230	Impossible % recipients with family history	t40r1 Table 1	20% of 42 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 8 (19.0%) and 9 (21.4%).

t40/231	Impossible % recipients on aldosterone antagonists	t40r1 Table 1	25% of 42 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 10 (23.8%) and 11 (26.2%).		
t41/201	Recipients who had died were still taking medication	t41r4 Table 1 p1644	12 of 41 died by 3 years	t41r4 Table 1 p1644	41/41 were taking ACEi or ARB at 3 years
t41/202	Recipients who had died were still taking medication	t41r4 Table 1 p1644	14 of 40 died by 3 years	t41r4 Table 1 p1644	40/40 were taking ACEi or ARB at 3 years
t43/201	Inconsistent number of controls when describing location of MI	t43r1 Table 1	9+5+3+2=19 (multi-side infarcts are given separate categories, so this is not double-counting)	t43r1 Table 1	Control group is said to be n=18
t45/201	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group with hypertension	t45r1 Table 1	38.7% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 24 (38.1%) or 25 (39.7%).		

t45/202	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group with hyperlipidaemia	t45r1 Table 1	41.9% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 26 (41.3%) or 27 (42.9%).
t45/203	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group with diabetes	t45r1 Table 1	9.7% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 6 (9.5%) or 7 (11.1%).
t45/204	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group with family history of CAD	t45r1 Table 1	24.2% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 15 (23.8%) or 16 (25.4%).
t45/205	Impossible % of patients in early treatment group with family history of CAD	t45r1 Table 1	26.1% of 65 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 16 (24.6%) or 17 (26.2%).

t45/206	Impossible % of controls with concomitant PCI other than infarct related artery	t45r1 Table 1	18.2% of 67 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 12 (17.9%) or 13 (19.4%).
t45/207	Impossible % of controls using Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors/bivalirudin	t45r1 Table 1	71.7% of 67 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 48 (71.6%) or 49 (73.1%).
t45/208	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group using Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors/bivalirudin	t45r1 Table 1	78.1% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 49 (77.8%) or 50 (79.4%).
t45/209	Impossible % of patients in late treatment group with intra aortic balloon pump / other assist device	t45r1 Table 1	22.6% of 63 patients is not an integer number of patients. Possible integer numbers of patients would be 14 (22.2%) or 15 (23.8%).

t47/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for female controls with 7 days	t47r1 Table 1	11.70%	t47r1 Table 1	2/17=11.8%		
t47/202	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for controls with day 3 who had stent in Left circumflex artery	t47r1 Table 1	4.70%	t47r1 Table 1	1/24=4.2%		
t48/201	Percentage incompatible with ratio, for history of smoking in recipients	t48r1 Table 1	61%	t48r1 Table 1	18/29=62%		
t49/201	Number of patients receiving cells	t49r3	62 (finished treatment by 2003)	t49r5	20 t49r4	By 2005, only 50 patients treated, of which only 30 had had 3-month assessment.	t49r5 States: Until then only 40 AMI patients have been treated
t49/202	Baseline EF comparability	t49r3 Table 1	51.6 (SD 10.6 versus 57.2 (SD 10.4) which gives p=0.004277 by Students t-test	t49r3 (Text)	States: "The control group consisted of 62 patients with comparable left ventricular EF and diagnosis."	t49r3 (Table 2)	51.6 (SD 11) versus 50.8 (SD 10)
t49/203	Number of patients treated	t49r3	Reported results of 62 AMI patients who were treated 2002-2003	t07r5	Reported in 2006 that only 50 AMI patients had been treated		
