

Reply to the “Letter to the Editors”

S. Dhillion

Published online: 14 January 2009
© Springer-Verlag 2009

Dear Editors,

I am writing in regards to the “Letter to the Editor” by the Rectors of the Norwegian University of Life Sciences and the University of Oslo.

As they correctly point out, there was an investigation, and a report was generated by a committee, where names and identities were kept anonymous. The report, however, concluded that there was no ground to declare that any ‘serious misconduct’ had occurred in scientific practice, although there are those that are of ‘a lesser nature’/‘less serious’ (as with this article).

At present, I do not have the raw data from 1999 for the mycorrhiza status of the species reported in the article. The data is that of the presence/absence notations and not the levels of colonization of mycorrhiza. None of the authors recall in what form or how the data were delivered to the first author

(this is declared by all authors). I am thus said not to have had good scientific practice (that of ‘a lesser nature’), as I do not have the original presence/absence notes and lab protocol. The protocol is the simple staining of roots, which was not written up in a log book as the committee had desired it to be.

The evaluation committee clearly state in their report that there is ‘system-weakness in the universities of concern in that there have been no clear regulations or requirements for data storage and keeping....’

Please note that the reports of mycorrhiza of most of the species of concern have been also reported from elsewhere in Norway or in the literature: Three out of 18 species are new reports (*Carex brunnescens*, *Myosotis decumbens*, and *Rumex longifolius*).

With regards,
Shivcharn Dhillion, Ph.D.

This refers to the article that can be found at doi:10.1007.s00572-008-0225-y

S. Dhillion (✉)
2510 Tyllidalen, Norway
e-mail: dhillion@online.no