


Reply to Erratum Silybin (Silibinin) Structure and Chirality

Vladimir Kren , Radek Gažák, David Biedermann, Petr Marhol

Centre of Biocatalysis and Biotransformation, Institute of Microbiology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Videňská 1083, 14220 Prague, Czech Republic; E-Mail: kren@biomed.cas.cz

Received: 23 October 2009

Online publication: 18 December 2009

Dear Editor,

Erratum of the paper: “Szabolcs Nyiredy, Zoltán Szücs, Sándor Antus, Zsuzsanna Samu: New Components from *Silybum marianum* L. Fruits: A Theory Comes True. *Chromatographia* 68:S5–S11 (2008).” doi:[10.1365/s10337-008-277-3](https://doi.org/10.1365/s10337-008-277-3)

We are deeply convinced, that suggested erratum still contains serious offences against scientific method. We have to insist on the omitting all structures of compounds, which are not confirmed by sufficient structural characterization—none of the compound with *cis*-configuration at C2', C3' has been structurally characterized and there are no sufficient proofs of their existence. The authors are referring to the previous paper of the same group of authors (Sz. Nyiredy et al., *J Chrom Sci* 46:93–96, 2008), where the analytical and spectral data are referred to as “unpublished results” (see Ref. 34 in this paper). Already this paper should not have been published as the structural data were not available to the scientific community.

By publishing the same (Sic!) incomplete data authors just try to support their case and/or questionable priority. Authors themselves acknowledge in the erratum that many of the structures are only tentative. Such structures should, therefore, not to be published as their structure is not sufficiently proven.

Another strange point is that authors published their paper in *J Chrom Sci* 46:93, 2008 (Submitted 10 July 2007; published February 2008) in parallel with the later submitted paper to *Chromatographia* (Submitted 30 December 2007; revised 26 May 2008) without citing it, which sounds like they tried to deceitfully publish the same (wrong) results twice. Comparison of these two publications actually opens another problem: Figure 6—HPLC record—in the paper in *Chromatographia* is absolutely identical to the Fig. 3 in *J Chrom Sci* (only different scale and captions). Thus they might have infringed copyright of the late journal and also citation ethics. They tried to create a vicious

circle of papers without proper starting point.

Generally it is unacceptable to publish structures of new compounds (together with those having absolute configuration determined by other authors) based only on their *m/z* value (even obtained from LRMS and not HRMS, which would be required for new structure) and their retention characteristics from HPLC and without NMR data.

Another point which is completely unacceptable for erratum is that authors are trying to add new structures (we do not want to say “new results”), thus this erratum is becoming some kind of “addendum”.

Therefore, we stipulate that—if the paper is not retracted, which should have been the correct action—none of the structure that has not been structurally identified is repeatedly published in this erratum due to the fact that by repetitive publication the erroneous data are affirmed as to be correct!