

RETRACTION

View Article Online
View Journal | View Issue



Cite this: *Biomater. Sci.*, 2024, **12**, 5644

Retraction: Cytocompatible, soft and thick brush-modified scaffolds with prolonged antibacterial effect to mitigate wound infections

Shaifali Dhingra,^a Vidit Gaur,^b Varsha Saini,^c Kajal Rana,^c Jayanta Bhattacharyya,^b Thomas Loho,^d Sudip Ray,^{d,e} Avinash Bajaj^c and Sampa Saha^{*a}

DOI: 10.1039/d4bm90059f

rsc.li/biomaterials-science

Retraction of 'Cytocompatible, soft and thick brush-modified scaffolds with prolonged antibacterial effect to mitigate wound infections' by Shaifali Dhingra *et al.*, *Biomater. Sci.*, 2022, **10**, 3856–3877, <https://doi.org/10.1039/D2BM00245K>.

The Royal Society of Chemistry hereby wholly retracts this *Biomaterials Science* article due to concerns with the reliability of the data.

A number of panels in Fig. 5, 6, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19 and S20 contain sections of partially or fully duplicated images.

In the SEM image in Fig. 5, part of Fig. 5a is duplicated in Fig. 5b, 5c, S18h, S17g and S19h. Part of the SEM image in Fig. 5f is duplicated in S18c.

The inset of Fig. 5c is duplicated in Fig. S15c, S15i and S16h.

The inset of Fig. 5f is duplicated in Fig. S15j.

In the fluorescence microscopy images in Fig. 6, there is overlap between Fig. 6b and 6h, and between Fig. 6f and 6g.

In the ESI SEM images, there is overlap between Fig. S17a, S18a and S19a, between Fig. S17b, S18b and S19b, between Fig. S17c and S19c, and between Fig. S17f, S18g, S19f and S20f. There is overlap between the SEM images in Fig. S17e, S18e, S18f, S19e and S20h, between Fig. S20a and S20b, and between Fig. S20c and S20d.

Given the number and significance of the concerns about the validity of the data, the findings presented in this paper are no longer reliable.

In addition, the name of the fifth author was spelt incorrectly in the original article, and this notice provides the correct spelling.

Dr Sampa Saha and her current team have reproduced the key findings, however she agrees with the retraction and takes responsibility for the unintentional mistakes in image representation.

The authors Sudip Ray and Thomas Loho would like to clarify that the contribution from the University of Auckland and the New Zealand Institute for Minerals to Materials Research is only on the nanoindentation section of the article. Fig. 5, 6, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19 and S20 were not provided by Sudip Ray or Thomas Loho.

The authors Jayanta Bhattacharyya, and Vidit Gaur would like to clarify that the contribution from the Centre for Biomedical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology, India, for this manuscript is only on some sections of cell culture studies. Fig. 5, 6, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19 and S20 were not provided by Jayanta Bhattacharyya or Vidit Gaur.

The authors Avinash Bajaj, Varsha Saini, and Kajal Rana would like to clarify that the contribution from the Regional Centre for Biotechnology Faridabad, India, for this manuscript is only on the section on animal studies. Fig. 5, 6, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19 and S20 were not provided by Avinash Bajaj, Varsha Saini, or Kajal Rana.

All authors were informed of the retraction. Vidit Gaur, Varsha Saini, Kajal Rana, Jayanta Bhattacharyya, Thomas Loho, Sudip Ray, Avinash Bajaj and Sampa Saha agree to the retraction. Shaifali Dhingra does not agree.

Signed: Sampa Saha, Avinash Bajaj, Varsha Saini, Kajal Rana, Sudip Ray, Thomas Loho, Jayanta Bhattacharyya and Vidit Gaur

Date: 23rd July 2024

Retraction endorsed by Maria Southall, Executive Editor, *Biomaterials Science*

^aDepartment of Materials Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India. E-mail: ssaha@mse.iitd.ac.in

^bCentre for Biomedical Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, India

^cLaboratory of Nanotechnology and Chemical Biology, Regional Centre For Biotechnology, India

^dDepartment of Chemical and Materials Engineering, The University of Auckland, New Zealand

^eNew Zealand Institute for Minerals to Materials Research, New Zealand

