

**Table 1: Index of page numbers for 2017 misconduct allegation.** Note: Recording of the offending interview is here

(<https://player.whooshkaa.com/episode?id=113918> (start at 32 minutes 40 seconds))

	<b>Allegation page</b>	<b>Reply page</b>	<b>Breach Category</b>	<b>Notes</b>
JCU’s Original (2017) allegation about Jones and Co interview. “Trustworthiness” statement	5	7 In particular 9 onwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not collegial.</li> <li>• Represented views of JCU without authorization.</li> <li>• Failed to uphold the integrity of JCU.</li> <li>• Failed to treat fellow staff members, students and public with honesty respect and courtesy and have regard for the dignity of others.</li> <li>• Failed to comply with a direction from the SDVC.</li> <li>• Acted outside the limits of authority.</li> </ul>	In the light of the Replication Crisis, Ridd questions the trustworthiness of science organisations work including AIMS, and ARCCoE. JCU used a media analysis company summary of Ridd’s interview which is not accurate.
JCU Revised allegation about Jones and Co Interview. (a) “Trustworthiness” statement.	32	91 in particular (a-g)  93 in particular (a-c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not collegial</li> <li>• Denigrated AIMS and ARC CoE</li> <li>• Damaged the reputation of AIMS and the universities relationship with AIMS</li> <li>• Damaged the reputation of JCU</li> </ul>	As above except JCU corrects the wording, but still does not include the context, i.e. the “Replication Crisis”. Note that the breaches have changed significantly from the original allegations in the row above.
Additional JCU allegation about the Jones and Co Interview. (b) Scientist are sometimes “Emotional” statement.	32	As above.	As above.	Despite JCU taking offense at this statement, in context Ridd is actually defending his scientific opponents against a suggestion by Alan Jones that they exaggerate claims to secure grant funding. Ridd says they are not corrupt but sometimes emotional about the GBR – an understandable reaction. Despite defending his opponents he is still accused of misconduct.

**Table 2:** Index of Affidavit page numbers for second set of allegations showing the offending article or email, JCU allegation, Ridd’s lawyer’s reply, and category of allegation.

<b>Offending email, article or comment by Ridd</b>	<b>Offending Email or article page</b>	<b>Allegation page</b>	<b>Reply page</b>	<b>Breach Category</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Reply to email from ex JCU colleague .	43	33 and 38	93top of page	Denigrating AIMS	Email has nothing to do with the case and "Knighthood" winner does not refer to AIMS scientists.
Comment to Townsville Bulletin.	44	34	93 para (a)	failure to be silent	Ridd spoke about existence of allegations
Reply to email from colleague and Ex PhD student	46	34	93 para b)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd mentioned the case
Reply to email from a group of Teacher friends	47	34	93 para ( c)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd mentions the case and says he has offended some powerful organisations
Reply to email from Ridd’s PhD supervisor and very old friend Dr John. Nicol	51	34	93 para (d)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd says he is in a “spot of bother” with JCU and that “it is all pathetic”
Reply to email from undergrad student	53	35	93 para (e,f) and 342 (b)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd said he was in hot water and had offended some “powerful and ruthless egos”
Reply to email from to MSc Student	55	35 and 37	93 para (g) and 101 (c)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd defended JCU and said that universities in general were “Orwellian”, a point proven by the monitoring of emails.
Reply to email from Teacher friends	57	35 and 37	93 (para h)	Denigrating JCU	Ridd says his opponents are “fragile flowers”
emails to JCU HR department		35		failure to be silent	
Email sent to one of Ridd’s PhD students.	70	37	95 (h)	failure to be silent	Ridd tells his student that he is in a “spot of bother”
Email sent to Ridd’s wife	71	37	95(i)	failure to be silent	Relaying information to his wife
Email sent to Ridd’s wife	76	37	95 (i)	failure to be silent	Relaying information to his wife
Reply to email from colleague and old friend Dr Piers Larcombe.	79	37	95 (j)	failure to be silent	Ridd says he is in trouble again
Reply to email from friend and ex-Canberra Uni VC Prof Don Aitkin	80	37	95 (l)	attempting to influence disciplinary process	Aitkin asks what he can do to help. Ridd suggests writing a letter to the VC.

Email sent to Prof Ron White (Ridd's direct boss).	81	37	95 (4th last para)	attempting to influence disciplinary process	Ridd was seeking a mutually beneficial solution to avoid pointless legal and public blood letting
Email sent to Prof Ron White and Science and Engineering Dean Prof Marcus Lane.	82	38	95 (4th last para)	attempting to influence disciplinary process	Ridd was seeking a mutually beneficial solution to avoid pointless legal and public blood letting
Reply to email from ex PhD student and friend	83	39		Denigration of Prof Hughes	Ridd says Terry Hughes is not an expert on the weather.
Email with the SDVC in 3 May 2016	86	40		not respecting disciplinary process	Ridd comments about the 2016 censure. Ridd is polite but disparaging.
Email to SDVC 5 June 2016	85	40		Failing to respect the disciplinary process?	Ridd asking for his 2016 censure to be rescinded
Comment to <i>The Australian</i> 4 June 2016	85	40		Failure to be silent	Ridd's on-line comment to an article in <i>The Australian</i>