Annex 2.3.10

Minutes from the Panel’s meeting 11 April – 13 April

Place of meeting:
Panum Institute, Faculty of Health Sciences (SUND), University of Copenhagen (KU), Nørre Allé 20, Copenhagen.

Participants:
Panel:
Professor Hans Lassmann, Austria (Chair of Panel, Chair of meeting) (HL)
Professor Margaret M. Esiri, United Kingdom (ME)
Professor, Director Hartmut Wekerle, Germany (HW)
Professor Anders Blomqvist, Sweden (AB)
Professor Christine Dijstra, the Netherlands (CD)

Secretariat to the Panel:
Professor Lars Terenius, Medical Expert in the Secretariat (LT)
Consultant Pia Jørnø, Leader of the Secretariat (PJ)

Meetings with:
Former President of the Supreme Court of Denmark Torben Melchior
Head of Office Inge-Lise Damberg, the Faculty of Health Sciences
Lab technicians Hanne Hadberg and Pernille Froh, the Faculty of Health Sciences
Associate professor Jørgen Kurtzhals, co-author of 4 papers with MP
Professor Marianne Juhler, co-author of 1 paper with MP
Dean Ulla Wewer and Professor Ole William Petersen, the Faculty of Health Sciences
Prorector Thomas Bjørnholm, Rector’s Office
Head of Department for Neuroscience and Pharmacology, Albert Gjedde, the Faculty of Health Sciences (Skype meeting)
Milena Penkowa.

Wednesday 11 April

1. Microscopy studies of samples
The Panel members conducted microscopy studies of the primary samples (slides) collected by the Secretariat, together with studies of the collected written documentation, and compared their observations with the results in the respective scientific papers to which the different slides were related.

2. Meeting between the Panel Chair and Legal Expert Torben Melchior
HL met briefly with Torben Melchior who provided advice on the legal aspects of the Panel’s meetings with selected key persons Thursday 12 April.

3. Short visit to the archive rooms holding the materials from Milena Penkowa’s lab and office.
All materials, which have been obtained in, and found relevant for, the investigation, had been collected and/or copied in advance and made available for the Panel. Nevertheless, the Panel also visited the rooms of the archive holding the materials from Milena Penkowa’s lab and office in order to get a first-hand impression of the archive and its contents, accompanied by Inge-Lise Damberg, Senior Adviser, SUND’s Faculty Service.

Inge-Lise Damberg introduced the Panel to the archive and informed about the “history” of the moving of the materials from MP’s lab and office to the archive.

Among other things, the Panel inspected the freezer, in which the Secretariat in advance had identified some slides of maybe-relevance for the selected papers. In addition the Panel inspected the “−80 freezer” newly found and moved to the archive. A separate report on the contents of the freezers is elaborated (annex 3.2.3.2 to the investigation report).

4. Microscopy studies of samples continued
After the visit to the archive, the Panel resumed its microscopy studies of the found slides.

5. Discussions on findings
On basis of its examinations of the collected documentation in advance of the meeting, and its microscopy studies during the meeting, the Panel discussed its findings and observations.

Thursday 12 April

6. Preparatory discussion of the day’s interviews
The Panel conducted a brief preparatory discussion on the planned interviews of the day.

7. Meetings/interviews with key persons
During the day, the Panel met with, and interviewed, the following key persons and obtained supplementary information to the found documentation:

- Lab technicians Hanne Hadberg and Pernille Froh
- Associate professor Jørgen Kurtzhals, co-author of 4 papers with MP
- Professor Marianne Juhler, co-author of 1 paper with MP
- Dean Ulla Wewer and Head of Department, Professor Ole William Petersen
- Prorector Thomas Bjørnholm
- Head of Department, Professor Albert Gjedde (SKYPE meeting)
- Milena Penkowa.

Associate Professor Jørgen Kurtzhals and Professor Marianne Juhler were invited on request from Milena Penkowa. None of the co-authorships of Jørgen Kurtzhals or Marianne Juhler are among the papers selected by the Panel. Furthermore, the Panel had invited Lab technician Magdalena
Kus, Professor Agnete Larsen and Senior researcher Meredin Stoltenberg on request from MP. These three persons were not able to meet the Panel 12 April, though.

From Hanne Hadberg, Pernille Froh, Jørgen Kurtzhals and Marianne Juhler the Panel achieved information on their respective collaboration with MP. Ulla Wewer, Ole William Petersen and Albert Gjedde provided information on the procedures of SUND, respectively the previous departments of MP, for documentation of research and handling and storing of research material.

The Panel met with Thomas Bjørnholm, as he is responsible for University of Copenhagen’s initiation of the investigation. The Prorector was abroad when the Panel met for the initiation meeting in October 2011, and he had therefore suggested meeting with the Panel this time to briefly discuss the investigation.

From Milena Penkowa the Panel obtained supplementary information on the procedures for her handling of experimental material and her documentation of experiments. In addition the Panel received MP’s view on the problems with finding documentation in the archive.

Separate minutes for each of the meetings have been elaborated (annexes 3.3.1-3.3.7 to the investigation report).

8. Discussions in Panel and further microscopy studies
Before, in between and after the meetings with key persons, the Panel conducted further microscopy studies and discussed its findings and observations on basis of the studies and the information obtained at the meetings.

Friday 13 April

9. Discussions on the scientific papers examined by the Panel
In advance of the meeting the Panel had filled in a form for each of the 79 scientific papers of the investigation, with its assessments of the paper. On basis of these assessments and of the studies of the found documentation, the Panel discussed its observations and assessments regarding the papers.

10. Overall findings and conclusions
The Panel discussed its findings and conclusions overall.

11. Discussion of the further process plan, next steps etc.
On basis of a draft for structure/contents of the investigation report, the Panel decided on the structure of it.

In addition, the Panel decided on its process for elaborating the investigation report.