Annex 2.3.5

Minutes from the Panel’s meeting
10 October 15-17 and 11 October 09:15-12

Place of meeting: University of Copenhagen (KU), The Professor Villa, Nørregade 10, Copenhagen

Participants:
Panel:
Professor Hans Lassmann, Austria (Chair of Panel) (HL)
Professor Margaret M. Esiri, United Kingdom (ME)
Professor Hartmut Wekerle, Germany (HW)
Professor Anders Blomqvist, Sweden (AB)
Apologies from: Professor Christine Dijkstra (CD)
Secretariat to the Panel:
Professor Lars Terenius, Medical Expert in the Secretariat (LT)
Consultant Pia Jørnø, Leader of the Secretariat (PJ)

Agenda:
10 October:
2.1 Brief presentation of the preliminary process plan (time and work plan) for the investigation, based on the Terms of Reference, by Leader of the Secretariat PJ
2.2 Secretariat’s comments to the investigation and to the tasks of the Panel, by Medical Expert in the Secretariat Professor Lars Terenius
2.3 Results of the Secretariat’s survey on identifying the scientific production of Milena Penkowa, by PJ
2.4 Presentation of the ToR’s definition of scientific dishonesty, by PJ.
11 October:
3.1 Summing up. Discussion of and decision on work procedure, next steps, etc.
3.2 Decision on dates for Panel’s meetings, including for Panel’s assembly at the Panum Institute.

Several enclosures were mailed to the Panel in advance of the meeting and handed over as hard copies at the meeting. The main part of these enclosures is annexed to the investigation report.
Minutes

2.1 Brief presentation of the preliminary process plan (time and work plan) for the investigation, based on the Terms of Reference, by Leader of the Secretariat PJ

PJ presented the preliminary process plan which is an appendix to the Terms of Reference and which sets out the main tasks of the Panel/Secretariat. According to the agenda, the Panel will decide on the approach, process, time-schedule etc. for the investigation in items 3.1 and 3.2.

Ad 2.2 Secretariat’s comments to the investigation and to the tasks of the Panel, by Medical Expert in the Secretariat Professor Lars Terenius

LT commented briefly on the investigation and the various aspects of it.

2.3 Results of the Secretariat’s survey on identifying the scientific production of Milena Penkowa, by PJ

PJ presented statistics on the papers co-authored by MP and the co-authors of MP, including statistics on the result of the Secretariat’s survey. The survey has resulted in responses from several co-authors (incl. from MP herself) with statements on their own, respectively MP’s, scientific contributions to the approximately 100 papers co-authored by MP. There is thus a response from one or more of MP’s co-authors for all papers except for two papers (A131 and A302) and except for those few papers of which MP is sole author.

The result of the survey, together with the appr. 100 papers (full text) are intended to form part of the basis for the Panel’s assessments and examination of further information and scientific background material should be collected (e.g. lab reports, primary samples, illustrations etc.)

The following was agreed:

- PJ shall pursue responses from co-authors for paper A302, while paper A131 is a review for which responses besides the obtained response from MP is not necessary.
- PJ shall obtain the full text of the paper A302 (this paper, in which MP’s name is wrongly spelled, was unknown to the Secretariat until MP pointed at it).
- PJ will update and improve the overview of all the papers so that the papers reported to DCSD are easier to overview, including further specific information on the reports to DCSD.

Ad 2.4 Presentation of the ToR’s definition of scientific dishonesty, by PJ

PJ informed that in accordance with the Terms of Reference, the Panel must use the definition of scientific dishonesty indicated in the Act concerning the Danish Committees on Scientific
Dishonesty (DCSD), i.e. use the same definition as the DCSD. PJ presented this definition of scientific dishonesty.

3.1 Summing up. Discussion of and decision on work procedure, next steps, etc.

3.2 Decision on dates for Panel’s meetings, including for Panel’s assembly at the Panum Institute.

(The two last items of the agenda, 3.1 and 3.2, were addressed as one item.)

HL introduced: The purpose of the two last items was the Panel to discuss and decide on the procedure of the investigation.

In addition HL presented his proposal on how to classify the papers into different groups. (Enclosed in the end of the minutes).

On this basis the Panel members discussed the approach and process, as well as their observations as regards the papers and scientific production involved in this investigation.

*The Panel decided the following approach and process of the investigation:*

1. Obtainment of documentation and other information:

At present, the following documentation is available:
- the full texts of the papers co-authored by MP
- the statements from MP and the co-authors collected via the Secretariat’s survey in July-august 2011.

The Panel would thus like to obtain the following documentation and information in the first coming period of time (assisted by the Secretariat):
- The full documentation of the experiments conducted in Copenhagen, including:
  - Animal ethics permits/licenses and primary documentation for all animal experiments in MP’s lab, including documentation on the primary material used for experiments, and documentation on how this material has been handled. (Incl. storing, lab books on histology, what has been stained, protocols on tissue, the relation of each sample section to the animal/brain sent into the lab, which primary material is available (e.g. stained sections)).
  - Human ethics permits for experiments involving humans (incl. permits for muscle biopsy studies, Alzheimer’s, Hodgkin’s, tumors etc.). The Panel will decide later whether to request any other primary documentation on experiments involving humans, i.e. after having examined the papers on these experiments.
Information on the Danish general rules on ethics permits etc. in connection with human and animal experiments.

Information on the rules and guidelines of the Faculty of Health Science/the Panum Institute on procedures for: experiments, handling of experimental material, documentation of experiments etc. (including possible rules for “medforfattererklæringen” (co-authors’ declarations) cf. A20).

- Information on the organisational structure in which MP and her group of researchers, scholars, technicians etc. have conducted their work (including names, titles/positions, responsibilities etc. of MP co-workers and indications of periods of time.)

2. Analysis of the (abovementioned) documentation and obtainment of further material and information

- The Panel will analyse the already obtained documentation (the full texts and the authors’ statements) in the coming months.
- Likewise, the Panel will analyse the documentation indicated in point 1 when it has been obtained.
- On basis of analysing the documentation the Panel will decide on which primary material should be obtained for further analysis.
- Furthermore the Panel may decide to acquire, for selected papers, the final manuscripts sent into the journals, from the co-authors.

3. Grouping of the papers

In order to optimise the efficiency and effectiveness of the Panel’s analyses indicated in point 2, the papers must be categorised into different groups in accordance with HL’s proposal for grouping the papers. (The proposal is enclosed in the end of the minutes)

The book chapters, reviews, abstracts and conference proceedings do not need to be investigated by the Panel, as the research addressed in them is more thoroughly presented in the “genuine” papers. These papers will thus be discarded.

4. The Panel’s work division

As for the coming analyses of the papers and supplementary documentation, it was decided to divide the work between the Panel members.

5. Completion of an assessment form for each paper

Furthermore it was agreed that, in connection with the analyses, the Panel must indicate its assessments and possible need for further investigation, documentation, material etc. for each studied paper in an assessment form.
The completion of these forms will help to keep overview and to close the investigation of papers, where no dishonesty is suspected, as well as papers where MP’s role is marginal.

6. Meetings with key persons

- On basis of the obtained organisational information indicated in point 1 the Panel (assisted by the Secretariat) will organise interview of 1-2 technicians and perhaps 1-2 (then) PhD scholars on how the lab of MP was running,
- In order to further clarify the “whole situation” the Panel would also like to meet with some of the previous Danish key collaborators of MP, including MP:

7. Place and time of Panel’s meetings

The Panel intends to meet at the Panum Institute in Spring (probably April) 2012 for:
- analysing selected primary material
- interviewing selected key persons
- discussing and deciding its conclusions of the investigation.

The meeting is intended to last 3 days, starting with analysing selected primary material. The meetings with selected key persons can e.g. take place on day 2, while Panel discusses its findings and conclusions for the report on day 3. (Secretariat will distribute a doodle for setting the exact dates).

Besides the Spring meeting at Panum, it was agreed that the Panel’s and Secretariat’s mutual communication would be conducted most efficiently via email and telephone. Other meetings than the Spring meeting at Panum were thus not planned.

Enclosure to agenda items 3.1-3.2:

Proposal for classifying the scientific papers of Milena Penkowa into different groups

The questionnaire responses allow to classifying the different papers regarding the involvement of Dr. Penkowa into e.g. the following groups:

1) The first type of papers relates to studies, which are based on the microarray analysis of experiments, which have been performed originally in Dr. Hidalgo's Lab. These array studies were performed by R. Borup and FC Nielsen. The results of the array studies have been made available
to the co-authors and are available in the public domain. The question for these studies is, what was the role of Dr. Penkowa in this research and does it justify co-authorship.

2) The second (and largest) group of papers involves Dr. Penkowa as neuropathologist, who performed some histological (and exceptionally) some electron microscopic investigations, while the experiments were done by collaborators, such as the group of Dr. Hidalgo or Dr. Montalban. Here we should have a look, how this material was analyzed. This should be documented in respective laboratory books and the respective sections should be available. Here we should look, whether the documentation is fine, whether the sections are present and we can also have a look into the quality of the pathological work, analyzing at least some of the stained sections.

3) The third group deals with studies dealing with human disease. Here, too, according to the questionnaire response Dr. Penkowa claims that her work was to perform some pathological analysis on material, which was collected in the course of clinical studies by local or international partners. There is one particular set of studies, which need much more detailed investigations and they deal with the analysis of muscle biopsies under the collaboration with Drs. Pedersen and Klarlund. Here the same set of biopsies has been used to address a number of different questions. This is in principle fine, but there is need for clarification, whether the same sections have been used for different purposes with different outcomes.

4) The fourth group relates to studies, which were performed under Dr. Penkowa’s leading responsibility in her lab (including the respective experiments) and where Dr. Penkowa has guided her graduate and PhD students. Here we would have to have a close look into the protocols, maybe supplemented with information from the students.

5) Regarding animal experiments, some of the studies have been performed on archival material, asking new questions by using material from experiments, which have been performed years before. This is a fully legitimate approach, provided the material is suitable to answer the respective question. This should also be checked in more detail.

6) There seems to be agreement, according to the questionnaire responses, that the early studies in Dr. Penkowa’s career done under the supervision of T. Moos are double checked and may not pose a problem.

7) A point, which needs to be discussed relates to authorship in papers. Looking at the responses, the contribution of Dr. Penkowa to many of the papers is now regarded as rather minor. This contrasts with several first and second authorships. In addition, it is not clear, why other people, who have apparently contributed to the work are not listed as authors or mentioned in the acknowledgements.