

A. Dr Andrew Jeremy WAKEFIELD

[Note: selected sections relevant to Andrew Wakefield and the scientific substance of the 1998 Lancet Article are excerpted here. The text of the entire GMC ruling is available online at the following link: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/25983372/FACTS-WWSM-280110-Final-Complete-Corrected>]

This section appears on page 45 of the full document.

33. a. The Lancet paper stated that the children who were the subject of the paper were “*consecutively referred to the department of paediatric gastroenterology with a history of a pervasive developmental disorder with loss of acquired skills and intestinal symptoms (diarrhoea, abdominal pain, bloating and food intolerance)*” and subsequently described them as a “*self referred*” group,
Admitted and found proved

b. You knew or ought to have known that such a description implied,

i. a routine referral to the gastroenterology department in relation to symptoms which included gastrointestinal symptoms,
Found proved

ii. a routine process in which the investigators had played no active part;
Found proved

In reaching its decisions, the Panel has taken into account the article in the Lancet (volume 350, October 4, 1997) “Writing for the Lancet”, which states, “...it is a general reader whom you are trying to reach”. The Panel is satisfied that a general reader would interpret the wording in 33.a. to mean that the children had been referred to the gastroenterology department with gastrointestinal symptoms, and that the investigators had played no active part in the referral process.

B. Dr Andrew Jeremy WAKEFIELD

[Note: selected sections relevant to Andrew Wakefield and the scientific substance of the 1998 Lancet Article are excerpted here. The text of the entire GMC ruling is available online at the following link: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/25983372/FACTS-WWSM-280110-Final-Complete-Corrected>]

This section appears on pages 45-46 of the full document.

34. a. Contrary to paragraph 33.b.i., the referrals of,
- i. Child 1 as set out at paragraphs 10.a. and 10.b.,
Found proved
 - ii. Child 9 as set out at paragraphs 18.a. to 18.d.,
Found proved
 - iii. Child 5 as set out at paragraphs 20.a. to 20.c.,
Found proved
 - iv. Child 10 as set out at paragraphs 28.a. and 28.b.,
Found proved

did not constitute routine referrals to the gastroenterology department in relation to intestinal symptoms as the referring doctors referred the children for investigation of the role played by the measles vaccination or the MMR vaccination into their developmental disorders and did not report any history of gastrointestinal symptoms,

Found proved

Having regard to its findings in relation to Child 1, 9, 5 and 10, namely that these children were admitted to undergo a programme of investigations for research purposes, and that they all lacked a history of gastrointestinal symptoms, the Panel is satisfied that these referrals did not constitute routine referrals to the gastroenterology department.

- b. Contrary to paragraph 33.b.ii., the referrals of,
- i. Child 2 as set out at paragraphs 8.a. to 8.e.,
Found proved
 - ii. Child 9 as set out at paragraphs 18.a. to 18.c.,
Found proved
 - iii. Child 5 as set out at paragraphs 20.a. and 20.b.,
Found proved
 - iv. Child 12 as set out at paragraphs 22.a. to 22.c.,
Found proved

included active involvement in the referral process by you,
Found proved on the basis of your admissions and the Panel's findings.

c. The description of the referral process in the Lancet paper was therefore,

i. irresponsible,
Found proved

ii. misleading,
Found proved

iii. contrary to your duty to ensure that the information in the paper was accurate;
Found proved

In reaching its decision, the Panel concluded that your description of the referral process as “routine”, when it was not, was irresponsible and misleading and contrary to your duty as a senior author.

C. Dr Andrew Jeremy WAKEFIELD

[Note: selected sections relevant to Andrew Wakefield and the scientific substance of the 1998 Lancet Article are excerpted here. The text of the entire GMC ruling is available online at the following link: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/25983372/FACTS-WWSM-280110-Final-Complete-Corrected>]

This section appears on page 47 of the full document.

35. a. In a letter to the Lancet volume 351 dated 2 May 1998, in response to the suggestion of previous correspondents that there was biased selection of patients in the Lancet article, you stated that the children had all been referred through the normal channels (e.g. from general practitioner, child psychiatrist or community paediatrician) on the merits of their symptoms,
Admitted and found proved

b. In the circumstances set out in paragraphs 32.a., 34.a. and 34.b. this statement was,

i. dishonest,
Found proved.

ii. irresponsible,
Found proved

iii. contrary to your duty to ensure that the information provided by you was accurate;
Found proved
The Panel is satisfied that you had such a duty, as set out in paragraph 31.c.ii.

The Panel is persuaded by all the correspondence in the Lancet Journal volume 351 dated 2 May 1998 regarding a suggestion by correspondents to the Lancet that there was a biased selection of patients in the Lancet Paper of 28 February 1998, of which you were one of the senior authors.

The Panel has found that your statement as set out in paragraph 35.a. does not respond fully and accurately to the queries made by correspondents to the Lancet.

The Panel is satisfied that the statement you made would be considered by ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people to be dishonest. Additionally, you knew that this statement omitted necessary and relevant information, such as the active role you played in the referral process, and the fact that the referral letters in four cases made no mention of any gastrointestinal symptoms and the fact that the investigations had been carried out under Project 172-96 for research purposes.

Therefore, the Panel is satisfied that your conduct in this regard was dishonest and irresponsible.