

# The University of Sheffield

---

## Bone metabolism Group



Bone metabolism Laboratory  
Clinical Sciences Centre  
Northern General Hospital  
Herries Road, Sheffield  
S5 7AU, UK  
Tel: (0114) 271-4705  
Fax: (0114) 261-8775  
E✉ : [ablumsohn@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:ablumsohn@sheffield.ac.uk)

---

8 July 2005

Professor A Weetman  
Dean, School of Medicine and Biomedical Sciences  
University of Sheffield

### Re: Response to email of 29 June 2005

Dear Tony

Thank you for your email (attached). I am sorry you feel questions I have asked reflect on your integrity. I hope that you can sympathise with my concern that questions asked have not been answered. This may be due to ignoring of the questions or simple oversight.

I will not reiterate the questions. Of most immediate concern is the failure of any answer, any acknowledgement or any apology relating to my letter of 29 June 2005 and the obvious and urgent problems raised therein. This letter was directed primarily to yourself.

I would suggest that there is more than enough in these revealed documents to merit serious action to address behaviour of the respondents in this case, irrespective of the research misconduct itself. Along similar lines, I note from our recent meeting that you say that Professor Eastell had not told you anything at all of explicit written questions about the honesty of research involving a pharmaceutical benefactor. Particularly since he was Research Dean at the time, one would hope that the failure to convey such concerns would in itself be worthy of serious examination.

You will be aware that our interaction with Procter and Gamble Pharmaceuticals raises concerns which could not be more fundamental to a University. You write that "there can be no question of my providing moral support while you continue to question my integrity". Despite poor collegial relations and the several problems involving Professor Eastell, we must continue to work together to make sure that patients are well served by our research. We must also ensure that the reputation of our research and research governance is maintained. General Medical Council guidance states that "A doctor must work with colleagues in ways that best serve patients' interests" and I hope that this will be possible. I have approached the Vice Chancellor to seek related support.

Dr Barker and I have written again about another important matter we believe could have been dealt with in an honest and transparent way and which should not have been hidden in the aftermath of the misconduct enquiry. I will write again regarding this pending your response.

Kind regards

Aubrey Blumsohn

From: "Tony Weetman" <a.p.weetman@sheffield.ac.uk>  
To: "Aubrey Blumsohn"  
CC: "Tim Searle" <t.searle@sheffield.ac.uk>  
References: <599722761.20050629180422@btinternet.com>  
Subject: Re: Minutes last meeting  
Date: Wed, 29 Jun 2005 19:24:17 +0100

Dear Aubrey

I responded to Tim with my amendments to the minutes promptly and have heard no more from him. The version you have sent does not contain these amendments. Most importantly, at the last meeting you effectively accused me again of lying over the conduct of the initial inquiry, despite the outcome of the grievance committee (which you stated had been biased to protect those involved). This caused me deep offence, as observed by Tim Searle.

I cannot see how we can simply move on to issues arising without a retraction and an apology, which I have been expecting since you made those comments. I repeat that I have acted fairly and honestly throughout this whole affair and there can be no question of my providing 'moral support' while you continue to question my integrity.

Yours sincerely

Tony