

Witness Name: Dr Adam Jacobs

Statement No.: WITN7662001

Exhibits: WITN7662002-WITN7662014

Dated: 14 September 2023

INFECTED BLOOD INQUIRY

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF DR ADAM JACOBS

I provide this statement in response to the requests made under Rule 9(1) and (2) of the Inquiry Rules 2006 dated 6 February 2023 and 3 July 2023.

I, Dr Adam Jacobs, will say as follows: -

Section 1: Introduction

1. My name is Adam Jacobs, and I am a medical statistician. I previously worked as a medical writer and ran a medical writing company, and my work for the Department of Health was as a medical writer. My address is GRO-C
GRO-C and my date of birth is GRO-C.
2. My initial career (up to 1994) was as an organic chemistry researcher. I worked as a medical translator from 1994 to 1996, and had 2 jobs as a medical writer from 1996 to 1999.
3. From 1999 to 2014, I ran my own company, Dianthus Medical Limited, and the work I did for the Department of Health was through that company. The company provided medical writing, medical statistics, and clinical data management services. This company now no longer exists.

4. Since 2014 I have worked as a statistician for Premier Research, a contract research organisation. My current role is Senior Director, Biostatistical Science.
5. I have never belonged to any committees, associations, parties, societies, or groups relevant to the Inquiry's Terms of Reference.
6. I have not been involved in any other inquiries, investigations, or litigation in relation to any pathogens in blood or blood products, nor have I previously provided evidence in relation to any such matters.

Section 2: Work for the Department of Health

7. Given that the work took place in 2004, my memory of events may not always be complete. However, I set out below my answers to the questions raised by the Inquiry to the best of my recollection.
8. It is correct that I signed an agreement with the Department of Health ("DoH") on behalf of Dianthus Medical Ltd. The agreement provided that Dianthus Medical Ltd would *"provide the services of one or more of its medical writers to the Department of Health to improve the quality of referencing in a report of hepatitis C and blood transfusions"*.
9. The agreement came about after I was approached by DoH, in 2004, who asked if we (Dianthus Medical Limited) would be willing and able to do the work for them, to which we agreed. The job involved editorial services, and as we were a company providing medical writing services, this seemed a good fit.
10. I do not recall the precise details of what was discussed before starting the work, but in general terms, it was explained to me that the DoH was looking for someone to improve the editorial quality of the report. My main contact at the DoH was Mr Gutowski, so I would assume any such discussions were with him.

11. I do not remember receiving a written brief before starting the work, though it is possible that I did. If I did, I did not keep a record of it.
12. My understanding of the task was that the editorial quality of the report needed to be improved. As far as I remember, the main element of this was making sure that the report was properly referenced: the initial draft of the report made reference to many external documents, but in a way that made it hard to know exactly what documents were being referenced. Our task was to ensure that referencing was clear and complete. In addition, I think we were probably asked to edit the text for clarity and consistency.
13. I do not remember being provided with the list in document DHSC0020720_081, but it does fit well with my memory of the kinds of things we were asked to do. The information in WITN5292016 at paragraphs 4.39 to 4.42 is also a good match for my memory of events.
14. I do not remember the specific wording used in the request for the work, but it seems entirely possible that we would have been asked to “*redraft the Report in a more robust form*”. My understanding of what it meant was primarily to improve the quality of the referencing as set out above.
15. I did not keep a copy of the report I was provided with, but I think it is very likely that we were provided with WITN7485005, based on our early redrafts of the report, which are substantially similar.
16. I do not recall any specific instructions other than the brief as described in paragraph 12 above.
17. As far as I remember, we worked our way through the report looking for references to external data sources. This was a lengthy process, as it was not always clear from the original report that external sources were being referred to. We did most of this work on site at DoH offices. Mr Gutowski made documents available to us, if possible, where we needed to consult them to determine how best to reference the information in the report. We would also have done

literature searching via the internet. In addition, it is likely we would have done standard editorial tasks, such as correcting any typos or tidying up the formatting of the document.

18. It is correct that Dr Nataraja carried out work on the report.
 - a. Dr Nataraja was employed as a medical writer at Dianthus Medical at the time of carrying out this work. As it was clear that the work was probably too much for one person to do in the desired timescale, I asked Dr Nataraja to help me.
 - b. I do not recall what the division of tasks was between us.
 - c. I do not recall any specific disagreements between myself and Dr Nataraja. It is likely that there were minor disagreements, which would have been resolved by discussion between us, but I do not recall the details of these, nor any major disagreements arising.
 - d. DoH had ultimate responsibility for writing the report, as we were editing it under their instructions.
19. As stated above, we did attend DoH offices to examine files and most of the work was done on site at DoH. This would accord with the statement in DHSC0200135 that "colleagues who were present at that time recall seeing the consultants working on documents from the cupboard" (albeit, as I state below, I do not remember specifically what files we considered and therefore cannot confirm if any cupboard we looked in contained the files referred to in DHSC0200135). In answer to the specific queries raised:
 - a. I do not recall which specific files we considered
 - b. We felt it necessary to consider files to ensure that we could reference them correctly
 - c. Mr Gutowski provided some files and told us which files were available. It is likely that we would also have found files for ourselves from internet searches if we needed documents available in the public domain.
20. We had discussions with Mr Gutowski about the contents of the report. I do not recall speaking to anyone else about it, though I can't be sure that we didn't have brief discussions with anyone else.

21. I can confirm that WITN7485007 is the report we submitted, although it is not the first draft, it is the final draft. It was submitted in October 2004, not September 2004.
22. I do not recall why those changes were made. I would assume that they were requested by Mr Gutowski, as we did not consider it part of our job to substantially change the content of the report on our own initiative, and Mr Gutowski was our main contact at the DoH. However, I do not remember any details.
23. I have carried out a search for any other relevant documents and I have located documents held on my system in the following folders:
- a. Folder entitled "Work in Progress" containing different versions of the report (**WITN7662002-WITN7662007**)
 - b. Folder entitled "Previous Drafts" containing different versions of the report (**WITN7662008-WITN7662013**)
 - c. Document entitled "Burgin Report Final" dated 8 October 2004 (**WITN7662014**).
24. I cannot recall with precision the difference is between the "previous drafts" and the "work in progress" folders, but I think it is likely that the documents in the "previous drafts" folder would have been shared with DoH and "work in progress" folder contains working files shared only between myself and Dr Nataraja. However, I cannot be completely sure.
25. The document called "BurginReportFinal.doc" at **WITN7662014** is the last version I worked on. It is possible that someone at DoH edited it further since I last saw it, but I have no knowledge of whether or not this happened.
26. The Inquiry has noted that in an email from Dr Shanida Nataraja to Richard Gutowski dated 27 July 2004 (WITN5292111), Dr Nataraja states that there "are sections of the report that could be re-written and/or re-structured for clarity" and "additional information that could be included in the report, such as the availability of surrogate and first/second generation Hepatitis C testing, and the rationale for

the Government not implementing these test[s] when they became available”, and asks Richard Gutowski whether she should make these changes. I do not see any inconsistency between this and my description of Dianthus Medical's role as set out in paragraph 12 above. It was our job to edit the report for clarity and consistency. The activities described by Dr Nataraja sound like standard ways of improving the clarity of the document. It is not clear to me that the material was “substantive”. Although I do not remember the e-mail at WITN5292111, it sounds as if Dr Nataraja was simply asking about adding extra information with the aim of improving clarity. As for why she emailed Mr Gutowski, that would have been because we were working under Mr Gutowski's direction and we would have consulted him about many matters to do with the report. In addition, I have no recollection of the specific emails from Dr Nataraja and I do not remember how Dr Nataraja and I identified the additional material. It seems possible that it was something we found in the reference material that we reviewed when improving the referencing of the document and felt it was relevant, but I cannot be sure. Any additional material would have been found in the way described in my earlier statement, either through documents provided to us by the DoH or through internet literature searches.

27. I have no recollection of any changes suggested by Dr Nicholas or how we would have implemented them. In addition, I do not specifically remember having to come to any conclusions about the Department's views on anything, but if we did, we would have discussed that with Mr Gutowski.
28. In regard to the views expressed in the final report, I do not think any views expressed would have been from me or Dr Nataraja. It was not our job to express a view. I do not remember investigating what the DoH's policy was. If that was relevant, I imagine we would have been given the information by Mr Gutowski.
29. As already stated, I do not specifically remember having to come to any conclusions about the Department's views on anything, but if we did, we would have discussed that with Mr Gutowski. In addition, I do not recall whether we were given any information about the DoH's views. Our main contact was Mr

Gutowski, so if it was relevant for us to identify the Department's views, we would have spoken to him.

30. With regards to the comments within WITN7662008, I do not remember writing these and do not remember making the comment regarding "intuitive opinions". Looking at the metadata in this document, it seems it was last edited by Dr Nataraja, so it is likely that she wrote the comments. I do not know which opinions in the report are referred to or whether Mr Gutowski gave such assurance and I do not remember who (if anyone) took that responsibility.
31. In reference to paragraph 4 of WITN7662008, I do not remember whether the material suggested a clear and consistent reason for pursuing a policy of self-sufficiency.
32. In reference to paragraph 7 of WITN7662008, I do not remember any details regarding the sources of whether UK products may still have eventually infected most patients with haemophilia.
33. In reference to paragraph 10 of WITN7662008, and the reference to the "intuitive statement", we wrote the sentence about doctors carefully explaining the risks of viral infection in an early draft of the document (dated 4 August 2004). We gave as a citation for that statement reference 66 in that version of the document (Haemophiliacs and AIDS. Internal report, 1985. (Filed; BLH 1)), so I assume the supporting evidence came from the report cited there, although I do not remember the details of that evidence and to what extent it was based on opinion or purely objective. I note that the statement was removed in the final version that we submitted to the DoH in October 2004, so perhaps after discussion of Dr Nicholas' comments we did feel the supporting evidence was inadequate.
34. In terms of the feedback for paragraph 2 of page 10 given by Dr Nicholas (DHSC0041232_006), I am not entirely sure what was meant by "on file". As stated earlier, I do not think I wrote this text but I assume it would have meant among the files made available to us at the DoH.

35. As stated previously, I think the comments in response to Dr Nicholas' feedback are Dr Nataraja's comments, not my own. I do not remember the details of how we arrived at the views in Dr Nataraja's comments, but I assume it would have been from reading the report and the reference material we looked at as part of our task, and possibly also discussion with Mr Gutowski.
36. Finally, in regard to Dr Nicholas' suggested changes, I do not remember any of the details of these comments.

Section 3: Other

37. I have no further comment to make.

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.

Signed:

Dated:

DocuSigned by:
GRO-C
Signer Name: Adam Jacobs
Signing Reason: I am the author of this document
Signing Time: 14-Sep-2023 | 12:22:21 EDT
NOT RELEVANT