

Q And the one thing they do not promote is over-audit of one's figures?

A Exactly, yes.

Q Do you think that in any way that articles such as these explain a perceived unwillingness to divulge figures to you?

A I think from after May 1992 they may explain or they may be part of an explanation of people's unwillingness, but it does not explain an unwillingness to produce results prior to that.

Q I appreciate that entirely. From May 1992 onwards you would say that that would explain perhaps why people were not willing to give you figures?

A I do not know whether they were unwilling to give me figures. I do not think they were prepared to give anybody figures.

Q You attribute that in part to these articles?

A It is probably partly explicable by this series of articles, yes.

Q I move back to the audit itself. Are you able to say you do not think it was finished by October 1992?

A The data collection was complete but the analysis had not been carried out by then.

Q I think it had been completed by some time into the next year, because you were able then to give copies to a number of people. Can I start with Professor Vann Jones? You say that you gave him a copy of your data.

A Yes.

Q Did it promote a discussion between you and him?

A Yes. I showed him the results and discussed them with him. I think he was mildly surprised that of the two cardiac surgeons, Janardan was better than James for the two operations that we had looked at.

Q Did you gain the impression from your meeting with Professor Vann Jones that he accepted your data was accurate?

A He accepted the data. He said he was going to have to look at it ---

Q As a result of that meeting did you feel it was necessary for you to revisit your data?

A No.

Q To have another look?

A No.

Q Was there anything said to you in the course of that meeting which suggested to you that that was the case?