

# Tweets from first 100 posts in S4ME thread: Michael Sharpe skewered by @JohntheJack on Twitter

1 2 3 4 5 6 → 6/ Next >

Unwatch Thread Ignore Thread



**Indigophoton**  
Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 674  
Likes Received: 7,160  
Location: UK



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

7 Apr

Replying to @PeterTatchell and 2 others

Dear Peter, you are an heroic campaigner but I think you may have been a tad misled on this issue.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



You mean like the #PACEtrial TSC was when you made a false and misleading statement to them saying you didn't have a financial COI when you did? [pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4](https://pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4)

9:25 PM - Apr 7, 2018



53 See John Peters's other Tweets



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



In your ICMJE disclosure of 15/11/2010 (released by QMUL, their ref: 2017/F194, ICO decision 696884) you reveal financial benefit from work for an insurance co and for law firms.

11:48 AM - Apr 8, 2018



39



See John Peters's other Tweets



Indigophoton, Apr 9, 2018 [Report](#) [Bookmark](#)

#1 [Like](#) [+ Multiquote](#) [Reply](#)



**large donner**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 476

Likes Received: 3,788



**michael sharpe**@profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.

Who failed this test then Mr Sharpe?

large donner, Apr 9, 2018 [Report](#) [Bookmark](#)

#2 [Like](#) [+ Multiquote](#) [Reply](#)



**JohnTheJack**  
Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 232  
Likes Received: 1,989

Thanks. I confess I did rather enjoy that one.

If anyone is interested, the full thread in reply is:



**John Peters** @johnthejack

7 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 3 others

You mean like the [#PACEtrial](#) TSC was when you made a false and misleading statement to them saying you didn't have a financial COI when you did?  
[pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4](https://pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4)



**michael sharpe**  
@profmsharpe



Dear Mr Peters  
Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel  
Thank you.

8:47 AM - Apr 8, 2018

♥ 2 👤 See michael sharpe's other Tweets





**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



Yes, happy to: At TSC meeting of 22/04/2004 you declared no COI & agreed that you had no other substantial or material conflict relevant (minute, drafted by you).

11:47 AM - Apr 8, 2018



23



See John Peters's other Tweets





**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



On 28/06/2004 you wrote a letter to Peter White 'to formally state [you] do not have any any COIs of a financial or other nature regarding the PACE trial'.

(Attached, released by QMUL, their ref: 2017/F37.)

[pic.twitter.com/m6R2ip1MBO](https://pic.twitter.com/m6R2ip1MBO)

11:47 AM - Apr 8, 2018



29 See John Peters's other Tweets





**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



In your ICMJE disclosure of 15/11/2010 (released by QMUL, their ref: 2017/F194, ICO decision 696884) you reveal financial benefit from work for an insurance co and for law firms.

11:48 AM - Apr 8, 2018



39



See John Peters's other Tweets





**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

8 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Dear Mr Peters

Please do state your allegation in precise detail so it can be tested for libel

Thank you.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



Offhand I have no proof you were doing this work in 2004, but evidence suggests you were (eg attendance at insurance conference)

In any case, you also list royalties from 'CFS the facts'. This was published in 2000 so the COI, as defined by you, existed in 2004.

11:48 AM - Apr 8, 2018



14



See John Peters's other Tweets



<https://twitter.com/johnthejack/status/982933386049347585>

Then one later with a link to work he did for Unum.

<https://twitter.com/johnthejack/status/983295771826180097>

Connecting...

9, 2018 Report Bookmark



**Indigophoton**  
Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 674

Likes Received: 7,160

Location: UK

Keith Geraghty responding to the tweets,



**Dr Keith Geraghty** @keithgeraghty

9 Apr

Amazing: Oxford Prof Sharpe lead PI of PACE trial wrote to oversight committee saying he had no conflicts of interest - despite having being paid by Insurance companies to review CFS patients, having advised insurance companies promoting CBT-GET, the treatments tested in trial.

[twitter.com/johnthejack/st...](https://twitter.com/johnthejack/st...)



**Dr Keith Geraghty**

@keithgeraghty



whats even more ironic is he was writing letter to other PACE PI Prof White who was a DWP advisor and also paid advisor to insurance companies to say No Conflicts here. DWP part funded PACE and insurance companies promoted its findings. No COIs here - really no elephants at all

11:36 AM - Apr 9, 2018

♡ 59 💬 25 people are talking about this







**Dr Keith Geraghty** @keithgeraghty

9 Apr

Amazing: Oxford Prof Sharpe lead PI of PACE trial wrote to oversight committee saying he had no conflicts of interest - despite having being paid by Insurance companies to review CFS patients, having advised insurance companies promoting CBT-GET, the treatments tested in trial.

[twitter.com/johnthejack/st...](https://twitter.com/johnthejack/st...)



**Dr Keith Geraghty**

@keithgeraghty



No conflicts of interest at start of trial - but Conflicts of Interest listed at end of trial - Go figure? (must of only happened mid trial, but then could one keep running a trial of treatments CBT-GET when promoting CBT-GET?) I wouldnt call that equipoise, more like Monopoise ! [pic.twitter.com/Q2PEfP5Cq5](https://pic.twitter.com/Q2PEfP5Cq5)

11:49 AM - Apr 9, 2018

#### Conflicts of interest

PDW has done voluntary and paid consultancy work for the UK Departments of Health and Work and Pensions and Swiss Re (a reinsurance company). DLC has received royalties from Wiley. JB was on the guideline development group of the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence guidelines for chronic fatigue syndrome and myalgic encephalomyelitis and has undertaken paid work for the insurance industry. GM has received royalties from Karnac. TC has done consultancy work for insurance companies and has received royalties from Sheldon Press and Constable and Robinson. MB has received royalties from Constable and Robinson. MS has done voluntary and paid consultancy work for government and for legal and insurance companies, and has received royalties from Oxford University Press. ALJ, BA, HLB, LVC, JCD, KAG, LP, MM, PM, HO, RW, and DW declare that they have no conflicts of interests.

♡ 42    💬 20 people are talking about this





**large donner**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 476

Likes Received: 3,788



michael sharpe@profmsharpe

7 Apr

Replying to @PeterTatchell and 2 others

Dear Peter, you are an heroic campaigner but I think you may have been a tad misled on this issue.



John Peters@johnthejack

You mean like the #PACEtrial TSC was when you made a false and misleading statement to them saying you didn't have a financial COI when you did?

[pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4](https://pic.twitter.com/Rz9og81yO4)

I've only just realised Sharpe was responding to Peter Tatchell here in the original tweet, not John Peters. What was the tweet that prompted Sharpes response to Tatchell?

large donner, Apr 10, 2018 Report Bookmark

#19 Like + Multiquote Reply



**Indigophoton**  
Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 674

Likes Received: 7,160

Location: UK

@large donner



**Peter Tatchell** ✓

@PeterTatchell



Patients with ME are demanding justice. There are political, social & medical issues surrounding the [#PACE](#) trial. READ:

[independent.co.uk/news/long\\_read...](http://independent.co.uk/news/long_read...)

[#TimeForUnrest](#) [@NHScampaigners](#) [@saveournhs](#)

2:35 PM - Apr 7, 2018



**'We live with this illness in the dark': The truth ab...**

"I feel seen for the first time!" exalts one viewer. "I feel vindicated. I finally understand what's wrong with me, I  
[independent.co.uk](http://independent.co.uk)

♥ 251    💬 144 people are talking about this



Go to First Unread



**Lucibee**  
Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 248

Likes Received: 2,508

Location: Mid-Wales



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe

Follow

Replying to @johnthejack @PeterTatchell and 2 others

Thank you. I know that bit because I wrote the letter. What exactly is the alleged conflict?

7:39 PM - 8 Apr 2018

4



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe · 3h

Replying to @profmsharpe @johnthejack @PeterTatchell

sorry - still don't get it? A lecture? a book? what am I supposed to have been paid to say what and why?

1



**John Peters** @johnthejack · 2h

I'm not saying you were paid to do anything. I'm pointing out that you had a financial interest in the outcome of the PACE trial, as recognized by you in your ICMJE statement, and you falsely and misleadingly stated to the TSC that you had none.

2

Sharpe is only doing what he is obliged to do, and he is correct in that (whether that's acceptable or not is another thing).



**Lucibee**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 248

Likes Received: 2,508

Location: Mid-Wales

And so it goes on:



**John Peters** @johnthejack

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe @PeterTatchell

For the 3rd time: the interests you declared in 2010/11 existed in 2004 when you stated you had none viz royalties & work for insurance cos. Book [bmj.com/content/322/72...](http://bmj.com/content/322/72...) Insurance [web.archive.org/web/2004082313...](http://web.archive.org/web/2004082313...) [pic.twitter.com/XLOY4mJq7i](https://pic.twitter.com/XLOY4mJq7i)



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe



You have still not explained I am afraid. Different items on different forms reflect differing reporting requirements for things that MAY be seen as conflicts at different times. So what exactly is the undeclared ACTUAL CONFLICT that troubles you ?

11:55 AM - Apr 14, 2018



See michael sharpe's other Tweets



He is correct. There is a difference between a perceived conflict of interest and an actual conflict of interest.





**Lucibee**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 248

Likes Received:  
2,508

Location: Mid-Wales

He is playing games:



**Richard Vallée** @richardvallee

13 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe @StenHelmfrid  
You mean work? You just described work. Including yours. #PACEtrial got millions for your BPS viewpoint, despite repeated failure.

There is no such thing as not having a particular viewpoint and work always requires resources. He works in our interest, which is rare and good.



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe



My point exactly. And that is fine. But it is then not really open minded science us it ?

6:58 AM - Apr 14, 2018



See michael sharpe's other Tweets



He simply sees it as "work". When he does it, it's "open-minded science", but when anyone else does it, it's not.

Lucibee, Apr 14, 2018 Report Bookmark

#67 Like + Multiquote Reply



**Indigophoton**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 674

Likes Received: 7,165

Location: UK



**davidtuller** @davidtuller1

23 Feb

Replying to @profmsharpe and 2 others

.@profmsharpe Michael, you're losing the debate. You relaxed your outcome measures and got better-looking results. Then you refused to provide the data and called patients "vexatious." But things have changed. Everyone can see that PACE is a five-million-pound disaster.



**John Peters** @johnthejack

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 3 others

It is nonetheless how it is viewed in the USA by all the major institutions, incl the NIH, IOM/NA, AHCQ, FDA and CDC all of which reject yr analysis & claims for efficacy of CBT-GET. Perhaps you are the one endlessly repeating claims in the hope that they will magically come true



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe



Let's be clear. This is not really about science. Its about trying to destroy all the evidence that is inconsistent with a certain viewpoint. Am I wrong ?

6:28 PM - Apr 14, 2018



1



See michael sharpe's other Tweets





**John Peters** @johnthejack

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 3 others

Is that what you think the US institutions are doing?



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe



Am I wrong Mr Peters ?

6:45 PM - Apr 14, 2018



See michael sharpe's other Tweets



**John Peters** @johnthejack

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 3 others

Did you see my reply? Yes, you are. In fact it's quite the opposite: it's about scientific rigour. It's about the need to ensure claims are based only on good, sound evidence.



**michael sharpe**

@profmsharpe



Good

7:32 PM - Apr 14, 2018



See michael sharpe's other Tweets







**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 4 others

Then you will be issuing scores of FOI requests to the authors of biologically focussed studies.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



I haven't made scores of FOI requests to any authors. But if there are 'biologically focussed studies' that are clearly flawed, then I would question them as well.

7:36 PM - Apr 14, 2018



17



See John Peters's other Tweets



Indigophoton, Apr 14, 2018 [Report](#) [Bookmark](#)

#82 [Like](#) [+ Multiquote](#) [Reply](#)



**Indigophoton**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 674

Likes Received: 7,165

Location: UK



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe 14 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others  
So are then any in your view ,?



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



At the moment, in my opinion, there are no 'definitive' studies.

7:38 PM - Apr 14, 2018

♡ 2 👤 See John Peters's other Tweets



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

14 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack and 3 others

Well I respect a pursuit of truth. I don't respect propaganda.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



Do you not understand that 'propaganda' is how the papers written by the PACE investigators appear to many? Why do you keep denying their central flaws? What truth is pursued by using subjective outcomes in an unblinded trial?



7:45 PM - Apr 14, 2018



**michael sharpe**  
@profmsarpe

You are blocked from following @profmsarpe and viewing @profmsarpe's Tweets. [Learn more](#)

**Who to follow** [Refresh](#) [Clear all](#)

-  **David Okai** @davidokai [Follow](#)
-  **Alastair Southouse** @Dr\_southouse [Follow](#)
-  **Annabel Price** @AnnabelPrice [Follow](#)

[Find people you know](#)  
Import your contacts from Gmail



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



Oh dear. Was it something I said?

8:20 PM - Apr 14, 2018

 56  See John Peters's other Tweets



**The Tweets** @augustine\_ryan14 Apr

Replying to @johnthejack

That's what I believe called a 'win'.



**John Peters**

@johnthejack



Hehe. Yes, game forfeited when he took his bat and ball and left the field.

9:16 PM - Apr 14, 2018

 6  See John Peters's other Tweets





**Barry**

Senior Member  
(Voting Rights)

Messages: 2,281

Likes Received:  
14,681



**Sten Helmfrid** @StenHelmfrid · Apr 8

Professor Michael Sharpe of the #PACETrial team confirms the importance of Dr David Tuller's work. #MECFS

**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe

This is what researchers who are studying aspects of CFS/ME that activists don't want studied are up against.

[occupyme.net/2018/04/07/ret...](http://occupyme.net/2018/04/07/ret...)

4 14 76



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe · Apr 12

It was actually the COI and style I was referring to.

1 1



**Sten Helmfrid** @StenHelmfrid · Apr 12

What conflict of interest?

1



**michael sharpe** @profmsharpe · Apr 12

Seeking money to promote a particular view point.

"[DT] Seeking money to promote a particular view point". No. Requesting funding to continue investigating a particular miscarriage of justice. Being paid fairly for honest work is wholly legitimate.

Barry, Apr 14, 2018 Report Bookmark #84 Like + Multiquote Reply



**Jhanne and ME** @Jhanne45

14 Apr

Replying to @profmsharpe and 4 others

yes, i do have problems with that. the newspapers in my country are full of propaganda for CBT. Poepole are brainwashed to believe that is what would help #pwME. This is detrimental to the last remnants of health we have.



**Jhanne and ME**

@Jhanne45



I don't like personal attacks either, whether blunt or more 'sophisticated' ad hominem.

8:17 PM - Apr 14, 2018



11



See Jhanne and ME's other Tweets



Last edited: Apr 14, 2018

Esther12, Apr 14, 2018 [Report](#) [Bookmark](#)

#87 [Like](#) [+ Multiquote](#) [Reply](#)