
JOURNAL OF INVESTIGATIVE CRITIQUES OF
PUBLISHED SCIENTIFIC ARTICLES
VOLUME THREE, ISSUE ONE (JULY, 2021),
REPORT ONE (pp 6-16):

Did the authors of the paper entitled "The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations-We should rethink the policy", published then retracted in Vaccines [Walach, H. et al. (2021) Vaccines, DOI: 10.3390/vaccines9070693] mis-interpreted and distorted available scientific data?

Author: H.Y. Lim Tung, Ph.D., Peptide and Protein Chemistry Research Laboratory, Nacbraht Biomedical Research Institute, 3164 21st Street, Suite 122, New York City (Astoria), NY 11106, USA. E mail: hyltung2010@nacbrahtbiomedresins.net

Abstract.

The paper entitled "The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations-We should rethink the policy" by Walach, H. et al. [1] was published in Vaccines after undergoing "peer review" and then retracted sua sponte by the Editor in Chief and Editorial Board of vaccines. The said paper has generated much controversy and debate among those who have stated that Walach, H. et al. have not only mis-interpreted available data in the but have also distorted them in order to come up with an erroneous conclusion that essentially states that "for three deaths prevented by vaccinations we have to accept two inflicted by vaccinations". Mis-interpretation of scientific data is human and should not be censored but rebutted scientifically However distortion of scientific data to come up with an erroneous conclusion that fits one's hypothesis constitutes Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification. To state that a Scientific Researcher has distorted scientific data to arrive at an erroneous conclusion in order to mislead the reader is unscientific and defamatory if one does not have scientific proof that scientific data has been distorted.

That Vaccines would first publish a paper after so-called "peer review" and then retract the paper after objectors (The Mob Review Squad) complain of data mis-interpretation and distortion is hypocritical of the Editor in Chief and the Editorial Board of Vaccines. Further, by publishing and then retracting the paper by Walach, H. et al. after mob pressure, Vaccines has caused serious prejudice and harm to the scientific reputation of Walach, H. et al. Walach, H. et al. could have submitted and published their paper in scientific journals and preprint website that do not practice censorship by Mob Peer review. Vaccines should offer an official apology to Walach, H. et al.

Walach, H. et al. [1] submitted and after "peer review" publish a paper entitled "The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations-We should rethink the policy. " in Vaccines. In their paper [1] based on their analysis of scientific data presented in a large Israel field study and the Adverse Drug Reactions (ADR) database of the European Medicines Agency and the Dutch National Register (lareb.nl), Walach, H. et al. essentially argue that "for three deaths prevented by vaccinations we have to accept two inflicted by vaccinations". Immediately thereafter, the paper by Walach, H. et al. [1] which caused much controversy and debate because it was show-cased by anti-vaccines advocates as evidence that anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines are harmful was retracted sua sponte by the Editor in Chief and Editorial Board of Vaccines based on the following: "Serious concerns were brought to the attention of the publisher regarding interpretation of data, leading to incorrect and distorted conclusions" [2]. Vaccines [2] went on to insinuate that Walach et al. [1] not only mis-interpreted available scientific data which led to erroneous conclusions but they also distorted the content of the repository of the Lareb report (www.lareb.nl/coronameldingen) when they stated that fatal cases were certified by medical specialists [2]. Science Magazine [3] has also maligned and defame Walach et al..when it publishes that "Several respected virologists and vaccinologists have resigned as editors of Vaccines to protest its 24 June publication of a peer-reviewed article that misuses data to conclude that 'for three deaths prevented by [COVID-19] vaccination, we have to accept two inflicted by vaccination' ". Vaccines [1] must be cognizant of the fact that they have charged Walach, H. et al. with very serious charges which will impact upon the scientific reputation of Walach, H. et al. In essence, the Editor in Chief and

Editorial Board of Vaccines are accusing Walach, H. et al. of committing Dishonest Reporting and Data Falsification in order to arrive at conclusions that suit their hypothesis. Retracting the paper of Walach, H. et al. is the harshest judgement for a Scientific Researcher that will have serious ramifications for his/her scientific reputation and career advancement. Normally, a paper is retracted because there is evidence of Dishonest Scientific Reporting, Data Falsification and Data Fabrication, and honest but serious mistakes (many scientific journals do not retract papers that contains evidence of Dishonest Scientific Reporting, Data Falsification and Data Fabrication). A paper in which there is perceived mis-interpretation of scientific data is not subjected to retraction but is rebutted scientifically. Retracting a paper after it has been "peer reviewed" and published without any evidence of Dishonest Scientific Reporting, Data Falsification and Data Fabrication is equivalent to censorship and Mob Peer Review by Mob Peer Review Squad. Before answering the questions as to whether Vaccines was justified in retracting sua sponte the paper by Walach, H. et al. in the first place, a number of key questions must first be answered. Vaccines was supposed to have conducted "peer review" (whatever it means) before accepting and publishing the paper by Walach, H. et al. Is Vaccines stating and acknowledging that their so-called peer review system is a sham and that the so-called "experts" who reviewed the paper of Walach, H. et al. are a bunch of imbeciles. Is Vaccines also stating that its Editor in Chief is an imbecile because he accepted to publish the paper of Walach, H. et al. after so called "peer review" that was a sham, and he was not doing his job properly or qualified to perform as Editor in Chief of Vaccines.

What is the evidence that Walach, H. et al. [1] mis-interpreted and distorted scientific data to arrive at conclusions that suit their hypothesis. As indicated above, mis-interpretation of scientific data is human. However, distortion of scientific data constitutes Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification [3,4]. According to the paper by Walach, H. et al. [1], the authors stated in their abstract that (i) COVID-19 vaccines have had expedited reviews without sufficient safety data, (ii) they calculated the NNTV Number (Number Needed To Vaccinate to prevent one death) from a large Israel field study and they used data in the Adverse Drug Reactions (ADR) database of

the European Medicines Agency and the Dutch National Register (lareb.nl) to extract the number of cases of reported severe side effects, (iii) they calculated that NNTV is between 200-700 to prevent one case of COVID-19 for the mRNA vaccine made by Pfizer and NNTV to prevent one death is between 9000 and 50000 (95% interval confidence interval) with 16000 as a point estimate, (iv) they stated that the reported number of serious cases of adverse reactions is 700 per 100000 vaccinations and the number of cases of fatal adverse reactions is 4.11 per 100000 vaccinations, (v) they stated that "for three deaths prevented by vaccinations we have to accept two inflicted by vaccinations" and (vi) they concluded that "This lack of clear benefit should cause governments to rethink their vaccination policy".

At first glance, based on their calculations from available scientific data, Walach, H. et al. [1] have put forward perfectly reasonable arguments that lead them to conclude that "for three deaths prevented by vaccinations we have to accept inflicted by vaccinations" and "This lack of clear benefit should cause governments to rethink their vaccination policy". Walach, H. et al. (i) did not commit Dishonest Scientific Reporting by mis-reporting the methods and procedures that they used, (ii) did not commit Data Falsification by designing their methods and procedures to produce the results that they wanted to have in order that they would fit their hypothesis (They could not have committed Data Falsification since the scientific data was not theirs. Instead, they used available scientific data to make their calculations), (iii) did not commit Data Fabrication by making up false scientific data (They could not have committed Data Falsification since the scientific data was not theirs. Instead, they used available scientific data to make their calculations), (iv) did not steal scientific data from other Scientific Researchers (They could not have stolen since the scientific data was not theirs. Instead, they used available scientific data to make their calculations and they referenced clearly the source of the scientific data), (v) did not mis-interpret scientific data intentionally since they stated in the paper how they arrive at their calculations and they also describe caveats to their method of calculation and the source of the scientific data, and (vi) did not distort scientific data which constitutes Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification since they did not change the

scientific data. They merely used the scientific data to calculate parameters that have not been previously reported.

Based on the above, there is no justification for the retraction of the paper of Walach, H. et al. [1,2] by Vaccines. The only lame reason for Vaccines to justify the retraction of the paper of Walach, H. et al. has to do with the fact that Walach, H. et al. stated that the fatal cases in the repository of the Lareb report (www.lareb.nl/coronameldingen) was certified by medical specialists [1]. Lareb's Head of science and research, Eugene van Puijenbroek responded by stating that the fatal cases in the Lared report was not certified by medical specialists and "all reports with a fatal outcome to be causally reported is far from truth" [3]. Walach, H. et al. [6] have shown that on the website of the Lareb's report (www.lareb.nl/coronameldingen), it is indeed stated that "The Netherlands Pharmacovigilance Centre Lareb collected 34.000 reports of adverse drug reactions in 2019, of which 14.000 reports are submitted directly to Lareb by *healthcare professionals* and patients and more than 20.000 were forwarded by the *marketing authorisation holders*. These reports are assessed and analysed, which may lead to safety signals about adverse drug reactions. These are reported to and reviewed by the Medicines Evaluation Board (MEB), supporting the MEB in its decisions in pharmacovigilance in the Netherlands and Europe." The question that must be asked is why publish the Lareb report when its head of science and research admits that the data in its repository is unreliable and useless. One can say that Lared's Head of science and research is the one committing Dishonest Scientific Reporting since he is admitting that the scientific data present in its repository is not to be relied upon and is most probably false. Is it not incumbent upon Lareb's Head of science and research to conduct investigations to determine whether the entered data of fatal cases is true or false, and whether the data of fatal cases are linked to anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccinations It is not rocket science? It should be straight forward to determine whether ~4.1 fatal cases per 100000 are linked to anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccinations or not. It is not the article of Walach, H. et al. [1] that undermines public confidence in the use of anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines. It is the laziness and inactions of people like Lared's Head of science and research that are undermining public confidence.

The journal Vaccines is also at fault because it is acting as a censorship review board with the help of a Mob Review Squad that wants to prevent legitimate scientific inquiries through censorship. In the United States, the paper by Walach, H. et al. would be an issue of Freedom of Speech pursuant to the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. In the United States, retracting the paper of Walach, H. et al. [1,2] based on the above flimsy reasons would be a violation of the Fundamental Right of Walach, H. et al. to Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Writing and Freedom of the Publishing pursuant to the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. After accepting a scientific paper and publishing the said paper after its review, Vaccines kowtowed to the Mob Review Squad and retracted the said paper sua sponte. Vaccines should be ashamed of itself. It is not clear what the Mob Review Squad are hiding. Are they hiding the fact that one of them, Katie Ewer has a serious conflict of interest and is not entitled to insert herself in the editorial decision of Vaccines with respect to the paper by Walach, H. et al. Katie Ewer is someone from the Jenner Institute at the University of Oxford who participated in the development of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine manufactured by Astra-Zeneca/University of Oxford whose clinical trial is associated with Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification [6,7], and has so far not been approved by the United States Federal Drug Administration because it is riddled with inconsistencies, Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification [8].

Walach, H. et al. [1] have rightfully raised the issue of the safety of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech. Wallach, H. et al. [1] have stated that "for three deaths prevented by vaccinations we have to accept two inflicted by vaccinations" . As pointed out in [6], there is alarming discrepancy in the IPUV-10000 Number (Total Number of Individuals Infected with SARS-COV-2 Per 100000 Unvaccinated Population) and IPV-10000 (Total Number of Individuals Infected with SARS-COV-2 Per 10000 Vaccinated Population) of the clinical trial of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine developed by Pfizer/BioNTech [9] and the IPUV-10000 Numbers and IPV-10000 Numbers of the clinical trials of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10] respectively. Only, the IPUV-10000 reported by Johnson & Johnson for the clinical trial of its anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine appears to be relatable to

prevailing real life SARS-COV-2/COVID-19 Pandemic situation [7,11]. Moreover, the clinical trials of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson [9-11] did not recruit enough participants to allow the determination of the DPUV-10000 Number (Total Number of Deaths of Individuals Infected with SARS-COV-2 Per 10000 Unvaccinated Population) and DPV-10000 Number (Total Number of Deaths of Individuals Infected with SARS-COV-2 Per 10000 Unvaccinated Population). Therefore, the effectiveness and safety of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson [9-11] are questionable and most a mirage. If the clinical trials were designed so that the DPUV-10000 Number and DPV-10000 Numbers could not be determined, Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson have committed Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification [9-11]. If the clinical trials of the said anti -SARS-COV-2 vaccines [8-10] were not properly designed and as a result, the DPUV-10000 Numbers and DPV-10000 Numbers could be not be determined, then the said clinical trials are useless as far as their efficacy and safety are concerned. Touting the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson as effective and safe constitutes Dishonest Scientific Reporting.

Walach, H. et al [1] are totally correct when they pointed out that "COVID-19 vaccines have had expedited reviews without sufficient safety data", None of the clinical trials of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech [8], Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10] could determine whether vaccinations prevent death [7]. Walach, H. et al. [1] rightly point out that there is a paucity of scientific data with respect to the number of deaths due to administration of anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines. It is somewhat puzzling that after spending so many billions of dollars, neither the manufacturers of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines nor the governments that funded the manufacturers bothered to determine whether the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines prevent death due to SARS-COV-2 infection and also whether they cause death after being administered into the population. The anecdotal registration of breakthrough infections and deaths after vaccinations with anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines is beyond comprehension. One would think that the experts and pundits would see to it that breakthrough infections

and deaths vaccinations with anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines would be meticulously, systematically and scientifically recorded, studied and analyzed. Walach, H. et al. [1] must be given due credit for highlighting this important issue that somehow has escaped the so-called experts and pundits. It is unscientific and unconscionable that Science Magazine [12-16] and Nature Magazine [17-19] keep extolling the virtues of the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech [8], Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10] when they have presented zero evidence that their anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines can actually prevent death of individuals infected with SARS-COV-2. Science Magazine and Nature Magazine must know that commenting and praising the effectiveness and safety of the ant-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech [8], Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10] without demanding scientific evidence from them constitute Dishonest Scientific Reporting. The Editor in Chiefs must be smoking something that they should not when they authorized the publication of the above opinion pieces or they must be totally incompetent at their jobs. The New England Journal of Medicine can take credit for publishing the results of the clinical trials of anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech [8], Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10]. However, New England Journal of Medicine must be criticized for not having knowledgeable reviewers who could point out that none of Pfizer/BioNTech [8], Moderna [9] and Johnson & Johnson [10] has provided any scientific evidence that their ant-SARS-COV-2 vaccines can prevent death due to SARS-COV-2 infections. It is indeed a pity that the Mob Review Squad, including Katie Ewer, including Katie Ewer, Florrian Krammer, Helen Petoussis-Harris, Diane Harper [3] could not appreciate the research work of Walach, H. et al. [1] which suggests that the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine developed by Pfizer/BioNTech had marginal effect on death due to SARS-COV-2 infection (Walach, H. et al. [1] have in fact been quite charitable in that they allowed that the anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine developed by Pfizer/BioNTech has some effect on death due to SARS-COV-2 infection when the clinical trial of anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccine developed by Pfizer/BioNTech showed that no such conclusion could be made), Is the Mob Review Squad, including Katie Ewer, Florrian Krammer, Helen Petoussis-Harris, and Diane Harper stating that the reviewers who approved the paper by Walach, H. et al. are a bunch of imbeciles? It is quite disgusting and alarming that as a

result of the tantrums of the Mob Review Squad, including Katie Ewer, Florian Krammer, Helen Petoussis-Harris and Diane Harper (As pointed out above, Katie Ewer has major conflict of interest because she was a participant of the development of the Astra Zeneca/University of Oxford vaccine that had turned out to be a dud as it has not been approved by the United States FDA. The other listed individuals also have conflict of interests because they are all proponents of anti-SARS-COV-2 vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and Johnson & Johnson), the academic and research appointment of Walach, H. was terminated by Poznan University of Medical Sciences [3]. What transgression did Walach, H. commit to deserve the sanction of termination of his university appointment and livelihood.

What the Mob Review Squad, including Katie Ewer, Florian Krammer, Helen Petoussis-Harris, Diane Harper have done is disgusting and despicable, constitutes personal vendetta and harassment, can be called censorship, and is unscientific, derogatory and defamatory towards Walach, H. et al. They should have scientifically rebutted the findings and conclusions of Walach H. et al. Instead, they chose extortion to get what they want: muzzling of Walach, H. et al. The Mob Review Squad should go back to school in order to read and study the History and Philosophy of Science and Karl Popper's Logic of Scientific Discovery, Thomas Kuhn's Theory of Scientific Revolutions and Paul Feyerabend's Against Method. They clearly have no idea what Scientific Inquiry is and what Scientific Methods are.

References.

1. Walach, H. et al. (2021) Vaccines, DOI: 10.3390/vaccines9070693.
The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations-We should rethink the policy.
2. Vaccines Editorial Office (2021) Vaccines, DOI: 10.3390/vaccines9070729.
Retraction: Walach et al. The safety of COVID-19 vaccinations-We should rethink the policy.
3. Wadman, M. (2021) Science, Issue of July 1, 2021.
Scientists quit journal board, protesting 'grossly irresponsible' study claiming COVID-19 vaccines kill.

4. Tung, H.Y.L. (2020) in In the Matter of Scientific Misconduct and Fraud by H.Y. LimTung, Chapter One, pp5-26, Cactoa Scientific Publishers, Inc., New York City (Astoria), New York, U.S.A.

Definition of Scientific Misconduct, Scientific Fraud and Dishonest Scientific Report.

5. Tung, H.Y.L. (2019) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Articles, Vol. 1, pp6-20.

Scientific Misconduct, Scientific Fraud and Dishonest Scientific Report.

6. Tung, H.Y.L. (2020) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Articles, Vol. 2, pp182-193.

Dishonest scientific reporting and data falsification with respect to the effectiveness of the candidate vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech, Moderna and AstraZeneca/University of Oxford

7. Tung, H.Y.L. (2021) J. Invest. Cri. Pub. Sci. Articles, in press.

Further evidence of Dishonest Scientific Reporting and Data Falsification in the clinical trial of the anti-SARS-COV-2/COVID-19 vaccine developed by Astra Zeneca/University of Oxford.

8. Sorkin, A.D. (2021) The New Yorker, Issue of March 21, 2021.

Why there is so much confusion about the Astra Zeneca vaccine.

9. Polack, F.P. et al. (2020) New Engl. J. Med., Vol. 383, pp2603-2615.

Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine.

10. Baden, L.R. et al. (2021) New Engl. J. Med., Vol. 384, pp403-416.

Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine.

11. Sadoff, J. (2021) New Engl. J. Med., DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa2101544.

Safety and efficacy of single-dose Ad26.COV2.S vaccine against Covid-19.

12. Cohen, J. (2020) Science, Issue of November 9, 2020.

Champagne and question greet first data showing that a COVID-19 vaccine works.

13. Cohen, J. (2020) Science, Issue of November 16, 2020.

'Just beautiful': Another COVID-19 vaccine from newcomer Moderna, succeeds in large scale trial.

14. Cohen, J. (2020) Science, Issue of November 18, 2020.

'Incredible milestone for science.' Pfizer and BioNTech update their promising COVID-19 vaccine test.

15. Cohen, J. and Travis, J. (2020) Science, Issue of November 23, 2020.

Another COVID-19 vaccine success? Candidate may prevent further coronavirus transmission too.

16. Kupferschmidt, K. and Vogel, G. (2021) *Science*, Issue of May 3, 2021.

What's the future of vaccines linked to rare clotting disorders? *Science* breaks down the latest.

17. Ledford, H. (2021) *Nature*, Issue of January 29, 2021.

J & J's one-shot COVID vaccine offers hope for faster protection.

18. Calloway, E. (2020) *Nature*, Issue of November 9, 2020.

What Pfizer's landmark COVID vaccine results mean for the pandemic.

19. Calloway, E. (2020) *Nature*, Issue of November 16, 2020.

COVID vaccine excitement builds as Moderna reports third positive result. Preliminary data show that the immunization is 94% effective and seems to prevent severe infections.

END