



Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Cochrane-branded scientifically unsound review on aluminium and vaccine safety - response to Mark Wilson, CEO of Cochrane

Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 21, 2018 at 9:58 PM

To: Mark G Wilson <MWilson@cochrane.org>

Cc: "martin.burton@cochrane.nhs.uk" <martin.burton@cochrane.nhs.uk>, Cindy Farquhar <c.farquhar@auckland.ac.nz>, "j.e.clarkson@dundee.ac.uk" <j.e.clarkson@dundee.ac.uk>, "gerald.gartlehner@donau-uni.ac.at" <gerald.gartlehner@donau-uni.ac.at>, "Peter C. Gøtzsche dk" <pcg@cochrane.dk>, "marguerite.a.koster@kp.org" <marguerite.a.koster@kp.org>, "admin@cochrane.org" <admin@cochrane.org>, Catherine Marshall <bluekakariki@gmail.com>, "meerpohl@cochrane.de" <meerpohl@cochrane.de>, "santesna@mcmaster.ca" <santesna@mcmaster.ca>, Tom Jefferson <jefferson.tom@gmail.com>, Chris Del Mar <cdelmar@bond.edu.au>, Paul Glasziou <pglaszio@bond.edu.au>, RayMoynihan@bond.edu.au, peter.collignon@act.gov.au, dtovey@cochrane.org, Karla Soares-Weiser <ksoares-weiser@cochrane.org>, Hilary Simmonds <hsimmonds@cochrane.org>, Toby Lasserson <TLasserson@cochrane.org>, Fiona Godlee <fgodlee@bmj.com>, Peter Doshi <pdoshi@bmj.com>, iditorial@lancet.com, richard.horton@lancet.com, Christopher Exley <c.exley@keele.ac.uk>, Vinu Arumugham <vinucube@gmail.com>, Christian Gluud <christian.gluud@ctu.dk>, Dimitrinka Nikolova <dimitrinka.nikolova@ctu.dk>, "snezana.djurisic@ctu.dk" <snezana.djurisic@ctu.dk>, "sdjurisic@gmail.com" <sdjurisic@gmail.com>

For the attention of

Mr Mark G. Wilson
CEO Cochrane

Mr Wilson

As noted in your email response to me dated 15 February 2018, Cochrane continues to refuse to be accountable for the scientifically unsound systematic review on aluminium and vaccine safety authored by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, i.e.

Jefferson TO, Rudin M, Di Pietrantonj C. Adverse events following immunization with aluminium containing DTP vaccines systematic review of the evidence. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2004; 4: 8490.

Jefferson et al's Cochrane-branded review has influenced international vaccination policy and mandatory vaccination laws.

To address the ambiguity of this matter, it is incumbent upon Cochrane to issue a public statement that formally declares that Cochrane disassociates itself from this scientifically unsound review authored by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, and to insist that *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* journal publish this statement in an open access editorial.

Mr Wilson, with its self-declared authorship by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, Jefferson et al's review clearly bears the Cochrane 'brand', a brand which Cochrane boasts represents **"an international gold standard for high quality, trusted information"**.^[1]

Jefferson et al's review paper does not meet the 'gold standard' and cannot be trusted, as it is self-admittedly based on study data of low methodological quality, and astoundingly recommends no further research in the area of aluminium and vaccine safety. This review can best be described as 'garbage in, garbage out'.

Whose best interests were served by the publication of Jefferson et al's scientifically unsound review, which was personally endorsed by the world's foremost vaccine promoter, Paul Offit, who strangely described it as **"a very thorough, thoughtful review of the subject"** in an article titled **'Aluminium in vaccines poses no harm'**, published on the industry-funded WebMD website in January 2004?^[2] (Copy attached.)

It seems to me the vaccine industry has been the major beneficiary of Jefferson et al's review.

Jefferson et al's review has given the green light to the global proliferation of lucrative aluminium-adjuvanted vaccine products, e.g. multiple doses of the novel VLP HPV vaccine products Gardasil and Cervarix, which have been fast-tracked around the world, creating a multi-billion dollar market for their makers i.e. Merck, CSL and GlaxoSmithKline.

Jefferson et al's review is influencing vaccination policy and mandatory vaccination laws. For example, **six doses** of aluminium-adjuvanted acellular pertussis multivalent shots are now on the vaccination schedule for children in Australia, which is mandatory to access government benefits, and childcare and pre-school in some states. It is

well-known within academia that there are problems with the acellular pertussis vaccine[3], and yet repeated revaccinations with this multivalent product continue to be pressed upon children, plus pregnant women and others.

Industry lobbying is also underway to add yet more doses of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines to the Australian mandatory vaccination schedule, i.e. GlaxoSmithKline's Bexsero meningococcal B vaccine, for a very rare disease.

There appears to be no consideration of the possible deleterious effects of repeated revaccination throughout life with aluminium-adjuvanted vaccine products. **Jefferson et al's scientifically unsound review must be held accountable for deliberately recommending against research in this area.**

Mr Wilson, despite the denials of you and your colleagues, **the Cochrane brand is clearly associated with Jefferson et al's review paper published in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases Journal* in February 2004.**

On the first page of the paper it is noted that the authors are members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, i.e. Tom Jefferson and Melanie Rudin were at Cochrane Vaccines Field and Health Reviews Ltd, Rome, Italy, and Carlo Di Pietrantonj at Cochrane Vaccines Field, Alessandria. (See highlighted copy of the paper attached.)

Why did these members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field have their review on aluminium and vaccine safety published behind the paywall of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, when the mission of Cochrane is "to provide accessible, credible information to support informed decision-making..."?[4]

Who approved this at Cochrane? It is up to you Mr Wilson to clear up the ambiguity on this matter.

Jefferson et al's review paper was also included in the Cochrane Vaccines Field Bibliography, a copy of which I saved from the Cochrane Vaccines Field website before the Cochrane Vaccines Field was closed down in November 2015.[5]

On the second page of the Cochrane Vaccines Field bibliography (see highlighted copy attached), Jefferson et al's review is listed, i.e. Jefferson TO, Rudin M, Di Pietrantonj C. Adverse events following immunization with aluminium - containing DTP vaccines systematic review of the evidence. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2004; 4: 8490.

In fact several of the reviews prepared by the Cochrane Vaccines Field appear to have been published in journals rather than in the Cochrane Library - **why? Why were these reviews not published in the Cochrane Library?**

The Cochrane Vaccines Field bibliography now appears to have disappeared from the Cochrane website, **is this attempted erasure of the evidence...?**[6]

It is a serious matter that material influencing vaccination policy is published behind paywalls, i.e. not open access for scrutiny by the community, **particularly now with governments such as those in Australia, the United States and Italy implementing mandatory vaccination laws, making communities compliant to a growing number of lucrative vaccine products and revaccinations.**

It is astonishing that these moves towards government-mandated medical interventions have received little or no critical analysis in academia or the mainstream media.

It is also astonishing Jefferson et al's scientifically unsound paper got through peer review at *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, it would be interesting to know who were the reviewers.

Given Tom Jefferson's more recent reputation for blowing the whistle on flu vaccination and Tamiflu, I was very surprised to read his 2004 review, the aim of which appears to be to defend and protect the use of aluminium in vaccine products.

[In my email to Tom Jefferson about his review \(24 March 2013\)](#) I challenged the conclusion of his review, i.e. **"Despite a lack of good-quality evidence we do not recommend that any further research on this topic is undertaken"**, and I also included discussion about aluminium adjuvants in veterinary medicine, and how veterinary experts had raised concerns about this.

Tom Jefferson's terse response on the same day to my carefully considered email was: **"Very simple: it is not a Cochrane review"**.

As the review was clearly authored by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, as noted on the paper published in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, I was confused and unconvinced by Tom Jefferson's response.

[In July 2014 I followed up with a letter to Peter Gøtzsche](#), Co-founder of The Cochrane Collaboration and Director of The Nordic Cochrane Centre.

Peter Gøtzsche responded to me on 9 July 2014 saying:

Dear Elizabeth Hart,

you discuss some relevant issues. I am aware, for example, that the placebos in some of the vaccine trials of HPV contained aluminium adjuvant, which means that findings of no harm are questionable, if we think that aluminium adjuvant might cause the harm we are concerned about (in this case, brain damage).

However, I am not the person you should address. Furthermore, our procedure is to ask critics of Cochrane reviews to submit a criticism, which I therefore encourage you to do.

I personally believe the discussion you raise is important and hope you will carry on with it. Many of our vaccines are fantastic, but others aren't, and even good vaccines can sometimes give unpleasant surprises. Danish researchers, for example, found out that a vaccine recommended by the WHO for African children, actually killed them (I think it was the di-te-pol vaccine; one of the authors are Peter Aaby, an absolutely outstanding researcher).

I have holidays now, and am overworked, so I will not respond to further emails about this.

best wishes Peter Gøtzsche

(My emphasis.)

As noted above, Peter Gøtzsche indicates in his email response to me that he is aware of the controversial issue of inclusion of aluminium adjuvant in the placebo in HPV vaccine trials.

Peter Gøtzsche also acknowledges that the discussion I raise in my letter is important and hopes I will carry on with it, indicating that the procedure is to ask critics of Cochrane reviews to submit a criticism, which he encouraged me to do.

However, it transpired that the matter was difficult in that, despite being prepared by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, as noted on the review paper, it appears Jefferson et al's review was **not technically** 'a Cochrane review', as it had been published in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* (behind the paywall), instead of in the Cochrane Library. As the review was not available online on the Cochrane website, I was unable to make an online comment.

And yet, as noted above, **Jefferson et al's 2004 review was clearly associated with the Cochrane Vaccines Field, and listed in the bibliography on the Cochrane Vaccines Field website. Again, why was this review by the Cochrane Vaccines Field published behind the paywall of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*?**

[I followed up with another letter to Peter Gøtzsche \(17 July 2014\)](#), asking him to clarify how to make a submission to Cochrane in regards to the review, given that he himself had said **"the discussion you raise is important and hope you will carry on with it"**.

I received no response from Peter Gøtzsche.

(I undertook more (unsatisfactory) correspondence with Cochrane, [see for example my letter \(16 December 2014\) to David Tovey](#), Editor in Chief, The Cochrane Library, and Deputy Chief Executive Officer Editorial Unit / Cochrane Central Executive.)

[In August 2014 I forwarded a letter to John McConnell, Editor of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*](#), requesting that Jefferson et al's poorly evidenced review be retracted.

This letter was also copied to Richard Horton, Editor of *The Lancet*.

My letter to John McConnell and Richard Horton was ignored, yet another example of the disdain with which academia and the journal industry treats citizens' valid concerns about literature promoting vaccine products and influencing vaccination policy.

Note also that my letters were copied to a number of key people, see for example my letter to Peter Gøtzsche of 8 July 2014, linked to above. Relevant people such as you Mr Wilson, Cochrane's Paul Glasziou and Chris Del Mar, *The BMJ*'s Fiona Godlee and Peter Doshi, and others.

Jefferson et al's unsound review, which carries the 'brand' of Cochrane, has been used to defend the safety of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines. For example a Fact Sheet on Vaccine Components, published by the Australian National Centre for Immunisation Research & Surveillance (NCIRS), refers to Jefferson et al's review (listed in the references) and states: **"Aluminium salts, in small amounts, have been added to certain vaccines for about 60 years and a recent review of all the available studies of aluminium-containing diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis vaccines (either alone or in combination) found that there was no evidence that aluminium salts in vaccines cause any serious or long-term adverse events..."** (Highlighted copy attached.)

It is pertinent to note that the NCIRS is a very influential organisation on vaccination policy in Australia, and some of its staff are part of the international network that is influential on global vaccination policy, and are also associated with the vaccine industry. The Director of the NCIRS, Peter McIntyre, is an ex-officio member of the Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisation (ATAGI). Peter McIntyre is one of the 'kingpins' of vaccination in Australia, a foremost member of the powerful vaccination clique here. **The NCIRS/Peter McIntyre were instrumental in getting aluminium-adjuvanted HPV vaccination off the ground in Australia, see the report of a meeting held in December 2003: 'Planning for human papillomavirus vaccines in Australia - Report of a research group meeting'.[7]**

The report was co-authored by Peter McIntyre and Julia Brotherton, another person who has built a career on the back of the HPV vaccine industry. **CSL Pharmaceuticals and GlaxoSmithKline were thanked for their support in facilitating the meeting.**

And Jefferson et al's review was published around this time, how convenient, complete with glowing endorsement from the world's foremost vaccine promoter, Paul Offit, in the WebMD online article 'Aluminium in vaccines poses no harm'. At the same time, WebMD reports Paul Offit had to admit "it's still unclear exactly how aluminium salts stimulate the body's immune response, making the vaccines more effective". It's becoming evident now that acellular pertussis vaccines are *not* working effectively, as noted above and see reference no. 3.

In 2006/2007 the turbo-charged aluminium-adjuvanted Gardasil vaccine found its way onto the Australian national vaccination schedule, **after first being rejected for the taxpayer-funded vaccination schedule by the Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee, a decision over-turned within 24 hours by then Prime Minister John Howard after lobbying by vested interests and politicians.** This occurred in the run-up to the 2007 Federal election, politicians do so like making an announcement. Gardasil HPV vaccination was subsequently fast-tracked in Australia, and in a domino effect, HPV vaccination was fast-tracked around the world, a lucrative component of the burgeoning global vaccine market.

In regards to seeking accountability for misleading information on aluminium and vaccine safety, [in May 2016 I also contacted \(then\) Chief Medical Officer Chris Baggoley](#), my letter to him including examples of Jefferson et al's review being cited in other material in the 'peer-reviewed literature' supporting aluminium adjuvants.

This got nowhere as usual in the unaccountable Australian over-vaccination bureaucracy.

A number of academics have raised questions about the safety of aluminium in vaccines, e.g. Christopher Exley and Yehuda Shoenfeld. Needless to say these people are attacked by people associated with the coercive vaccination lobby groups. It appears the plan is to stifle any dissent about vaccination and protect the industry.

We have no idea of the long-term cumulative effects of repeated revaccination with aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines as this research has not been done. This is an experiment currently being undertaken in the community with the increasing amount of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines and revaccinations being given to children, i.e. they are unknowing guinea pigs whose parents are not being properly informed about the uncertainties of these medical interventions. (Adults are also being targeted for more vaccination, e.g. more doses of the failed aluminium-adjuvanted pertussis/whooping cough vaccine, along with failing annual flu vaccination, plus pneumococcal and shingles vaccination for the elderly. There could be problems with all of these, the cumulative long-term effects of regular vaccination throughout life are unknown.)

In regards to Jefferson et al's Cochrane-branded, scientifically unsound 2004 review, published courtesy of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, it seems nobody wants to take responsibility and deal with the fallout from this in regards to the plethora of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines and revaccinations which have been added to vaccination schedules since this review was published.

Indeed, members of the scientific/medical establishment and others seem determined to protect the status quo on this matter, regardless of the impact of this poorly evidenced review on vaccination policy and mandatory vaccination laws, and millions and millions of over-vaccinated children and adults.

Given Tom Jefferson's more recent critical analysis of annual flu vaccination and Tamiflu, his 2004 review on aluminium and vaccine safety was a **complete shambles**. (In regards to Tamiflu and the difficulty of obtaining data for analysis, see this *BMJ* webpage: <http://www.bmj.com/tamiflu>) It seems that Tom Jefferson 'saw the light' in regards to questioning the quality of data supporting pharmaceutical products **after** his 2004 review...

It's notable that in recent times both Tom Jefferson and Peter Gøtzsche have become active in regards to questioning HPV vaccine safety, i.e. their complaint filed to the European Medicines Agency over maladministration related to safety of the HPV vaccines, as outlined on the Cochrane Nordic website.

Given that Cochrane have set themselves up to be god's gift to evidence based medicine, they should indeed be standing up on this matter. **How ironic that Jefferson et al's 2004 review, prepared by (then) members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, including him, is a significant part of the problem...**

The elephant in the room remains, and that is Jefferson et al's scientifically unsound review on aluminium and vaccine safety, which is cited in literature supporting the burgeoning use of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines. In the environment fostered by Jefferson's review, I suggest children are being grossly over-vaccinated with aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines, e.g. recently in South Australia 60,000 students have been pressed to have two doses of Bexsero meningococcal B vaccine, in a GSK sponsored 'trial' for a very rare disease, on top of three doses of Gardasil, and another repeat dose of the failed acellular pertussis/diphtheria/tetanus vaccine, not to mention all the other shots they had in early childhood.

When I read Jefferson et al's review in 2013 it struck me immediately that this review should not have been published, i.e. making recommendations on the basis of study data of overall low methodological quality. I subsequently discovered that Christopher Exley had raised this matter in letters to *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* in 2004[9] and 2006[10], but apparently nobody took any notice.

In December 2017, independent aluminium and vaccine safety researcher Vinu Arumugham also forwarded an article including criticism of Jefferson et al's review[11] to *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, and requested that Jefferson et al's review be retracted. As in my case, Vinu Arumugham's request for retraction of Jefferson et al's deeply flawed review was given the brush-off. Vinu Arumugham also contacted Cochrane on 17 February 2018 saying **"If you want the Cochrane brand to be associated with *Trusted evidence, Informed decisions, Better health*, then you cannot have it associated with the Jefferson et al. article"**.

Somebody has to deal with this, this matter is getting worse the longer it continues...

Mr Wilson, as I have demonstrated, Jefferson et al's review on aluminium and vaccine safety carries the imprimatur of Cochrane, and was listed in the Cochrane Vaccines Field bibliography. Why did members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field undertake this review and then seek to publish it behind the paywall of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*?

Who at Cochrane oversees what is published under the Cochrane brand?

If this was not a 'Cochrane review', why were these authors allowed to use the Cochrane brand in their paper published in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*?

Again, given the impact of Jefferson et al's review on vaccination policy and mandatory vaccination laws, it is incumbent upon Cochrane to issue a public statement that formally and unambiguously declares that Cochrane disassociates itself from this scientifically unsound review authored by members of the Cochrane Vaccines Field, and to insist that *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* journal publish this statement in an open access editorial.

For more background, also see my webpages which contain hyperlinks to my letters and emails relevant to aluminium and vaccine safety:

Cochrane - Aluminium and vaccine safety: <https://over-vaccination.net/aluminium-and-vaccine-safety/>

Cochrane Nordic and HPV vaccine safety: <https://over-vaccination.net/cochrane-collaboration/>

I request your urgent response on this matter.

Sincerely
Elizabeth Hart
<https://over-vaccination.net/>

References:

1. About Cochrane: <http://www.cochranelibrary.com/about/about-the-cochrane-collaboration-and-how-to-get-involved.html>
2. Aluminium in vaccines poses no harm. WebMD, 29 January 2004.
3. See for example **Resurgence of Whooping Cough May Owe to Vaccine's Inability to Prevent Infections** which states **"The startling global resurgence of pertussis, or whooping cough, in recent years can largely be attributed to the immunological failures of acellular vaccines"**. A/Professor Christopher Gill says **"This disease is back because we didn't really understand how our immune defenses against whooping cough worked, and did not understand how the vaccines needed to work to prevent it. Instead we layered assumptions upon assumptions, and now find ourselves in the uncomfortable position of admitting that we...made some crucial errors. This is definitely not where we thought we'd be in 2017."** Boston University School of Public Health, 21 September 2017. It is mind-boggling that children are being repeatedly revaccinated with obviously problematic acellular pertussis vaccines via aluminium-adjuvanted multivalent vaccine products, and adults are also often pressed to have pertussis/whooping cough revaccination.
4. About Cochrane: <http://www.cochranelibrary.com/about/about-the-cochrane-collaboration-and-how-to-get-involved.html>
5. Cochrane Community - Closure of the Vaccines Field, November 2015: <http://community.cochrane.org/news/closure-vaccines-field>

6. This link to the Cochrane Vaccines Field bibliography now brings up the message 'Not found': <http://vaccinesfieldol.d.cochrane.org/bibliography%C2%AD2003>
7. Julia ML Brotherton, Peter B McIntyre. Planning for human papillomavirus vaccines in Australia: Report of a research group meeting. Communicable Diseases Intelligence, Volume 28 Issue Number 2, June 2004.
8. Aluminium in vaccines poses no harm. WebMD, 29 January 2004.
9. Exley C. Aluminium-containing DTP vaccines. Lancet Infect Dis 2004; 4: 324
10. Exley C. Aluminium-adsorbed vaccines. Lancet Infect Dis. 2006; 6: 189
11. Vinu Arumugham. Safety studies of aluminium in vaccines lack immunotoxicity analysis of this immunological adjuvant: Ignorance of deception? Zenodo 16 December 2017 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1117241>

On Thu, Feb 15, 2018 at 7:07 PM, Mark Wilson <MWilson@cochrane.org> wrote:

Dear Ms. Hart,

I've been asked to reply to you on behalf of the Cochrane Co-Chairs and Governing Board.

Please be advised that as communicated to you in the past by Cochrane's Editor in Chief, Dr. David Tovey, the issue that you raise is not one that we are going to engage with as an organization as it related to a systematic review we did not publish in the Cochrane Library. We would ask that you do not send us further communications on the subject, and we consider the matter closed with this response to you.

Yours sincerely,

Mark G. Wilson

Chief Executive Officer

 hrane_Logo_RGB_200px.png

E mwilson@cochrane.org **T** +44 (0)207 183 7503 **S** markg.wilson

Cochrane, St Albans House, 57-59 Haymarket, London SW1Y 4QX, UK

www.cochrane.org

Trusted evidence. Informed decisions. Better health.

From: Elizabeth Hart <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Date: Wednesday, 7 February 2018 at 8:07 PM

To: "martin.burton@cochrane.nhs.uk" <martin.burton@cochrane.nhs.uk>, Cindy Farquhar <c.farquhar@auckland.ac.nz>, "j.e.clarkson@dundee.ac.uk" <j.e.clarkson@dundee.ac.uk>, "gerald.gartlehner@donau-uni.ac.at" <gerald.gartlehner@donau-uni.ac.at>, ""Peter C. Gøtzsche" dk>" <pcg@cochrane.dk>, "marguerite.a.koster@kp.org" <marguerite.a.koster@kp.org>, "admin@cochrane.org" <admin@cochrane.org>, Catherine Marshall <bluekakariki@gmail.com>, "meerpohl@cochrane.de" <meerpohl@cochrane.de>, "santesna@mcmaster.ca" <santesna@mcmaster.ca>

Subject: Response to Cochrane re Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention protocol

For the attention of the Cochrane Governing Board:

Co-Chairs:

Martin Burton and Cindy Farquhar

Members:

Janet Clarkson, Gladys Faba, Gerald Gartlehner, Peter C. Gøtzsche, David Hammerstein Mintz, Tracey Howe, Marguerite Koster, Rae Lamb, Catherine Marshall, Joerg Meerpohl, Nancy Santesso

(Admin Cochrane - please forward this email to Gladys Faba, David Hammerstein Mintz, Tracey Howe and Rae Lamb)

Ladies and gentlemen, for nearly five years now I have been seeking accountability from Cochrane and *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* journal for a scientifically unsound review on aluminium and vaccine safety prepared by Tom Jefferson et al under the imprimatur of the 'Cochrane Vaccines Field', i.e. *Adverse events after immunisation with aluminium-containing DTP vaccines: systematic review of the evidence* (2004).

People associated with Cochrane and *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* journal failed to take action on this matter.

I suggest this review has helped to facilitate the global proliferation of lucrative aluminum-adjuvanted vaccine products. This is impacting on countries implementing aggressive and coercive vaccination schedules, e.g. Australia, the United States, Italy, France and Germany.

I suggest gross **over**-vaccination is occurring with a number of vaccine products and revaccinations and, due to serious conflicts of interest in vaccination policy, international vaccination schedules must be objectively and independently reviewed as a matter of urgency.

For your information, please see below my recent response to Dimitrinka Nikolova, Managing Editor of the Editorial Team Office/The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group in Denmark re the current Cochrane *Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention protocol*: <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD012805/full>

Elizabeth Hart

<https://over-vaccination.net/>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Elizabeth Hart** <elizmhart@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Feb 7, 2018 at 3:10 PM

Subject: Re: Your feedback on the Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention protocol

To: Dimitrinka Nikolova <dimitrinka.nikolova@ctu.dk>

Dimitrinka, this Cochrane aluminium adjuvant review refers to serological response, **so my submitted comments in regards to unnaturally antibody titers after HPV vaccination, and the lack of evidence for multiple doses, are very relevant:** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD012805/full>

I'm alarmed by the introduction to this review which is a hagiography for 'vaccination'. This appears to me to be a very biased and unobjective introduction, particularly in light of the emerging problems with vaccine products, eg failures with pertussis and mumps vaccines and others. There is much that is unknown about vaccination, particularly the long-term consequences of this intervention via the burgeoning vaccination schedules.

Also, this review refers to the aluminium and vaccine safety systematic review undertaken by Jefferson et al in 2004, which was published under the imprimatur of the 'Cochrane Vaccines Field' behind the paywall in *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* Journal. As the current review protocol notes, Jefferson et al's review **"advised the ending of future research despite concluding that their finding was based on poor-quality evidence"**.

I suggest Jefferson et al's review has had a catastrophic impact on facilitating the proliferation of aluminium-adjuvanted vaccines, e.g. repeated revaccination with pertussis containing vaccines, multiple doses of controversial HPV vaccines, and meningococcal B vaccination for a very rare infection.

It is likely many millions of individuals have been over-vaccinated with these highly questionable aluminium-adjuvanted vaccine products, supported by the scientifically unsound review prepared by Jefferson et al. There are serious problems in regards to 'informed consent' before vaccination with these products.

For your information, I have forwarded correspondence on this matter since 2013 to Tom Jefferson, Peter Gøtzsche, David Tovey, and the Editor of *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* and others, with a most unsatisfactory response - see hyperlinks to my correspondence on this webpage: <https://over-vaccination.net/aluminium-and-vaccine-safety/>

I have also forwarded much correspondence relevant to HPV vaccination safety to Tom Jefferson, Peter Gøtzsche and others, see hyperlinks on this webpage: <https://over-vaccination.net/cochrane-collaboration/> **I have received no acknowledgement from Dr Jefferson or Professor Gøtzsche, my detailed and fully referenced correspondence has been ignored.**

Diminrinka, I suggest the authors of the current Cochrane aluminium adjuvant review think very carefully about their response to my comments...

I question whether a cover-up is underway to hide Cochrane's influence in facilitating the global proliferation of lucrative aluminium-adjuvanted vaccine products.

Given the conflict of interest, I have no confidence in Cochrane's ability to undertake an independent and objective review on this matter.

Please note I am also pursuing this matter via other avenues.

I look forward to the response to my comments from the current Cochrane aluminium adjuvant review authors.

Regards

Elizabeth Hart

<https://over-vaccination.net/>

On Mon, Feb 5, 2018 at 10:01 PM, Dimitrinka Nikolova <dimitrinka.nikolova@ctu.dk> wrote:

Dear Elizabeth Hart,

Thank you for your two further comments which I received today in two separate mails.

I have now forwarded them to the authors.

I have also seen their reply on the previous comments received, but the replies need to be read by the criticism editor before I can publish them. As mentioned earlier, I will inform you when I do this. It shall not take much longer.

Thank you for your patience.

Best regards,

Dimitrinka

Dimitrinka Nikolova, M.A.

Managing Editor

Editorial Team Office/The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group (The CHBG), Copenhagen Trial Unit, Rigshospitalet, Dept. 7812, [Blegdamsvej 9](#)

[DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø](#)

Denmark

Tel. [+45 3545 7169](tel:+4535457169)

Fax [+45 3545 7101](tel:+4535457101)

The CHBG website: hbg.cochrane.org

The Impact Factor for the *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR)* is **6.264**.

From: Elizabeth Hart [mailto:elizmhart@gmail.com]

Sent: 5. februar 2018 04:47

To: Dimitrinka Nikolova <dimitrinka.nikolova@ctu.dk>

Subject: Re: Your feedback on the Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention protocol

Thank you for acknowledging receipt of my comment Dimitrinka.

Today I have submitted two further comments.

I would appreciate your acknowledgement of these comments.

I await Cochrane's early consideration of the points I have raised.

Regards

Elizabeth Hart

<https://over-vaccination.net/>

On Tue, Jan 30, 2018 at 8:23 PM, Dimitrinka Nikolova <dimitrinka.nikolova@ctu.dk> wrote:

Dear Ms Elizabeth Hart,

Thank you very much for your feedback which is forwarded to the authors of the "Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention protocol" review protocol.

When the comments are addressed and published, I will inform you about it. We do hope that this will be in the following three to four weeks.

Best regards,

Dimitrinka

Dimitrinka Nikolova, M.A.

Managing Editor

Editorial Team Office/The Cochrane Hepato-Biliary Group (The CHBG) Copenhagen Trial Unit Rigshospitalet,
Dept. 7812 [Blegdamsvej 9](#)

[DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø](#)

Denmark

Tel. [+45 3545 7169](tel:+4535457169)

Fax [+45 3545 7101](tel:+4535457101)

The Impact Factor for the *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR)* is **6.264**.

From: WileyOnlineLibrary [mailto:cochrane_feedback@wiley.co.uk]

Sent: 16 January 2018 00:33

To: Cochrane Feedback <cochrane_feedback@wiley.com>

Subject: New Feedback has been submitted for CDSR

++++
++++

Database: The Cochrane Library

Article: Aluminium adjuvants used in vaccines versus placebo or no intervention

Review Group: LIVER

DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD012805

++++
++++

Date of Submission: 15-Jan-2018

Name: Elizabeth Hart

Email Address: elizmhart@gmail.com

Affiliation: Independent

Role: Independent researcher

Comment: Will this review investigate/consider the impact of the unnaturally high antibodies induced by HPV vaccination?

In a review paper published in 2010, Ian Frazer, a co-inventor of the technology enabling the HPV vaccines, states:

"HPV immunization induces peak geometric mean antibody titers that are 80- to 100-fold higher than those observed following natural infection [19]. Furthermore, after 18 months, mean vaccine-induced antibody titers remain 10- to 16-fold higher than those recorded with natural infection [19], and these levels appear to be preserved over time, suggesting that immunization may provide long-term protection against infection..." (See page S9.)

HPV 'immunization' inducing antibody titres that are 80- to 100-fold higher than those observed following natural infection seems to be a very unnatural response.

Is this a good thing? Does anybody know?

Frazer's review paper is titled Measuring serum antibody to human papillomavirus following infection or vaccination, published in Gynecologic Oncology 118 (2010) S8-S11, and funded by Merck & Co. Inc. His reference for his high antibody titre comment is a paper by Diane M Harper et al - Efficacy of a bivalent L1 virus-like particle vaccine in prevention of infection with human papillomavirus types 16 and 18 in young women: a randomised controlled trial, published in The Lancet, Vol 364 November 13, 2004, and funded and co-ordinated by GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals.

In their paper Harper et al state:

"Geometric mean titres for vaccine-induced antibodies to HPV antibodies were over 80 and 100 times greater than those seen in natural infections with HPV-18 and HPV-16, respectively. Vaccine-induced titres remained substantially raised at 18 months, and were still 10-16 times higher than those seen in women with natural HPV-16 or HPV-18 infections, respectively." (See page 1763.)

And on page 1764:

"We have shown that the HPV-16/18 virus-like particle vaccine adjuvanted with AS04 induces a level of antibody production against HPV-16/18 that is much higher than that induced by natural infection. Previous work has shown that combinations of the adjuvants MPL and aluminium salts induce an enhanced immune response compared with antigen alone or adjuvanted with only aluminium, at both the humoral and cellular level. These findings suggest that the immune responses induced in vaccinated women may provide a longer duration of protection than the protective effects induced by natural HPV infection; however, a protective antibody level has not been established nor is there sufficient data currently available to estimate the duration of vaccine-induced protection."

Should we be concerned that HPV vaccines produce antibodies over 80 and 100 times greater than those seen in natural infections with HPV-18 and HPV-16 respectively, and which remain substantially raised months after vaccination?

Do you have any affiliation with or involvement in any organisation with a financial interest in the subject matter of your comment?

I do not have any affiliation with or involvement in any organisation with a financial interest in the subject matter of my comment

4 attachments



Jefferson Aluminium review 2004.pdf

1451K



Bibliography (since 2003) _ Cochrane Vaccines Field.pdf

106K



vaccine-components-fact-sheet NCIRS.pdf

107K



Aluminum in Vaccines Poses No Harm.pdf

98K