Ignoring Safety Signals and Quality Issues of Novel mRNA Vaccines: A Response to Delfi's Fact-Check

Date: 13.12.2024
Authors:
1. Kaari Saarma, MSc in Molecular Biology, Member of the Council of the United Doctors and Scientists NGO, Estonia
2. Dr. Jonathan D. Gilthorpe, PhD, Cell Biologist, Neuroscientist, Sweden
3. Prof. Jiří Beran, MD, vaccinologist and epidemiologist, Centre for Vaccination and Travel Medicine, Hradec Králové, Czech Republic
4. Dr. Sven Román, MD, Psychiatrist, President of The Doctors' Appeal, Sweden
5. Dr. Jeanne A. Rungby, MD, Founder of NORTH Group, Denmark

On November 25-26, the NORTH Group, an international association of medical and other professionals, appealed to the prime ministers and governing bodies of Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Iceland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Greenland to suspend the use of all mRNA vaccines, citing serious health risks.[1]

There were a total of 432 signatories to the appeal, almost 50% of whom were doctors or scientists, including 36 professors. There were 57 signatories from Estonia, almost half of whom were doctors.

The fact check by Delfi/Eesti Päevaleht published on December 5th reduced the international appeal, which has been joined by five other European countries to date, to a mere "appeal of 57 Estonians", leaving the impression that it was a statement by incompetent persons.[2] This approach is common in the repeal culture of recent years, focusing on discrediting people instead of making a fact-based argument.

The fact-check article highlighted signatories such as midwives and nurses, presenting them as unqualified in vaccinology, while ignoring the involvement of professors who signed the petition. One might question why an intensive care nurse working with vaccine-related complications could not support such a petition. Should their voice be less significant than that of a medicines agency specialist, who may face conflicts of interest?

Unproven safety claims about residual DNA

Regarding the content of the petition and its scientific summary, the fact-check's arguments fall short. Instead of countering with disproving data, they label the petition's foundational studies as misinformation. Preprints are disparaged as non-peer-reviewed and pseudoscientific sources.
For instance, the fact-check emphasizes that most articles addressing DNA contamination were published as "non-peer-reviewed." However, they overlook a peer-reviewed article cited in the petition (reference 3) that explains why certain methods might underestimate residual DNA levels in vaccine vials. The study concluded:
For instance, the fact-check emphasizes that most articles addressing DNA contamination were published as "non-peer-reviewed." However, they overlook a peer-reviewed article cited in the petition (reference 3) that explains why certain methods might underestimate residual DNA levels in vaccine vials. [3] The study concluded:

For example, the fact-checker points out that most articles reporting DNA contamination have been published in "non-peer-reviewed journals." At the same time, a scientific article that has been peer-reviewed (source no. 3 in the appeal) is ignored. and which explains why certain methodologies may falsely indicate lower levels of residual DNA in vaccine vials. The conclusion of this article states:

"The available information and data indicate that the ready-to-use mRNA vaccine Comirnaty contains DNA impurities that exceed the permitted limit value by several hundred times…and that this went unnoticed because the DNA quantification carried out as part of batch testing only at the active substance level appears to be methodologically inadequate when using qPCR… the applied qPCR is designed so that a massive under-detection of DNA impurities appears to be the result… qPCR is matchless if specific DNA sequences are being quantified, but this is not the case if the aim is the quantification of the total DNA content."

One reason why three out of four DNA contamination studies remain unpublished in peer-reviewed journals could be due to censorship in scientific publications, especially for works questioning the safety or quality of COVID-19 vaccines. Nevertheless, hundreds of peer-reviewed articles have documented various health impacts linked to modified mRNA technology and other COVID-19 vaccines. Including case studies, such data amount to thousands.

The fact-check fails to substantively address the petition's primary claim. It quotes: "The Medicines Agency assures that the residual DNA levels in vaccines are within permitted limits and pose no health risk," yet provides no evidence to support this assertion. Every scientific study measuring DNA content corroborates the view that mRNA vaccine vials contain significant and variable levels of foreign DNA.

It remains unclear what specific data the agency used to become convinced that vaccines are safe, because we can't know what we don't study. Has the safety of the permitted levels of residual DNA and other possible additives been studied in a situation where they are incorporated into lipid nanoparticles and thus transported directly into the cells of the vaccinated person, just like the mRNA active ingredient?

Standards that do not guarantee safety

International standards do not require vaccine manufacturers to submit genotoxicity, carcinogenicity, or pharmacokinetic studies for final product when applying for marketing authorization. However, these studies are necessary to assess the safety of mRNA products.
In addition, safety requires factual answers to three key questions:

1. To which tissues does the mRNA vaccine travel post-administration?
2. How long do cells in different tissues produce the foreign protein?
3. How much of the foreign protein is produced?

Without answers to these questions, no mRNA vaccine should have been and should not be approved for human use in the future. Today, it is known that, contrary to what was promised, the modified mRNA vaccine did not stay in the injection area, but spread throughout the body. It is known that the toxic spike protein is produced for at least six months, but it is not excluded that even longer.[4] It is not known how to limit the production of excess spike protein or how to stop it completely.

Fact checkers do not touch on topics that are inappropriate for them. They do mediate the Australian Medicines Agency's criticism of the studies that found residual DNA, but fail to explain how unacceptably high levels of residual DNA contamination occur in vaccine vials allegedly sent by "non-refrigerated mail". It is evident that residual DNA from the manufacturing process cannot spontaneously arise in a sealed vial – DNA can only degrade in such conditions. Yet, they unjustifiably imply that these findings of several independent scientific laboratories worldwide result from poor laboratory practices.

The fact checker disputes statements that are not in the appeal

In addition, fact checkers refute claims that are not in the appeal or scientific summary. This is a common demagogic technique to distract attention and distort the truth. For example, it is claimed that the address stated:

For instance, they allege the petition stated, *"mRNA vaccines do not prevent COVID-19 spread; therefore, they are ineffective."*

In reality, the petition stated: *"COVID-19 vaccines were never tested for their ability to block virus transmission. Regulatory authorities, governments, and organizations misled the public into accepting these products under false pretenses."*
Equating these two statements is unprofessional.

The article claims that "*the appeal equates the SV40 virus with a specific region in the SV40 virus DNA called the promoter.*" In reality, the scientific summary supporting the appeal highlighted not the SV40 virus itself but a sequence derived from the virus that was found in Pfizer's vaccine and was not disclosed by the manufacturer:

"Pfizer's vaccine contains a specific DNA segment, the SV40 promoter-enhancer, derived from the Simian Virus 40 (SV40). Regulatory authorities were not informed about the use of this sequence in the vaccine production process. If Pfizer had declared this component in its manufacturing process, it would likely have triggered more thorough scrutiny, as the SV40 virus is associated with cancer, and the SV40 promoter-enhancer itself exhibits strong biological activity."

The fact-checkers' attempt to divert attention with inaccuracies, as well as their avoidance of topics that do not align with their agenda, is regrettable, albeit ideologically understandable. Had they addressed the second claim in the appeal—"*COVID-19 vaccines resulted in an unprecedented number of reported adverse events, including deaths. Repeated analyses of public data show that the occurrence and severity of these adverse events depended on the vaccine batch received*"—for which thousands of peer-reviewed scientific articles exist, it would have inevitably led to public outrage.

Balanced Journalism Would Seek Comments from Both Sides
On November 27th, a press release regarding the appeal was sent to EPL, which included the contact details of both the international coordinator of the NORTH Group and the Estonian representative. For a balanced article, one would expect the journalist to reach out to the representatives of the appeal, but this was not done. To our knowledge, not a single signatory of the appeal was asked for a comment.

The specialist from the Estonian Medicines Agency (Ravimiamet) featured in the article showed no interest in discussing the topic at a joint table, even though the appeal was also sent to the agency, including directly to Pille Säälik. Instead of fostering an open discussion, EPL's fact-check team and the Medicines Agency produced a biased article, whose dismissive tone could be deeply disturbing to anyone who has suffered adverse effects from a COVID-19 vaccine.
Reading the comments from the Medicines Agency representative raises a question: how would the agency act if its primary goal were to protect the interests of its people rather than those of pharmaceutical companies?

Refuting the claims made in the joint article by EPL and the Medicines Agency is not difficult. However, since this is an international appeal now supported by 15 countries, an official response

must be coordinated with the medical professionals and scientists from other countries who contributed to the appeal. A more comprehensive article, supported by international experts, will be published in the near future.

In the meantime, let us remain vigilant, critical, and steadfast in defending the principles of academic freedom—especially when it serves the public interest.

References:

[1] https://northgroup.info/estonia.html

[2] https://epl.delfi.ee/artikkel/120341553/faktikontroll-vakksiniavante-poordumine-ministerite-ja-riigikogu-poole-sialdab-korduvalt-umber-lukatud-valevaiteid

[3] **König & Kirchner (2024).**Methodological Considerations Regarding the Quantification of DNA Impurities in the COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine Committee. Methods Protoc.https://www.mdpi.com/2409-9279/7/3/41

[4]Röltgen K, Nielsen S, Silva O et al (2022). Immune imprinting, breadth of variant recognition, and germinal center response in human SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination, January 24, Elsevier. 2022 DOI:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.01.018
https://www.cell.com/cell/fulltext/S0092-8674(22)00076-9