

Study: mRNA COVID Shots Caused More Deaths Than They Saved

Analysis by [Dr. Joseph Mercola](#)

March 14, 2024

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- › A now-retracted narrative review published in the journal Cureus calls for a global moratorium on mRNA COVID-19 shots
- › The review cited significant increases in serious adverse events among those who received the injections, along with an “unacceptably high harm-to-reward ratio”
- › When factoring in absolute risk and the “number needed to vaccinate” (NNV), the review found “for every life saved, there were nearly 14 times more deaths caused by the modified mRNA injections”
- › The study’s lead author suspected the paper would be retracted almost as soon as it was published because “our evidence-informed paper was an all-out indictment of the COVID-19 vaccine enterprise”
- › Board-certified internist and cardiologist Dr. Peter McCullough, another of the paper’s authors, called the retraction a “stunning act of scientific censorship”

A now-retracted narrative review published in the journal Cureus calls for a global moratorium on mRNA COVID-19 shots.¹ The review cited significant increases in serious adverse events among those who received the injections, along with an “unacceptably high harm-to-reward ratio.”²

When factoring in absolute risk and the “number needed to vaccinate” (NNV), a metric used to quantify how many people need to be vaccinated to prevent one additional case

of a specific disease, the review found "for every life saved, there were nearly 14 times more deaths caused by the modified mRNA injections."³

As for why the paper was retracted, study author Steve Kirsch said, "It's about supporting the narrative."⁴ Board-certified internist and cardiologist Dr. Peter McCullough, another of the paper's authors, called the retraction a "stunning act of scientific censorship."⁵

COVID Shot Trials Omitted Absolute Risk Reduction

In a review of the initial phase 3 trials for Pfizer's and Moderna's COVID-19 mRNA shots, the study criticized their exclusive focus on relative risk (RR) while omitting absolute risk (AR) reduction:⁶

"The latter measure gives a better indication of a drug's clinical utility than the former relative measure since it is scaled by the sample size. RR is the ratio of COVID-19 symptom rates in the vaccine versus placebo groups, which was reported as 95% and 94.5% for the Pfizer and Moderna products, BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273, respectively.

Absolute risk refers to the probability of an outcome (in this case, symptoms of clinical infection), based on the number of people experiencing the outcome in relation to the population at large. It is typically calculated as the number of events that occurred in a study population divided by the number of people in that population.

Both types of risk estimation are required to avoid reporting bias and to provide a more comprehensive perspective on vaccine efficacy."

In other words, there are two ways to understand how effective the shots are at preventing COVID-19. Relative risk shows how much the shot lowers the risk of getting COVID-19 compared to not getting the vaccine at all. The Pfizer and Moderna shots were found to be 95% and 94.5% effective, respectively, which sounds impressive.

However, absolute risk reduction gives a clearer picture of the shots' real-world impact. This measure shows how much the vaccine lowers the chance of getting sick in the entire population. For the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines, this reduction was only about 0.7% and 1.1%, much lower than the relative risk figures suggest.

In fact, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton sued Pfizer, alleging the Big Pharma giant lied about the effectiveness of its COVID-19 vaccine.⁷ The suit begins by stating how Pfizer "broadcast to the world" that its COVID-19 shot was 95% effective. As a result, Americans were led to believe that this was the panacea to end the pandemic, prompting them to receive the experimental product. But not only did Pfizer's shot not end the pandemic, the pandemic worsened.⁸

Pfizer's representation of its shot being 95% effective was deceptive, the suit claims, because Pfizer used relative risk reduction. Meanwhile, "An absolute risk reduction of approximately 1% for the COVID-19 mRNA vaccinations meant that a substantial number of individuals would need to be injected in order to prevent a single mild-to-moderate case of COVID-19," the study points out.⁹

They calculated the "number needed to vaccinate" (NNV), which reveals how many people need to get injected to prevent one case of COVID-19. For the Pfizer vaccine, the NNV is 142, and for Moderna, it's 88. This means 142 people would need to get Pfizer's shot or 88 people Moderna's shot to prevent one case of COVID-19.

This raises questions about the balance between the shots' benefits and risks. Using conservative estimates, including an NNV of 119 and an infection fatality rate (IFR) of 0.23%, the study found about 52,000 vaccinations would be needed to prevent one death from COVID-19.

With the Pfizer COVID shot, the review suggested it might save two lives for every 100,000 doses given. But, since the shot causes serious side effects, the harm greatly outweighs the benefits, with nearly 14 times more deaths caused by the shot for every life saved.¹⁰

Calls for COVID Shot To Be Immediately Removed From Childhood Schedule

In addition to calling for a global moratorium on mRNA COVID-19 shots, the authors of the paper — M. Nathaniel Mead, Stephanie Seneff, Ph.D., Russ Wolfinger, Ph.D., Jessica Rose, Ph.D. Kris Denhaerynck, Ph.D., Kirsch and McCullough — said the shots should be immediately removed from the childhood vaccine schedule. Boosters should also be suspended.

"It is unethical and unconscionable to administer an experimental vaccine to a child who has a near-zero risk of dying from COVID-19 but a well-established 2.2 percent risk of permanent heart damage based on the best prospective data available," the paper notes.¹¹

The moratorium is warranted based on the shots' risks of serious adverse events, the mechanisms behind those adverse events, mortality data and issues with inefficacy, vaccine control and processing.¹² According to the review:¹³

"Federal agency approval of the COVID-19 mRNA vaccines on a blanket-coverage population-wide basis had no support from an honest assessment of all relevant registrational data and commensurate consideration of risks versus benefits.

Given the extensive, well-documented SAEs [serious adverse events] and unacceptably high harm-to-reward ratio, we urge governments to endorse a global moratorium on the modified mRNA products until all relevant questions pertaining to causality, residual DNA, and aberrant protein production are answered."

Simian Virus 40 — 'A Surprising and Potentially Alarming Discovery'

The review cited both quality control issues and process-related impurities with the mRNA shots – "a key issue that could help explain why some individuals succumb while others do not ..."

Some batches, for instance, of both Pfizer's and Moderna's COVID shots were contaminated with double-stranded RNA, which may trigger immune-inflammatory reactions like myocarditis, or inflammation of the heart muscle. "A surprising and potentially alarming discovery was the presence of the Simian virus 40 (SV40) promoter in samples of the Pfizer vaccine," the study states.¹⁴

Florida Surgeon General Dr. Joseph Ladapo also called for an end to the use of COVID-19 mRNA shots, citing concerns about DNA fragments in the products.¹⁵ In a December 6, 2023, letter sent to the U.S. FDA and CDC, Ladapo outlined findings showing the presence of lipid nanoparticle complexes and SV40 promoter/enhancer DNA.

"Lipid nanoparticles are an efficient vehicle for delivery of the mRNA in the COVID-19 vaccines into human cells and may therefore be an equally efficient vehicle for delivering contaminant DNA into human cells. The presence of SV40 promoter/enhancer DNA may also pose a unique and heightened risk of DNA integration into human cells," according to a news release from the Florida Department of Health (DOH).¹⁶

In a 2023 preprint study, microbiologist Kevin McKernan – a former researcher and team leader for the MIT Human Genome project¹⁷ – and colleagues assessed the nucleic acid composition of four expired vials of the Moderna and Pfizer mRNA shots. "DNA contamination that exceeds the European Medicines Agency (EMA) 330ng/mg requirement and the FDA's 10ng/dose requirements" was found.¹⁸

So, in addition to the spike protein and mRNA in COVID-19 shots, McKernan's team discovered SV40 promoters that, for decades, have been suspected of causing cancer in humans, including mesotheliomas, lymphomas and cancers of the brain and bone.¹⁹

"While absent in the vials utilized during the registrational trials, the SV40 promoter has been identified in all tested BioNTech vials drawn from batches that have been distributed to the public," the review points out.²⁰

Was the Paper's Retraction an Inevitable Result of Industry Pressure and Agency Capture?

Mead, the study's lead author, suspected the paper would be retracted almost as soon as it was published. He told Children's Health Defense:²¹

"I knew as soon as I hit the Cureus 'publish' button on January 24, following the extensive review process and multiple re-submissions, that we were dealing with a ticking time bomb. By citing solid evidence and exposing how the industry-sponsored trials misled the public, our evidence-informed paper was an all-out indictment of the COVID-19 vaccine enterprise."

Ironically, John Adler Jr., Cureus' editor in chief, told the industry-friendly Retraction Watch just days after the study was published that it had been carefully vetted:²²

"Yes I am aware that many of these authors are skeptical zealots when it comes to the dangers of vaccines. Our editorial response was extra vigilance during the peer review process with 8 different reviewers weighing in on publication or not, including a few with strong statistics knowledge. Therefore, a credible peer review process was followed and the chips fell where they may."

Shortly after, the study's authors received notice from a "little known publication integrity staffer Tim Kersjes"²³ that the paper was being retracted due to "a significant number of concerns with your article that in our view can't be remedied with a correction."²⁴ Mead told Children's Health Defense:²⁵

"At least four of the retraction points appear to be position statements issued directly by the vaccine industry – a concerted attempt to declare, for example, that the mRNA vaccines are not gene therapy products, that these products are not contaminated with high levels of DNA, that they do not linger in the body and cause adverse effects, and finally, most incredibly, that the mRNA products underwent adequate safety and efficacy testing ..."

Once a major counter-narrative paper gets published and its findings begin to garner lots of attention, the Bio-Pharma stakeholders exert immense pressure on the publisher to retract the paper."

McCullough also suspects industry pressure was involved, telling Children's Health Defense:²⁶

"I am suspicious that Kersjes and Springer Nature [Cureus' publisher] were pressured by the powerful Bio-Pharmaceutical Complex of coordinated public health organizations, vaccine manufacturers, and regulatory agencies to censor our paper to keep critical vaccine safety information from getting to the medical community.

We rejected the retraction, fully appealed and will report this unethical action to all relevant authorities as we move on to publish elsewhere."

The silver lining is that, as the saying goes, all publicity is good publicity. The study was already incredibly popular, with more than 330,000 views/reads/downloads in one month compared to the average Cureus paper, which gets only 2,700 in an entire year.²⁷ With the retraction, more people will begin to ask questions about why this crucial information is continuing to be censored instead of openly debated and presented to the public.

Resources for Those Injured by the COVID Jab

Based on these and many other data from across the world, it's beyond clear that the COVID shots are the most dangerous drugs ever deployed. In addition to the evidence reviewed above, other recent research also shows that flaws in the codon optimization process is causing the shots to **produce off-target proteins** with unknown health effects and risks.

If you already got one or more COVID jabs and are now reconsidering, you'd be wise to avoid all vaccines from here on, as you need to end the assault on your body. Even if you

haven't experienced any obvious side effects, your health may still be impacted long-term, so don't take any more shots.

If you're suffering from side effects, your first order of business is to eliminate the spike protein – and/or any aberrant off-target protein – that your body is producing. Two remedies shown to bind to and facilitate the removal of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein are hydroxychloroquine and ivermectin. I don't know if these drugs will work on off-target proteins and nanolipid accumulation as well, but it probably wouldn't hurt to try.

The Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance (FLCCC) has developed a post-vaccine treatment protocol called **I-RECOVER**. Since the protocol is continuously updated as more data become available, your best bet is to download the latest version straight from the FLCCC website at covid19criticalcare.com.²⁸

For additional suggestions, check out the **World Health Council's spike protein detox guide**,²⁹ which focuses on natural substances like herbs, supplements and teas. Sauna therapy can also help eliminate toxic and misfolded proteins by stimulating autophagy.

Sources and References

- ¹ [Cureus January 24, 2024](#)
- ^{2, 13} [Cureus January 24, 2024, Abstract](#)
- ^{3, 6, 9, 10} [Cureus January 24, 2024, Review](#)
- ^{4, 24} [Substack, Steve Kirsch's newsletter February 18, 2024](#)
- ^{5, 23, 27} [Substack, Courageous Discourse February 24, 2024](#)
- ⁷ [Texas Attorney General, State of Texas V. Pfizer](#)
- ⁸ [Texas Attorney General, State of Texas V. Pfizer, Page 1](#)
- ¹¹ [World Tribune February 5, 2024](#)
- ^{12, 21, 25, 26} [Children's Health Defense January 29, 2024](#)
- ^{14, 20} [Cureus January 24, 2024, Quality control issues and process-related impurities](#)
- ^{15, 16} [Florida Health January 3, 2024](#)
- ¹⁷ [The Healthcare Channel May 22, 2023](#)
- ¹⁸ [OSF Preprints April 10, 2023](#)
- ¹⁹ [Expert Rev Respir Med October 2011; 5\(5\): 683-697](#)
- ²² [Retraction Watch February 19, 2024](#)
- ²⁸ [Covid19criticalcare.com](#)
- ²⁹ [World Council for Health Spike Protein Detox Guide November 30, 2021](#)