

121 Breastfed Infants Had "Issues" After Maternal Vaccination in Just ONE study!

Pfizer and Moderna-paid Scientists Did not Even Look Into It



Igor Chudov
5 hr ago

♡ 249

💬 134



Another interesting [article](#)!

Original Investigation | Public Health



September 8, 2022

Analysis of Vaccine Reactions After COVID-19 Vaccine Booster Doses Among Pregnant and Lactating Individuals

Alisa Kachikis, MD, MS¹; Janet A. Englund, MD²; Isabela Covelli, MD³; [et al](#)

✖ Author Affiliations | Article Information

The point of that article was to provide a strong confirmation that Covid-19 vaccination in pregnant or lactating women is “safe and effective”.

Yeah, it is safe and effective... except for one small problem mentioned in passing... **121 breastfed infants were having problems after their mothers received their booster shots. The nature of the problems is *not being disclosed*.**

Before we go on, please appreciate the “conflict of interest” disclosures in the article. Most of the scientists in the study are sponsored by vaccine companies, but specifically *Dr. Kachikis and Dr. Englund report being sponsored by Covid vaccine makers Pfizer, Moderna, and AstraZeneca.*

Author Contributions: Drs Kachikis and Singleton had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Kachikis, Englund, Eckert.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Kachikis, Englund, Covelli, Frank, Haghighi, Drake.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Kachikis, Englund, Singleton, Drake, Eckert.

Statistical analysis: Kachikis, Singleton, Drake.

Obtained funding: Kachikis.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Englund, Covelli, Frank, Haghighi, Eckert.

Supervision: Englund, Eckert.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Dr Kachikis reported serving as a research consultant for Pfizer and GlaxoSmithKline on maternal immunization-related projects in 2020 and as an unpaid consultant for GlaxoSmithKline in 2022 outside the submitted work. Drs Kachikis, Englund, and Drake reported receiving grant support from Merck outside the submitted work. Drs Kachikis and Englund reported receiving grant support from Pfizer outside the submitted work. Dr Englund reported receiving grant support from GlaxoSmithKline and AstraZeneca and serving as a consultant for AstraZeneca, Moderna, Sanofi Pasteur, and Meissa Vaccines Inc outside the submitted work. No other disclosures were reported.

Pfizer and Moderna-sponsored Dr. Kachikis and Dr. Englund are not minor participants in this scientific work: they are the key persons in the study, involved in concept, design, and writing, all the way to critical revisions of the manuscript.

Dr. Kachikis, sponsored by Pfizer specifically, is always at the forefront of the effort to vaccinate pregnant and lactating women against Covid.



IDSOG
"Ask the Expert"

**Focus
paper**

Vaccinating Pregnant and Lactating Patients Against COVID-19

Practice Advisory ⓘ | December 2020

<https://www.acog.org/clinical/clinical-guidance/practice-advisory/articles/2020/12/vaccinating-pregnant-and-lactating-patients-against-covid-19>

**Discussion
Team**



Alisa Kachikis, MD, MS
 Assistant Professor,
 Maternal-Fetal Medicine,
 University of Washington,
 Dept of OB/GYN
ACOG Liaison to ACIP Ebola
 Vaccine committee



What did the study find?

Most of the [study](#) was devoted to showing how safe Covid boosters are for pregnant and lactating women. Some of the ways the information was presented seemed odd to me.

Nearly half (7683 of 16913 [45.4%]) of participants were at work or planned to go to work on the day of the booster or third dose, and **only 5.7% (434 of 7672) either left work or called out of work because of vaccine reactions.**

Only **6.3% (1067 of 16989) reported that the vaccine reactions significantly affected their ability to perform activities of daily living.**

Somehow, the fact that 5.6% of pregnant or lactating mothers were unable to work, is considered to be a vaccine success. Similarly, I am not sure why they say that "only" 6.3% of such women could not perform their daily activities. It seems

to be a lot to me!

More importantly, the text in "Results" above does not agree with Table 2.

The text in "Results" says "*Of those who did work, most (6659 of 7672 [86.8%]) reported minimal or no effect of the vaccine on work.*" So, the authors say, $7672 - 6659 = 1,013$ reported a significant effect in reducing their ability to work.

Table 2, meanwhile, says the opposite: 3,164 women (out of 7,672 who were at work), had "*had a significant impact on ability to work on the day of the booster*" (so they were at work):

Table 2. Reported Reactions and Perceptions About Booster or Third Dose of the COVID-19 Vaccine, by Pregnancy and Lactation Status (N = 16 162)

Table 2. Reported Reactions and Perceptions About Booster or Third Dose of the COVID-19 Vaccine, by Pregnancy and Lactation Status (N = 16 162)

Reaction	Total No. ^a	aOR (95% CI) or difference in mean values (comparing pregnant vs nonpregnant and nonlactating) ^b	P value	Total No. ^c	aOR (95% CI) or difference in mean values (comparing lactating vs nonlactating and nonpregnant) ^b	P value
Reported	6417			14 238		
At injection site						
Local pain		1.2 (1.1 to 1.4)	.01		1.1 (1.0 to 1.2)	.03
Redness		0.9 (0.7 to 1.1)	.26		1.0 (0.9 to 1.2)	.74
Swelling		0.7 (0.6 to 0.9)	.001		0.9 (0.8 to 1.0)	.05
Myalgias		0.6 (0.5 to 0.7)	<.001		1.0 (1.0 to 1.1)	.36
Fatigue		1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.47		1.0 (0.9 to 1.0)	.46
Headache		0.7 (0.7 to 0.8)	<.001		1.1 (1.0 to 1.1)	.17
Chills		0.6 (0.5 to 0.6)	<.001		1.1 (1.0 to 1.2)	.16
Fever		0.5 (0.4 to 0.6)	<.001		1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.70
Gastrointestinal symptoms		0.8 (0.6 to 1.0)	.08		1.0 (0.8 to 1.1)	.75
Any local reaction		1.2 (1.0 to 1.4)	.01		1.1 (1.0 to 1.2)	.06
No. of local reactions ^d		0.0 (-0.04 to 0.03)	.81		0.0 (-0.02 to 0.03)	.54
Any systemic reaction		0.7 (0.6 to 0.8)	<.001		1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.51
No. of systemic reactions ^d		-0.3 (-0.4 to -0.2)	<.001		0.0 (-0.04 to 0.08)	.47
Sought medical care or advice within 24 h after receiving vaccine booster or third dose	6416	2.3 (1.1 to 4.8)	.03	14 238	1.0 (0.6 to 1.9)	.91
Went to work or planned to go to work on day of booster or third dose	6391	0.9 (0.8 to 1.0)	.23	14 164	0.6 (0.6 to 0.7)	<.001
Vaccine						
Had a significant impact on ability to work on the day of the booster or third dose	3164	0.6 (0.4 to 0.8)	.003	6062	1.0 (0.9 to 1.3)	.71
Had a somewhat or significant impact on ability to perform daily activities	6408	0.8 (0.7 to 1.0)	.007	14 226	0.9 (0.9 to 1.0)	.05
Dose with most severe perceived symptoms ^e	6157			14 649		
First		1.2 (1.0 to 1.4)	.13		1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.98
Second		1.3 (1.1 to 1.6)	<.001		1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.70
Booster or third		0.7 (0.6 to 0.8)	<.001		1.0 (0.9 to 1.2)	.48
Received influenza vaccine this season (2021-2022)	6056	2.7 (1.7 to 4.3)	<.001	13 278	1.1 (0.9 to 1.4)	.30

Reported any hesitancy to get the booster or third dose	6345	2.3 (2.0 to 2.7)	<.001	14 087	0.8 (0.7 to 0.9)	<.001
Discussed booster or third dose with a health care professional	6396	25.8 (22.3 to 29.8)	<.001	14 183	1.2 (1.1 to 1.3)	<.001
Received a recommendation to get the booster or third dose	5967	6.8 (5.8 to 8.0)	<.001	12 796	1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	.78
Recommendations from public or medical health authorities were helpful in decision about a booster or third dose	6204	1.2 (1.0 to 1.4)	.06	13 789	1.2 (1.0 to 1.3)	.01

So, *is that 1,013 women* whose ability to work was significantly impacted (as per Results), *or 3,164 women* (as per Table 2)?

How does the sentence in Results, agree with the study data? Unless I am missing something, it does not agree. I hope someone explains.

What about the Infants?

Strangely enough, the study did not even look in detail at what the vaccine does to the developing fetuses or breastfed infants. The authors declared that the vaccines are “safe in pregnancy and breastfeeding” only by considering the *immediate* reactions of the *women* involved — *not the effect on their children*.

However, the authors slipped up in one sentence:

Among lactating individuals, ... , *355 of 10278 (3.5%) reported a decrease in breast milk supply*, and **121 of 10278 (1.2%) reported any issues with their breastmilk-fed infant after vaccination.**

So, we have 121 infants (out of 10,278) having “issues” after their mothers were vaccinated.

Did the study authors ask the women what the problems were that impacted their infants? No. There was literally not one single sentence, in the entire study, that showed any level of concern or interest in the “infants”.

Now, I am not saying that mothers are not important. Of course, they are! But what about the infants? Should there be concern? Are 121 infants having “issues”

what about the infants? Should they be ignored? Are 121 infants, having issues after maternal vaccination, not material to determining vaccine safety?

We have no idea how severe, or mild the "issues" with infants were. The authors do not appear to be concerned. They could have asked the women involved. The booster shot caused 121 breastfed infants to have unspecified "issues" that the authors did not investigate. (We discussed some [quite severe events](#) recently)

Instead, Dr. Kachikis is presenting the (contradictory) data as proof that the booster is "safe for pregnant or lactating persons".

Well, it was not safe for 121 infants.

Why did these scientists not ask what happened to them?



Original Investigation | Public Health

September 8, 2022

Analysis of Vaccine Reactions After COVID-19 Vaccine Booster Doses Among Pregnant and Lactating Individuals

Alisa Kachikis, MD, MS¹; Janet A. Englund, MD²; Isabela Covelli, MD³; et al

[% Author Affiliations](#) | [Article Information](#)

Pfizer-sponsored scientist found vaccine "safe for breastfeeding"

In same study...

121 Breastfed Infants had "issues" -- who cares right?

