

Dear Madam, Dear Sir

In the name of our organization associating experts from the fields of medicine, science and law from the Czech Republic, we would hereby like to draw your attention to the problems of the study submitted recently to the FDA by Pfizer, which will, presumably, be soon submitted (if not submitted already) to EMA as well; namely, the subject of our concern is the study supporting the request to approve the use of the Comirnaty vaccine in the youngest children (6 months to <5 years of age). Unfortunately, the study shows significant shortcomings, while, most importantly, not sufficiently proving the vaccine efficacy. We have already sent our Letter of concern including the analysis prepared by our experts to EMA.

Hereby, we would like to ask you to exercise your powers with respect to the European Commission, which grants marketing authorizations for medicines in the EU; in particular, we would like to suggest that you exercise your right of interpellation against the President of the EC, Ursula von der Leyen, as well as the Commissioner responsible for Health and Food Safety, Stella Kyriakides, the Vice-President Commissioner responsible for Values and Transparency, Věra Jourová, and possibly other Commissioners of your choice. During such an interpellation, a question should be presented of whether the EC intends to grant authorization for the use of this vaccine in children aged 6 months to <5 years of age; if so, another query regarding the knowledge of what proofs of effectiveness and safety were provided by Pfizer should follow. As many Commissioners may not possess detailed knowledge of the Pfizer study (although we are sending similar emails to Commissioners Kyriakides and Jourová), we would also like to kindly ask you to present the information from the attached analysis of the Pfizer study and to suggest that the Commissioners compare objections from that analysis with the version of the respective version of the Pfizer study submitted for EMA approval.

Among other things, we would like to emphasize the following facts (the attached analysis is more detailed):

- 1) The efficacy of the vaccines against infection, hospitalization or death was not proved by the Pfizer study for any of the groups. The approximately 80% efficacy of the vaccine against infection declared in the Executive Summary is based just on a subgroup containing a small number of patients, which resulted in the confidence interval for this value ranging virtually from -370% to 100%; in other subgroups, the protective effect of the vaccine has not been demonstrated, either.
- 2) During the study, changes were made to the protocol to support the efficacy assessment of the 3rd dose (it should be noted that no positive vaccine effect was observed following 2 doses of the original protocol). This, in itself, would not have posed a major problem; however, as a result of these changes, an unprecedentedly high number of subjects were „unblinded“ and the data presented as the main results come from only a very small subset of patients.
- 3) Due to unblinding, it is very difficult to discern the actual length of follow-up of the safety profile after the Dose 3. For example, Tables 19 and 20 report a follow-up time after Dose 3 of less than 7 days for the majority of participants; on page 13, for example, for the 6-23 months group, only 461 subjects out of 1178 vaccinated are reported to have a follow-up time of more than 2 months (i.e. a minority, but presented as 60.8%). However, the median follow-up times after the Dose 3 stated in the report (e.g. page 23) are longer than one month (for both the blinded and combined populations), which is impossible – given the fact that the majority of subjects were vaccinated with Dose 3 for less than one week, the median should be less than a week.

- 4) The only endpoint showing certain beneficial effects of the vaccine was the production of antibodies. However, this criterion is very „soft“, among other things because the immunobridging included a comparison to a group of young adults whose immune system works very differently from the youngest children. Added to this, we should also point out the dichotomy in the official position that antibodies cannot be considered proof of protection from COVID-19 as no „safe“ level of antibodies can be established (while it is apparently sufficient for vaccine approval) or the fact that virus neutralization test was performed using the original Wu-han strain, from which the vaccine was constructed while against the Omicron variant, the effectiveness is approximately 5-6 times lower.
- 5) COVID-19 is a far less dangerous disease for children under five than for the adult population, and severe course in this age group is rare, occurring most often in children with other underlying conditions. The death of a healthy child is exceedingly rare. To the best of our knowledge, there was not a single fatality following reinfection with COVID-19 in a previously healthy child from this age group. It is likely that most children have already encountered the infection and acquired post-infection immunity. Administering the vaccine to these children may increase the risk of adverse events while providing no benefit (as demonstrated by the Pfizer study itself) to such children and hence, the risk associated with vaccine administration may significantly outweigh the benefit.
- 6) In addition, the mRNA vaccines have, so far, been always approved in a simplified way, i.e., an emergency mode (FDA) or conditional authorization (EMA) and we assume that the current request to EMA would be also for conditional authorization, the regulations for which are much less strict than for standard authorization. This is, however, only applicable and justifiable if the population in question is at grave risk of serious health impacts of the disease, which is not the case here.

We would like to kindly ask you to propose to the members of the EC that they should look at the study objectively, without prejudice, and that they should ask themselves the crucial questions: Does the Pfizer study prove the effectiveness of their vaccine for the youngest age group and does it offer good protection (and from what)? And as so many statements presented to us with great certainty over the last year and a half about these vaccines (such as „they are 100% effective, their effectiveness is long-term, whoever gets vaccinated, cannot die of COVID,“ etc.) have already turned out to be false, can we indeed be 100% certain that the vaccines based on this novel technology are completely free of any adverse effects that would develop over years? And once we answered these two questions, can we really approve the administration of these vaccines to our children based on this study or should we rather apply the precautionary principle?

Thank you very much for your kind understanding and thorough evaluation of the submitted materials. Should you wish to call on our expertise, for example, to give an opinion on the version of the Pfizer study presented to EMA, we will be happy to help and are open to any discussion.

Yours sincerely (in alphabetical order),

Prof. MUDr. Jiri Benes, CSc., specialist in infectious diseases  
Prof. MUDr. Jiri Beran, CSc., epidemiologist and vaccinologist  
MUDr. Emil Berta, Ph.D., anaesthetist and ICU doctor  
MUDr. Mgr. Jan Brodnicsek, general practitioner and pneumologist  
Mgr. Zuzana Candigliota, attorney-at-law  
MUDr. Vladimir Cizek, angiologist, chairman of an ethics committee  
MUDr. Alena Dernerova, pediatric neurologist, senator

Prof. RNDr. Gejza Dohnal, CSc., expert in applied statistics  
MUDr. Vaclav Fejt, immunologist  
RNDr. Tomas Furst, Ph.D., university teacher, data analyst  
MUDr. Martin Gabrys, neurosurgeon  
MUDr. Jana Gandalovicova, cardiologist  
MUDr. Radan Gocal, specialist in internal medicine  
MUDr. Jan Hnizdil, specialist in internal medicine and psychosomatics  
MUDr. Jitka Chalankova, physician, senator  
RNDr. Jaroslav Janosek, Ph.D., university teacher, editor of medical texts  
Assoc. Prof. RNDr. Arnost Komarek, Ph.D., biostatistician  
MUDr. Roman Kovarik, epidemiologist  
MUDr. Mgr. Jana Kralova, general practitioner for children and adolescents  
RNDr. Zuzana Kratka, Ph.D., clinical immunologist  
Mgr. Vladimir Mrkvicka, attorney at law  
JUDr. Tomas Nielsen, attorney at law  
Assoc. Prof. RNDr. Marek Petras, Ph.D. vaccinologist and epidemiologist  
Ing. Lenka Piherova, Ph.D., molecular biologist  
MUDr. Lukas Pollert, physician, anesthesiologist  
JUDr. Jindrich Rajchl, attorney-at-law  
MUDr. Simon Reich, physician  
Prof. MUDr. Eliska Sovova, Ph.D., MBA, cardiologist and sports physician  
Mgr. Ondrej Svoboda, attorney-at-law  
RNDr. Jiri Sinkora, immunologist  
PhDr. Daniel Stach, psychologist  
MUDr. Hana Stefanicova, cardiologist and sports physician  
Mgr. Lenka Trkalova, attorney at law  
MUDr. Jiri Urbanek, MBA, healthcare consultant  
JUDr. Petr Vacek, attorney-at-law  
JUDr. Vladana Vališová, LL.M., attorney at law  
Mgr. Ondrej Vencalek, Ph.D., statistician  
MUDr. Hana Zelena, Ph.D., virologist  
Prof. MUDr. Jan Zaloudik, CSc., oncologist, senator

Prague August 5th, 2022