

Why a study claiming vaccines cause chronic illness is severely flawed – a biostatistician explains the biases and unsupported conclusions

Jeffrey S. Morris, Professor of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, University of Pennsylvania

These factors can affect both the chance of getting vaccinated and the chance of having health problems. They also change how often families visit Henry Ford clinics, which affects what shows up in the records.

When too many measured and unmeasured differences line up, as they do here, the study is unable to fully separate cause from effect.

Bottom line

The Henry Ford data could be helpful if the study followed both groups of kids to the same ages and took into account differences in health care use and background risks.

But as written, the study's main comparisons are tilted. The follow-up time was short and uneven, kids had unequal chances for diagnosis, and the two groups were very different in ways that matter. The methods used did not adequately fix these problems. Because of this, the differences reported in the study do not show that vaccines cause chronic disease.

Good science asks tough questions and uses methods strong enough to answer them. This study falls short, and it is being presented as stronger evidence than its design really allows.

Jeffrey Morris receives funding from the National Institute of Health and the Annenberg Public Policy Center

This article is republished from The Conversation under a Creative Commons license.