The gagged teacup

Srivatsan’s powerful commentary is an important reminder that we live in an era of new McCarthysm.

The issue of the sacking of Peter Gøtzche is complex and has two linked aspects. The first are the facts of his dismissal and the second is our work on Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccines

Peter Gøtzche’s dismissal was because of “bad behaviour”, defined by the Board as repeated presentation of personal views as those of Cochrane despite requests and promises not do so” and serious defamatory and outrageous allegations against Cochrane colleagues – and publicly”. The full list of “charges” can be accessed here: <https://community.cochrane.org/news/governing-board-webinars-october-2018>. So far no hard evidence to back these “charges” has ever been produced by the rump Management Board. Peter Gøtzche was sacked because his style and his message are not popular in an organisation which has lost sight of its birthright and is intent in tightly controlling the release of information it produces. Those present at the Annual General Meeting in September or those who have watched the recording will remember the sheer venom with which Peter’s expulsion was discussed. Balanced statements, proposals and analyses of the facts can be found in the statement by the Directors of the Iberoamerican Cochrane Network: <http://www.nogracias.eu/2018/10/06/the-cochrane-iberoamerican-network-asks-to-improve-the-governance-of-the-organisation-as-well-as-transparency-participation-and-an-independent-review-of-the-peter-gotzsches-process/> and David Hammerstein's comment <http://www.nogracias.eu/2018/10/08/regenerate-cochrane-to-strengthen-the-production-of-trusted-evidence-for-the-common-good-of-public-health-by-david-hammerstein/>. Hammerstein is one of the four Board members who resigned in protest at Gøtzche’s expulsion. But that is all it was: fire, smoke and personality clashes, little substance.

The Cochrane Collaboration was established in 1993 to help people reach more reliable conclusions about the benefits and harms of interventions than what was otherwise possible at the time. We were a cultural movement based on openness, collaboration and what we thought at the time to be a good basis of fact: journal publications of clinical trials. As time went by it became clear that these were in most cases no better than nice stories with exaggerated claims of benefits and forgotten or miniaturized harms reporting. This is why, after our experience with our Tamiflu Cochrane review, we decided to review the evidence based for HPV vaccines focussing only on regulatory data. Regulatory data are still part of a commercial operation: getting your intervention to market. However they are far more detailed and reliable than 10 page journal summaries. We started by asking the European regulator EMA for clinical study reports. We have documented the difficulties encountered and the correspondence1. Despite the difficulties, we succeeded in creating an index of 206 prospective comparative studies of HPV vaccines accessible here: <https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-018-0675-z>. This unique achievement is aimed at addressing publication bias and minimising the effects of other types of reporting bias, effectively providing an alternative to journal-published articles and their databases (see here for the conceptual details <https://ebm.bmj.com/content/23/2/46>).

A copy of the index was sent to the Cochrane editors and review group finalising the HPV review on the day of publication: 19 January 2018. They took no notice of the index, its content and implications and published a biased and factually wrong review with a series of gushing testimonials in the covering press release. We responded publicly pointing out the list of problems3. It now turns out that our list was rather conservative4. The Cochrane editors responded with an urgent investigation which is nothing more than the rest: smoke to hide their dismissal of our Index and its implications. Shortly after, the man who has done more than anyone else to open our eyes to the shortcomings of published trials was sacked.

Despite the mounting evidence for the need to switch to an alternative form of “E” for EBM (see here for details https://ebm.bmj.com/content/23/2/46) Cochrane has taken no corporate action, concentrating on commercial mantras like “brand” dropping our hallowed “Collaboration” from the name, and building a whole bureaucratic infrastructure to service its boss, not its life and blood: reviewers. The story is by no means finished as we are about to publish our review of the regulatory evidence: The Editor-in-Chief of BMJ EBM is leading further scrutiny of the Arbyn et al review.

But do HPV vaccines cause serious harms? To that I can only answer that the trials were not designed to test harms fairly through a combination of idiosyncratic harms categorization, reporting and the use of active comparators dubbed “placebo”.

Now the current Cochrane leadership wants to carry on as if nothing has happened.

Tom Jefferson
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