

Yale University Study – Certified BS'

Some asked me to provide my take on the narrative published in a substack article, "Yale Just Proved COVID Vaccine Injury Exists and Spike Production Persists for Years Inside The Body" ([link](#)).

The narrative concerns a seemingly popular Yale University publication about the spike protein's claimed side effects. "Immunological and Antigenic Signatures Associated with Chronic Illnesses after COVID-19 Vaccination" ([link](#)).

The substack article could be misleading by misreading the false science presented in the Yale publication. Therefore, I describe below my view on the publication from Yale University so that false science from the university can be correctly interpreted.

I read the publication and found it inferior quality, which would hardly qualify as a genuine scientific study or work. It's more like a personal view/observation.

Every single word or sentence seems to have a high speculative inference. A detailed critical assessment would require an extended time and effort. I will be happy to do so if someone could consider paying for it. In addition, I will require interaction with author(s) who have experience working in science to explain to me if they understand what is being described. I doubt anyone will come forward to explain it because if someone had scientific expertise, this publication would not have so many errors and false claims and would not have been submitted for publication.

My conclusion is that this publication is an example of a certified BS'

Some observations from the articles with my comments (in red) are described below.

"... that merit further investigation to better understand this condition and inform future research into diagnostic and therapeutic approaches." **There is no conclusion, but more funding is needed for further "research."**

"In summary, by revealing distinct immunological features of PVS, this study helped generate hypotheses regarding the underlying pathobiology of this condition." **It generated hypotheses for further research and funding but nothing definitive. The study claim is a guess, not a scientifically valid claim or conclusion.**

“ ... COVID-19 vaccines have prevented millions of COVID-19 deaths.” How? It is common knowledge that there is no such thing as COVID-19. The illness is claimed to be caused by a virus (SARS-COV-2) that has not been shown to exist. Therefore, the claim of the illness has to be false. Moreover, COVID-19 vaccines have never been tested on COVID-19 patients, so the conclusion that vaccines were effective against illnesses or prevented deaths is false ([link](#)).

"... Serological evidence of recent Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) reactivation was observed more frequently in PVS participants." There is no scientific evidence for the existence of viruses. Therefore, the claim of reactivation is false ([link](#)).

"These findings reveal potential immune differences in individuals with PVS that merit further investigation to better understand this condition and inform future research into diagnostic and therapeutic approaches." It is "potential" cause that requires "further" research. It is not a scientific conclusion but a request for funding further "research" which may disprove the so-called "conclusions."

"For example, vaccine components, such as mRNA, lipid nanoparticles, and adenoviral vectors, trigger activation of pattern recognition receptors." From a scientific perspective, these are all speculations and guesses, as vaccine components such as mRNA. There are no valid scientific tests available for such components ([link](#)). Hence, claims are unsubstantiated.

"Secondly, it has been shown that the S protein expressed following BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 vaccination circulates in the plasma as early as one day after vaccination." It is impossible to see or test s-protein, as no valid scientific test/method is available.

"However, upwards of 40% of SARS-CoV-2 infections are asymptomatic." There is no such thing as an asymptomatic infection. However, it means the test is false and showing positive when it should not ([link](#)).

"The next step was to evaluate if the most recent exposure to SARS-CoV-2 ..." One cannot evaluate exposure to SARS-COV-2, as no scientifically valid test is available ([link](#)).

"Hence, we next sought to investigate whether the S1 subunit of the SARS-CoV-2 S protein could be detected in the plasma ..." It is impossible to study the subunit of SAR-COV-2. For a valid scientific study, one requires a test involving a sample (reference standard of the "thing," virus, or subunit) that is unavailable. Hence, the subunit cannot be determined. Therefore, the claim is false ([link](#)).

"This study has several limitations. Our small sample size could have affected the robustness of the machine learning approaches and prediction of specific immune features in PVS." **The conclusion lacks the needed strength.**

"However, this study is early-stage and requires replication and validation." **Suggesting the replication and validation of the study may be questionable.**