

Covid vaccination: High effectiveness "was never reproducible."

[Martina Frei](#) / 9.02.2023

The proven expert Franz Allerberger considers the claim of an effectiveness of 95 percent to be "irresponsible".

Professor Allerberger, you contracted Corona after your sixth Covid vaccination. How well do the mRNA vaccinations work?

In reality, the 95 percent effectiveness that was initially postulated against Covid, i.e. against a positive PCR result, was never reproducible. If we normally have 60 percent effectiveness for respiratory infections, we're happy. The mRNA Covid vaccination protects against Sars-CoV-2 diseases similarly well and was therefore helpful.

Was the statement that the mRNA vaccinations were around 95 percent effective exaggerated?

That's putting it kindly. It was irresponsible to postulate something like that. In addition, it could not be substantiated with any scientific data. A lot of trust was lost there.

But the alleged effectiveness of around 95 percent was based on the results of the large approval studies?

The vaccination was sold as protection against Covid - that was completely unrealistic. Because against respiratory pathogens you need good immunity on the mucous membrane. It cannot be influenced nearly as well with a vaccine that is injected as with measles, mumps or rubella vaccinations. Measles, mumps and rubella are infections that affect the whole body, while respiratory infections like Covid mostly affect the mucous membrane. That's a huge difference. And that was clear from the start.

Obviously not all. Even the German virologist Sandra Ciesek, for example, recently confessed in the "Zeit" [Zeit](#) that she "thought that the vaccination would end the pandemic". Why had the pharmaceutical companies and the authorities never clearly communicated that the Covid vaccinations can only protect against infection to a very limited extent?

In my opinion, this Babylonian confusion of languages was deliberately accepted. So far, vaccines against similar respiratory pathogens have never achieved what has been postulated. Incidentally, this should also be kept in mind

when vaccines against RS viruses and other respiratory tract pathogens come onto the market.

But thanks to the vaccination, significantly fewer infected people had to go to a hospital or intensive care unit?

Yes. This vaccination is effective against severe Covid courses. It can even shorten the chain of infection. I consider them very valuable. But it was initially sold as a vaccine that protects against Covid. This is something completely different. Because Covid was defined as "positive PCR proof". This definition left us in a mess.

It is now said that the vaccination "cannot always prevent infection, but has been shown to protect against a severe course of Covid 19". This is what it says on an official information sheet in Austria. But people are still dying of Covid who were vaccinated.

A quarter of our patients with a severe course of Covid are vaccinated. It is therefore unjustifiable for a government to say apodictically: "Anyone who has been vaccinated does not have a severe course of the disease." Even the manufacturers disclose that the vaccination "may not protect all vaccinated people".

This information is included in the package insert for the Pfizer/Biontech vaccination, for example. We also do not see in Austria that people who did not get vaccinated against Covid are affected by Covid so much more often. This argues against the vaccination having such a large effect on severe disease progression as has been postulated.

This does not mean that this vaccine should not be promoted. But there is no such thing as 100% protection. This applies to all vaccinations. For example, six people have died of measles in German-speaking countries in recent years, two of whom were vaccinated.

An official estimate in the UK came to the conclusion that it takes thousands to hundreds of thousands of boosters across different age groups for a person to avoid developing severe Covid disease. On the other hand, there are the side effects that were not calculated there

I am not qualified to comment on these figures from the UK. The task of public health professionals is to see where we can use the available money with the greatest possible benefit. If we act on Covid according to the motto "no matter what the cost" and want to prevent every death, then my concern is that the money we need there will not be available elsewhere afterwards. In the retirement homes, for example, the exact number of minutes that basic care may last is calculated. But when it comes to Covid, the money flows. Also in science.

In February 2021, together with colleagues, you published a study [Studie](#) in which you were able to show that a previous infection with Sars-CoV-2 protects against further infections at least as well as vaccination. How were the reactions?

We were "beaten" when this was published.

The Swiss task force was still struggling to make such a statement in the summer of 2021. With reference to the antibody levels, she even advocated limiting the validity of the recovered certificate to six months, i.e. only half as long as the certificate for vaccinated people was valid at the time - a mistake?

The best possible immunization is to go through the disease.

Doesn't both, an illness that has gone through and an additional booster, lead to even better protection?

Yes, I'm afraid we will see annual vaccinations and natural infection every few years as "normal" in the future.

One of your co-authors on the publication mentioned was the infectiologist and epidemiologist John P.A. Ioannidis. A well-known Swiss scientist has described Ioannidis as "extremely controversial".

Dissent is normal in science. Ioannidis may have made mistakes - like all of us in this pandemic - but he remains one of the brightest people in this field. Ioannidis is one of the most successful epidemiologists and has more experience than some inexperienced scientists who have been hailed as experts. In the "Ischgl study" the mortality rate was 0.26 percent. This coincides with what Ioannidis estimated. He was right when he claimed the mortality rate from Covid was in the parts per thousand range.

The output of the scientists during the pandemic was gigantic: the "PubMed" database alone lists over 330,000 publications on the keyword Covid-19. During this time you yourself published several studies in the very respected journals of the "Science" and "Nature" groups. Despite this, you were attacked by colleagues.

I was even accused of «slandering». It is common for people to disagree in science. But that it gets personal, that accusations are made that one has worked dubiously, or that one would "not pull together" just because the results do not fit with politics - I have never experienced that in my 40-year career. Some scientists demanded that we had to adapt the

scientific results to the needs of politics. I can only shake my head at that.