

The LANCET Case Series and the DOCUMENTED Truths around Gastrointestinal Disease, Autism and the MMR

Dr. Andrew Wakefield Sets the Record Straight, Again

Calls on the BMJ to Retract the Latest False Allegations Made by Brian Deer

“My goal is to find answers for children suffering from autism. There are two sides to this issue, I realize, and we have our differences. But our first priority as physicians must be to help the children who are suffering from autism, to find ways to treat them, and to protect other children from this disease. Our children must come first -- before the medical industry and before public health policy,” argues Dr. Wakefield.

BMJ/Deer Allegation One:

Dr. Wakefield altered clinical findings in the LANCET case series to report bowel disease in the children where none existed

Dr. Wakefield’s response:

The findings reported in the LANCET case series reflect exactly what Professor John Walker-Smith recorded in his notes for a scientific meeting 14 months before the case series was published (see Walker-Smith document). The clinical assessments of these 7 children were Professor Walker-Smiths (not Dr. Wakefield’s); the findings were supported by senior pathologist Dr. Dhillon; and they match exactly what was published in the LANCET. This document confirms beyond doubt that Dr. Wakefield committed no fraud. No histories were altered for the LANCET case series, and this document proves that.

In the BMJ, Deer provided a table comparing what he had found in the General Practitioner’s (GP) records and what was reported in The LANCET paper. He cited inconsistencies as evidence of fraud. First, the GP records (other than a referral letter to the Pediatric Gastroenterology team) were not available to doctors who wrote The LANCET paper, so **fraudulent misrepresentation was not possible. Second, Deer used wrong or incomplete information from the GP records in order to create the impression of fraud (see Callous Disregard at www.callousdisregard.com and <http://childhealthsafety.wordpress.com/2011/01/16/the-big-lie-ii/>**

BMJ/Deer Allegation Two:

The Lancet paper was a case series of 12 child patients; it reported a proposed “new syndrome” of enterocolitis and regressive autism and associated this with MMR as an “apparent precipitating event.” But in fact, three of nine children reported with regressive autism did not have autism diagnosed at all. Only one child clearly had regressive autism.

Dr. Wakefield's Response:

Based upon the prospective records of development within the normal range for age, all children showed loss of skills and developmental regression. This was documented by the clinical team and the developmental diagnoses were reported accurately. (See *Callous Disregard* Chapters 2 and 12.)

BMJ/Deer Allegation Three:

Despite the paper claiming that all 12 children were “previously normal,” five had documented pre-existing developmental concerns.

Dr. Wakefield's Response

Mr. Deer, who is not a clinician, confuses ear infections and febrile seizures with developmental concerns. The developmental histories were exactly as described in THE LANCET paper. (See *Callous Disregard* Chapters 2 and 12.)

BMJ/Deer Allegation Four:

Some children were reported to have experienced first behavioral symptoms within days of MMR, but the records documented these as starting some months after vaccination.

Dr. Wakefield's Response:

The onset of first behavioral symptoms is exactly as described in the paper. A typical example of Deer's errors, and their corrections are provided in Appendix 1. (See *Callous Disregard* Chapters 2 and 12.)

BMJ/Deer Allegation Five:

In nine cases, unremarkable colonic histopathology results—noting no or minimal fluctuations in inflammatory cell populations—were changed after a medical school “research review” to “non-specific colitis.”

Dr Wakefield's Response:

All intestinal biopsy tissues went through three rounds of microscopic review to the highest scientific standards: the first from the duty non-specialist histopathologist, the second by Professor Walker-Smith and his team, and the third – a blinded review – by Dr. Amar Dhillon, the senior pathologist with expertise in intestinal diseases. (Statement of Dr. A.P. Dhillon to the GMC lawyers, footnote 14. p. 214 and p. 199-203 *Callous Disregard: Autism and Vaccines – The Truth Behind a Tragedy*. 2010. New York. Skyhorse Publishing, and Complaint against Brian Deer to UK's Press Complaints Commission (pending).

BMJ/Deer Allegation Six:

The parents of eight children were reported as blaming MMR, but 11 families made this allegation at the hospital. The exclusion of three allegations—all giving times to onset of problems in months—helped to create the appearance of a 14 day temporal link.

Dr Wakefield's Response:

Only children whose parent's made the link at the time of their child's regression were

included. To have included those who made the link later “at the hospital” therefore relying on recall, would have been misleading.

BMJ/Deer Allegation Seven:

Patients were recruited through anti-MMR campaigners, and the study was commissioned and funded for planned litigation.

Dr Wakefield’s Response:

The Children in The Lancet paper were seen on the basis of their clinical symptoms following referral from their family doctor or pediatrician. The study had nothing whatsoever to do with litigation, nor was is funded for planned litigation.

Appendix 1

Deer challenged : Deer’s response to being caught falsifying the facts about Child 1.

[Deer] "40 Well, I see Wakefield in his interview with George S lights on the case of child 1 in his fraudulent case series.

So be it. We can do child 1 here on Orac's page. And we can show what a cheat was at work. In my original copy, I highlighted this case as among those which showed the most evidence of "midnight oil". I'd be only to happy to go over it [sic].

This is the one where the ONLY symptom positively asserted as remembered something like 2 years later by the mother (7-10 days) after MMR is that her son was "pale". Yes: "pale".

Then the clinician (hunting for evidence against MMR) prompted the mother and took down a "maybe" and a "possibly", for a fever reaction, which he recorded in his notes with question marks.

Wakefield, in writing up the paper, then deleted the question marks - which is itself research fraud - and claimed that "delirium" was the first symptom of autism.

This was at one year. And yet the hospital's neurologist, working with Wakefield (and who in fact was Wakefield's closest personal ally on the project), recorded that the boy reached his normal milestones until 18 months.

And at 9 months, a GP took a history which included that the boy's older brother was autistic, and that the mother had brought the child because she was concerned about his hearing, and also that he may have an ear infection.

Sadly, with or without an ear infection (which elsewhere in the paper Wakefield uses to date the first onset of behavioural symptoms in another child, hence contradicting himself on this point), that encounter may have been (and I didn't say it was) a classic first presentation of autism. Indeed, the child went on the usual circuit of audiology clinics, which is typical of these unfortunae kids, and his hearing was, as is typical, normal. He just wasn't responding, which is typical.

In fact, unlike delirium, behaviour such as to lead parents to fear that a child cannot hear properly is a classic behavioural symptom of autism.

In any event, there were grounds to suspect a problem starting before vaccination, and grounds to suspect a problem starting long after vaccination. And no grounds to suspect a problem starting a week after vaccination, which was the plainest fraud - involving the deletion of question marks, the misrepresentation of symptoms as indicative of possible autism, and the alteration of the time-frame recorded by the clinician.

Wakefield then claimed that this boy had regressive autism, despite the fact that both admission and discharge summaries said he had "classical" autism.

Here is the history I gave;”

<http://briandeer.com/solved/bmj-wakefield-1-2.htm>

Dr. Wakefield's Response to The British Medical Journal

Feature: How the case against the MMR vaccine was fixed

Brian Deer BMJ 2011 342:c5347; doi:10.1136/bmj.c5347

Further to prior correspondence, please confirm whether BMJ will post this in response to Mr Deer's allegations regarding Child 1.

Additionally, would you ask Dr Godlee and Dr Groves to confirm the following history shows Child 1 regressed into autism following the MMR vaccination:-

Contrary to what Mr Deer says, the records appear to show that Child 1 regressed after the MMR vaccine. If Mr Deer wishes to cite evidence to the contrary, please can he indicate where it may be found?

The GMC transcript records that the referral letter to The Royal Free Hospital from Child 1's family doctor stated:-

"[Child 1] initially developed normally, reaching the normal milestones until he was about 15 months old. He then regressed and has now been diagnosed as autistic"

That shows Child 1 had regressive autism. Mr Deer appears to be engaging in a semantic distinction without a difference.

"Regressive autism" not a formal diagnostic term under DSM IV or ICD 9 or 10 but is a term used to distinguish an autistic condition which appears to start at birth from an autistic condition which occurs after a period of normal development where the child regresses into an autistic condition.

And what did the family doctor records show?:-

Before MMR:-

"4.11.93", which records that Child 1 is:

"New patient – recently posted from XXXX. Mum worried re hearing/wax in ears/? Discharge left ear ... Reassured."

MMR 19 January 1994

After MMR:-

"Little co-operation with psychomotor assessment. Will not obey. Tantrums when denied. Does not seem to understand or express speech very much."

That is not the same child behaviourally but that is Child 1 before and after MMR.

Child 1 - Hearing

11.3.93 [age 2 months] Health visitor record:

"Hearing and development normal."

12.8.93 [age 7 months] Health visitor record:

"Hearing and development normal."

And the family doctor records as seen above shows that the family doctor reassured the mother about Child 1's hearing on 4.11.93. But after MMR on 19 January 1994 Child 1's hearing was not normal according to the results of the audiology tests.

The records shows as of 27 February 1995:-

"Child 1 was tested by distraction technique using a variety of high and low frequency signals, namely to Voice, High Frequency Rattle, Low frequency Signal and the G Chime Bar. He responded at minimal levels to all these Msignals bilaterally. We are satisfied that Child 1's hearing is adequate for normal development of speech and have discharged him from this clinic."

But Child 1 did not develop normal speech and lost the few words gained prior to MMR."

I look forward to hearing from you.