

- [Home](#)
- [Contact](#)
- [Site Map](#)
- [Read Me](#)
- [Vaccines Did Not Save Us – 2 Centuries of Official Statistics](#)

Child Health Safety

[Entries RSS](#) | [Comments RSS](#)

• Key Data for Parents

[Measles - Official UK Statistics](#)

[US Statistics Measles - Rapid Decline Regardless of Vaccination](#)

• Recent Posts

- [Conflicted Government Expert Airbrushes Embarrassing Autism Science](#)
- [Children Risk Untested Flu Vaccines In Hyped Pandemic](#)
- [Minister Misled Parliament Over MMR Autism Link](#)
- [Sunday Times Defies Press Complaints Commission – News Release](#)
- [Doctor’s MMR Fears – 3,000 babies at risk](#)
- [Gardasil Victims – In Memoriam – Healthy Young Women – Aged 15 to 21](#)
- [Sunday Times’ Discredited – Wakefield’s Autism Research Verified](#)
- [Sunday Times Ordered ‘Remove Wakefield MMR “Data Fixing” Story’](#)
- [No UK Compulsory MMR \[Government U-Turns Amid Drug Industry Links\]](#)
- [Parents Cure Autism – As Useless Docs Fail Kids](#)
- [“Children to Die” – Latest Flu Scaremongering](#)
- [MMR Causes Autism – Another Win In US Federal Court](#)
- [Japanese Data Show Vaccines Cause Autism](#)
- [Compulsory Vaccination for Wales](#)
- [HPV Vaccine Questioned Internationally](#)

• Translations

الترجمة الحاسوبية
معدل وفيات الأمهات السريرية البريطانية اللقاحات الملفات المفتوحة القسري عن طريق رفع دعوى قانونية
دعوى قانونية

Перевод с русского на русский национальный
[СЕКРЕТНЫЕ БРИТАНСКИЕ ФАЙЛЫ О ДОКАЗАННЫХ ОПАСНОСТЯХ ВАКЦИНЫ ПРОТИВ КОРИ, ПАРОТИТА, КРАСНУХИ - ПЛЮСЕРИКС \(PLUSERIX MMR\)](#)

Equipo de traducción
[Secreto británico Vacuna MMR forzoso Abrir Archivos Por Acción Legal](#)

Computer Translation
[Secret Files vaccins ROR britannique ouverte par la force d'action juridique](#)

Computer-Übersetzung
[British Secret MMR-Impfstoff Forced-Dateien öffnen Legal Action](#)

-  [Search Engine Submission - AddMe](#)



- **Pages**

- [Contact](#)
- [Site Map](#)
- [Read Me](#)
- [Vaccines Did Not Save Us – 2 Centuries of Official Statistics](#)

-

[Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 38 British Boys – Cambridge Study](#)

Posted on March 21, 2009 by childhealthsafty



A new Cambridge University study's figures show 1 in 38 British boys has an autistic condition. Autistic spectrum conditions are already costing the UK £28 billion per annum: "[One child in 60 'suffers from a form of autism'](#)" By Sue Reid, Daily Mail, UK 20th March 2009. The new study authors advise Government services planners to revise calculations of child service provision on a rate of 1 in 60 British boys and girls, but 4 in 5 cases affect boys.

1 in 38 boys affected

ie. 4 boys in every 150 boys

Despite this health authorities worldwide refuse to carry out large-scale studies comparing vaccinated to unvaccinated children. Such studies would determine finally the issue of the extent to which vaccination is implicated in causing the condition.

This demonstrates the pharmaceutical industry's success expanding profits into vaccination over the past 20 years by encouraging a quasi religious belief that vaccines are vitally important.

A study of vaccinated and unvaccinated children by charity Generation Rescue reveals rates of autism in unvaccinated children are lower: [Vaccinated vs. Unvaccinated](#). Dr Mayor Eisenstein of a Chicago USA family medical practice claims his practice has seen few or no autism cases amongst 35,000 unvaccinated child patients. Autism amongst Amish families in the USA are reported to be very low, as are vaccination rates.

If you are concerned, you must write to your political representative and keep writing to demand the proper studies are carried out [See end for how to email].

It is important studies of vaccinated against unvaccinated children are carried out by truly independent unbiased objective researchers. Too many currently involved are tainted by drug and health officials' influence. Clinical studies are needed. Studies currently relied on are epidemiological [statistical] studies which are easily manipulated [*as used by the tobacco industry in 40's and 50's to prove smoking does not cause cancer*].

The new figures also take no account of other neurological disorders like speech impediments, ADHD and tics, which have been associated in a study by the US Centers for Disease Control: [CDC & Vaccine Caused Neurological Disorders](#).

Many individually brought cases of vaccine caused autism have been successful in the US Courts: [AUTISM – US Court Decisions and Other Recent Developments – It’s Not Just MMR](#)

The study reveals that for every 3 known cases, there are a further two cases yet to be diagnosed:

The average age of diagnosis for childhood autism is around 3 to 4 years and for Aspergers’ Syndrome it is around 8 years, meaning half of all children affected under these ages are yet to be diagnosed.

The results were published at the International Meeting for Autism Research May 2008 and the IMFAR study has already been cited in 5 formal journal papers and an autism textbook:

[ESTIMATING AUTISM SPECTRUM PREVALENCE IN THE POPULATION: A SCHOOL BASED STUDY FROM THE UK](#)

Conclusions: The prevalence estimate of known cases of ASC, using different methods of ascertainment converges around 1%. The ratio of known to unknown cases means that for every three known cases there are another two unknown cases. This has implications for planning diagnostic, social and health services.”

Contacting Your UK or US Political Representative

USA

- [Contact the Senate](#)
- [Find Your Representative](#)
- [Write Your Representative](#)

UK Residents – Write To Your Politicians – Do It Now!

Write to your Member of Parliament with the link to this page. If you do not write to your MP, and do not keep on writing them, then don’t complain when politicians do nothing. Write to your Member of Parliament with the link to this page. It is their job to represent you.

Ask your MP to ask for proper clinical studies comparing vaccinated to unvaccinated children and that these are by independent unbiased objective researchers. Ask that the UK’s Secretary of State explain why the British Government allows officials of the UK’s Department of Health to cause the human rights of **children** to be violated.

To email your MP, all you need to know is your MP’s name. MP’s email addresses are in the form:-

surname.initial@parliament.uk.

To find out who your MP is click on this link:-

<http://www.writetothem.com/>

More You Can Do

If you found this information helpful – share this page with others:-

- email the links to this page to others
- post links to this page
 - on your website
 - on your blog
 - in comments on relevant websites and blogs
- email them to health journalists and journalists from your local newspapers, TV and radio stations – [phone them for details of email addresses or look them up on the internet]

Here is a link for you to copy and paste :-

[Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 38 British Boys – Cambridge Study](#)

RELATED POSTS:

[US Research Fraud, Tax Dollars And Italian Vaccine Mercury Study](#)

[MMR/Autism Cases Win In US Vaccine Court](#)

[Autism Not Genetic – Says Expert Professor Simon Baron Cohen](#)

[Vaccines Did Not Save Us – 2 Centuries of Official Statistics](#)

[Brian Deer’s Boss Joins MMR Manufacturer Glaxo’s Board](#)

[Sunday Times Journalist In Cedillo Vaccine Case Controversy](#)

[Sunday Times Journalist Admits Wakefield MMR Data Fixing Allegation Is Unqualified Speculation](#)

[Sunday Times’ London Editor Must Quit Over False “Wakefield MMR Data Fixing” Story](#)

[US Federal Court, US Justice Dept & The Sunday Times – More Questions Than Answers](#)

[Sunday Times Journalist Challenged Over Role in US MMR Cases & Denying Being Complainant In UK MMR Case](#)

[Sunday Times Journalist Made Up Wakefield MMR Data Fixing Allegation](#)

[Sunday Times – Sinks To New Low With Yet More MMR Junk Journalism](#)

[Dr Andrew Wakefield Demolishes Ignorant US Vaccine Lobby](#)

[UK’s GMC, Dr Jayne Donegan’s Story, Vaccines & MMR](#)

[Secret British MMR Vaccine Files Forced Open By Legal Action](#)

Possibly related posts: (automatically generated)

- [British Minister Misled Parliament Over US MMR Autism Case](#)
- [Cambridge University Autism Expert Highlights Flaw In Reports of New Autism...](#)
- [British research finds many undiagnosed kids with autism](#)
- [A Genetic Clue to Why Autism Affects Boys More](#)

Filed under: [ADHD](#), [Aspergers](#), [Barak Obama](#), [Child Health Safety](#), [Disease Statistics](#), [Hannah Poling](#), [John Poling](#), [MMR](#), [Obama](#), [Vaccine Damage](#), [Vaccines](#), [autism](#), [vaccination](#), [vaccine](#), [vaccine court](#) | Tagged: [ADHD](#), [Andrew Wakefield](#), [Aspergers](#), [autism](#), [Barak Obama](#), [Baron Cohen](#), [Brian Deer](#), [CDC](#), [David Kirby](#), [fraud](#), [genetic](#), [genetics](#), [Hannah Poling](#), [immunisation](#), [Jon Poling](#), [Julie Gerberding](#), [MMR](#), [Obama](#), [Professor Baron Cohen](#), [Professor Simon Baron Cohen](#), [research](#), [research fraud](#), [Simon Baron Cohen](#), [Sunday Times](#), [vaccination](#), [vaccine](#), [vaccine adverse reaction](#), [Vaccine Damage](#), [vaccine risks](#), [Vaccines](#), [Wakefield](#)

« [Times’ Group Journo Costs GMC £1M – But Blames MMR Doc! Dr Ben Glaxacre’s “BadScience” Gets It Wrong – Again](#) »

24 Responses

1. [Health Blog » Blog Archive » Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 48 British Boys - Cambridge Study](#), on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:32 am](#) Said:

[...] View original here: [Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 48 British Boys – Cambridge Study](#) [...]

2. [Topics about Religion » Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 48 British Boys - Cambridge Study](#), on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:38 am](#) Said:

[...] _____ Child Health Safety _____ put an intriguing blog post on Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 48 British Boys – Cambridge Study Here’s a quick excerpt: :: :: :: :: :: :: Cambridge University study figures show 1 in 48 British boys has an autistic condition, which is already costing the UK £28 billion per annum: “One child in 60 ’suffers from a form of autism” By Sue Reid, Daily Mail, UK 20th March 2009. The new study authors advise Government services planners to revise calculations of child service provision on a rate of 1 in 60 British boys and girls, but 4 in 5 cases affects boys. Despite this health authorities worldwide re [...]

3. [Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 48 British Boys - Cambridge Study | ongamesnet.com](#), on [March 21st, 2009 at 9:03 am](#) Said:

[...] here to see the original: [Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 48 British Boys – Cambridge Study Related Articles](#)BookmarksTags Girls Generation-Baby Baby Korean girl group Girls [...]

4. **Richard Lockwood**, on [March 21st, 2009 at 6:34 pm](#) Said:

The vaccinated versus non-vaccinated children study has already been done.

<http://www.medicine.ox.ac.uk/bandolier/booth/Vaccines/MMRDen.html>

“Clinical bottom line

A large survey of all children born in Denmark between January 1991 to December 1998 shows no difference in the incidence of autism between vaccinated and unvaccinated children.”

The raw data’s available at that link.

[ED: Thank you for making the point. Madsen is a deeply flawed "study" by "researchers" who were not independent or unbiased or objective.

Summarised by The Cochrane Collaboration's review of MMR safety:

"The follow up of diagnostic records ends one year (31 Dec 1999) after the last day of admission to the cohort. Because of the length of time from birth to diagnosis, it becomes increasingly unlikely that those born later in the cohort could have a diagnosis"

In short, to get the numbers they wanted Madsen et al included children who could not possibly have a diagnosis and when the data was re analysed to correct Madsen's "error" it produced the opposite conclusion.

Or in the words of a lead author of the Cochrane review in an interview with Richard Halvorsen for Halvorsen's book "The Truth about Vaccines":-

"The safety studies of MMR vaccine are crap. They're the best crap we have but they're still crap".

Still want to reply on Madsen?

There is much more that can be said about this "study" [and much of it has been]. Madsen never resurfaced to answer the criticisms. Peer review in action.

And in science, just as one swallow does not make a summer, one paper does not make anything, and less than anything when like Madsen it is neither replicated nor withstands criticism. And Madsen is another statistical study – just like those used to prove smoking does not cause lung cancer. It is not a clinical study and it sure ain't "science".

And if you want to refer to reliable websites, Bandolier and its supposedly "Evidence Based Medicine" does not cut much ice here. On Bandolier one can find enough biased comment lacking in objectivity to justify that. They have not corrected their website to point out Madsen's "error", nor the Cochrane Collaboration's review of it – speaks for itself – Bandolier seem to be a bunch of Oxford academics seemingly toeing the Glaxo line.

Next please.

5. **Richard Lockwood**, on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:10 pm](#) Said:

As this study shows catagorically that your theory is nonsense, I was hardly expecting you to say "oops – yes. You're right". So, as expected, you put out your own pat response which consists primarily of ad hom attacks and a quote supposedly given to that well known anti-MMR Dr, Halvorsen – who makes his living from doling out single jabs.

Frankly Mr Stone, yes. I'll take the figures from this study over any of your spin on it. It pretty well destroys your theory, and you can't spin it any other way. Your supposed "reanalysis" of the data – is it published anywhere other than that journal of quackery, the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons? The rebuttal seems to have been made by other famed anti-vaccination activists, Yazbak and Carol Stott. As you say – hardly impartial.

I don't expect you to publish this comment, obviously – I expect you to bin it, and then accuse me of "running away" from your powers of argument.

ED: Thanks Richard Lockwood – [or is it Rich Scopie?]. This matter is dealt with as your response so ably demonstrates. The Cochrane Collaboration MMR safety review confirms the "error" in the Madsen study published in the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons. Looks like two peer reviewed publications trashing Madsen. We need more independent journals like the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons which refuse to take drug company advertising and have a policy of the applying the scientific method. Shame more do not have that integrity.]

6. [Richard Lockwood](#), on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:58 pm](#) Said:

As you are so keen on the accuracy of the Cochrane Collaboration's MMR Safety Review, perhaps you should mention that the review found:

“No credible evidence of an involvement of MMR with either autism or Crohn's disease was found.”

You can't have it both ways.

And either Scopie or Lockwood – I'm not worried. Whichever you feel more comfortable with.

ED: It is spelt “Collaboration” and not “Collaberation”. Thank you also for providing a further illustration of the point about bias, lack of independence and objectivity.

The statement you quote appears nowhere either in the discussion or in the conclusions of the paper. It is not a finding of the review. The preamble to the paper, which contains that statement was written after the paper but is not part of its conclusions. That raises questions about who added such a statement and why.

And it does not assist you because as the Cochrane Collaboration MMR safety review confirmed the Madsen “error” validating that “error” identified in the Goldman and Yazbak peer reviewed paper which confirms the correct analysis of the Madsen data shows an increase in autism.

Additionally, another peer reviewed paper in the independent Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons “[Questions on the Independence and Reliability of Cochrane Reviews](#)” found that:-

“The conclusions of the Cochrane review on the safety and effectiveness of MMR vaccine violate the standards of evidence based medicine and are not supported by the body of the review. There are material concerns that the conclusions were influenced by efforts of the British government to avoid liability in claims brought on behalf of allegedly vaccine-injured children.”

Those criticisms have been put to the Cochrane Collaboration and have never been answered. Another example of scientific peer review in action. Game, set and match.

Next please.

7. [Fielding J Hurst](#), on [March 22nd, 2009 at 4:13 am](#) Said:

Is it 1 in 38 or 1 in 48? You mention both above.

[ED: It is 1 in 38. The calculation is:-

- there are two unknown for every three known
- 1 in 100 children are known cases
- so for every 300 children, there are 3 known and 2 unknown cases [5 in total]
- 4 in every 5 cases is a boy
- roughly half of the 300 children will be boys
- so 4 in 150 boys will have an Autistic Spectrum Condition
- that is approximately 1 in 38

8. [Richard Lockwood](#), on [March 22nd, 2009 at 9:34 am](#) Said:

Mr Stone,

The phrase “No credible evidence of an involvement of MMR with either autism or Crohn's disease was found.” is found in the plain language summary; <http://www.cochrane.org/reviews/en/ab004407.html>

The abstract reads: “Exposure to MMR was unlikely to be associated with Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, autism or aseptic meningitis ”

You claim bias – but what you actually mean is that the final findings of the Cochrane Collaboration's Review doesn't support your position, and so you're not prepared to accept that. You are, however, prepared to accept individual lines which appear to cast any

doubt at all on that final finding. That's not bias on the part of Chchrane – that's cherry picking on your part.

When it comes down to it, the study has been done, and has found no evidence of a link.

ED: Blog rhetoric does not cut it. And thank you also for highlighting another anomaly in the Cochrane MMR safety review. They should also have said “We have also found no credible evidence exposure to MMR does not cause autism etc”? If they included one side, then they should have included that. They did not. And Cochrane have already hung themselves. They have not answered the criticisms of their paper. That is science – that is peer review – it is tough. End of.

Next please.

9. **Richard Lockwood**, on [March 22nd, 2009 at 10:04 am](#) Said:

In that case, surely they should have included the phrases: “We have also found no credible evidence exposure to MMR does not cause global warming”, “We have also found no credible evidence exposure to MMR does not cause syphilis” and “We have also found no credible evidence exposure to MMR does not cause recipients to vote Lib Dem.”

They found no evidence to suggest that it does cause autism. End of. That, Mr Stone, is the science, Cochrane have not hung themselves – except in your eyes, by not coming to the conclusion you would like. That, I'm afraid is what's tough. You need to find the evidence that MMR causes autism – you haven't found it, it isn't there. Move on.

[ED: Blog rhetoric does not cut it. And fortunately, people have moved on, but you seem not to have done.

There have been successful cases in the US Courts where it has been proven vaccines cause autistic spectrum conditions and new research showing the details of causal mechanisms.

What are you getting so worked up about? Aren't you glad we are getting closer to stopping this international health disaster for all the world's children, or do you just want to come on someone else's blog and rant and defend drug companies? Because that is exactly what the above comments are beginning to look like.

You are very close to being blocked from this entire site for being a nuisance. No further comment from you on this topic will be accepted.]

10. **Sally O'Boyle**, on [March 22nd, 2009 at 2:54 pm](#) Said:

Thank you for all you do. The evidence is overwhelming on the vaccine question. They do far more harm than good. Even Luis Pasteur agreed... This is solely an issue of Big Pharma gone bad, money over all. Keep up the good work. I appreciate your efforts and post your news on facebook and digg.

11. **Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 38 British Boys - Cambridge Study - [SZ] « Amy and Simon Blog**, on [March 22nd, 2009 at 4:50 pm](#) Said:

[...] Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 38 British Boys – Cambridge Study [...]

12. **johnstone**, on [March 23rd, 2009 at 12:46 am](#) Said:

I concur with CHS's calculation, 1 in 38.

13. **childhealthsafety**, on [March 23rd, 2009 at 11:09 am](#) Said:

In further reply to Richard Lockwood, [March 21st, 2009 @ 6:34 pm, 8:10pm, 08.58pm, 22 Mar @ 09.34am, 10:34am] who said “The vaccinated versus non-vaccinated children study has already been done.”

In addition to all else, a study of MMR vaccinated against non-MMR vaccinated is hopeless if children in the supposedly non-vaccinated group have had other vaccines.

We do not know how many vaccines cause autism. In the successful US Court case of Hannah Poling, Hannah received nine vaccines in one day, including but not limited to MMR..

14. **Hot News » The Cambridge Group**, on [March 23rd, 2009 at 11:40 am](#) Said:

[...] — Live Stage: Cyberscholar Working Group [Cambridge, MA]...Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 38 British Boys – Cambridge Study « _____ Child Health Sa...Cambridge School hosts international food festival | Asia Daily News Online Top [...]

15. **Kim**, on [March 23rd, 2009 at 4:00 pm](#) Said:

Thank you for keeping this information available and for the world to be a safer place to have our children. Kim

16. **John Stone**, on [March 25th, 2009 at 2:40 pm](#) Said:

Recollecting how this story was originally sunk by Simon Baron-Cohen and Ben Goldacre when it first appeared in the Observer I posted in British Medical Journal on Monday (two days ago) under Goldacre's article, asking them to explain it. We still await a response.

<http://www.bmj.com/cgi/eletters/335/7611/126>

It will be recalled that the story – which now turns out to be true – was removed from the web, and was said to be in part instrumental in Observer editor, Roger Alton, losing his job. So, what do Baron-Cohen and Goldacre now have to say?

It looks like nothing.

Goldacre has never answered criticism about his use of statistics in denying any connection between MMR and autism.

<http://www.bmj.com/cgi/eletters/335/7618/480#176662>

Ben receiving his Glaxo award for 'Never Mind the Facts'

<http://tinyurl.com/csslwt>

17. **Richard Lockwood**, on [March 25th, 2009 at 5:58 pm](#) Said:

While banning me from commenting on this story, you're quite happy to come back several days later, with a spurious point that you've just thought of.

While any study which includes other vaccinations is of course not enough to disprove the whole "vaccines causes autism", this study was specifically comparing MMR and non-MMR vaccinated children, and clearly demonstrates that MMR doesn't cause autism.

Stating that it doesn't prove this or that is disingenuous – you're implying that the study claims something it doesn't, and then that you're showing that it doesn't prove any such thing. Hardly surprising really.

[ED: You have been shown that Madsen et al's "error" has been set out in two peer reviewed medical papers, but you refuse to accept scientific peer review in action has discredited the paper and the authors failed to come back to answer.

Madsen did not compare MMR and non-MMR vaccinated children because it failed to exclude confounding factors of what other vaccines children in each group may have had. That is a fatal flaw.

Madsen also "clearly demonstrates" nothing other than the authors included data they should not have done and when corrected shows the opposite of what they claimed in their paper.

That is case closed in science but it seems not for you. And Madsen et al is not science but easily manipulated statistics and in this case the analysis has been shown to be invalid. This dialogue is over. Each side of the case has been put. There is nothing more to say. The decision to bring further comment from you to an end was the right one, as this further exchange demonstrates.]

[ED2: And there is nothing spurious about the point made. To have valid epidemiology you need to compare exposed populations to populations which have not been exposed to the risk concerned. Doing anything else means any such study has failed to exclude a serious confounding factor.]

18. **childhealthsafety**, on [March 26th, 2009 at 9:55 am](#) Said:

The comments by Richard [Rich Scopie] Lockwood on this blog demonstrate just how zealous these autism denialist campaigners are, supporting the commercial interest of the drug industry by denying the autism pandemic and the desperate damage done to helpless children by vaccines and at a time when the risks of the diseases the vaccines are meant to "protect" against have become minimal [especially when compared to what is now 1 in 38 British Boys being diagnosed with an autistic condition]:-

This comment is classic:-

Richard Lockwood, on [February 15th, 2009 at 7:33 pm](#)

What a load of shit.

And here are some more:

Richard Lockwood, on [March 25th, 2009 at 5:58 pm](#)
 Richard Lockwood, on [March 21st, 2009 at 6:34 pm](#)
 Richard Lockwood, on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:10 pm](#)
 Richard Lockwood, on [March 21st, 2009 at 8:58 pm](#)
 Richard Lockwood, on [March 22nd, 2009 at 9:34 am](#)
 Richard Lockwood, on [March 22nd, 2009 at 10:04 am](#)

19. **colmcq**, on [March 27th, 2009 at 2:07 pm](#) Said:

“There’s nothing wrong with the Madsen paper that I can see. It’s easy for me to figure out what Suissa did. In Figure 2 of the Madsen paper he divided 263/1,647,504 by 53/482,360 to get an unadjusted relative risk of 1.45 (or autism “45% more likely.”) In other words, a relative risk unadjusted for the confounding effect of age. Suissa then goes on to argue that it’s “somewhat implausible for the adjusted rate ratio to fall below 1, unless the risk profile by age in the unvaccinated group is vastly different than in the vaccinated (effect-modification).” Well, the reason for adjusting for age in the first place was because the risk distribution of unvaccinated children is much younger than that of vaccinated children — this is confounding, not “effect modification.” The rest of Suissa’s argument has the same problem, except it’s compounded by (1) his misunderstanding that you can’t calculate “rates per 100,000 per year” from the Madsen study — Madsen calculated rates per person time, which is what the Young-Geier study should have done. (2) in the Madsen study the n of autism cases vaccinated >20 months age is just too few to quibble about: 30 out of 316.”

[ED: Thanks for pointing out that Suissa also found Madsen to be deeply flawed. That makes three serious critics - two published peer reviewed and one turned down, if recall is correct, by the New England Journal of Medicine. Isn't that the journal which has been caught out on a number of occasions publishing dodgy papers favourable to the drug industry? Sounds like Suissa must be right then.

And the above quote you supply is not from any peer reviewed material. This really does not cut it. You are quoting the bizarrely named "epiwonk" on Suissa. None of the prior material on this page even mentions Suissa. And "epiwonk"'s blogging on all of this kind of thing is so absurdly "wonky" that it has zero credibility.

Next please]

20. **colmcq**, on [March 27th, 2009 at 5:01 pm](#) Said:

Do you agree with Suissa’s working then? In other words was Suissa right calculating rates per 100,000 per year instead of rates per person time?

[ED: Why don't you write up a critique and submit it for publication to a peer reviewed journal and let them decide.

Do you seriously expect anyone to spend time working through a lengthy mathematical and statistical debate with you on a blog when there are already two peer reviewed papers showing Madsen is wrong, correspondence and a paper by Madsen indicating Madsen accepts the position and has also failed to make any attempt to rebut the criticisms of the Danish MMR/autism study?

This is a rhetorical question.]

21. **colmcq**, on [March 28th, 2009 at 12:08 pm](#) Said:

Your attempts at spin are rather sad when it has been clearly demonstrated why Suissa was completely wrong. I’m guessing that the two peer-reviewed papers make exactly the same mistake but can’t confirm this because you have given no references. Either way, I think it’s a great shame you won’t engage with the science: perhaps because you have some irrational hatred of vaccinations or perhaps because you simply don’t possess the mental horsepower to properly appraise it:

“Studies currently relied on are epidemiological [statistical] studies which are easily manipulated [as used by the tobacco industry in 40's and 50's to prove smoking does not cause cancer].”

It was only through the rigours of epidemiology that an extremely strong relationships between lung cancer and smoking was finally established. Would you dispute this?

[ED: This comment is approved because it shows you are displaying the typical characteristics of the irrational approach adopted by Dr Ben Glaxacre's BadScience crew. You make raise irrelevant issues and make provocative allegations and personal attacks to take the issues previously discussed off on a tangent.

You hilariously cite the eccentrically named "epiwonk"'s blogging on Suissa to extrapolate "epiwonk"'s non peer reviewed biased writing to claim that two peer reviewed papers, one by the Cochrane Collaboration are in error. And that is when they are in fact reporting Madsen's "error" in the Danish 10 year MMR study. Madsen et al included as not autistic children far too young to be diagnosed and a large number would not be diagnosed for the entire period of the study - and that applies to children born at the start of the 10 year period

as well as towards the very end. They failed to answer the peer reviewed criticisms of their work and Madsen subsequently appears to have agreed in a study in just ten months later “From 1991 until 2000 the incidence increased and continued to rise after the removal of thimerosal from vaccines.”

Then you talk about statistics as if science and display a comprehensive misunderstanding of epidemiology. Sir Richard Doll who is credited with Bradford Hill in establishing the link between smoking and lung cancer was insistent that for valid epidemiology there should be full clinical data on every subject - but that seems to be sorely lacking from the studies so far.

Next please.

22. **colmcq**, on [March 28th, 2009 at 1:39 pm](#) Said:

To recapitulate:

“You hilariously cite the eccentrically named “epiwonk”’s blogging on Suissa to extrapolate “epiwonk”’s non peer reviewed biased writing to claim that two peer reviewed papers, one by the Cochrane Collaboration are in error. ”

“Your attempts at spin are rather sad when it has been clearly demonstrated why Suissa was completely wrong. I’m guessing that the two peer-reviewed papers make exactly the same mistake but can’t confirm this because you have given no references. ”

We can move this discussion on if you would give me the references of the two peer-reviewed papers that prove Madsen to be wrong.

[ED: "Discussion?" - It is impossible to have a discussion with those who choose to be unencumbered by the facts.

And that applies the more so because you attempted to impose your views here without even apparently being aware of their existence. And once you are aware of them and find them, we will have more and more nonsense claims here from you.

If you cannot track down the Cochrane MMR safety review nor the paper by Goldman and Yazbak in the Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, you should not even be attempting what you euphemistically describe as "discussion" but which in reality will be more of the tosh the BadScience crew and the likes of Kev Leitch come up with.

For educational purposes for our readers watching in black and white, this will assist to demonstrate the kind of thing "[Lies, Damn Lies and Blog Posts](#)"]

23. **colmcq**, on [March 28th, 2009 at 5:52 pm](#) Said:

You are being deceitful and dishonest over Cochranes conclusions over Madsen; Yazbak’s and Goldman’s criticisms are weak and this paper wouldn’t have passed review in any reputable journal; it is clear that you neither understand Epidemiology nor have any desire to engage with the science.

[ED: Thanks for demonstrating to everyone reading this the kind of argument you engage in - abuse and unjustified allegations - just what we all have come to expect from the Dr Ben Glaxacre's BadScience Crew. the "epiwonks" and Kev Leeches of this world]

24. [Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 48 British Boys - Cambridge Study | Dr. Buttar's Blog](#), on [July 5th, 2009 at 3:35 pm](#) Said:

[...] Autism Rates Rocket – 1 in 48 British Boys – Cambridge Study March 21, 2009 childhealthsafty “Cambridge University study figures show 1 in 48 British boys has an autistic condition, which is already costing the UK £28 billion per annum: “One child in 60 ’suffers from a form of autism” By Sue Reid, Daily Mail, UK 20th March 2009. The new study authors advise Government services planners to revise calculations of child service provision on a rate of 1 in 60 British boys and girls, but 4 in 5 cases affects boys.” [...]

Leave a Reply

Name (required)

Mail (will not be published) (required)

Website

Submit Comment

-

March 2009

M T W T F S S

1

[2](#) 3 4 5 6 7 [8](#)

9 10 11 12 13 14 [15](#)

[16](#) 17 18 19 20 [21](#) 22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29

30 31

[« Feb](#) [Apr »](#)

• **TOP POSTS**

[Japanese Data Show Vaccines Cause Autism](#)

[UK Compulsory Vaccination Imminent](#)

[Secret British MMR Vaccine Files Forced Open By Legal Action](#)

[Autism Rates Rocket - 1 in 38 British Boys - Cambridge Study](#)

[Vaccines Implicated in Rocketing Childhood Diabetes Rates](#)

[Autism In Amish Children - 1 in 10,000](#)

[MMR/Autism Cases Win In US Vaccine Court](#)

[Autism Not Genetic - Says Expert Professor Simon Baron Cohen](#)

[Larry King Live – Breakthrough Coverage & More](#)

[Recent US Data Shows Autism In Children Vastly Higher Than in Adults](#)

[Sunday Times Journalist Made Up Wakefield MMR Data Fixing Allegation](#)

[Sunday Times’ MMR Lies Nailed At Last - Editor Witherow Should Resign](#)

[UK Government Hands Drug Industry Control of Childhood Vaccination](#)

[US Research Fraud, Tax Dollars And Italian Vaccine Mercury Study](#)

[British Government’s Reckless Disregard for Child Health Safety](#)

• **Blogroll**

- [Generation Rescue](#)

• **Useful Links**

- [Generation Rescue](#)
- [Inside Vaccines](#)
- [The Age of Autism](#)

- [Vaccine Damage – Information on Vaccine Risks](#)

• **Copyright ChildHealthSafety 2009 - The authors hereby assert their moral rights. All rights reserved.**

• **Archives**

- [July 2009](#)
- [June 2009](#)
- [May 2009](#)
- [April 2009](#)
- [March 2009](#)
- [February 2009](#)
- [January 2009](#)
- [May 2008](#)

• **Meta**

- [Log in](#)
- [Entries RSS](#)
- [Comments RSS](#)
- [WordPress.com](#)

[Blog at WordPress.com](#). Theme: Digg 3 Column by [WP Designer](#)

»