mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines: Documented Injuries, Safety Evidence, and Unresolved Questions

Human Health Strategies® | Patient and family education | Evidence reviewed September 23, 2026

mRNA vaccines reduced COVID-19 illness and severe outcomes, especially early in the pandemic and in people at high risk. They also cause adverse effects, including rare but well-documented myocarditis and very rare anaphylaxis. The National Academies found evidence inadequate to accept or reject causality for pericarditis occurring without myocarditis. Some people report disabling symptoms that began after vaccination and remain poorly explained. These symptoms warrant respectful clinical evaluation while their causes are investigated.

This guide separates what randomized trials established, what large linked-data studies later discovered, what passive reports can and cannot show, and what remains unresolved. Rates are not interchangeable across products, doses, ages, sexes, intervals, case definitions, countries, or risk windows. Policy is dated because both circulating virus and recommendations change.

Emergency warning: Seek urgent medical care for new or worsening chest pain, shortness of breath, fainting, a sustained rapid or irregular heartbeat, facial droop, one-sided weakness, difficulty speaking, a severe new headache, confusion, seizures, or signs of a severe allergic reaction such as trouble breathing, throat or tongue swelling, widespread hives, or collapse. This guide cannot diagnose the cause.

Evidence Summary

• The Pfizer and Moderna pivotal efficacy trials were randomized, saline-placebo-controlled, and observer-blinded. Pfizer randomized 43,548 people in its initial report; 21,720 received vaccine and 21,728 placebo injections. Moderna randomized 30,420, with 15,210 assigned to each group. [1] [2]

• Those trials had important limits. The initial regulatory decisions relied on a median of about two months after dose two, trial sizes could not reliably detect events occurring only tens of times per million, and broad placebo crossover after authorization shortened randomized long-term comparison. Pregnant people, young children, and many immunocompromised people were absent or sparsely represented. [3] [4] [5]

• mRNA vaccines do not contain live coronavirus. Their mRNA is translated mainly in the cytoplasm and is then degraded. It does not need to enter the nucleus, and the vaccines do not supply the reverse transcriptase and integration machinery required to turn vaccine mRNA into chromosomal DNA. Residual-DNA manufacturing quality and genomic integration are separate evidence questions. [6]

• Myocarditis is causally associated with both mRNA vaccines. Myopericarditis is often grouped with it in surveillance, but the National Academies found evidence inadequate to accept or reject causality for pericarditis occurring without myocarditis. Myocarditis risk has been highest in adolescent and young adult males, especially after dose two; Moderna generally produced higher rates than Pfizer in young males, and longer intervals reduced observed rates. [7] [8] [9] [10]

• Clinical improvement was common after recognized vaccine-associated myocarditis, but recovery measures were not uniform. In a U.S. follow-up conducted at least 90 days after onset, clinicians considered 320 of 393 assessed patients recovered; 104 were still prescribed daily myocarditis-related medication, 268 were cleared for all physical activity, and 81 of 151 with follow-up cardiac MRI had an abnormal finding. The cohort began with VAERS reports, lacked a control group for symptoms, and included 519 of 836 eligible patients, so its results do not settle lifetime prognosis. [11]

• SARS-CoV-2 infection can also cause myocarditis and other cardiovascular injury. A population-average comparison may favor vaccination, while a product-, dose-, age-, and sex-specific comparison can differ; in English data for males under 40, estimated excess myocarditis was 11 per million after Pfizer dose two, 97 per million after Moderna dose two, and 16 per million after a positive test in the study's 28-day windows. These historical estimates do not automatically predict today's risk from a new dose or infection. [12]

• Anaphylaxis is a recognized vaccine risk and is usually immediate and treatable. Early national surveillance found 21 adjudicated reports after 1,893,360 Pfizer first doses (11.1 per million) and 10 after 4,041,396 Moderna first doses (2.5 per million); an intensively monitored employee cohort produced a much higher estimate, illustrating how ascertainment changes rates. Bell's palsy showed a numerical imbalance in the pivotal trials, but larger studies did not support an increased risk; the National Academies concluded that evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship for both mRNA products. [13] [14] [15] [16] [7]

• Thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome and the clearest COVID-vaccine Guillain–Barré signal were linked primarily to adenovirus-vector vaccines, not the Pfizer or Moderna mRNA platform. Product identification matters. [17] [7]

• VAERS, EudraVigilance, and Yellow Card reports are essential signal detectors, not lists of injuries verified as caused. VSD and FDA BEST add denominators and comparison groups; chart review and purpose-built studies are needed to test a signal. [18] [19] [20] [21] [22]

• The 1986 National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act and VICP are not the principal legal framework for COVID-19 vaccine claims. PREP Act declarations provide broad immunity for covered COVID countermeasures, subject to exceptions, and claims have gone through the more limited CICP. CICP generally requires filing within one year of administration. [23] [24] [25]

• Federal guidance and Florida advice have diverged. When accessed September 23, 2026, CDC's live clinical page was still labeled 2025–2026 and used individual-based decision-making for people six months and older; no 2026–2027 CDC schedule was available in the saved evidence. Florida's Surgeon General has recommended against mRNA vaccine use, while federal product approvals remained in effect. [26] [27]

1. How mRNA vaccine technology works

A temporary set of instructions

Messenger RNA is an intermediate instruction used by cells to make proteins. The Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines package modified mRNA inside lipid nanoparticles. After injection, some particles enter cells; ribosomes read the mRNA and make SARS-CoV-2 spike antigen. The immune system learns to recognize that antigen. The mRNA and much of the expressed antigen are then cleared over time. This differs from traditional live-attenuated vaccines, which use a weakened replicating pathogen, and inactivated vaccines, which use killed whole virus. It also differs from protein-subunit vaccines, which deliver manufactured antigen, and adenovirus-vector vaccines, which use a nonreplicating viral vector to deliver DNA encoding an antigen.

mRNA delivery and expression were investigated for decades before 2020, but the pandemic produced the first mRNA vaccines deployed at population scale. That scale revealed uncommon effects that a trial of tens of thousands could not reliably detect.

The vaccines are not live virus and cannot cause COVID-19. Vaccine mRNA functions outside the nucleus. Normal human cells contain reverse-transcribed sequences from many biological processes, but a theoretical biochemical possibility is not evidence that vaccine mRNA integrates into a vaccinated person's genome. Demonstrating integration would require credible in-vivo evidence of reverse transcription, nuclear entry, chromosomal insertion, and persistence—not merely showing an effect in a transformed liver-cell line under laboratory conditions. Current human evidence has not established vaccine-mRNA integration. [6]

Residual DNA is a different question

Plasmid DNA is used during manufacture as a template for mRNA. Purification and release specifications address residual material. Measurements of residual DNA, regulatory limits, or nanoparticle packaging require validated sampling, assay calibration, intact-dose denominators, independent replication, and clinical evidence. Detection of residual DNA fragments does not by itself demonstrate entry into the nucleus, integration, expression, or harm, and the cytoplasmic behavior of mRNA does not resolve every manufacturing-quality question. Florida's 2024 statement combined residual-DNA concerns with a genomic-integration hypothesis and recommended against use; it did not present human evidence of integration or cancer. [27]

Robert Malone's early contribution

Robert W. Malone made an early, real contribution, but "sole inventor of mRNA vaccines" is historically inaccurate. The 1989 paper Cationic liposome-mediated RNA transfection was coauthored by Malone, Philip L. Felgner, and Inder M. Verma. It demonstrated laboratory RNA delivery using cationic liposomes. [28] A 1990 mouse-muscle study by Jon Wolff, Malone, Phillip Williams, Wang Chong, Gyula Acsadi, Agnes Jani, and Felgner showed protein expression after direct RNA injection. [29] Modern vaccines emerged from many teams' work on RNA chemistry, innate immune sensing, nucleoside modification, purification, lipid nanoparticles, antigen design, manufacturing, and clinical development. Accurately crediting Malone as an early contributor neither validates nor invalidates his later policy opinions.

2. Pivotal clinical trials

Pfizer-BioNTech

Pfizer's phase 2/3 study was multinational, randomized 1:1, saline-placebo-controlled, and observer-blinded. In the initial report, 43,548 participants were randomized and 43,448 received injections: 21,720 BNT162b2 and 21,728 placebo. Two doses were scheduled 21 days apart. Site staff assessing safety were blinded; injection staff could not always be blinded because preparation differed. The primary efficacy analysis found eight symptomatic COVID-19 cases beginning at least seven days after dose two in vaccine recipients and 162 in placebo recipients. The result established high short-term efficacy against symptomatic disease in the pre-Omicron setting. [1]

Safety was not measured only for a few days. Solicited local and systemic reactions were collected in electronic diaries for seven days; unsolicited adverse events were collected for a longer specified window, serious events continued to be monitored, and two-year follow-up was planned. But at the December 2020 authorization review, the main safety population's median follow-up after dose two was about two months. The FDA explicitly identified limited information for pregnancy, immunocompromised people, children younger than 16, asymptomatic infection, transmission, and long-duration outcomes. [3]

The later report did contain more time, but "six-month data" did not mean every participant had six months of blinded follow-up. Among adults, about 51% had four to less than six months and only 6–8% had six months or more during the blinded period. Beginning in December 2020, eligible participants could learn their assignment, and placebo recipients were offered vaccine. That crossover was ethically understandable once an effective vaccine was available, but it weakened the planned long-term randomized comparison. Observational surveillance then carried more of the rare- and delayed-safety burden. [5]

Moderna

Moderna's COVE study was randomized, placebo-controlled, and observer-blinded. It randomized 30,420 adults: 15,210 to mRNA-1273 and 15,210 to saline placebo, with doses 28 days apart. The primary analysis identified 11 symptomatic COVID-19 cases in the vaccine group and 185 in placebo, and severe cases occurred only in placebo at that cutoff. [2]

The same limitations apply. The median blinded follow-up after dose two was approximately two months for the authorization dataset. Solicited reactions were actively captured, while uncommon outcomes depended on unsolicited reports and serious-event monitoring. Pregnant people were excluded at enrollment; children were not in the adult pivotal trial; and numbers of immunocompromised participants were inadequate for confident subgroup conclusions. A 30,000-person trial can identify common reactions and large efficacy effects but is mathematically poorly suited to detect an event occurring, for example, 20 times per million doses or concentrated in a narrow subgroup such as adolescent males. [4]

Interpretation and limits

The randomized placebo-controlled designs supported estimates for outcomes common enough to occur during the controlled period. The sample sizes and follow-up periods could not reliably detect every rare, subgroup-specific, or delayed outcome, and placebo crossover shortened randomized comparison. Post-authorization causal assessment therefore relies on converging evidence: timing, a reproducible excess over expected background, specificity by dose, product, age, and sex, biological plausibility, dechallenge or recurrence information when ethical, and preferably multiple independent data systems.

Evidence for updated formulations

Annual strain updates retained the platform and altered antigen sequence, more like influenza strain changes than an entirely new platform. Regulators used manufacturing comparability, immunogenicity, nonclinical information, prior platform safety, and post-authorization effectiveness and safety studies rather than repeating the original large placebo efficacy trials each season. FDA's 2025 and 2026 deliberations also acknowledged uncertainty created by viral evolution, prior infection, heterogeneous vaccination histories, declining uptake, and the absence of neat seasonal boundaries. [30] [31]

This regulatory approach differs from direct randomized evidence for every new formulation, age, schedule, and clinical endpoint. FDA approval reflects a regulatory judgment that the statutory standard was met for the labeled population. CDC recommendations are clinical-policy judgments that can be narrower, broader, or more preference-sensitive than an FDA label.

3. How vaccine safety signals are found

No single system can answer every safety question. Systems are deliberately complementary.

System	What it is useful for	What it cannot establish by itself
VAERS (United States)	Rapid, open, passive signal detection; unusual patterns; reports from clinicians, manufacturers, patients, or families	Causation, incidence, or comparative risk from raw report counts. Reports may be incomplete, duplicate, stimulated by publicity, underreported, or coincidental. [18]
Vaccine Safety Datalink (United States)	Linked vaccination and clinical records, defined enrolled populations, comparison windows, rapid-cycle analyses, and medical-record validation	Perfect capture of care outside networks; complete control of confounding; instant answers for extremely rare events. [19]

FDA BEST (United States)	Active surveillance using large claims, electronic-health-record, and linked datasets; protocol-based studies	Removal of coding error, outcome misclassification, or all differences between vaccinated and comparison groups. [20]
v-safe (United States)	Voluntary smartphone follow-up about post-vaccination health and health-care use	A representative population sample, an unvaccinated comparator, or diagnosis/ causality on its own. [32]
CISA (United States)	Expert consultation and clinical research for complex individual adverse-event questions	Population incidence from consultations alone; consultation supports but does not replace the treating clinician. [33]
EudraVigilance (European Economic Area)	Collection and analysis of suspected adverse-drug-reaction reports and signal detection	Proof that a medicine caused each event or that report counts equal event rates. [21]
Yellow Card (United Kingdom)	Suspected-event reporting and early signal detection	Causality or incidence from raw totals; reports include events that may reflect underlying illness or coincidence. [22]

VAERS accepts reports from clinicians, manufacturers, patients, and families to maximize signal sensitivity. A report records an event after vaccination but does not certify its cause. Analysts look for disproportionality, clustering after a particular dose, biologically coherent timing, age/sex patterns, diagnostic validation, and replication in active systems. The myocarditis association was supported by a specific recurring pattern—young males, shortly after dose two, and product differences—across surveillance and national health databases.

Passive systems miss events; diagnostic labels vary; long-latency outcomes are hard to attribute; and vaccinated and unvaccinated groups can differ in health and behavior. Absence of a detected signal therefore does not establish zero risk, and conclusions must remain proportional to study design.

4. Myocarditis and pericarditis

Myocarditis is inflammation of heart muscle; pericarditis affects the lining around the heart. They can overlap. Typical symptoms include chest pain, breathlessness, palpitations, and reduced exercise tolerance. Evaluation may include an electrocardiogram, troponin, inflammatory markers, echocardiography, and cardiac MRI. A normal single test does not answer every case, but indiscriminate testing months later can also yield nonspecific findings; clinicians interpret the whole picture.

Absolute risk depends on the exact question

The table below intentionally keeps studies separate rather than averaging unlike estimates.

Population and design	Exposure and window	Absolute estimate	Interpretation
Nordic registry residents, males 16–24	Homologous Pfizer dose two; 28 days	5.55 excess myocarditis events per 100,000 vaccinees (95% CI 3.70–7.39)	About 56 excess per million in this historical setting. [9]
Same study and subgroup	Homologous Moderna dose two; 28 days	18.39 excess per 100,000 (95% CI 9.05–27.72)	About 184 excess per million; product mattered. [9]
Same study, males 25–39	Pfizer dose two versus Moderna dose two; 28 days	0.59 versus 8.01 excess per 100,000	Risk fell with age but remained product-dependent. [9]
England, males under 40	Pfizer dose two; days 1–28	11 excess events per million (95% CI 9–13)	Different design and denominator; do not substitute for the Nordic estimate. [12]
Same English analysis	Moderna dose two; days 1–28	97 excess per million (95% CI 91–99)	Higher than Pfizer in this stratum. [12]

Ontario males 18–24	Pfizer-Pfizer, Moderna-Moderna, Pfizer-Moderna dose two at "d4-week interval	95, 375, and 780 reported cases per million	Observed reporting rates fell at longer intervals; these are not adjusted excess estimates. [10]
Same Ontario group	Same sequences at "e8-week interval	10, 130, and 190 per million	Supports interval as a modifiable factor, while confidence and selection differences remain. [10]

These are not current personalized forecasts. Most data came from 2021 primary series, often with short intervals and immunologically naive populations. Dose amount, prior doses, prior infection, case finding, and formulation changed. Females and older adults generally had much lower estimates, but not zero risk. Pericarditis can have a somewhat broader age pattern.

Course and long-term uncertainty

Many reported patients were hospitalized for observation and improved with rest and anti-inflammatory treatment; ventricular function was often preserved or recovered. Nordic population data found fewer serious short-term outcomes after vaccine-associated myocarditis than after conventional myocarditis, although observational comparisons can be affected by different thresholds for admission and diagnosis. [34]

Myocarditis commonly triggers temporary exercise restriction because strenuous activity during active inflammation may increase arrhythmia risk. Some patients have persistent pain, palpitations, fatigue, or anxiety about recurrence. Cardiac MRI cohorts have found resolution of edema and preserved function while late gadolinium enhancement persisted in a subset. LGE can represent residual injury or fibrosis, but its extent, evolution, and prognostic meaning in this specific setting are not fully known. Small referral cohorts, variable scan timing, and incomplete pre-event imaging prevent confident lifetime predictions. [35]

In a U.S. follow-up surveillance study conducted at least 90 days after onset, investigators obtained information for 519 of 836 eligible patients aged 12–29. Clinicians considered 320 of 393 assessed patients (81%) recovered. At the last clinician follow-up, 104 of 393 (26%) were prescribed daily myocarditis-related medication and 268 of 393 (68%) had been cleared for all physical activity. Among 151 with follow-up cardiac MRI, 81 (54%) had an abnormal finding, while the combination of late gadolinium enhancement and edema was present in 20 (13%). Half of surveyed patients reported at least one symptom. Participation was incomplete, symptom analysis had no control group, tests were interpreted locally, and “recovered,” symptom-free, exercise-cleared, off medication, and normal MRI were not interchangeable outcomes. [11]

These data are reassuring about average clinical improvement, but follow-up is still shorter and cohorts smaller than would be needed to rule out every later arrhythmia or functional consequence. The separate 13-patient MRI series had median MRI follow-up of 100 days and clinical follow-up of 159 days; all were asymptomatic with normal troponin and no recorded adverse cardiac events at follow-up, while minimal LGE persisted in eight patients. [35] It is inaccurate to label all cases permanently disabling; it is also inaccurate to call every case trivial.

Myocarditis after SARS-CoV-2 infection

In an early English self-controlled study, estimated excess myocarditis within 28 days was 1 per million after Pfizer dose one, 6 after Moderna dose one, 10 after Moderna dose two, and 40 after a positive SARS-CoV-2 test in the overall studied population. [36] Stratification changed the picture: among males under 40, excess estimates were 11 per million after Pfizer dose two, 97 after Moderna dose two, and 16 after infection. [12]

Both statements can be true because an overall infection estimate averages older adults and women with young males, while a subgroup estimate isolates a high-vaccine-risk group. Infection estimates also depend on who was tested, variant, prior immunity, vaccination status at infection, and whether multiple infections were counted. The practical comparison is not “vaccine myocarditis versus no risk”; it is the marginal benefit and harm of a particular product and dose for a particular person now, considering their infection risk and existing immunity.

5. Other safety outcomes

Anaphylaxis

Anaphylaxis is an established causal risk. It usually starts within minutes, which is why vaccination sites use screening, observation for selected people, and immediate access to epinephrine. Early U.S. national surveillance adjudicated 21 reports after 1,893,360 Pfizer first doses (11.1 per million) during December 14–23, 2020, and 10 after 4,041,396 Moderna first doses (2.5 per million) during December 21, 2020–January 10, 2021. These were passive-surveillance estimates from the opening weeks of rollout, not timeless product rates. [13] [14] In one intensively monitored employee cohort, 16 confirmed cases occurred after 64,900 first doses—7 after 25,929 Pfizer doses and 9 after 38,971 Moderna doses, roughly 247 per million overall. That workforce estimate should not be treated as universal; ascertainment was unusually active and the confidence interval was wide. All patients recovered in that report. [15]

People with a known severe allergy to a vaccine component need product-specific specialist guidance. An allergy to food, venom, or an unrelated medicine is not automatically an allergy to mRNA vaccine. A suspected reaction should be documented carefully because fainting, panic, vocal-cord dysfunction, and flushing can mimic parts of anaphylaxis but require different future planning.

Bell's palsy

Bell's palsy causes acute weakness on one side of the face. The original trials had a numerical imbalance—four facial-palsy cases in Pfizer vaccine recipients versus none in placebo, and three in Moderna recipients versus one in placebo—but numbers were too small for a stable causal estimate. [3] [4] A multinational analysis found no increased Bell's palsy incidence in the 21 days after Pfizer or Moderna vaccination; in self-controlled analysis, Pfizer's adjusted incidence-rate ratio was 0.83 (95% CI 0.61–1.10), while Bell's palsy after SARS-CoV-2 infection was increased (1.82, 95% CI 1.21–2.61). [16]

After reviewing the body of evidence, the National Academies concluded that evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship between Bell's palsy and either Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna vaccination. [7] That population-level conclusion does not prove that causation is impossible in every individual case. Facial weakness still warrants urgent assessment because stroke and other causes must be excluded and early treatment may matter.

Product-specific findings for TTS and Guillain–Barré syndrome

Thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome combines unusual clots with low platelets and was causally linked to adenovirus-vector vaccines such as Janssen, especially in women aged 30–49 in early U.S. data. [17] Guillain–Barré syndrome, a progressive peripheral-nerve disorder, also showed its clearest COVID-vaccine signal after Janssen rather than mRNA vaccination. The National Academies reported product-specific conclusions for these outcomes. [7]

That distinction does not make every neurologic symptom after mRNA vaccination imaginary. It means that population studies have not established the same TTS or GBS signal for Pfizer/Moderna. New ascending weakness, loss of reflexes, trouble walking, facial/bulbar weakness, or breathing difficulty needs urgent clinical evaluation regardless of suspected trigger.

Menstrual changes, fertility, pregnancy, and other concerns

Temporary changes in menstrual timing or bleeding have been reported and supported in large cycle-tracking studies, generally small on average and self-limited. A temporary cycle change is not evidence of infertility. Large pregnancy cohorts and surveillance have not shown a consistent increased risk of miscarriage from mRNA vaccination, but original pivotal trials were not designed to establish pregnancy safety. Those are distinct statements: later observational evidence can be reassuring without rewriting the original trial population.

Evidence reviews have not established mRNA vaccines as causes of female infertility, male infertility, cancer, or broad immune-system collapse. Absence of a detected population signal cannot prove that no individual ever had an idiosyncratic event, but claims of common infertility or cancer require population-level patterns that have not appeared despite billions of doses and years of cancer and birth surveillance. The National Academies review distinguishes outcomes with sufficient causal evidence, evidence favoring rejection, and evidence inadequate to accept or reject—more informative categories than “safe” versus “dangerous.” [7]

6. Persistent symptoms, sudden deaths, athletes, and excess mortality

Persistent, debilitating symptoms

Some people describe fatigue, post-exertional worsening, cognitive difficulty, neuropathic sensations, palpitations, tinnitus, dizziness, sleep disruption, and other symptoms lasting months after vaccination. Their suffering is real even when mechanism is uncertain. Clinical care should not depend on first winning an argument about causation: clinicians can document chronology, examine for treatable disease, review prior infection, medications, autonomic function and mental health without reducing symptoms to anxiety, and avoid unvalidated, risky “detox” regimens.

The Yale LISTEN descriptive preprint included 241 adults who self-identified as having post-vaccination syndrome. Common reports included exercise intolerance (71%), excessive fatigue (69%), numbness (63%), brain fog (63%), and neuropathy (63%); median reported onset was three days after vaccination. But participants were recruited online largely through social media and word of mouth, there was no unvaccinated or vaccinated-well control group, and exposure and outcomes were self-reported. The authors explicitly said the design could not determine causation or prevalence. [37]

This study establishes that a group of patients reports a severe, coherent burden worthy of research; it does not establish how common a syndrome is or whether every symptom was caused by vaccination. Long COVID, unrecognized infection, dysautonomia, migraine, endocrine disease, medication effects, autoimmune disease, deconditioning, sleep disorder, and unrelated illness can overlap. Good research needs prospective enrollment, validated exposure and infection histories, matched controls, prespecified case definitions, biomarkers reproduced in independent cohorts, and blinded analysis.

Sudden death and athlete claims

Sudden cardiac arrest in a young athlete is vivid and devastating, which makes anecdotes spread rapidly. But a social-media compilation usually lacks a defined athlete population, consistent case definition, complete pre-2021 comparison, verified vaccination status, dose-to-event timing, medical history, toxicology, autopsy, and adjudicated cause of death. It cannot establish a rate or a vaccine effect.

A registry study covering 2017–2022 identified 203 sudden cardiac arrest/death cases among young competitive athletes in 2017–2019 and 184 in 2020–2022. It did not contain individual vaccination status and acknowledged possible missed cases, changing sports participation, and incomplete cause data. Thus it cannot prove vaccination has zero athlete risk, but it does not support a massive post-rollout spike. [38]

The relevant denominator is athlete-person-years, not television clips or internet posts. The relevant numerator is adjudicated sudden cardiac death, not every collapse or every death from trauma, overdose, heat illness, congenital disease, commotio cordis, infection, or an unknown cause. To attribute an individual death, investigators need vaccination records, timing, clinical history, autopsy and histology, toxicology, genetic information when appropriate, and competing-cause analysis. Even myocarditis on autopsy does not by itself identify whether the cause was viral infection, immune disease, drug toxicity, vaccination, or another process.

Young-person mortality and all-cause excess mortality

UK Office for National Statistics linked vaccination and death registrations for people aged 12–29. Comparing the first six weeks after vaccination with weeks 7–12 in a self-controlled design, it found no significant elevation in cardiac-related death (relative incidence 0.99, 95% CI 0.67–1.46) or all-cause death (0.94, 95% CI 0.79–1.10). The first-week all-cause estimate was lower, a warning about the healthy-vaccinee effect: acutely ill people tend to postpone vaccination. [39]

This is stronger than a raw time trend because it links individual records, but it still has limits: wide intervals permit modest effects, registration can lag, and self-controlled assumptions may not fully hold. It argues against a large short-term mortality increase, not against every rare vaccine-related death.

“Excess mortality” means more deaths than a statistical baseline predicts. It does not identify cause. Baseline choice, aging, population size, delayed care, heat, influenza, drug deaths, COVID waves, socioeconomic disruption, and reporting lags all matter. Ecological correlations between national vaccine uptake and excess deaths cannot separate these factors or establish individual causation. Conversely, attributing all excess deaths to COVID without cause-specific analysis is also inadequate. Death certificates, linked health records, autopsies, and transparent methods are necessary.

7. Liability and compensation in the United States

Legal frameworks for vaccine injury claims

The National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 created the framework that led to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program for vaccines routinely recommended for children and subject to the excise tax. VICP uses the U.S. Court of Federal Claims and has a vaccine injury table, litigation procedures, and attorney-fee provisions. COVID-19 vaccines have not simply been ordinary VICP vaccines during the emergency program.

The controlling COVID framework arose chiefly from the 2005 Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act. A PREP Act declaration can grant covered persons broad immunity from federal and state claims for loss relating to administration or use of covered countermeasures. The Twelfth Amendment extended the COVID-19 declaration through December 31, 2029; coverage still depends on the declaration’s terms, including the countermeasure, person, activity, and applicable conditions. [40] The statute includes, among other limits, a willful-misconduct route that is narrow and procedurally demanding. The Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program is the administrative compensation route for serious injuries or deaths directly caused by covered countermeasures. [23]

Comparison of CICP and VICP

Feature	CICP	VICP
Authority	PREP Act	National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act
COVID-19 vaccines	Covered while applicable PREP declaration covers the countermeasure	Not the principal route described by HRSA for pandemic COVID claims
Filing deadline	Generally one year from countermeasure administration	Generally three years from first symptom, or two years from death, subject to program rules
Standard	Compelling, reliable, valid medical and scientific evidence of direct causation unless a table presumption applies	Table presumptions may apply; otherwise causation-in-fact litigation
Benefits	Unreimbursed medical expenses, lost employment income, and death benefit, with statutory limits	Medical and rehabilitation expenses, pain and suffering subject to cap, lost earnings, and death benefit

Review	HRSA administrative review/reconsideration; limited transparency and no ordinary Court of Federal Claims merits trial	Petition adjudicated by special masters with judicial review pathways

HRSA's own comparison is the best starting point because program details can change. [24] CICP says requests generally must be filed within one year of administration; waiting for diagnostic certainty or for a doctor to use the words "vaccine injury" can therefore create a deadline problem. [25] This is general information, not legal advice. A person considering a claim should promptly obtain current HRSA instructions and individualized legal advice.

As of September 1, 2026, HRSA listed 14,206 COVID-19 countermeasure claims filed, 120 found eligible for compensation, and 63 compensated. Those counts are not a denominator for vaccine-injury incidence: filings include allegations involving different COVID countermeasures, a filing is not an adjudicated injury, unresolved claims remain, and program standards and documentation affect outcomes. HRSA explicitly says temporal association alone is insufficient. [41]

The small compensated fraction can be interpreted in competing ways—few provable injuries, a demanding program, incomplete evidence, administrative delay, narrow benefits, or some combination. The numbers alone cannot decide which explanation dominates.

8. Current recommendations: federal, Florida, and the United Kingdom

Federal United States position

When accessed September 23, 2026, CDC's live clinical page was still titled 2025–2026 COVID-19 Vaccination Guidance, was last reviewed November 4, 2025, and said vaccination for people aged six months and older was based on individual-based decision-making, also called shared clinical decision-making. Its schedule depended on age, product, vaccination history, and immune status. [26] The companion overview listed 2025–2026 products and product-specific minimum ages. [42] This guide does not treat those pages as a 2026–2027 schedule or infer a later CDC recommendation that was not published in the saved evidence.

That wording is more preference-sensitive than the universal language used earlier in the pandemic. It recognizes that expected benefit varies. Older adults, people with significant chronic disease, residents of long-term-care settings, and moderately or severely immunocompromised people have the greatest absolute risk of hospitalization and death and therefore usually the greatest potential absolute benefit. A healthy young person with prior doses and infections may have a smaller absolute benefit, while a young male considering another mRNA dose has a myocarditis discussion that an older female does not. Individual-based decision-making is not "no recommendation"; it means values, timing, product, prior reactions, and risk belong in the decision.

FDA approval and CDC recommendation should not be conflated. FDA's August 2025 Comirnaty letter directly documented use for adults 65 and older and for people aged 5–64 with at least one underlying condition placing them at high risk for severe COVID-19. [43] FDA's August 2026 letter approved the 2026–2027 formula supplement and associated labeling revisions, but the letter did not reproduce the complete indication. [44] The contemporaneous package insert is needed for the exact 2026 indication, and a formula approval letter is not a CDC recommendation.

Florida

Florida's State Surgeon General stated in January 2024 that mRNA vaccines were "not appropriate for use in human beings" and recommended that providers use non-mRNA options, citing residual-DNA and integration concerns. [27] In May 2025, Florida celebrated a federal announcement removing routine recommendation for healthy children and pregnant women and reiterated its opposition. [45]

The Florida recommendations are broader than the conclusions of the National Academies and federal regulators. The documents present policy and scientific arguments from the state Surgeon General but did not present human evidence demonstrating genomic integration or a population cancer signal, and they did not create a legal ban on all administration. Florida residents should verify current availability, insurance coverage, pharmacy rules, and federal/state guidance at the time of care.

United Kingdom

The UK's Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation recommended targeting autumn 2026 vaccination to those at highest risk of serious disease, including adults aged 75 and older, residents of care homes for older adults, and immunosuppressed people aged six months and older. The recommendation reflected changing prior immunity, lower present absolute benefit in low-risk groups, program cost-effectiveness, and concentration of severe outcomes in the oldest and immunosuppressed. [46]

9. Methodological review of Aseem Malhotra's two-part article

In 2022 British cardiologist Aseem Malhotra published a two-part article arguing that mRNA vaccination should be paused and that regulatory capture and distorted risk communication had undermined informed consent. Part 1 discussed randomized trials, observational data, pharmacovigilance reports, ambulance-call data, myocarditis, and absolute versus relative risk. Part 2 emphasized institutional conflicts, commercial influence, access to raw data, and metabolic health. Both were labeled review articles; neither reported a new randomized trial, cohort, autopsy series, or original reanalysis of person-level safety data. [47] [48]

Several themes deserve serious consideration. Absolute risk reduction is more useful than relative risk alone for individual decisions. Rare harms can emerge after authorization. Industry funding and regulatory transparency matter. Healthy-vaccinee bias can make observational vaccine effectiveness look better. Consent should be updated as evidence changes. None of those methodological points, however, establishes the papers' strongest conclusion.

The main evidentiary problems are:

1. Narrative selection. A narrative review can choose heterogeneous studies and anecdotes without a reproducible search, inclusion criteria, risk-of-bias assessment, or meta-analysis. It is less reliable for a global benefit-harm verdict than a systematic review or linked-data study.

2. Passive-report interpretation. VAERS and Yellow Card totals can generate hypotheses but cannot supply caused-event rates without validation and denominators. [18] [22]

3. Ecological inference. Ambulance calls, excess deaths, or population time trends do not identify vaccination status and cause at the individual level.

4. Mixing populations and eras. Benefits in a high-risk older adult during an active wave cannot be transferred to a previously infected healthy adolescent, and the adolescent's myocarditis estimate cannot be transferred back to the older adult.

5. Endpoint substitution. Infection prevention, symptomatic disease, hospitalization, and death are different outcomes; waning against infection does not imply zero protection against severe disease.

A neutral appraisal therefore treats Malhotra's articles as advocacy-oriented narrative reviews that raise legitimate governance and risk-communication questions but do not, by themselves, overturn randomized efficacy evidence, active-surveillance findings, or product-specific causal reviews. Critiquing methods is sufficient; personal motives or insults are irrelevant.

10. Practical care after a suspected adverse event

During an acute event

For chest pain, breathlessness, fainting, or palpitations within days after a dose, clinicians commonly consider ECG, troponin, inflammatory markers, and echocardiography, with cardiac MRI or rhythm monitoring when indicated. Patients should avoid strenuous exercise until myocarditis is excluded or a clinician clears return to activity. Suspected anaphylaxis requires epinephrine and emergency care; antihistamines do not replace epinephrine.

For persistent symptoms

A structured record can make care more productive:

• vaccine brand, lot if available, dose number, date, and prior vaccine reactions;

• exact symptom onset and trajectory rather than “soon after”;

• documented COVID infections, exposures, and tests;

• emergency, laboratory, imaging, rhythm-monitor, and specialist results;

• medications and supplements started or stopped;

• functional effects on work, school, sleep, exercise, and daily living;

• objective measures such as heart rate and blood pressure only when collected safely and interpreted clinically.

The goal is not to force one cause. It is to identify urgent disease, treat what is treatable, avoid duplicate or harmful testing, and preserve information that may support future research or compensation. Reporting a clinically significant event to VAERS is reasonable even when causation is uncertain; the report should contain records and diagnostic detail, not certainty the evidence cannot support.

After confirmed myocarditis or a severe allergic reaction, future-dose decisions should be individualized with current CDC clinical considerations and appropriate specialists. Do not attempt to “challenge” a suspected allergy or resume intense sport without guidance. Do not stop prescribed cardiovascular, anticoagulant, immune, or psychiatric medicine based on an online protocol.

FAQ

Were there placebo-controlled randomized trials?

Yes. Pfizer and Moderna each conducted large randomized, observer-blinded, saline-placebo-controlled phase 3 trials. The important critique is not absence of placebo; it is limited initial follow-up, later crossover, subgroup exclusions, and insufficient power for very rare harms. [1] [2]

Can mRNA alter DNA?

The vaccines do not need to enter the nucleus and do not provide the machinery needed for genomic integration. Human evidence has not established integration of vaccine mRNA into chromosomal DNA. Residual-DNA manufacturing questions should be tested directly and are not proof of integration. [6]

Is myocarditis “one in a million”?

There is no honest single rate. In young males after dose two, historical estimates ranged from tens to more than one hundred excess cases per million depending on product and design; some short-interval reporting rates were higher. Rates were much lower in many female and older groups. Product, dose, interval, age, sex, and window must accompany the number. [9] [10]

Is vaccine myocarditis always mild?

No. Most recognized patients improved, but many were hospitalized and some had persistent symptoms or MRI abnormalities. Death, transplant, or severe ventricular failure were rare. Long-term implications of persistent MRI findings are not fully resolved. [34] [35]

Does infection cause more myocarditis than vaccination?

Often at a population level, but not in every subgroup-product-dose comparison. In one English analysis, Moderna dose two exceeded infection-associated excess myocarditis in males under 40, while Pfizer dose two was lower. Both infection and vaccination estimates change by era and immunity. [12]

Does a VAERS report prove injury?

No. It documents an event reported after vaccination and can help reveal patterns. It is not an adjudication of cause, and raw counts lack a reliable unvaccinated comparison and complete denominator. [18]

Are reported sudden athlete deaths proof of a vaccine wave?

No. Anecdote lists lack stable denominators and verified exposure/cause. A 2017–2022 registry did not find the claimed massive case increase, but it also lacked individual vaccination status, so it cannot prove zero risk. [38]

Can Bell’s palsy be caused by an mRNA vaccine?

The pivotal trials showed a small numerical imbalance, but larger observational evidence did not support an increased risk. The National Academies concluded that evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship for both mRNA products. This population-level conclusion does not prove that causation is impossible in every individual case. [16] [7]

What is the filing deadline for a U.S. COVID vaccine injury claim?

CICP generally requires filing within one year after administration of the covered countermeasure. Exceptions and other legal routes are fact-specific. Consult current HRSA instructions and qualified legal counsel promptly. [25]

What should a person who believes they were harmed hear from clinicians?

That the symptoms and functional loss deserve respectful evaluation; temporal sequence is important but does not by itself settle causation; recognized injuries should be diagnosed and treated; uncertain syndromes need careful research; and neither blanket denial nor an unproven universal explanation helps the patient.

Evidence Limits and Unresolved Questions

This evidence base has structural limits. Original placebo control became shorter after crossover. Many rare-event studies are observational and vulnerable to coding error, health-seeking differences, prior-infection misclassification, and changing diagnostic intensity. Myocarditis studies use different definitions and windows. Long-term imaging cohorts remain relatively small. Persistent-symptom research lacks a validated case definition and representative controlled cohorts. Death attribution is limited by incomplete autopsy and vaccination linkage. Annual formulations and population immunity change faster than multi-year studies can report.

The most important open questions include the long-term significance of residual cardiac MRI abnormalities; recurrence risk after infection or another dose; mechanisms and incidence of persistent multisystem symptoms; safety differences by updated product and schedule; and how to target vaccination so that people at high risk retain benefit while low-risk people avoid unnecessary doses. Better answers require transparent protocols, linked records, independent replication, patient partnership, and willingness to revise policy in either direction.

Summary

The Pfizer and Moderna pivotal studies used randomized, saline-placebo-controlled, observer-blinded designs, followed by post-authorization surveillance and observational research. Myocarditis—especially after dose two in younger males—and anaphylaxis are documented causal risks; evidence remains inadequate for isolated pericarditis. Product and interval choices affect risk. Evidence favors rejection of a causal relationship with Bell's palsy at the population level; TTS and the strongest GBS signal belong mainly to adenovirus-vector products. Persistent symptoms warrant care and rigorous study, while the cited descriptive preprint cannot establish prevalence or causation. Denominator-based evidence does not show a large increase in athlete or youth mortality, but population averages cannot exclude every rare individual fatal outcome.

The best decision is not ideological. It is dated, product-specific, age- and sex-specific, informed by prior infection and medical risk, explicit about uncertainty, and made with respect for people who benefited and people who were harmed.

Sources

1. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine

New England Journal of Medicine | 2020-12-10 | randomized placebo-controlled trial

https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2034577

2. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine

New England Journal of Medicine | 2020-12-30 | randomized placebo-controlled trial

https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2035389

3. FDA Briefing Document: Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2020-12-10 | regulatory review

https://www.fda.gov/media/144245/download

4. FDA Briefing Document: Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2020-12-17 | regulatory review

https://www.fda.gov/media/144434/download

5. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine through 6 Months

New England Journal of Medicine | 2021-09-15 | randomized trial follow-up

https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa2110345

6. Understanding mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2022 | government scientific explainer

https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/119428/cdc119428DS4.pdf

7. Evidence Review of the Adverse Effects of COVID-19 Vaccination: Summary

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine | 2024-04-16 | independent evidence review

https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/27746/chapter/2

8. Evidence Review of the Adverse Effects of COVID-19 Vaccination: mRNA Vaccines

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine | 2024-04-16 | independent evidence review

https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/27746/chapter/9

9. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination and Myocarditis in a Nordic Cohort Study of 23 Million Residents

JAMA Cardiology | 2022-04-20 | population cohort study

https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamacardiology/fullarticle/2791253

10. Myocarditis and COVID-19 Vaccine Intervals

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2022-02-04 | government evidence briefing

https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/114164/cdc114164DS1.pdf

11. Outcomes at least 90 days since onset of myocarditis after mRNA COVID-19 vaccination in adolescents and young adults in the USA

The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health / CDC | 2022-09-22 | follow-up surveillance study

https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9555956/

12. Risk of Myocarditis After Sequential Doses of COVID-19 Vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 Infection by Age and Sex

Circulation | 2022-08-22 | self-controlled case series

https://www.ahajournals.org/doi/10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.122.059970

13. Allergic Reactions Including Anaphylaxis After Receipt of the First Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine Dose

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention / Food and Drug Administration | 2021-01-15 | early national passive-surveillance assessment

https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7808711/

14. Allergic Reactions Including Anaphylaxis After Receipt of the First Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine Dose

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention / Food and Drug Administration | 2021-01-29 | early national passive-surveillance assessment
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7842812/

15. Acute Allergic Reactions to mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines

JAMA | 2021-03-08 | prospective employee cohort
https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2777417

16. Association between covid-19 vaccination, SARS-CoV-2 infection, and risk of immune mediated neurological events

The BMJ | 2022-03-16 | multinational cohort and self-controlled case series
https://www.bmj.com/content/376/bmj-2021-068373

17. Updated Recommendations from ACIP for Use of the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine After Reports of TTS

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2021-04-30 | government safety assessment
https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7017e4.htm

18. VAERS Data Use Guide

HHS Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System | 2026 | government surveillance guide
https://vaers.hhs.gov/data/dataguide.html

19. Vaccine Safety Datalink

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2025 | government surveillance description
https://www.cdc.gov/vaccine-safety-systems/vsd/index.html

20. CBER Biologics Effectiveness and Safety System

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2026 | government active-surveillance description
https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/safety-availability-biologics/cber-biologics-effectiveness-and-safety-best-system

21. EMA boosts transparency with online publication of suspected side-effect reports

European Medicines Agency | 2012-05-31 | government pharmacovigilance explainer
https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/european-medicines-agency-boosts-eu-transparency-online-publication-suspected-side-effect-reports

22. Coronavirus vaccine: summary of Yellow Card reporting

UK Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency | 2023-12-01 | government pharmacovigilance report
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-vaccine-adverse-reactions/coronavirus-vaccine-summary-of-yellow-card-reporting

23. Compensation for COVID-19 Vaccine Injuries

Congressional Research Service | 2023-10-20 | legal research report
https://www.congress.gov/crs-product/R46982

24. Comparison of CICP to the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program

Health Resources and Services Administration | 2026 | government program comparison
https://www.hrsa.gov/cicp/cicp-vicp

25. CICP Filing and Benefits Information

Health Resources and Services Administration | 2026 | government compensation guidance
https://www.hrsa.gov/cicp/filing-benefits

26. 2025–2026 COVID-19 Vaccination Guidance

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2025-11-04 | current federal guidance
https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/vaccine-considerations/routine-guidance.html

27. Florida State Surgeon General Calls for Halt in the Use of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines

Florida Department of Health | 2024-01-03 | state recommendation
https://www.floridahealth.gov/documents/newsroom/press-releases/2024/01/20240103-halt-use-covid19-mrna-vaccines.pr.pdf

28. Cationic liposome-mediated RNA transfection

Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences | 1989-08 | experimental paper bibliographic record

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2762315/

29. Direct gene transfer into mouse muscle in vivo

Science | 1990-03-23 | animal experimental paper

https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.1690918

30. Considerations and Recommendations for the 2025–2026 Formula of COVID-19 Vaccines

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2025-05-22 | regulatory briefing

https://www.fda.gov/media/186594/download

31. FDA Briefing Document: 2026–2027 COVID-19 Vaccine Formula

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2026-05-28 | regulatory briefing

https://www.fda.gov/media/192693/download

32. V-safe After Vaccination Health Checker

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2025 | government surveillance description

https://www.cdc.gov/vaccine-safety-systems/v-safe/index.html

33. About the Clinical Immunization Safety Assessment Project

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2025-05-21 | government clinical safety network description

https://www.cdc.gov/vaccine-safety-systems/hcp/cisa/index.html

34. Clinical outcomes of myocarditis after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccination in four Nordic countries

BMJ Medicine | 2023-02-01 | population cohort study

https://bmjmedicine.bmj.com/content/2/1/e000373

35. Cardiac MRI and Clinical Follow-up in COVID-19 Vaccine–associated Myocarditis

Radiology | 2022-06-28 | clinical imaging cohort

https://pubs.rsna.org/doi/10.1148/radiol.220802

36. Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and cardiac arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection

Nature Medicine | 2021-12-14 | self-controlled case series

https://www.nature.com/articles/s41591-021-01630-0

37. Post-Vaccination Syndrome: A Descriptive Analysis of Reported Symptoms and Patient Experiences After COVID-19 Immunization

medRxiv | 2023-11-10 | preprint descriptive cohort

https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.11.09.23298266v1.full

38. Sudden Cardiac Arrest Among Young Competitive Athletes Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic

JAMA Network Open | 2025-02-20 | time-trend registry study

https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2830557

39. COVID-19 vaccination and mortality in young people during the coronavirus pandemic

UK Office for National Statistics | 2022-03-22 | linked-record self-controlled analysis

https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/articles/covid19vaccinationandmortalityinyoungpeopleduringthecoronaviruspandemic/2022-03-22

40. Twelfth Amendment to the PREP Act Declaration for Medical Countermeasures Against COVID-19

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services / Federal Register | 2024-12-11 | federal legal declaration

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/12/11/2024-29108/12th-amendment-to-declaration-under-the-public-readiness-and-emergency-preparedness-act-for-medical

41. Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program Data

Health Resources and Services Administration | 2026-09-01 | government program data

https://www.hrsa.gov/cicp/cicp-data

42. Overview of COVID-19 Vaccines and Vaccination

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention | 2026-04-23 | current federal guidance

https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/vaccine-considerations/overview.html

43. August 27, 2025 Approval Letter — Comirnaty

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2025-08-27 | approval letter

https://www.fda.gov/media/188439/download?attachment

44. August 27, 2026 Approval Letter — Comirnaty

U.S. Food and Drug Administration | 2026-08-27 | approval letter

https://www.fda.gov/media/194509/download?attachment

45. Florida Department of Health statement on federal COVID-19 vaccine schedule change

Florida Department of Health | 2025-05-28 | state policy statement

https://www.floridahealth.gov/2025/05/28/cdc-removes-covid-19-mrna-vaccines-from-immunization-schedule-florida-leads-the-nation-in-groundbreaking-public-health-shift

46. JCVI statement on COVID-19 vaccination in autumn 2026 and spring 2027

UK Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation | 2025-07-16 | government advisory recommendation

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/covid-19-vaccination-in-autumn-2026-and-spring-2027-jcvi-advice-16-july-2025/jcvi-statement-on-covid-19-vaccination-in-autumn-2026-and-spring-2027

47. Curing the pandemic of misinformation on COVID-19 mRNA vaccines through real evidence-based medicine — Part 1

Journal of Insulin Resistance / Journal of Metabolic Health archive | 2022-09-26 | narrative review/opinion

https://journalofmetabolichealth.org/index.php/jmh/article/view/71/221

48. Curing the pandemic of misinformation on COVID-19 mRNA vaccines through real evidence-based medicine — Part 2

Journal of Insulin Resistance / Journal of Metabolic Health archive | 2022-09-26 | narrative review/opinion

https://journalofmetabolichealth.org/index.php/jmh/article/view/72/225