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# Article summary:

1. The efficacy results of Pfizer's and Moderna's mRNA vaccines have been released, but there are still some concerns about the trustworthiness and meaningfulness of the reported results.

2. There were 20 times more suspected than confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the trials, which could significantly decrease vaccine efficacy if many or most of these cases had false negative PCR test results.

3. There is an unexplained detail in FDA's review of Pfizer's vaccine that shows 371 individuals excluded from the efficacy analysis for "important protocol deviations on or prior to 7 days after Dose 2."

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article by Peter Doshi raises several important questions about the trustworthiness and reliability of the reported efficacy results for Pfizer’s and Moderna’s mRNA vaccines. The article points out that there were 20 times more suspected than confirmed cases of COVID-19 in the trials, which could significantly decrease vaccine efficacy if many or most of these cases had false negative PCR test results. Additionally, there is an unexplained detail in FDA's review of Pfizer's vaccine that shows 371 individuals excluded from the efficacy analysis for "important protocol deviations on or prior to 7 days after Dose 2." This imbalance between randomized groups in the number of excluded individuals (311 from the vaccine group vs 60 on placebo) raises questions about potential biases in the data collection process.

The article does not provide any evidence to support its claims, nor does it explore any counterarguments to its assertions. Furthermore, it does not present both sides equally; instead, it focuses solely on potential issues with the reported efficacy results without providing any insight into their potential benefits. Additionally, possible risks associated with taking either vaccine are not noted in this article.

In conclusion, while this article raises important questions about the trustworthiness and reliability of Pfizer’s and Moderna’s mRNA vaccines, it fails to provide sufficient evidence to support its claims and does not present both sides equally.

# Topics for further research:

* Benefits of mRNA vaccines
* Risks associated with mRNA vaccines
* Protocol deviations in Pfizer vaccine trial
* False negative PCR test results
* Imbalance between randomized groups in vaccine trial
* Potential biases in data collection process
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