# Article information:

Deaths involving COVID-19 by vaccination status, England - Office for National Statistics  
<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsinvolvingcovid19byvaccinationstatusengland/deathsoccurringbetween1january2021and31may2022>

# Article summary:

1. Monthly age-standardised mortality rates (ASMRs) for deaths involving coronavirus (COVID-19) have been consistently lower for those who had received a third dose or booster at least 21 days ago, compared with unvaccinated people and those with just a first or second dose.

2. ASMRs are not equivalent to measures of vaccine effectiveness; they account for differences in age structure and population size, but there may be other differences between the groups that affect mortality rates.

3. The dataset includes monthly ASMRs by vaccination status for deaths involving COVID-19, non-COVID-19 deaths, and all deaths broken down by age group and sex.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article is overall reliable and trustworthy as it provides detailed information on the data used to measure the mortality rates across different vaccination statuses in England. It also provides methodological information on how the ASMRs are calculated, which is important for understanding the results presented in the article. Furthermore, it acknowledges potential biases due to differences in health status between groups and mentions possible waning of protection from vaccination over time.

However, there are some points of consideration that could be further explored in order to increase trustworthiness of the article. For example, it does not provide any evidence for its claims about waning protection from vaccination over time or mention any counterarguments that could challenge this claim. Additionally, it does not provide any information on possible risks associated with vaccinations or present both sides of the argument equally when discussing vaccine effectiveness. Finally, it does not mention any promotional content that could influence readers’ opinions on vaccinations or their efficacy.

In conclusion, while overall reliable and trustworthy, this article could benefit from further exploration into potential biases and missing points of consideration in order to increase its trustworthiness even more.

# Topics for further research:

* Vaccine effectiveness
* Vaccine risks
* Promotional content related to vaccinations
* Waning protection from vaccinations
* Health status differences between groups
* Counterarguments to waning protection from vaccinations
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<https://www.fullpicture.app/item/dff1010a2676fb5a428b1065ef13afe1>