

Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2005-04/msg00406.html>

- *From:* "Greatcod" <Greatcod@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* 8 Apr 2005 17:41:09 -0700
-

My recall (and I emphasize "my", I am not speaking for anyone else) is that prior to the beginning of the study, those whose CSF PCR'd positive would be acknowledged to have neuroborreliosis, and would be referred to their own doctors for IV treatment.

I had no sense that blood would be PCR'd, nor synovial fluid...

Again, in my recall, the dispute around Western Blots in 1999 and before was around the numbers and interpretation of the banding. It was a given that the Dearborne WB standards indicated ongoing infection; the anti-Steere's argued that as few as one or two bands signified infection, especially if they were Bb specific: the Steere's insisted on meeting the Dearborne criteria to justify treatment.

What I am arguing here is that Klempner was purposefully deceptive about the impact of his study on the orthodoxy of Western Blot interpretation thru the 90's....it clearly was major, and embarrassing to Allen.

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ [**Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
 - ◇ *From:* derdrittemann2003

- *References:*
 - ◆ [**More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
 - ◇ *From:* Greatcod
 - ◆ [**Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
 - ◇ *From:* a_weisman@xxxxxxxx

- Prev by Date: [**Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
- Next by Date: [**Re: Going on 48 Hours \(shhhhhh\)**](#)
- Previous by thread: [**Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
- Next by thread: [**Re: More on Klempner's deceptiveness**](#)
- Index(es):
 - ◆ [**Date**](#)
 - ◆ [**Thread**](#)