

Re: FOLLOW THE MONEY – Industry shill Elizabeth Whelan claims mercury fears unfounded

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.med/2004–12/2614.html>

From: john (nospamoriidiotss_at_vaccine.com)

Date: 12/30/04

Date: Thu, 30 Dec 2004 07:43:15 +0000 (UTC)

Putz the pharma shill <http://www.whale.to/m/putz.html>

Journal article & peer review <http://www.whale.to/w/journals1.html>

Junk Science <http://www.whale.to/vaccines/ploy2.html>

<nospam@pacbell.net> wrote in message

news:sb57t096ion9s1a3r4ip5m48ttbiiqg2r0@4ax.com...

> *On Wed, 29 Dec 2004 21:08:25 –0800, "Jeff" <kidsdoc2000@hotmail.com>*

wrote:

>

>>

>> *"Ilena Rose" <ilena@san.rr.com> wrote in message*

>>news:6c86t05j6rqppolfpb5pm44vmgfhocr134@4ax.com...

>>> *On Wed, 29 Dec 2004 12:34:40 –0800, "Jeff" <kidsdoc2000@hotmail.com>*

>>> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> *Yet, the fact remains that mercury fears ARE unfounded. If I am*

incorrect,

>>>> *please provide peer–reviewed evidence to the contrary.*

>>>>

>>>> *Jeff*

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>

>>> *Peer reviewers like Quack Barrett is for ACSH????*

>>

>> *No, peer–reveiwers who are experts in their fields. They examine the papers*

>>before they are published and determine if the conclusions are supported by

>>results and if the papers are of high quality.

>>

>> *I don't mean to imply that Dr. Barret is or not qualified to be a*

>>peer–reviewer. I don't know.

>>

>> *Personal attack deleted.*

> >

> >Jeff

>

> *Do they check for accuracy? The reason I ask is because a doctor I know of,*

> *announced that he was doing a study using a certain number of people.*

When the

> *study was published, the number of people was reduced by about 50% which made*

> *the results different than they would have been otherwise.*

>

> *Ora*

>

>