SOURCE:

https://www.phmpt.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/reissue_5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf

In the 5.3.6 document, Pfizer reported **42 adverse events as low arterial oxygen levels.** An additional **44 had "Respiratory failure," which would include all cases requiring a ventilator, but other medical diagnoses are not specified. Ten adverse events were diagnosed with ARDS.** Thirty-six adverse events were a non-specific "Respiratory disorder," and three were "Chronic respiratory syndrome." Two patients were defined as **"Severe acute respiratory syndrome" (SARS).**

This SOC is interesting in that there was a high percentage of the adverse events that were serious (92%), and 44 adverse events (32%) were "respiratory failure." Pfizer was vague in defining what happened. How many were put on a ventilator in an ICU? How many of those with ARDS placed on a ventilator developed severe, long-term lung impairment or even chronic ventilator or oxygen dependency? The outcome category of "resolved with sequelae" is missing from this SOC, while it is present in the majority of the other Table 7 SOCs. Instead, Pfizer reports a large percentage of "not recovered" and "unknown" outcomes in this SOC with a high percentage of deaths and serious adverse events.

The early vaccine program prioritized the elderly and those with chronic diseases. Pfizer has this SOC and others with serious adverse events and a high mortality rate. Where are the studies to show there is a net benefit to vaccination with BNT162b2 in cohorts with varied chronic diseases?

WHY WERE TWO PATIENTS REPORTED AS HAVING SARS?
This disease has not been seen around the world since 2004, according to the CDC website:

"Since 2004, there have not been any known cases of SARS reported anywhere in the world. The content in this website was developed for the 2003 SARS epidemic. But some guidelines are still being used. Any new SARS updates will be posted on this website."

SARS | Home | Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome | SARS-CoV Disease | CDC (accessed 8/02/2023)

This is a problem. There is no explanation for the SARS diagnosis, though the SARS virus was a different coronavirus, SARS-CoV-1.

Pfizer's Conclusion:
"This cumulative case review does not raise new safety issues. Surveillance will continue."

Post-Marketing Team's CONCLUSION

RECALL this unsafe "vaccine."

Post Marketing Team