

## **Dr. Christopher Exley**

Rapid Response on

„Aluminium adjuvants in vaccines and potential health effects: systematic review“ (6.5.2026)

### **How do you solve a problem like Maria?**

I have been addressing the problem of human exposure to aluminium for over four decades. The specific subject of aluminium adjuvants in vaccines has been my concern for the past twenty years. I am always interested to learn of new research in this field. Congratulations are due to the BMJ for publishing research on aluminium adjuvants in human vaccination. Not all journals are as open to the subject.

However, the new paper by Doyon-Plourde *et alia* has not adequately addressed never mind solved ‘a problem like Maria’. When I look at the author list, I wonder how they thought that they might contribute to the subject of aluminium adjuvants in vaccines. They set out to review previous research, essentially clinical studies, in the field without anyone in their team with even the barest knowledge of any aspect of aluminium adjuvants. The authors are completely incapable of critically examining anything concerning the chemistry, biology, bioinorganic chemistry, biochemistry *et cetera* of aluminium in any of the published science included or indeed excluded from their analysis. I use the term ‘analysis’ purposely since what is produced in the paper is, at best, a numerical assay. It has no empirical understanding of the subject matter presumably originally stated in their null hypothesis, namely the benign nature of aluminium adjuvants in vaccines.

Since these authors never stood a chance of solving a problem like Maria one has to wonder as to their motivation for taking on such an important subject in human health. I can give them the benefit of the doubt and assume curiosity to be their driving force. However, their employers, Health Canada, is an established propagandist for human vaccination and so one is left with a certain bad taste in one’s mouth in attempting to swallow any other conclusion than that this research was carried out for the sole purpose of supporting human vaccination using aluminium adjuvants. I hope that the authors can convince me otherwise.

Let me be clear at this point that I am not suggesting that an authorship better informed on the subject of aluminium adjuvants would have solved a problem like Maria. However, they would have produced a better-balanced set of conclusions with clear indications as to which studies carry weight, and ought to be included in their analysis, and which studies are clearly fraught with errors and fundamentally flawed and consequently should be excluded.

There is a clear conclusion that should be accepted by all concerned parties and this is that the science remains equivocal as to safety of human vaccines that include an aluminium adjuvant. However, the science on the toxicity of aluminium in humans is unequivocal. Many decades of peer-reviewed published research have documented the myriad health effects of human exposure to aluminium. Aluminium is only toxic in all biota and this alone should be a red flag as to its continued use in human vaccination. If nothing else, it should be appreciated by all concerned that the efficacy of aluminium adjuvants in producing an immune reaction lies in its direct toxicity at the injection site.

„An aluminium adjuvant in a vaccine is an acute exposure to aluminium“

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0946672X19304201?via%3Dihub>

05.2026