Question for written answer E-001201/2022 to the Commission

Rule 138

Christine Anderson (ID)

Subject: Experts consider that the COVID-19 pandemic was artificially overblown as a result of

PCR-testing

To date, RT-PCR tests have been considered as the gold standard for detecting infections and assessing the pandemic situation. The results of the tests are used to determine the rate of incidence, i.e. the number of new infections per 100 000 inhabitants. Depending on the rate of incidence, anti-pandemic measures are adapted.

This approach – using the results of the PCR tests as a tool for political decision-making – is now being questioned critically.

According to a study¹ by the University of Essen/Duisburg, many of those who tested positive did not pass on the SARS-CoV-2 virus at all. In their publication, scientists concluded that more than half of these cases were likely to have been non-infectious and that therefore positive RT-PCR tests should not be considered as a precise measure of the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infected persons.

British experts have even said that the pandemic had been artificially overblown² by PCR testing.

A huge number of positive cases had either no or only mild symptoms. In serious or fatal cases, it was not uncommon for there to have been pre-existing conditions for which the persons concerned had already received intensive treatment when a COVID-19 infection was additionally diagnosed.

The COVID-19 measures have resulted in immense economic consequences and restrictions on fundamental rights.

- 1. What is the Commission's view of the PCR tests as a tool for political decision-making?
- 2. What is the Commission's assessment of the completely different reopening strategies of the Member States, given that the scientific basis should be the same?

https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.05.06.21256289v2.full-text

https://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-10606107/Did-flawed-tests-convince-Covid-worse-really-was.html