

----- Forwarded message -----

From [REDACTED]
Date: Mon, 17 Aug 2020 at 13:15
Subject: Re: Has your report been peer-reviewed? Covid-19 in schoolchildren - A comparison between Finland and Sweden
To: <info@folkhalsomyndigheten.se>, <johan.carlson@folkhalsomyndigheten.se>

Dear Johan et al,

I still have not had the courtesy of a response in relation to the flawed report entitled ***Covid-19 in schoolchildren - A comparison between Finland and Sweden***

It is clear that this report was never peer-reviewed so, we urgently request that you immediately retract or drastically amend it.

It is misleading, cherry-picked, and above all deceptive.

I have had a meritorious scientist look at this report and here are the following comments.

- 1) It states there is no higher incidence of COVID for teachers as a profession, but in that report, the data was misrepresented and still showed a higher than average level in teachers (reported as 110%, but compared to 70% in the population), this is a 60% increase.
- 2) The data is completely meaningless as in Sweden during the time from March 18 to May 13, did not test children (or almost anyone) unless they had symptoms requiring hospitalization; children especially were not tested.
- 3) The increased testing began in week 23, not 22.
- 4) The Finland data clearly goes up until schools were closed and peaks about a week or so for infection after they closed exactly what one would expect if schools were a source.
- 5) The Sweden data goes up a lot more in weeks 23-24 than the relative increase in tests.
- 6) FHM really cheated in using the overall average for cases to compare as the plots over time do not look anything similar! If we use ICU cases to compare, Sweden had 14 x as many and so probably 14 x as many cases, but appear to be only double. This is because Sweden did not test almost at all for most of this time period. The beginning and the end weeks then show the real data, and this means we have a much higher infection in the schools than Finland.

Please amend this report or retract it before we go out to the media with our very real concerns of the FHM's continuous misreporting and misleading publications.

I look forward to hearing from you as a matter of urgency.

[REDACTED]

On Tue, 11 Aug 2020 at 18:45, [REDACTED] wrote:
Greetings,

I have to admit that I was quite disturbed by the publication of the report mentioned above in the Subject Line.

It would appear that it has not been peer-reviewed as it demonstrated such a lack of clear scientific methodology, instead, focusing on questionable, cherry-picked, and quite frankly misleading information.

1. It is no secret that the level of testing on children in Sweden was extremely low. In fact, certain regions such as Västra Götaland and Sörmland halted the testing of children and young adults under the age of 18 and 19 respectively.
2. Equally disturbing is that you fail to mention that 14 (now 23) children ended up in ICU in Sweden compared to just 1 in Finland.
3. Sweden has 50 cases of hyper-inflammatory cases compared to Finland's 1 during the time period you specified.
4. This report disregards evidence that came in from Israel, the USA, and a plethora of other sources showing that opening schools had been an "unmitigated" disaster.
5. If my memory serves me correctly when a teacher died in Skellefteå and ten of his colleagues were infected, all of the children were sent home without being tested. The simple fact is that so few children were tested to make this report even remotely validated.

Please advise how you can explain the following facts?

Fig 1 depicts the number of cases tested in Sweden in the age categories 0–9 and 10–19 years. Notably, the number of cases before June is indeed exceptionally low for children, which coincides with a period where testing was almost impossible to get (note: the data collection for the report comparing Sweden and Finland actually ended in June). The number of positive cases then increases in the 10–19-year-old categories as the testing capacity gradually increases. The testing once again slows down after the school year ends and new regulations are introduced to limit testing to those over 16–18 years of age in several regions in Sweden.

 image.png

This report is misleading and based on cherry-picked information, poor science, and above all ridiculous interpretations.

Please confirm that this report will be retracted, amended, or peer-reviewed because quite frankly as it stands it is a work of fiction.

Thank you,
[REDACTED]