

THREE YEAR VACCINE PROTOCOLS – VETERINARIANS SHOULD BE PREPARED FOR, *AND LIABLE FOR*, THE OUTCOME AND RISKS IN 24-36 MONTHS.

Dr. Johnson,

Of course, my "Whole Dog Journal" was in my mailbox when I returned home after Jazz's annual wellness and vaccine visit today.

I had heard about the "3yr vs annual" vaccine controversy in the past but the argument seems to be gaining more steam in the press and similar journals such as "Whole Dog". Attached please find their recs for vaccine.

In your leisure, please contrast your knowledge and training vs this new movement of "less is more" in the vaccine world. As a medical technologist, the antibody titer seems like a good idea although I know some would have objections to the cost being higher and would therefore just give the vacs instead.

**I would just like to be knowledgeable on the subject.
Thanks for your time and attention,**

The above was a letter I got from a well-educated, concerned client. The questions are very well presented and the approach is rational. Here's my answer.

DRJOHNSON: "Picking up steam in the media much the same way, and for the same reasons that West Nile, Y2K-meltdown, Avian flu and recently Swine flu were hyped by the media, and were not the predicted national-catastrophes. Read: Newspaper sales, and "special report" viewership.

www.drjohnson.com/a_article_companion_animal_three_year_vaccinations.html

The whole thing is horrifying because it is the product of *journalistic* interpretation and is following natural-order #4 below in the *human-side* pendulum of vaccination:

1. Disease emerges
2. Vaccine introduced
3. Disease subsides
4. Vaccinations reduced with necessity questioned
5. Disease recurs
6. Vaccinations produced
7. Repeat.

NONE of the cat stuff has any relationship to the work that was extrapolated empirically from the KSU *DOG* test, by a journalist. Nothing wrong with journalists, but they don't have the training to identify defects in the interpretation of crucial facts as I will point out several times later. Ughhhh.

Here are some highlights of THREE main problems I have with the CLINICAL practice of three-year vaccine cycles using nothing but ONE-YEAR vaccines.

I've looked at some of the "research" on the three-year cycle of vaccinations, and it makes really broad assumptions about the immune status of EVERY animal falling under the protocol. Not all animals generate the same level of response, not all animals can even mount an adequate response. And of course some animals mount an exaggerated response. Not all animals are the same and yet the safety of three-year vaccinations cycles is being assured to us. Irrefutable logic indicates that a 3 year cycle risks more animals to inadequate coverage, than it does risking animals to overprotection and vaccine-related diseases.

I do wholeheartedly agree that certain categories of animals are being over vaccinated on [maybe] one antigen or another - and I also have long-accepted the sustainability of certain immune responses with street challenge re-exposure - But the greater percentage of my clients only have lap dogs - that is; they'll only get HIGHLY segmental re-exposures to various things.

So the Blue Heeler that moves all around the neighborhood and everyone's back yard probably *does* auto-boost itself against Parvo - and the like - but Mrs. Smith's Maltese won't see virulent Parvo until it goes to the kennel when something that mandates boarding comes up. It's guard will be down, and it will likely break and die, because attending parties will not soon-enough suspect Parvo (Why? Because the dog's vaccinated of course or so they think!) The dog will die of hematological changes because it was "a serious diarrhea" and "probably not" Parvo.

Simply, most of my customer's dogs will not auto expose and auto challenge their immunity ENOUGH to sustain viable immunity. Plus, the legitimate risk of under vaccination is far too great for my type of customer.

I also propose, if a novel-strain or "morph" of some virus (perhaps Parvo) suddenly emerges with a new behavior / virulence it might be *two or more years* before I get access to the customer again to change their "three-year position".....For example, the current pandemic of Leptospirosis in the Georgia area, currently. A Leptospirosis-increase aided perhaps in part by enhanced diagnostic efforts as a result of some human exposures - **we *WERE* actually in the process of diminishing the influence / importance of Lepto in our vaccination protocols** - only now we're ramping it up again with recent events.... On a THREE year cycle - staying current with the average "My-dog-is-current-for-three-years"- "see-ya-in-2013" type of customer would be, at least, challenging.

I explain to my customer "The 'research' is presented both intelligently and un-intelligently on the Internet. Dog breeders are jumping on this bandwagon because it reduces one of the biggest pushbacks to selling more of their puppies - (cost of medical care)

With regards to the research - You can sift through it, as I did. Valid arguments are made, but; kept in context and perspective are VERY unconvincing. For me, the "dust has not settled" and I am concerned this could be a FAD like former Veterinary faux pas' alarms; including Giardia vaccine, dental-disease "vaccine", cat hormone spray, the widely reported 'Febreeze kills dogs' hoax (Then, not), the awful Ringworm vaccine, grapes kill dogs, invention of dangerous FIP vaccine and the funniest 'hype' of all: West Nile Virus will kill us all!!! The media loves hype; remember when Swine Flu and Avian Influenza were going to be our very end? It sure sold a lot of papers.

I added this to my soapbox the next day:

I forgot to tell you; there is no such thing as a 'three-year' Da2P vaccine for dogs, nor a three-year FVRCP-C for cats.

Those veterinarians that did not jump on the '*sell titers for three times the profit of shots*' have simply started giving the one year shot, recording it as a three year. (And, I wonder, charging 3x the price?)

I just have little doubt that once they look a little further, some Channel 5 exposé will uncover that vets sell one-year shots as three-year shots and it will blow up in their faces.

Not to be outdone, and in response to perceived consumer demand for a 'less frequent vaccine', vaccine manufacturers have gone back to the drawing board to invent a vaccine that actually DOES create three year immunity (none currently do as evidenced by their research) but I worry that when they have created a repository vaccine so powerful that it shakes up the immune system, to meet the demand created by the New York Times Assured Three Years, they will have invented a vaccine-abomination that blows the doors off the current, minuscule levels of vaccinoses we sometimes see. (Later I talk about how vaccinoses are reported by the media to occur in the majority of vaccinates and how that white-lie is supported to sell papers)

What vaccine companies, like so many who market the animal-care industry, realize is that people will take medical advice from a freelance journalist, and merge that fact with the motto that what the consumer demands is what they should get. (That's capitalism)

People will never even know to ask the question 'how is a violent three year shot going to be safer than a gentler one-year vaccine?'

We've been told that we over vaccinate by giving a gentle immunization annually.

It will, according to someone who went to Journalism School, be so much better vaccinating every three years.

Little knowing that when those three-year shots come out, they're likely to do **more** harm, by being amended for extended immune response.

But it sure will sell like hotcakes.

By the way, almost all the research that has been extrapolated across to so many pets, came from ONE study, done at Kansas State, by ONE guy, on ONE disease (Parvoviral enteritis) and included **annual** re-exposure to VIRULENT Parvo. A risk taken deliberately, that none of MY customers would willingly participate in.

But it confirmed in my mind (neglected by the press) that the key word is (even in THAT study) ANNUAL re-exposure.

And then it was extrapolated to all other diseases, in all other companion animals; but the rest of the journalists picking this 'new discovery' up don't even know to **question** THAT little fact. And it gets richer and more embellished every time they tell it.

Most recently, someone (journalist) wrote that almost 70% of vaccinated pets have a deleterious reaction.....**Failing to tell the reader** that they included a HALF DEGREE fever or localized tenderness (common reactions of minimal significance) in their side effect tabulation "research"

Ugghhhhh"

Erik