Well resolved

Naturally, there was no talk of that behaviour in Andersen's parallel 2016 paper a few months later with Holmes and Rambaut, titled *The evolution of the Ebola virus: Insights ...*

In this evolution story:

*It is **believed** that bats serve as the primary reservoir for EBOV*. .. (T)*he origin and spread of the 2013–2016 EVD epidemic **seem well resolved***.

appears - probably - seems - believed

In fact, Baize's paper reports the first *confirmed case* was in a Health worker at Gueckedou hospital, Guinea on **Feb 23**. It speculates about a chain of 12 *unconfirmed* but suspected cases, going back 83 days, to the bat tree on Dec 2 - that *may have* lead to the first confirmed case but notes *the epidemiologic links are **not well established***. Including how the health worker (who was the *take-off* case) contracted the disease.

The above amounts to academic skulduggery by Holmes, Andersen, Rambaut. The very paper they cite to say the Dec 2 Meliandou origin is *well resolved - says it's **not well established** -* a fact they acknowledged in a 2014 paper writing: *The current outbreak started in February 2014 in Guinea.*

So why has that been airbrushed out in the 2016 paper? You could say *well, we had more information* - but there wasn't - it's based on the same paper. With a radically different interpretation.

Baize's *not well established* theory, in turn, is based on what he calls i*nitial epidemiologic investigation* that he doesn't cite but it appears to be a Fabian Leendertz expedition.

That sounds exciting - scientist bug-hunters on an expedition. Let's go exploring with Fabian in West Africa ...

Revision #1
Created 2022-06-01 09:01:35 UTC by dulandrift
Updated 2022-06-01 09:39:28 UTC by dulandrift