GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY
Center for Research & Fellowships

Science and Public Health in the Modern Era: The Dismantling of Evidence and Institutions

Kayla Wontumi
Georgetown University

LAIDLAW SCHOLARS

August 15, 2025

Faculty Mentor: Sam Halabi

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and express my utmost gratitude to the Laidlaw Scholars Foundation, the Georgetown University Laidlaw Scholars Programme, and the Georgetown University Center for Research and Fellowships for their unwavering support and funding to promote student leadership and research. Thank you to Director Colleen Dougherty for her admirable commitment to the program and the invaluable guidance she provided me throughout the course of my project.

I am especially grateful for my faculty mentor, Professor Sam Halabi, whose mentorship and expertise were integral to this project and my growth as a researcher. I would also like to extend my gratitude to the CTHL team at the O'Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law as well as my co-authors Professor Lawrence Gostin, Professor John Kraemer, and Anjola Tega for their meaningful insight and dedication to this research project. I am honored to have the opportunity to submit this project for publication in the *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law.*

Introduction

I originally applied to conduct research and draft memos on universal health coverage in Sub-Saharan Africa under the guidance of Professor Sam Halabi. His team at the O'Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law has been working in close collaboration with the World Health Organization Regional Office for Africa on this project. This topic aligns closely with my academic and career interests, as I am deeply passionate about advancing health equity and aspire to become a global health practitioner in the future.

During the first two weeks of the program, I was tasked with writing two brief memos regarding the legislative process in Ghana and the implications of current and proposed health laws. However, my research focus soon pivoted to an equally important and timely topic: the degradation of science and public health in the United States over the course of the new presidential administration. This topic is especially meaningful to me because I have recently witnessed significant changes to science and public health institutions that are worth public attention.

This research project explores the evolving dynamic between science and politics in the context of the current administration. It examines the ways in which evidence-based research and public health institutions have been strategically undermined through rhetoric and legislative action, and further analyzes the real-world implications of this politicization.

Background of Study

Science and politics are two complex fields of study and practice that are crucial to shaping society. These entities are ever-changing and often converge and diverge from one another. Over time, however, science has become increasingly politicized, which has intensified under the current presidential administration. The intersection between both fields has provided a foundation for the misappropriation and distortion of scientific findings by political actors to push self-interested agendas. One underlying reason for this misuse is that science is indefinite, inherently uncertain, and often conducted by a homogenous group of experts, making scientific outputs more susceptible to exploitation and criticism (Druckman 2022). Furthermore, this dynamic has contributed to the growing distrust towards scientific institutions, particularly among those who uphold conservative ideologies. Consequently, there has been a decline in support for scientific pursuits and investments in research under the current political administration (Knott 2025).

Although science provides a systematic, evidence-based platform of knowledge that is utilized to inform decision-making, threats to this basis, such as the spread of inaccurate claims, often perpetuate a dangerous cycle of ignorance (Druckman 2022). The dissemination of misleading information has profound implications, as exemplified by the political controversy surrounding public health guidance during the COVID-19 pandemic. The erosion of scientific literacy and public confidence in institutions has undermined efforts to protect public health and exacerbated the relationship between science and society.

To better understand the extent to which science has been politicized in the modern political climate, it is imperative to reflect upon occurrences from the COVID-19 pandemic. While this global crisis affected all people, regardless of political affiliation, it ultimately became a divisive subject matter within the United States. Misconceptions regarding the transmission of the virus and the nature of the pandemic spread rapidly across the country (Neely and Witkowski 2024). The politicization of science and public health measures along with an immensely polarized climate posed a significant threat to the livelihoods of Americans.

In 2020, the administration ignored early warning signs from scientists and public health experts pertaining to the scope of the pandemic. By repeatedly downplaying the severity of coronavirus and deeming it a hoax, early surveillance and containment efforts were not employed in a timely manner. His delayed action was evidently consequential, as the death toll skyrocketed beyond 3000 by the end of March of 2020 and continued to rise at a devastating rate (Parker and Stern 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic revealed the reality of dismissing scientific findings, especially when it disagreed with certain

political agendas. In addition to delayed action on the part of the administration, mask wearing and vaccination were politicized, as the President discouraged his followers from adhering to CDC recommendations (Kahane 2021). His skepticism transcended across the nation, despite the presence of scientific research that supported the efficacy of these public health measures. The politicization of public health guidance severely hindered compliance, resulting in disproportionately high death rates among politically conservative communities (Wallace, Goldsmith-Pinkham, and Schwartz 2023).

Moreover, a powerful catalyst of the politicization of science during the COVID-19 pandemic was the dissemination of misinformation and disinformation in the media. The spread of false claims often fueled political agendas and exacerbated public distrust in scientific institutions. Misinformation refers to inaccurate information while disinformation is defined as false information that is intended to mislead others, according to the American Psychological Association (2025). In a society where technology and online mediums are constantly evolving, there is no doubt that these deceptive campaigns are flourishing. They play a significant role in the media with the aim of skewing narratives and altering public opinion (Broda and Strömbäck 2024). This is especially applicable when information is not common knowledge or there is a collective unwillingness to conduct fact checks with reputable sources. In relation to science, these misconceptions may motivate individuals to no longer use science, potentially placing them in a worse position than when they were merely uninformed (Druckman 2022). The COVID-19 pandemic serves as a powerful case study of how the politicization of science, fueled by misinformation and political agendas, can erode public trust, distort evidence-based guidance, and threaten the integrity of science and public health platforms.\

Research Process & Methodology

This research project required prior knowledge of conducting qualitative literature reviews and utilizing keywords in credible databases, which I gained from earlier research work. I consulted over 30 sources, primarily from *PubMed, JAMA, the National Library of Medicine*, and other academic journals related to public health and policy. I also reviewed news reports from reputable outlets for current events that have not yet been published in academic literature. Key search terms included "science politicization," "dismantling scientific institutions," "public health and misinformation," and "defunding research." I ensured objectivity in my research and writing by selecting peer-reviewed and factual sources. My mentor also provided me with a detailed outline to guide structure and content, which ensured that my analysis remained focused and evidence-based. I did not necessarily encounter any significant challenges during the research process, as the topic is timely and there are numerous sources that provide relevant information.

Analysis & Findings

Beyond the COVID-19 pandemic response and public health efforts, the politicization of science has even reached into fields that examine social phenomena. Throughout the course of time, science has played a crucial role in understanding of disparities pertaining to demographic characteristics, such as sex, race, gender identity, and minoritization. This area of research is essential to addressing systemic injustices and devising evidence-based policies to serve vulnerable populations. Scientists have long studied the

intersection between demographics and societal outcomes. However, in this current political climate, scientific inquiry has been discredited and driven by political ideology, as opposed to evidence-based. These dismissals undermine not only the research itself, but also the lived experiences of communities most affected by the issues being studied. Recent proposals that aim to cut funding for initiatives relating to DEI in science are viewed as an effort to silence inquiry into some of the most pressing challenges faced by marginalized groups in contemporary society (Efimov et al. 2024).

The targeting of DEI policies is detrimental to both scientific progress and social equity. The executive orders carried out in the earlier months of this year have targeted DEI programs within numerous institutions nationwide, including the federal government, universities, and the broader workforce. Some federal websites that contain civil rights histories have been erased (Root and Becker 2025). Furthermore, the current administration has proposed funding freezes and cuts to organizations, such as the NIH, and universities that uphold DEI initiatives in an effort to weaponize them. These restrictions not only suppress academic freedom, but obstruct progress towards both understanding and resolving the deeply rooted inequities that affect millions of Americans (Efimov et al. 2024). Some early career scientists have reported that research in DEI related fields is being disrupted not only by funding freezes, but by self-censorship due to fears over their career prospects (Despa 2025). This anti-DEI sentiment is evidently harmful and demonstrates the politicized nature of science.

While evolving scientific knowledge is essential to progress, this evolution has been reframed as a weakness under the current administration (O'Grady 2025). It is widely known that scientific understanding naturally develops over time as new evidence and technologies become available. This has proven to be beneficial and help advance fields such as medicine. However, these changes are often misinterpreted by the public as scientific inconsistency or error. Critics exploit shifts in recommendations, as demonstrated with mask wearing and vaccine schedules, to suggest that scientists are unreliable or untrustworthy. Over time, science has been weakened as a platform for knowledge and inquiry.

Another consequence of the politicization of scientific outputs and guidance is the erosion of scientific literacy and public confidence in peer-reviewed sources. In recent years, skepticism towards peer-reviewed literature has grown, especially among right-leaning populations, whose critiques are fueled by a lack of trust in science, misperceptions of peer review as inconsistent or partisan, and the belief that evidence is misaligned with their personal beliefs (McKenzie 2024). Consequently, credible peer-reviewed journals are now dismissed by some as biased or corrupt (Bonavitacola 2025). This erosion has significant real-world implications, such as widespread rejection of basic facts related to climate change, health, and social inequalities. As more individuals become unwilling to distinguish credible science and research from personal opinions, the use of evidence-based information and informed decision-making continues to decline.

In the sphere of global health governance, the United States has historically been a leader in innovation and research that have led to phenomenal breakthroughs across the globe. Its leadership has been evident in initiatives ranging from HIV/AIDS interventions to pandemic preparedness frameworks and vaccine development. However, recent shifts in the political climate of the United States have sparked a decline in its credibility as a scientific powerhouse, weakening global health diplomacy and disregarding decades of multilateral cooperation (Fidler 2025). Through substantial funding cuts, a shift from multilateral policies, and the dismantling of public health institutions, the President has minimized the role of the country in global health governance. These changes have far-reaching consequences, such as funding gaps, strained relationships, and increased health inequities, that are likely to have lasting effects on generations to come (Yazdi-Feyzabadi et al. 2025).

A prime example of the loss of scientific credibility of the United States is the President's recent decision to withdraw the United States from the WHO– a decision that has raised concerns from many experts and

the public. As one of the WHO's primary sources of funding and as a co-founder of the organization in 1948, its withdrawal from this multilateral framework poses crucial threats to the livelihoods of everyone around the world. The retreat of the United States poses major risks to key initiatives, such as the Pandemic Accord, a recently adopted international agreement that aims to improve global preparedness and coordination for future global health emergencies (Yazdi-Feyzabadi et al. 2025). This move jeopardizes the strength and legitimacy of the Pandemic Accord, as the contribution from the United States is important to upholding its provisions.

The repercussions of the United States' withdrawal extend beyond leadership. On a global scale, it poses serious budget constraints to the WHO, reducing its ability to maintain initiatives that deliver critical health services in LMICs. These countries rely heavily on the WHO for disease surveillance, technical training, and health system strengthening, and with the departure of the United States, there is no doubt that its capacity will lessen (Hingorani 2025). Furthermore, the weakening of research and scientific institutions, such as the CDC and NIH, limits the reach of American expertise and funding. The implications of this are noteworthy, specifically with regards to achieving vaccine equity. According to Hotez (2022) true vaccine diplomacy has the capacity to bridge gaps between nations and strengthen health systems globally. With collaborative efforts from the CDC, NIH, and other research institutions around the world, the pathway vaccine equity would be accelerated.

Another significant catalyst of the scientific decline of the United States is the dismantling of USAID, an agency that has saved the lives of numerous individuals across the globe. As a key part of his political agenda, the executive order signed by the President to pause all foreign aid from the United States was an effort to prioritize domestic interests. The deconstruction of USAID has notable impacts on healthcare and research, especially within LMICs. Millions of people no longer have access to medical supplies and treatments for various health issues, as a result. Many other programs, including those aimed at improving maternal and child health, polio, and family planning are also in a period of uncertainty (Gostin, Friedman, and Wetter 2025). Not only does the dismantling of USAID hinder funding for international programs, it also undermines ongoing scientific studies and the broader global health research infrastructure (Mansour et al. 2025). Researchers based in LMICs who depend largely on grants from the United States are experiencing delays or suspensions in their studies, which could further perpetuate health inequities (Davison 2025). This underestimates scientific progress and intensifies the stark power imbalance that exists between the United States and LMICs in global health knowledge production. While this may encourage LMICs to engage in domestic capacity building and the construction of self-reliant, sustainable health systems, the transition is costly and will not be a quick fix (Mansour et al. 2025).

The weakening of research partnerships on the part of the United States also reduces the transformative power of international scientific collaboration. As highlighted by Mayor et al. (2025), a key driver of social change and effective solutions for global health inequities is large-scale cooperation. Yet, in the current political era, international collaboration has been downplayed in an effort to prioritize domestic interests. This action, as detailed by Yazdi-Feyzabadi et al. (2025), not only disrupts immediate global coordination but also threatens long-term commitments to coordinated global health governance. As a result, several LMICs are turning to philanthropic organizations, which may not offer the same sustained or equitable support as multilateral scientific institutions (Charani et al. 2022). Without equitable global health research and reliable institutional support, progress toward inclusivity in global health knowledge production is in jeopardy.

Furthermore, the role of the United States in multilateral science diplomacy has been subjected to disinvestment. The impact of the diminishing influence of the United States in global science diplomacy and crucial international relations poses significant challenges worldwide. Without sustained collaboration, these diplomatic gaps risk being filled by actors whose interests may not align with democratic or equitable principles (The Royal Society 2025).

The overall decline of the United States' leadership in global health is heavily reshaping the landscape of international cooperation, capacity building, and scientific progress. The withdrawal from the WHO and the dismantling of major international aid organizations weakens the coordination of global health systems, ultimately threatening the health of numerous individuals worldwide. Rebuilding credibility will require a renewed commitment to science-based and equitable collaboration worldwide.

Conclusion

The sentiments of the current presidential administration towards science are evidently dismantling public health both domestically and abroad. From the deconstruction of USAID and the withdrawal from the WHO to the slashing of funding and personnel from federal agencies, the damage to domestic progress and international diplomacy has been profound. These actions have threatened global progress towards improving health, weakened the credibility of the United States in global health, and hindered effective responses to public health crises. In addition, the rapid spread of misinformation and disinformation across the country highlights the urgent need for comprehensive reform within the framework of the United States government.

The path forward should be guided by firm legislation, sustainable investments, and active public engagement. By restoring civil service protections, codifying the independence of advisory bodies, and enacting scientific integrity laws, the field of science will be reinstated as a reliable source of knowledge. These measures are not only crucial for preserving the credibility of scientific inquiry, but are essential to ensuring that science can continue to effectively guide policymaking. When insulated from manipulation and politicization, science can truly help serve the common good. Reclaiming the narrative surrounding science requires a thorough commitment to these reforms, ensuring that science remains a cornerstone in the United States even in the ongoing political climate. The future of evidence-based governance in the United States depends largely on the steps taken to rebuild institutions and protect the integrity of science. Failing to rectify these issues risks further erosion of public trust, weakens institutional frameworks, and undermines the principles of a democracy that is supported by science.

References

American Psychological Association. 2025. “Misinformation and Disinformation.” American Psychological Association. 2025. https://www.apa.org/topics/journalism-facts/misinformation-disinformation.

Arjuna Ugarte, Dominic, William G. Cumberland, Lidia Flores, and Sean D. Young. 2021. “Public Attitudes about COVID-19 in Response to President Trump’s Social Media Posts.” *JAMA Network Open* 4 (2): e210101. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.0101.

Berman, Emily J. 2023. “Shielding Science: The Scientific Integrity Act and Enforcing Firewalls between Science and Politics – Columbia Journal of Law & Social Problems.” *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems* 56 (4). https://jlsp.law.columbia.edu/2024/02/19/shielding-science-the-scientific-integrity-act-and-enforcing-firewalls-between-science-and-politics/.

Blader, Ira, Felicia Goodrum, Michael J. Imperiale, Arturo Casadevall, Cesar A. Arias, Andreas Baumler, Carey-Ann D. Burnham, et al. 2025. “A Call for the United States to Continue Investing in Science.” *MSphere* 10 (3). https://doi.org/10.1128/msphere.00128-25.

Bonavitacola, Julia. 2025. “RFK Jr Suggests Creating ‘In-House’ Publications for Government Scientists.” AJMC. May 29, 2025. https://www.ajmc.com/view/rfk-jr-suggests-creating-in-house-publications-for-government-scientists.

Broda, Elena, and Jesper Strömbäck. 2024. “Misinformation, Disinformation, and Fake News: Lessons from an Interdisciplinary, Systematic Literature Review.” *Annals of the International Communication Association* 48 (2): 139–66. https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2024.2323736.

Charani, Esmita, Seye Abimbola, Madhukar Pai, Olusoji Adeyi, Marc Mendelson, Ramanan Laxminarayan, and Muneera A. Rasheed. 2022. “Funders: The Missing Link in Equitable Global Health Research?” Edited by Deisy de Freitas Lima Ventura. *PLOS Global Public Health* 2 (6): e0000583. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000583.

Davison, Catherine. 2025. “USAID Funding Cuts Jeopardize Breakthrough Drugs and Research.” Devex. March 12, 2025. https://www.devex.com/news/usaid-funding-cuts-jeopardize-breakthrough-drugs-and-research-109615?consultant_exists=true&oauth_response=success.

Despa, Ana. 2025. “Faculty Members Voice Concerns over Impact of Federal Funding Cuts on Early Career Scholars, DEI Research.” The Chronicle. May 26, 2025. https://www.dukechronicle.com/article/2025/05/duke-university-faculty-voice-concerns-federal-funding-cuts-impact-early-career-scientists-diversity-equity-research.

Druckman, James N. 2022. “Threats to Science: Politicization, Misinformation, and Inequalities.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 700 (1): 8–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/00027162221095431.

Efimov, Igor R., Jeffrey S. Flier, Robert P. George, Anna I. Krylov, Luana S. Maroja, Julia Schaletzky, Jay Tanzman, and Abigail Thompson. 2024. “Politicizing Science Funding Undermines Public Trust in Science, Academic Freedom, and the Unbiased Generation of Knowledge.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* 9 (July). https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1418065.

Fernández Pinto, Manuela. 2020. “Open Science for Private Interests? How the Logic of Open Science Contributes to the Commercialization of Research.” *Frontiers in Research Metrics and Analytics* 5 (November). https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2020.588331.

Fernandez, Mariel. 2025. “Five Rights and Protections All Federal Workers Have.” Legal Defense Fund. January 29, 2025. https://www.naacpldf.org/five-rights-federal-workers/.

Fidler, David P. 2025. “President Trump Begins Changing U.S. Global Health Policy | Think Global Health.” Think Global Health. January 28, 2025. https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/president-trump-begins-changing-us-global-health-policy.

Fisher, Oliver J., Debra Fearnshaw, Nicholas J. Watson, Peter Green, Fiona Charnley, Duncan McFarlane, and Sarah Sharples. 2024. “Promoting Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in Research and Funding: Reflections from a Digital Manufacturing Research Network.” *Research Integrity and Peer Review* 9 (1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-024-00144-w.

Gostin, Lawrence O., Dorit Reiss, and Paul A. Offit. 2025. “Changed Recommendations for COVID-19 Vaccines for Children and Pregnant Women.” *JAMA*, June. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2025.10658.

Gostin, Lawrence, Eric Friedman, and Sarah Wetter. 2025. “Dismantling US Global Health Aid.” *Forefront Group*, February. https://doi.org/10.1377/forefront.20250213.21884.

Groux, Gaëlle M. N., Steven J. Hoffman, and Trygve Ottersen. 2018. “A Typology of Scientific Advisory Committees.” *Global Challenges* 2 (9): 1800004. https://doi.org/10.1002/gch2.201800004.

Hingorani, Micky. 2025. “Global Health Watch: Leadership in Flux, Further Cuts to Foreign Aid, a Pandemic Accord.” AVAC. April 18, 2025. https://avac.org/blog/global-health-watch-issue12/.

Hotez, Peter J. 2022. “COVID-19 Vaccines: The Imperfect Instruments of Vaccine Diplomacy.” *Journal of Travel Medicine*, May. https://doi.org/10.1093/jtm/taac063.

Kahane, Leo H. 2021. “Politicizing the Mask: Political, Economic and Demographic Factors Affecting Mask

Wearing Behavior in the USA." *Eastern Economic Journal* 47 (January): 163–83. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41302-020-00186-0.

Kekatos, Mary. 2025. "RFK Jr. Removes All 17 Members of CDC's Vaccine Advisory Committee." ABC News. June 9, 2025. https://abcnews.go.com/Health/rfk-jr-removing-17-members-cdcs-vaccine-advisory/story?id=122670046.

Knott, Katherine. 2025. "Trump Proposes Deep Cuts to Education and Research." Inside Higher Ed | Higher Education News, Events and Jobs. May 2, 2025. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/government/student-aid-policy/2025/05/02/trump-proposes-deep-cuts-education-and-research.

Mansour, Wesam, David Bishai, Irene Torres, Shehla Zaidi, Valéry Ridde, and Tiago Correia. 2025. "The Shock Effect: How U.S. Global Health Policy Shifts Reshape Health Systems and Research." *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, April. https://doi.org/10.1002/hpm.3936.

Mayor, Alfredo, Lemu Golassa, Hamtandi Magloire Natama, Alberto L. Garcia-Basteiro, and Tacilta Nhampossa. 2025. "Transforming Partnerships through Transboundary Research." *BMJ Global Health* 10 (4): e017602. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2024-017602.

McFarling, Usha Lee. 2025. "Day by Day, How Trump Is Roiling Science and Health." STAT. April 24, 2025. https://www.statnews.com/2025/04/24/trump-100-days-timeline-science-health-nih-cdc-fda-hhs/.

McKenzie, Lindsay. 2024. "Public Opinion Divided over Role of Scientists in Policymaking." AIP. November 21, 2024. https://www.aip.org/fyi/public-opinion-divided-over-role-of-scientists-in-policymaking.

McKenzie, Lindsay. 2025. "Agencies Closing Science Advisory Committees." American Institute of Physics. March 20, 2025. https://www.aip.org/fyi/agencies-closing-science-advisory-committees.

Neely, Stephen R., and Kaila Witkowski. 2024. "Belief in Misinformation and Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine Boosters: A Survey Analysis." *PEC Innovation* 4 (December): 100261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2024.100261.

Neely, Stephen R., and Kaila Witkowski. 2024. "Belief in Misinformation and Acceptance of COVID-19 Vaccine Boosters: A Survey Analysis." *PEC Innovation* 4 (December): 100261. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecinn.2024.100261.

O'Grady, Cathleen. 2025. "Science's Reform Movement Should Have Seen Trump's Call for 'Gold Standard Science' Coming, Critics Say." Science.org. 2025. https://www.science.org/content/article/science-s-reform-movement-should-have-seen-trump-s-call-gold-standard-science-coming.

Parker, Charles F., and Eric K. Stern. 2022. “The Trump Administration and the COVID-19 Crisis: Exploring the Warning-Response Problems and Missed Opportunities of a Public Health Emergency.” *Public Administration* 100 (3): 616–32. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.12843.

Root, Brian, and Cristina Becker. 2025. “US Information Erasure Hurts Everyone.” Human Rights Watch. February 7, 2025. https://www.hrw.org/news/2025/02/07/us-information-erasure-hurts-everyone.

Roper, William. 2020. “Science, Politics, and Public Health.” *Science* 370 (6515): 385–85. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf2837.

The Royal Society. 2025. “Science Diplomacy in an Era of Disruption.” The American Association for the Advancement of Science. https://royalsociety.org/-/media/about-us/international/science-diplomacy/science-diplomacy-in-an-era-of-disruption.pdf.

U.S. BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS. 2025. “Employment Situation Summary.” BLS. 2025. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm.

U.S. President. 2024. *Upholding Civil Service Protections and Merit System Principles*. Executive Order 14117. *Federal Register*89 (69): 25143–25147. https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/04/09/2024-06815/upholding-civil-service-protections-and-merit-system-principles.

Wallace, Jacob, Paul Goldsmith-Pinkham, and Jason L. Schwartz. 2023. “Excess Death Rates for Republican and Democratic Registered Voters in Florida and Ohio during the COVID-19 Pandemic.” *JAMA Internal Medicine* 183 (9): 916–23. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2023.1154.

Yazdi-Feyzabadi, Vahid, Ali-Akbar Haghdoost, Martin McKee, Amirhossein Takian, Elizabeth Bradley, Ruari Brugha, Nir Eyal, et al. 2025. “The United States Withdrawal from the World Health Organization: Implications and Challenges.” *International Journal of Health Policy and Management* 14 (1): 9086. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.9086.

Zogmaister, Cristina, Michela Vezzoli, Alessio Facchin, Federica Paola Conte, Ezia Rizzi, Francesco Giaquinto, Elisa Cavicchiolo, Gabriele Fusco, Sara Pegoraro, and Maura Simioni. 2024. “Assessing the Transparency of Methods in Scientific Reporting.” *Collabra Psychology* 10 (1). https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.121243.