

## Table S2. Additional concerns

This table contains summaries of additional concerns associated with the Nysetvold et al. paper, including 1) inappropriate and libelous statements, 2) misrepresented funding issues, and 3) technical inaccuracies.

### Inappropriate and libelous statements in the Bailey reanalysis

In the original Bailey paper (version 1), the authors made several libelous statements, falsely claiming that we engaged in "intentional deception" and "a fraudulent research practice called data dredging," excluded data "to achieve a specific answer," and their findings would have been "virtually impossible without data manipulation." Since these claims are outrageous, an attorney contacted a faculty chairman to inform the Bailey team that their article sets a poor example to students that libel is acceptable, and suggested that they remove their malicious and false statements prior to going forward with publication. Although this language was adjusted in later versions, it served to reveal author bias and demonstrated a misunderstanding and misuse of basic scientific methodologies.

### Funding issues misrepresented

The original Bailey paper falsely claims that we received funding from anti-vaccination organizations. The National Vaccine Information Center (NVIC) is not "anti-vaccine" and did not fund our study. The NVIC and Michael Belkin had no knowledge of or influence over our study which was self-funded. The NVIC and Michael Belkin only contributed to the Open Access fee. This donation was solicited after the study was accepted for publication. This false information in the Bailey reanalysis appears to be an *ad hominem* slur designed to unfairly discredit us.

In contrast, Elizabeth Bailey received a salary from BYU while collaborating with her students on their manuscript. This internal funding was not explicitly noted in a conflict of interest or funding statement.

### Technical inaccuracies

In the abstract of the Nysetvold et al. paper, the Bailey team incorrectly claimed that our study reported a "correlation coefficient of 0.49 when the actual  $r$ -value reported was 0.70. Our coefficient of determination ( $r^2$ ) was 0.49.

The Bailey team claimed in their paper to have located an "identical dataset" for IMRs as that which was used in our paper but instead used a different dataset retrieved from an alternate resource containing less recent IMR data. The Bailey team's non-identical dataset contains 29 IMRs that vary from the IMRs in our original dataset. For example, the IMR for Sierra Leone in the CIA dataset that we used is 81.86 but the Bailey team has it listed as 154.43 and used this figure in their analyses. (See Supplementary Table S5.)