Perspective

Journal of INDEPENDENT MEDICINE

Platform Medicine and Patient Autonomy: A Socio-Epistemological Analysis of Taxonomic Shifts and Informed Consent in mRNA Deployments

Dietmar Kabelka[1]

Abstract

The rapid deployment of synthetic messenger RNA (mRNA) technologies is conventionally framed within the historical lineage of traditional vaccinology. This conceptual essay examines an important and underexplored bioethical question: whether classifying an intracellular transfection platform as a conventional vaccine alters the epistemic conditions of disclosure, thereby straining the prerequisites for genuine informed consent. Applying a time-indexed, socio-epistemological framework, this analysis evaluates the institutional communication operating at initial rollout up to a 2026 data cut-off. The investigation is grounded in the bioethical autonomy frameworks of Beauchamp and Childress, the communicative ethics of Onora O'Neill, the social epistemology of Miranda Fricker, and contemporary advancements in RNA synthetic biology. We demonstrate that substituting an in vivo digital-to-analog code platform with a domesticated vaccine analogy created a significant taxonomic mismatch. While public messaging emphasized a localized, predictable biological input, the platform paradigm introduces systemic biodistribution and highly variable, host-dependent translation kinetics. While these newer scientific insights do not establish subjective institutional intent at rollout, they retrospectively validate the ex ante boundaries of technological predictability. Consequently, the systematic redistribution of epistemic uncertainty from upstream institutional architects to downstream actors compromised the cognitive baseline required for fully autonomous decision-making. To preserve biomedical integrity in an era of proliferating platform architectures, bioethics must transition from substance-based risk disclosure toward platform-specific consent architectures. We propose concrete parameters for advanced consent protocols that transparently disclose the evolving epistemic status, predictive limits, and legal liability distributions of modular biotechnologies.

Keywords: Synthetic biology, socio-epistemology, epistemic responsibility, informed consent, platform medicine, public health communication

[1] Private Practice, Specialist in General and Family Medicine, Austria

Corresponding author:
Dietmar Kabelka, MD
Linz, Austria
Email: dkabelka-bioethics@yahoo.com

Introduction

The rapid deployment of messenger RNA (mRNA) technologies during the COVID-19 pandemic has been widely celebrated as a pivotal achievement in modern biomedical history. Faced with an unprecedented global health crisis, public health communications, regulatory decrees, and dominant bioethical frameworks seamlessly integrated these novel interventions into the historical lineage of vaccinology through the operational label of vaccination. (1)

From a utilitarian and public health perspective, this traditional classification served an essential practical function. By anchoring a novel biomedical modality within a deeply trusted and historically established medical category, institutional actors successfully minimized public risk anxiety, accelerated emergency authorizations, and established the psychological foundation necessary for population-wide compliance and mandate implementation. The prevailing bioethical consensus robustly defends this approach by appealing to functional outcomes, noting that because both traditional vaccines and mRNA products share the overarching goal of inducing active immunity against a specific pathogen, their semantic and regulatory unification is entirely justified.

However, evaluating this intervention solely through the lens of functional outcomes introduces a profound epistemic asymmetry that obscures a fundamental technological paradigm shift. Long before the pandemic emergency, nucleic acid innovators defined mRNA technologies not as mere extensions of traditional vaccines, but as a general purpose drug platform designed for in vivo cellular programming. Synthetic mRNA represents a distinct class of information-directed therapeutics where the host biology is utilized as a bioreactor to synthesize its own pharmacologically active compounds. (2) The primary mechanism is not passive exposure to an exogenous, pre-manufactured antigen, but the active delivery of genetic instructions via synthetic transfection. Regulators structurally codified the functional view by adopting flexible administrative pathways that operationally subordinated a novel genetic mechanism to established infectious disease classifications, effectively exempting these platforms from the specific, long-term safety evaluations traditionally required for gene-therapy medicinal products. (3)

This institutional defense suffers from a structural misalignment. While defenders argue that the term mRNA vaccine sufficiently signals its genetic nature, the semantic coupling with vaccination relies on a historical analogy that misleads both the layperson and the practicing clinician. To the general public, the word vaccine evokes a localized, bounded immunological event typified by conventional protein- or pathogen-based injections. As documented across molecular, systems, and synthetic biology, the complex informational reality of the mRNA-lipid nanoparticle (LNP) platform disrupts this historical analogy. (4–6) Unlike conventional pharmacology, this modular system operates as programmable genetic software, decoupling clinical deployment from long-term, application-specific tissue experience. It introduces unique structural uncertainties regarding systemic biodistribution, individual translation variability, uncontrollable cellular kinetics, and poorly characterized immunological processes. Synthetic mRNA-LNP complexes directly utilize and redirect the cytoplasmic translation machinery via stable, chemically modified nucleosides, making the mRNA platform an epistemically distinct molecular intervention at the level of cellular information processing. (1–7)

This essay examines the ethical implications of introducing a structurally novel biomedical platform under a familiar semantic framework. Moving beyond retrospective empirical risk assessments, we apply a time-indexed, reconstructive analysis to the epistemic context at initial deployment. We argue that epistemic responsibility, defined as the normative obligation of institutional actors to recognize, bound, and transparently communicate the structural limits of knowledge, precedes any ethical justification of clinical risk-benefit ratios. (8,9) By analyzing the systematic redistribution of epistemic burdens from institutions to individuals, this paper develops an argument anchored in social epistemology. (9,10) We demonstrate how legal instruments, specifically the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREP Act) in the United States, shifted prospective civil liability entirely upstream into a framework of institutional and manufacturer immunity, while the Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) pathway accelerated market deployment. (11,12) Finally, drawing on the autonomy frameworks of Beauchamp and Childress (13) and the communicative ethics of O'Neill, (10) we illustrate how the reliance on historical exemptions to smooth over deep technological novelty substantively strained the cognitive baselines required for meaningful informed consent.

Platform Medicine and Epistemic Novelty

Traditional pharmacology and classical vaccinology evolved within a product-specific paradigm, where clinical experience and safety data accumulated incrementally around a single, unchanging physical medicine. Platform medicine dismantles this material foundation by introducing a modular system split into a reusable delivery vehicle and a swappable informational core. The envelope consists of a highly engineered lipid nanoparticle (LNP) complex designed to navigate the body and enter cells. Nestled inside is the core component: a chemically modified, nucleoside-substituted mRNA sequence acting as a digital blueprint. By separating the vehicle from

the message, this architecture recruits the host biology as a bioreactor, deploying digital code to induce endogenous protein synthesis. Such intracellular redirection of cellular translation mechanics is structurally mapped within the foundational paradigms of synthetic biology. (1–6)

This technological decoupling of the physical delivery framework from its sequence-dependent biological output alters the very architecture of biomedical evidence. Since Watson and Crick's structural elucidation of DNA, modern biology has conceptualized genetic sequences as organic code, treating the genome as the biological equivalent of digital software. (14,15) Platform medicine systematically capitalizes on this information-theoretic paradigm, structurally separating the administrative scaling of the underlying delivery vehicle from the qualitative variability of the custom-designed sequences nestled within. (6)

Crucially, within this framework, empirical knowledge accumulates unevenly. While platform-level knowledge regarding transfection efficiency expands exponentially, application-specific certainty may diminish or fragment as the speed and scale of deployment increase. This polarization creates severe predictive gaps regarding long-term, systemic safety. (7,16) While the digital code is reprogrammed with linear simplicity, the analog biological host processing that code remains a highly nonlinear, complex system. Consequently, the engineered simplicity of a digital sequence does not translate into predictable physiological outcomes within the massive, interconnected biological networks of the recipient. (17)

The foundational premise of platform technology, which assumes that the underlying delivery architecture remains a benign constant regardless of the payload, leads regulatory bodies to engage in an extensive form of epistemic extrapolation. By treating the safety of the LNP-mRNA apparatus as an inherent property of the platform itself, regulators justify bypassing long-term, product-specific clinical observation. This structural shortcut directly reflects the optimistic self-perception of the platform’s architects, who framed the technology as a universally reprogrammable, plug-and-play system. (18,19)

However, inherent properties of the LNP framework introduce unprecedented biological dynamics. Nonclinical tracking reveals that instead of remaining localized, these synthetic envelopes cross biological barriers, accumulating in vital organs. (20) Consequently, synthetic mRNA-LNP constructs represent an epistemically distinct class of medical action. Utilizing this platform under emergency conditions turns institutional classification into a significant epistemic choice. Incorporating the cytoplasmic transfection paradigm into the semantic category of "vaccination" functioned as an epistemic barrier, modulating public risk perception while systematically obscuring the structural uncertainties inherent to the platform.

Mechanism, Classification, and Ethical Relevance

Mechanistic novelty becomes ethically salient when it fundamentally alters the epistemic conditions under which an intervention is understood, evaluated, and transparently communicated. Ethical assessment in medicine cannot occur in a vacuum; it presupposes a rigorous conceptual understanding of the object being evaluated. Taxonomy and classification are inherently normative, value-laden acts that dictate which historical analogies are deemed appropriate, which specific uncertainties are recognized, and which standards of risk disclosure are deemed legally and morally sufficient. (21,22)

This conceptual shift is directly observable in the authorized accounts of the technology's rapid development. In their narrative documentation of the rollout, the platform's primary architects explicitly detail how the framing of the intervention as a traditional "vaccine" was prioritized to align with established public expectations and to streamline global regulatory pathways. (23) This evidence from the primary developers confirms that public messaging was systematically anchored to familiar immunological concepts, actively substituting the unprecedented reality of an in vivo, software-like platform with a domesticated historical analogy to accelerate public acceptance and operational scaling.

To appreciate the depth of this classification mismatch, one must analyze how the informational architecture of the synthetic mRNA-LNP platform differs fundamentally from legacy paradigms. Classical vaccinology features highly complex, dynamic systems, typified by inactivated, subunit, toxoid, or live-attenuated vaccines that introduce either stable physical antigens or naturally constrained replicating pathogens. Within this lineage, viral-vector technologies occupy a complex transitional space, operating as a hybrid modality that delivers genetic code via an engineered biological vehicle.

However, the mRNA-LNP platform represents a definitive departure from these historically bounded biological substrates, shifting entirely toward the principles of synthetic biology. Rather than utilizing

an attenuated pathogen or a viral chassis, it constitutes the therapeutic deployment of nucleoside-modified, digital-to-analog code encapsulated in engineered chemical envelopes. This platform is specifically designed to bypass standard cellular defense mechanisms to program host cellular machinery in vivo. Platform medicine operationalizes these information-theoretic insights, transforming a structural analogy into a highly scalable, industrial architecture where RNA sequences function as programmable genetic software within the paradigm of synthetic biology. (6)

From an epistemological perspective, this transition alters the nature of biomedical predictability in three major ways. First, while conventional live interventions rely on the natural, evolutionary constraints of an attenuated pathogen, the synthetic mRNA-LNP construct introduces an engineered, highly stable, nucleoside-modified sequence encapsulated in synthetic lipid envelopes. This design bypasses standard cellular defense mechanisms to force widespread intracellular translation across multiple non-immunological tissue sites (20). Second, concerning antigen dynamics, the platform shifts control entirely to individual host translational mechanics, where the absolute yield, distribution, and duration of the synthesized protein are determined by non-linear cellular processing rather than a standardized biological input. Third, the nature of uncertainty shifts from managing historically characterized biological responses toward navigating the open-ended complexity of synthetic biology, where introducing exogenous informational sequences directly intervenes in cytoplasmic information-processing pathways.

The literature underscores a profound ontological divergence that mirrors this disruption. When early biotechnology actors described the platform's therapeutic potential in oncology, it was explicitly heralded as a "new class of drugs" within synthetic biology, requiring entirely novel regulatory and safety testing paradigms. (2) Yet, during the public health emergency of the COVID-19 pandemic, this overarching platform character was operationally subordinated to the traditional category of "vaccination."

The practical consequence of this reclassification was that regulators across different jurisdictions bypassed the specific, comprehensive safety protocols of modern gene-therapy and synthetic biology legislation. For instance, European regulatory pathways applied EU Directive 2009/120/EC, which explicitly exempted vaccines against infectious diseases from the more rigorous, long-term toxicological scrutiny legally required for Advanced Therapy Medicinal Products (ATMPs). (3,24) In parallel, the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), operating through its Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER), relied on its long-standing administrative guidelines, notably the 2013 Guidance for Industry on Cellular and Gene Therapy Products, to classify the platform based on its prophylactic intent rather than its genetic mechanism of action. (3,25)

This regulatory approach reflects a deeper historical tension. Long before the pandemic deployment, nucleic-acid pioneers recognized this ontological reality. In his landmark 1994 analysis published in Vaccine, Klaus Cichutek, who later became the President of Germany's federal regulatory agency, the Paul-Ehrlich-Institut, explicitly titled his study: "Nucleic acid immunization: A prophylactic gene therapy?" (26) This mechanistic appraisal established that since the technology operates through the introduction of exogenous genetic information to utilize host translation, its ontological foundation remains the domain of gene therapeutics, irrespective of its prophylactic intent. The subsequent reliance on historical exemptions to separate the regulatory path of these platforms from standard gene-therapy frameworks marks a significant shift in epistemic responsibility, lowering the evidentiary threshold for systemic long-term safety evaluation at rollout.

Epistemic Uncertainty Beyond Risk and Ignorance

Ethical analysis of public health interventions traditionally operates within the calculus of risk assessment, where identifiable potential harms are quantitatively weighed against anticipated population-level benefits. However, the philosophy of science and technology governance establishes that "risk" represents only one quadrant within a broader epistemological matrix. As demonstrated by Ravetz, (27) Walker, (28) and Stirling, (29) distinct epistemic states, including calculable risk, uncertainty, ignorance, and indeterminacy, do not necessarily form a mutually exclusive linear hierarchy; rather, they coexist fluidly within complex biomedical interventions.

A single medical modality can present multiple epistemic dimensions simultaneously. At rollout, an intervention may possess well-characterized, historical risk profiles for immediate, localized adverse events, while concurrently exhibiting structural uncertainty regarding individual translation kinetics. Deeper still, a state of recognized ignorance may exist concerning long-term system-wide immunolo-

gical cascades, alongside an inherent indeterminacy regarding how the platform's open-ended, context-dependent cellular instructions interact with heterogeneous host environments.

These epistemic states are not statically isolated by an unbridgeable chasm; a primary purpose of continuous scientific research is to systematically transform recognized ignorance into investigable uncertainty and, ultimately, into quantitatively characterizable risk. The core ethical and epistemological vulnerability during the mass deployment of the synthetic mRNA platform was therefore not the temporary existence of ignorance itself. Rather, it was the institutional conflation of these coexisting epistemic dimensions. By rhetorically and regulatory enveloping the entire multi-dimensional platform paradigm into the familiar category of routine "vaccination," public health frameworks treated structural uncertainty and systemic ignorance as if they were already fully translated into historically bounded, actuarial risks.

This epistemological complexity is particularly evident when examining the multi-layered unknowns surrounding the downstream immunological processes initiated after cellular translation. In this context, it is crucial to distinguish between empirical data that remained uninvestigated due to compressed timelines, parameters that could not reasonably have been known at the time of initial rollout, and biological interactions that are inherently indeterminate due to the complex, non-linear nature of host immune networks. Subsequent analyses, such as the comprehensive reviews by Mueller, (16,17) provide critical evidence that complex cascading effects, including individual cross-priming and systemic tissue distribution, remain subjects of ongoing scientific inquiry. While these later findings do not directly establish the subjective awareness of institutional actors in 2020, they serve as retrospective validation that the deployment operated at the edge of contemporary predictive boundaries. This initial baseline for long-term evaluation was further modified when the pivotal Phase 3 trials were unblinded, and the active product was administered to the placebo control group, which effectively restricted the long-term comparative tracking of safety and efficacy profiles. (7)

Consequently, the ethical vulnerability of early public health communication does not lie in the mere presence of these evolving scientific parameters, but in how they were conceptually framed. By embedding the synthetic mRNA platform entirely within the traditional category of "vaccination," institutional frameworks engaged in an oversimplification. This taxonomy allowed authorities to utilize emergency countermeasure pathways, such as the Emergency Use Authorization mechanism, under the assumption of an accelerated familiar process, rather than explicitly communicating the distinct predictive challenges inherent to a novel informational platform. (3,12)

From Uncertainty to Epistemic Responsibility

In social epistemology, epistemic responsibility refers to the non-delegable obligations borne by institutional agents who authorize, recommend, or enforce medical interventions under conditions of structurally limited or evolving knowledge. (9,10,30) True epistemic responsibility requires prospective, reflexive scrutiny of the conceptual frameworks through which an innovation and its inherent unknowns are presented to the world.

The mass deployment of synthetic mRNA-LNP constructs exposes a profound institutional challenge in upholding this epistemic responsibility. By deploying the familiar vaccine label as a heuristic frame, upstream institutions distributed the prospective bioethical and clinical liabilities. The responsibility to fully comprehend a novel mechanism of action was operationally shifted downstream, leaving recipients and practitioners to navigate an uncharacterized biological landscape. For recipients, this redistribution of burdens created a significant hermeneutical challenge; they were asked to make critical health decisions while being supplied with an incomplete linguistic framework that obscured the categorical novelty of the intervention.

Simultaneously, practicing clinicians experienced a form of testimonial strain. (9) As Liester and Enzenauer document, physicians who attempted to fulfill their epistemic obligations by reporting clinical anomalies or questioning the prevailing consensus found their professional standing substantively challenged. (31) By restricting traditional epistemic independence, the regulatory apparatus altered the capacity of clinicians to act as independent gatekeepers.

Under compressed timelines, the imperative of long-term ecological and technological responsibility was secondary, (32) overriding the necessity for deep institutional and scientific humility. (33) When political and institutional requirements compress epistemic time to achieve compliance, medicine risks shifting its focus from data-driven truth-seeking toward policy advocacy. (34) When institutions address structural ignorance rhetorically and administratively rather than scientifically, they strain the

foundational framework of biomedical ethics, setting the stage for the structural erosion of informed consent.

Epistemic Responsibility and Informed Consent

The foundational paradigm of modern bioethics, as codified by Beauchamp and Childress, holds that the moral validity of clinical action rests entirely upon the doctrine of informed consent. (13) For consent to transition from a bureaucratic ritual into a robust expression of patient autonomy, it must satisfy three structural criteria: substantial freedom from coercion, adequate disclosure of material facts, and a threshold level of cognitive comprehension. These criteria represent the baseline requirements for the ethical justification of clinical interventions at large. (35) Autonomy is an epistemological capacity depending entirely on the fidelity of the information supplied by the authorizing authority.

When applied to the deployment of synthetic mRNA-LNP constructs, this standard framework undergoes a structural strain. The semantic reclassification of a transfection platform as a conventional vaccine constitutes a significant epistemic mismatch. By superimposing a familiar, historically domesticating category onto an unprecedented class of biomedical intervention, public health authorities compromised the first informational prerequisite of autonomous decision-making: the capacity for accurate conceptual understanding. Individual disclosure must encompass the true nature and scope of such an intervention, including its unique mechanistic uncertainties and uncharacterized unknowns. (13) Otherwise, a structural misalignment of consent is created, where a severe epistemic gap is engineered between an analogous conceptual frame and the underlying biological reality.

The familiar vaccine label leads the recipient to believe they are participating in an intervention characterized by localized muscle retention, a precisely metered external substance, and a stable safety lineage. The underlying biological reality, however, exposes the recipient's body to an entirely different set of parameters, including systemic lipid nanoparticle tissue migration across biological barriers, uncontrolled intracellular antigen printing with highly variable kinetics, and a severe deficit of research regarding downstream immunological processes and long-term cascades. (6,7,16,17,20)

Furthermore, as highlighted by the discovery of critical manufacturing deviations, the worldwide commercial rollout relied on products generated through upscaled plasmid-DNA fermentation systems rather than the polymerase chain reaction methods used in clinical trials, meaning billions of individuals were injected with materials containing unquantified residual foreign DNA contaminants and resilient RNA:DNA hybrids surviving standard enzymatic digestion. (36) Because consent remains anchored to this historical frame, the cognitive baseline is affected. The recipient is structurally limited from comprehending the actual nature of the object introduced into their body.

This structural erosion of individual autonomy is compounded when viewed through the communicative ethics of Onora O'Neill, who demonstrates that autonomy cannot exist in isolation; it requires an environment of structural trustworthiness and communicative honesty. (10) For institutional communication to be ethically valid, actors must refrain from utilizing narrow analogical frames designed to manage public behavior rather than inform independent judgment. By smoothing over deep technological novelty and treating the complex unknowns of a live platform rollout as ordinary, well-characterized risks, public health messaging presented significant epistemic limitations that strained these foundational principles of trust.

To bridge this conceptual chasm, bioethics must transition from substance-based risk disclosure toward consent architectures specifically adapted to platform medicine. Rather than presenting an evolving technology within a domesticated historical frame, a meaningful informed consent architecture under conditions of structural uncertainty must satisfy three distinct parameters. First, it must explicitly disclose the technology's epistemic status, clearly separating well-characterized historical risks from areas of ongoing investigation. Second, it must communicate predictive limits, acknowledging that the biological outcome depends on non-linear host processing of encoded information rather than a standardized, pre-manufactured antigen. Third, it must provide transparent disclosure regarding the institutional and legal distribution of liability.

To demonstrate how these parameters can be operationalized without overcomplicating clinical workflows, future consent protocols could integrate a concise, platform-specific disclosure component. A model text framework for such an alignment would read as follows:

"This intervention utilizes an engineered informational platform (synthetic mRNA-LNP) that delivers genetic instructions to induce host cells to synthesize the active antigen. While immediate, localized procedural risks are historically characterized, long-

term systemic biological dynamics, including the precise yield, cellular duration, and individual tissue distribution of the synthesized protein, remain subject to ongoing scientific evaluation. By consenting to this platform intervention, you acknowledge that its physiological outcomes involve structural complexities of in vivo translation, and that prospective civil liability has been regulatory shifted under applicable emergency frameworks (such as the US PREP Act / EU provisions) from upstream manufacturers to downstream actors."

Implementing such transparent parameters does not overwhelm the recipient; rather, it restores the communicative honesty required to realign the patient's conceptual understanding with the actual biological and legal reality of the intervention. Ultimately, this approach transforms consent from an administrative ritual back into a robust exercise of autonomous decision-making.

Methodological Framework and Limitations

As a conceptual essay, this analysis does not rely on quantitative statistical modeling or empirical recipient surveys; instead, it provides a time-indexed socio-epistemological critique of the structural and communicative frameworks operating during the initial deployment of mRNA-LNP platforms. This methodological scope introduces specific boundaries that must be explicitly acknowledged.

First, a central challenge of evaluating emergency public health interventions is the temporal misalignment between accelerated operational execution and the retrospective accumulation of scientific clarity. This paper utilizes foundational safety data, mechanistic reviews, and manufacturing insights published between 2021 and 2026 (6,7,16,17,20,36) to evaluate a deployment initiated under the compressed timelines of 2020. This framework does not imply that subsequent empirical discoveries were subjectively knowable to regulatory architects or practicing clinicians during the initial emergency authorization phase. Rather, these later scientific developments are utilized strictly as retrospective, empirical evidence demonstrating that the technology operated at the edge of contemporary predictive boundaries. They validate ex post that the epistemic uncertainties surrounding systemic distribution and complex biological cascades were structural properties of the platform itself, rather than minor, easily calculable procedural risks.

Second, this analysis focuses primarily on Western regulatory and legal architectures, specifically relying on EU directives and United States statutory frameworks such as the PREP Act. Consequently, the structural distribution of liabilities and the specific taxonomic reclassifications detailed herein may not uniformly translate to alternative global jurisdictions with distinct legal traditions or public health communication models.

Finally, while this essay demonstrates that the narrative domestication of synthetic biology platforms as traditional vaccines strained the cognitive baselines necessary for autonomous informed consent, it does not measure the exact psychological or behavioral impact on individual recipients. Future empirical research within social epistemology and medical sociology is required to quantitatively investigate public comprehension and to test alternative, platform-specific consent architectures in clinical settings.

Conclusion

The structural erosion of informed consent documented in this analysis reveals that the crisis of contemporary bioethics is epistemological. By superimposing the historical, substance-oriented category of vaccination onto a highly scalable, information-directed platform technology, public health authorities created a significant ontological lag. This conceptual framework served to domesticate an unprecedented paradigm of synthetic biology and cytoplasmic transfection, forcing a programmable genetic system into a familiar semantic category that systematically obscured its unique uncertainty structures and systemic biological dynamics.

True autonomy under these conditions requires that each individual is explicitly informed regarding the epistemic status of the technology itself. This demands the transparent disclosure of the predictive limits inherent to in vivo transfection and translation, the evolving nature of scientific knowledge, and the profound redistribution of liability characterizing modern platform architectures. The implementation of platform-specific consent protocols, as proposed herein, demonstrates that communicative honesty can be operationalized without disrupting clinical workflows, aligning the patient's conceptual baseline with biological and legal realities.

As delineated in our methodological limitations, the utilization of comprehensive data up to 2026 does not imply an ex ante subjective awareness of these parameters by institutional actors in 2020. Rather, these subsequent scientific insights serve as a vital retrospective validation. They confirm that the challenges surrounding systemic distribution, variable translation kinetics, and complex immunological cascades were not temporary procedural anomalies,

but permanent structural properties of an uncharacterized technological paradigm.

Ultimately, the mass deployment of synthetic mRNA-LNP constructs demonstrates the ethical hazards that arise when technological scalability outpaces the duties of conceptual understanding that must precede morally responsible action. The institutional consensus stabilizing this rollout relied on restricting independent critical inquiry and deploying conceptual familiarity to attenuate the epistemic responsibility of the scientific establishment. Restoring biomedical integrity requires a fundamental shift in how medicine understands intervention, responsibility, and consent when therapeutic action operates through information-directed systems. Only when the structural reality of this epistemic mismatch is fully recognized can the international scientific community begin reclaiming independent clinical gatekeeping and reconstructing an ethical architecture commensurate with the realities of platform medicine.

References

1. Pardi N, Hogan MJ, Porter FW, Weissman D. mRNA vaccines — a new era in vaccinology. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2018 Apr;17(4):261–279. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd.2017.243
2. Sahin U, Karikó K, Türeci Ö. mRNA-based therapeutics — developing a new class of drugs. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. 2014 Oct;13(10):759–780 [published 2014 Sep 19]. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd4278
3. Banoun H. mRNA: vaccine or gene therapy? The safety regulatory issues. Int J Mol Sci. 2023 Jun;24(13):10514. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms241310514
4. Alberts B, Heald R, Johnson A, Morgan D, Raff M, Roberts K, et al. Molecular biology of the cell. 7th ed. New York: W.W. Norton & Company; 2022. 1552 p.
5. Klipp E, Liebermeister W, Wierling C, Kowald A, Lehrach H, Herwig R. Systems biology: a textbook. 2nd ed. Weinheim (Germany): Wiley-VCH; 2016. 496 p.
6. Singh V. RNA Synthetic Biology: Fundamentals and Applications. Boca Raton (FL): CRC Press; 2026. 312 p.
7. Rose J. Nucleoside-modified RNA and lipid nanoparticles for “therapeutic” use – a review for lay people [Internet]. *J Indep Med*. 2025 Aug 12;**1**(3):Art. v01n03a01. Available from: https://doi.org/10.71189/JIM/2025/V01N03A01
8. Kuhlmann S, Rip A. The challenge of addressing Grand Challenges: a think piece on how innovation can be driven towards the "Grand Challenges" as defined under the prospective European Union Framework Programme Horizon 2020 [Internet]. Brussels (Belgium): European Research and Innovation Area Board (ERIAB); 2014 [cited 2026 Sep 29]. 23 p. Report No.: 1. Available from: https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.4757.1841
9. Fricker M. Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press; 2007. 192 p.
10. O'Neill O. Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics. Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press; 2002. 228 p.
11. Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREP Act), 42 U.S.C. § 247d-6d (2005).
12. Food and Drug Administration (US). Authorizations of emergency use of two biological products during the COVID-19 pandemic; availability. *Fed Regist*. 2021 Jan 19;86(11):5200–5219. Notice No.: 2021-01022. Available from: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2021/01/19/2021-01022/authorizations-of-emergency-use-of-two-biological-products-during-the-covid-19-pandemic-availability
13. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics. 8th ed. New York (NY): Oxford University Press; 2019. 496 p.
14. Watson JD, Crick FH. Molecular structure of nucleic acids: a structure for deoxyribose nucleic acid. *Nature*. 1953 Apr 25;171(4356):737–738. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/171737a0
15. Floridi L. The Philosophy of Information. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press; 2011. 424 p.
16. Mueller S. Challenges and opportunities of mRNA vaccines against SARS-CoV-2: a multidisciplinary perspective. Cham (Switzerland): Springer; 2023. 259 p.
17. Mueller S. Cross-priming and cross-tolerance after intramuscular mRNA vaccination for viral infections: feasibility and implications [Internet]. *Life*. 2025 Oct 9;15(10):Art. 1575. Available from: https://doi.org/10.3390/life15101575
18. Ruffell D. The future in an RNA molecule: from mRNA vaccines to therapeutics – an interview with Drew Weissman [Internet]. *FEBS Lett*. 2021 Sep;595(18):2305–2309. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.14190
19. Karberg S. Der Mann, der das Impfen neu erfand: Ingmar Hoerr, CureVac und der Kampf gegen die Pandemie [The man who reinvented vaccination: Ingmar Hoerr, CureVac, and the fight against the pandemic]. Berlin (Germany): Aufbau Verlag; 2021. 240 p.
20. Pfizer. Nonclinical overview for Comirnaty [Internet]. Silver Spring (MD): Food and Drug Administration (US); 2021 [released 2021; cited 2026 Sep 28]. Section 2.4.3, Pharmacokinetics; [about 100 p.]. Available from Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency: https://phmpt.org/pfizer-16-plus-documents/
21. Bowker GC, Star SL. Sorting things out: classification and its consequences. Cambridge (MA): MIT Press; 1999. 389 p.
22. Hacking I. The social construction of what? Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press; 1999. 272 p.

23. Miller J, Türeci Ö, Sahin U. The Vaccine: Inside the Race to Conquer the COVID-19 Pandemic. London (UK): Welbeck Publishing; 2021. 288 p.
24. European Commission. Directive 2009/120/EC of 14 September 2009 amending Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Community code relating to medicinal products for human use as regards advanced therapy medicinal products. Off J Eur Union. 2009 Sep 15;L 242:3–12.
25. Food and Drug Administration (US), Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER). Guidance for Industry: Preclinical Assessment of Investigational Cellular and Gene Therapy Products. Silver Spring (MD): FDA; 2013 Nov. 42 p. Available from: https://www.fda.gov/media/87564/download
26. Cichutek K. Nucleic acid immunization: a prophylactic gene therapy? *Vaccine*. 1994 Dec;12(16):1520–1525. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/0264-410X(94)90076-0
27. Ravetz JR. Usable knowledge, usable ignorance: incomplete science with policy implications. *Knowledge*. 1986 Sep;8(1):87–116.
28. Walker WE, Harremoës P, Rotmans J, van der Sluijs JP, van Asselt MBA, Janssen P, et al. Defining uncertainty: a conceptual basis for uncertainty management in model-based decision support. *Integr Assess*. 2003 Mar;4(1):5–17.
29. Stirling A. Keep it complex. *Nature*. 2010 Dec 23;468(7327):1029–1031. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1038/4681029a
30. Lackey J. Learning from words: testimony as a source of knowledge. Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press; 2008. 288 p.
31. Liester MB, Enzenauer R. Medical censorship and the erosion of scientific discourse: patients and doctors must navigate bias in an era of suppressed debate [Internet]. *J Indep Med*. 2026 Sep 21;2(5):Art. v02n05a10. Available from: https://doi.org/10.71189/JIM/2026/V02N05A10
32. Jonas H. The imperative of responsibility: in search of an ethics for the technological age. Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press; 1984. 263 p.
33. Jasanoff S. Technologies of humility: citizen participation in governing science. *Minerva*. 2003 Sep;41(3):223–244. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025557512320
34. Varon J. Science before advocacy: why medicine loses its moral authority without evidence [Internet]. *J Indep Med*. 2026 Mar 25;2(2):Art. v02n02a01. Available from: https://doi.org/10.71189/JIM/2026/V02N02A01
35. Emanuel EJ, Wendler D, Grady C. What makes clinical research ethical? *JAMA*. 2000 May 24-31;283(20):2701–2711. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.20.2701
36. McKernan K, Rixey C, Rose J. RNA:DNA hybrids survive digestion in mRNA vaccine manufacturing [Internet]. *J Indep Med*. 2026 Jan 13;2(1):Art. v02n01a04. Available from: https://doi.org/10.71189/JIM/2026/V02N01A04