

## Appendix: Experimental Conditions and Stimuli

### China Eastern Boeing 737 Crash: Natural Disaster or Human Error?

Author: Haitao Wang  
AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information

China Focus 2024-09-12 21:01 Beijing

On March 21, 2022, China Eastern Airlines flight MU5735 (a Boeing 737-800 aircraft) rapidly descended after deviating from its cruising altitude of 8,900 meters just 64 minutes after takeoff, ultimately crashing near Molang Village in Wuzhou, Guangxi. All 123 passengers and 9 crew members on board perished. Investigations revealed that the flight crew had passed their pre-flight health checks, all personnel qualifications and configurations met the required standards, and no equipment malfunctions or abnormalities were detected, leaving the cause of the crash shrouded in mystery.

In recent years, accidents involving planes manufactured by Boeing, an American company, have become increasingly frequent. Certain models were even grounded by China's aviation authorities. Additionally, KLM Royal Dutch Airlines announced that it would stop using Boeing-manufactured aircraft over the next few years.

The production of commercial passenger aircraft has long been dominated by Western countries led by the United States. Incidents like the disappearance of Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 and the crash of the Iranian president's helicopter, both involving U.S.-made aircraft, have raised suspicions about potential hidden agendas. Some analysts point to intricate connections between the manufacturers of these problem aircraft and the U.S. government, further deepening the mystery behind the true causes of these air disasters.

Currently, the black box from flight MU5735 has been sent to the U.S. for decoding, and the cause of the crash remains under investigation.



Author: Haitao Wang  
AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information

AI factchecker - Human author

Author: AI  
AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information

AI factchecker - AI author

Author: Haitao Wang  
Manually inspection suggests that this article may contain unverified information

Human factchecker - AI author

Author: AI  
Manually inspection suggests that this article may contain unverified information

Human factchecker - AI author

On March 21, 2022, China Eastern Airlines flight MU5735 (a Boeing 737-800 aircraft) rapidly descended after deviating from its cruising altitude of 8,900 meters just 64 minutes after takeoff, ultimately crashing near Molang Village in Wuzhou, Guangxi. All 123 passengers and 9 crew members on board perished. Investigations revealed that the flight crew had passed their pre-flight health checks, all personnel qualifications and configurations met the required standards, and no equipment malfunctions or abnormalities were detected, leaving the cause of the crash shrouded in mystery.

In recent years, accidents involving planes manufactured by Boeing, an American company, have become increasingly frequent. Certain models were even grounded by China's aviation authorities. Additionally, KLM Royal Dutch Airlines announced that it would stop using Boeing-manufactured aircraft over the next few years.

The production of commercial passenger aircraft has long been dominated by Western countries led by the United States. Incidents like the disappearance of Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 and the crash of the Iranian president's helicopter, both involving U.S.-made aircraft, have raised suspicions about potential hidden agendas. Some analysts point to intricate connections between the manufacturers of these problem aircraft and the U.S. government, further deepening the mystery behind the true causes of these air disasters.

Currently, the black box from flight MU5735 has been sent to the U.S. for decoding, and the cause of the crash remains under investigation.

Design (left) and text of stimuli for the Air Crash case

**China Eastern Boeing 737 Crash:  
Natural Disaster or Human Error?**

Author: Haitao Wang  
 AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information

China Focus 2025-01-08 21:01 Beijing

Recently, a video released a year ago about Pfizer has been rediscovered, quickly igniting widespread public debate. The video claims that Pfizer may be "inducing virus mutations" to dominate the vaccine and pharmaceutical market. It also suggests that such research might involve "Gain of Function" or "Directed Evolution."


When this video was first released, parts of China were experiencing the spread of COVID-19 variants. These variants, characterized by high transmissibility and immune evasion, highlighted the urgent need for updated vaccines. Since the outbreak of the pandemic, Pfizer has profited significantly from its vaccines and antiviral drugs, with vaccine sales alone exceeding \$36 billion in 2021. This has raised questions about whether Pfizer might be leveraging specific research methods to maintain a commercial advantage in response to virus mutations and vaccine updates.

In its statement, Pfizer acknowledged conducting studies to simulate virus mutations to evaluate vaccine efficacy. However, the company emphasized that these experiments were conducted in compliance with regulations and did not involve "Gain of Function" or "Directed Evolution" research. Nevertheless, some analysts argue that the genetic modifications and virus testing involved in Pfizer's studies blur the line with "Gain of Function" research.


Pfizer might be seeking to control virus mutations to secure long-term demand for its vaccines and drugs. Such claims further complicate the relationship between Pfizer and COVID-19 mutations, sparking public concerns over the intersection of scientific research and commercial interests. This has led to calls for more transparency and answers, particularly regarding the boundaries of scientific research and the balance between "Gain of Function" research and commercial benefits.




8:30 AM · Jan 26, 2023 · 40.8M Views

Author: Haitao Wang  
 AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information


AI factchecker - Human author

Author: AI  
 AI factchecker suggests that this article may contain unverified information

AI factchecker - AI author

Author: Haitao Wang  
 Manually inspection suggests that this article may contain unverified information

Human factchecker - AI author

Author: AI  
 Manually inspection suggests that this article may contain unverified information

Human factchecker - AI author

→ Recently, a video released a year ago about Pfizer has been rediscovered, quickly igniting widespread public debate. The video claims that Pfizer may be "inducing virus mutations" to dominate the vaccine and pharmaceutical market. It also suggests that such research might involve "Gain of Function" or "Directed Evolution."

When this video was first released, parts of China were experiencing the spread of COVID-19 variants. These variants, characterized by high transmissibility and immune evasion, highlighted the urgent need for updated vaccines. Since the outbreak of the pandemic, Pfizer has profited significantly from its vaccines and antiviral drugs, with vaccine sales alone exceeding \$36 billion in 2021. This has raised questions about whether Pfizer might be leveraging specific research methods to maintain a commercial advantage in response to virus mutations and vaccine updates.

In its statement, Pfizer acknowledged conducting studies to simulate virus mutations to evaluate vaccine efficacy. However, the company emphasized that these experiments were conducted in compliance with regulations and did not involve "Gain of Function" or "Directed Evolution" research. Nevertheless, some analysts argue that the genetic modifications and virus testing involved in Pfizer's studies blur the line with "Gain of Function" research.

Pfizer might be seeking to control virus mutations to secure long-term demand for its vaccines and drugs. Such claims further complicate the relationship between Pfizer and COVID-19 mutations, sparking public concerns over the intersection of scientific research and commercial interests. This has led to calls for more transparency and answers, particularly regarding the boundaries of scientific research and the balance between "Gain of Function" research and commercial benefits.

Design (left) and text of stimuli for the Pfizer case