The Authors of the European Psychopathic Epidemic

Costantino Slobodyanyuk

Information Security Institute

@ Email: slobodyanuk.kv@gmail.com

Abstract

The COVID-19 pandemic related European hysteria of 2020 has a definite starting point. March 16 was the opening of a new order and new rules making in Europe. An unprecedented violation of the Schengen Agreement (first time in the history of the European Union) as a consequence of which Germany closed its borders. As it is known, afterward, Germany introduced an unusual quarantine. As a consequence of such precedent, these kinds of human control methods (targeted specifically on people, not the COVID-19) scaled all over the European Union and followed by some countries of Eastern Europe, in particular Ukraine. However, March 16 is a historical date for another off-radar reason. On March 16 a controversial article was published on the website of the Imperial College of London (Ferguson, 2020), which considerably influenced the decision-making process in European states and became one of the triggers of the psychopathic epidemic in western and eastern Europe. Materials published on the Imperial College of London website enabled elected officials to justify any measures with quarantine, which drove to significant economic consequences and generated unprecedented panic of populations. The invisible enemy and uncertain future, decorated and mutilated to some extent by the media, plunged Western and Eastern Europe into awe. The report of the scientific team led by Professor Ferguson (Neil Morris Ferguson) from Great Britain is the central object of this journalistic investigation.

Keywords
COVID-19, pandemic, expert opinion, critical evaluation

Introduction

Today we are all witnessing the effects that are caused by the pandemic (Campbell, 2020; Chia & Oyeniran, 2020; Goodell, 2020; Health, 2020; Schwartz, 2020; Yang et al., 2020). No small responsibility for the panic lies with the media, whose degree of influence is only confirmed with each new study in various fields (Bushman & Whitaker, 2017; see also Mudrick et al., 2016; Schlesinger, 2015; Vaterlaus et al., 2015; Walker, 2016; Wiedeman et al., 2015). However, the media are only repeaters. Who, then, are the actual creators of this content?

Every investigation is preceded by a prerequisite. In my particular case, the catalyst was the widespread dissemination of forecasts made by certain Ukrainian scientists, whom I suspect were aligned with the government's objectives in justifying stringent quarantine measures in Ukraine. The first simulation and evident instance of misleading the Ukrainian public emerged when the official website of the Kyiv City State Administration published news claiming that the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine had projected a potential coronavirus infection count of up

to 22 million in the country (*Protocol No. 16.PDF*, 2020). This news received extensive coverage from national media outlets, which, driven by their need to survive, seemed to prioritize disseminating information without due regard for its quality or potential consequences (Huzhva, 2020). Even the acting Director General of the Center for Public Health of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, Ihor Kuzin, fell for the same misinformation (Shuster online, 2020).

One would expect that after such a fake had been exposed, the situation would have stabilized, prompting people to contemplate the actual state of affairs. However, instead of pursuing scientific rigor and conducting a comprehensive investigation, Ukrainian scientists, regrettably, appeared to "prophecise", offering contradictory statements. Notable among these scientists is Prof. Olga Golubovskaya from Bogomolets National Medical University and the L.V. Gromashevsky Institute of Epidemiology and Infectious Diseases of the National Academy of Medical Sciences of Ukraine (*Coronavirus will infect 30 million Ukrainians, we will face a severe COVID-19 scenario. Interview with Olga Golubovskaya*, 2020).

One might think that I am being overly critical, but as a young scientist and corresponding member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, I am acutely aware that forecasts projecting potentially tens of millions of coronavirus infections in Ukraine should be based on a well-defined methodology. However, none of the Ukrainian "prophets" have provided such a methodology, at least not one that has been presented thus far. Consequently, the forecasts lack a solid foundation and seem to be limited to a ceiling figure of 80% infected within the territory of Ukraine. I became curious about the origin of this forecast and whether there was a proper basis for it. In the absence of a proper methodology and the inability to generate their own forecasts, it is likely that Ukrainian scientists borrowed these projections from external sources. Upon investigation, I discovered that British scientists were the source of this projection. At this point, I must urge readers to avoid sarcasm or generalizations about "British scientists," as it would be unfair to paint all scientists from Britain with the same brush. Nonetheless, it was indeed British scientists who initiated the forecast about 80% of infected individuals, and this scaremongering was not only propagated by the media but also endorsed by representatives of academia who may even not have examined Professor Ferguson's research materials.

Methods

Before delving into a comprehensive critical evaluation of the outlined issues, it is imperative to explore diverse methodologies for analyzing situations related to coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). This exploration may encompass various methods and approaches to assess the virus's spread, the effectiveness of control measures, and their impact on public health and society.

Various methods are employed to analyze the 2019 coronavirus crisis:

1. Epidemiological analysis involves evaluating the spread of the virus, encompassing factors such as transmission rate, incubation period, and incidence.
2. Investigating clusters and infection sources to pinpoint potential points of origin.
3. Utilizing mathematical models in spread modeling to forecast the virus's future dissemination and evaluate the effectiveness of control measures.
4. Conducting scenario analysis to evaluate how various factors impact epidemic dynamics.
5. Surveillance of morbidity and mortality involves monitoring illness and death rates to gauge the epidemic's severity. This includes analyzing potential shifts in disease patterns and identifying risk groups.
6. Genetic analysis of the virus entails studying its genetic characteristics to identify mutations and potential alterations in properties. This helps determine the extent of strain diversity and its implications for vaccination.
7. Assessing the effectiveness of control measures involves analyzing outcomes from interventions like quarantine, social distancing, and vaccination. This includes evaluating the cost-benefit ratio of the implemented measures.

8. Conducting economic analysis involves evaluating the epidemic's economic repercussions on various sectors and society at large. This includes assessing the effectiveness of economic support measures.

9. Social analysis entails evaluating the epidemic's impact on social structures, mental health, and public opinion. This involves examining social inequalities and how they are exacerbated during the pandemic.

10. Communication analysis is employed to assess the effectiveness of communication strategies employed by authorities and the media in informing the public. It also involves evaluating risk perception and adherence to recommendations.

11. Evaluation of vaccination involves assessing the efficacy of vaccination programs and the extent of population coverage. This includes monitoring potential side effects and ensuring the safety of vaccines.

12. Analysis of the health situation involves evaluating the preparedness and capacity of health systems to handle the surge in illness. This encompasses assessing resource utilization, access to care, and the effectiveness of the testing system.

13. International analysis includes comparing control strategies and measures implemented by various countries. This also involves studying international cooperation in sharing information, experiences, and medical resources.

14. Analyzing population behavior involves studying how the public responds to control measures and health recommendations. This includes examining the social and cultural factors influencing adherence to precautionary measures.

15. Technology analysis entails utilizing technology for tracking virus spread, contact tracing, and monitoring morbidity.

16. Assessing the effectiveness of digital solutions involves analyzing how well these technological tools prevent the spread of the virus.

17. Predicting future trends involves utilizing data and models to anticipate potential scenarios for a given situation. Strategies and control measures can then be adjusted based on projected changes.

18. Conducting socio-economic analysis entails evaluating the pandemic's impact on labor employment, businesses, and economic stability. This includes examining economic recovery measures post the easing of restrictions.

A comprehensive analysis of the pandemic situation necessitates an integrated approach, involving the collaboration of various areas of expertise. These research methods facilitate a better comprehension of the virus's characteristics, the efficacy of implemented measures, and the pandemic's impact on health, society, and the economy. The amalgamation of these methods contributes to a more thorough understanding of the COVID-19 situation and aids in the development of more effective strategies to combat the pandemic. In light of the established methodology, the next step involves an analysis of the current Covid-19 situation. Particularly crucial is the examination of how this situation is portrayed in the media by certain figures in the scientific community and the resulting consequences of such representations.

This article undertakes an investigative analysis of various facts related to the dissemination of information about the pandemic to the general public. The aim of this investigation is to empower discerning individuals to scrutinize the presented facts and formulate their own conclusions.

Results

Commencing with a fundamental scientific principle, it is essential to acknowledge that research founded on inaccurate initial data will inevitably yield errors. Intentionally doing so provides a model and the requisite mathematical calculations, offering a potential avenue for manipulating information. This article does not seek to draw conclusions for the reader; instead, its focus is on spotlighting key facts often overlooked or unasked by the average

reader. Consequently, the investigation has led to the following conclusions:

1. The simultaneous writing and publication of the scientific article on COVID-19 raise concerns about its thoroughness and peer review. The authors presented global statistics without sufficient evidence or independent verification, questioning the reliability of their conclusions.

2. The article appears more as a manifesto than a scientifically reviewed paper. Lack of peer review and failure to seek independent professionals for editing raise questions about its objectivity and credibility.

3. Unfounded allegations throughout the article, such as comparing COVID-19 to the 1918 H1N1 influenza pandemic, without proper substantiation, raise doubts about the scientific rigor of the authors.

4. The use of a South Asian model for predicting the UK situation lacks transparency in methodology. Transferring mathematical models without accounting for regional differences in living standards, climate, and culture is a significant concern.

5. The reliance on "expert clinical judgment" for predicting deaths lacks transparency about the experts' identities. The simplistic logic behind estimating a 50% death rate in intensive care raises questions about the validity and accuracy of the study.

Discussion

Source of Hysteria No1: Nicholas Lewis

In various professional environments, there are individuals who attempt to present themselves as experts to profit from different industry products. I personally refer to such entities as vultures, capitalizing on sensationalism, "hyping" and exploiting various topics for their selfish goals. Nicholas Lewis, in my view, falls into this category. He is primarily known for debunking major climate-related news stories, presenting himself as a crusader for "truth," albeit with financial motivations. His ability to generate sensationalism out of seemingly insignificant information makes him appealing to various media outlets, including the BBC (McGrath, 2018). For many journalists, it is challenging to grasp complex issues quickly, and thus, Nicholas Lewis, as a self-proclaimed "translator" of academic science for the general public, satisfies the media's need for attention-grabbing content and higher ratings.

Nicholas Lewis identifies himself as an independent scientist in climate science, statistics, probability, and the physics of global warming. While seemingly unrelated to COVID-19, epidemiology, and virology, he released an article on April 1 titled "Imperial College UK COVID-19 numbers do not seem to add up" (Lewis, 2020). This move stirred hype on social media and in the media. The crux of the article involves criticizing the research conducted by Ferguson's team. According to mathematician Nicholas Lewis, the number of COVID-19 victims will be at least 30% higher than the forecast of British scientists. Curiously, when inquiring about COVID-19 forecasts in Ukraine, four scientists referred to Nicholas Lewis's forecast, seemingly aiming to protect the reputation of Prof. Golubovskaya, Prof. Zadorozhnaya, and other speakers. I hold the belief that these individuals might be contributing to the psychopathic epidemic in Ukraine. Nonetheless, It would have been better if they had not sent me this link.

Resembling Show-Business Rather Than Scientific Endeavor

Professor Neil Morris Ferguson et al. (2020), a renowned epidemiologist and infection modeler from the United Kingdom, focuses on evaluating the consequences of epidemics and employing mathematical modeling. His research spans various infections, including influenza and MERS Coronavirus. Ferguson is a trusted advisor to governments and international organizations, offering insights on epidemiological strategies. His team of researchers commonly employs mathematical models to forecast the progression of epidemics and assess the efficacy of diverse control measures, including quarantine, social distancing, and vaccination.

One of his most notable achievements was the development of a model to project the spread of COVID-19 in the UK. Critical components of his contributions encompass:

- Mathematical modeling: Formulating mathematical models that capture the infection dynamics within diverse population segments.
- Epidemic forecasting: Employing models to anticipate the quantity of cases, disease severity, and mortality across various scenarios.
- Assessing the effectiveness of control measures: Examining the influence of diverse measures, including quarantine and vaccination, on curtailing the virus's spread.
- Exploring various epidemic scenarios to enhance comprehension and offer recommendations.
- Offering guidance and recommendations to governments and international organizations grounded in their research findings. However, it is important to acknowledge that in academia and among experts, opinions can vary.

Positive facets of Professor Neil Morris Ferguson's contributions:

- Ferguson possesses advanced expertise in the mathematical modeling, facilitating the provision of valuable forecasts and estimates.
- His endeavors in epidemiology and modeling significantly influence public health decision-making, playing a crucial role in shaping strategies for infection control.
- The scientist is frequently sought as a consultant by governments and international organizations, indicating the acknowledgment of his expertise in the field.
- Ferguson promptly addresses novel challenges, offering valuable assessments that assist governments and international organizations in taking urgent measures.
- His research and expert opinions garner extensive media attention, effectively spotlighting public health issues for the general public.
- Critique and alternative perspectives:
- Some critics contend that Ferguson's models may not consistently encompass a diverse range of scenarios, potentially resulting in over- or underestimated predictions.
- Models are susceptible to parameter choices, and slight alterations in assumptions can markedly impact results.
- Some experts highlight that Ferguson's models predominantly concentrate on medical aspects, affording minimal attention to the social and economic ramifications of interventions.
- Detractors also raise concerns about the clarity and replicability of the models by other researchers. Model Uncertainty: The mathematical models utilized by Ferguson occasionally rely on assumptions that might be incomplete or variable, introducing uncertainty into the predictions.
- Some critics contend that Ferguson's models may diverge from actual data, potentially reducing their accuracy in predicting real-world events.
- Alternative perspectives suggest that Ferguson's models may demonstrate less adaptability to a changing situation and a rapidly evolving epidemic.
- Critics may also highlight that Ferguson's recommendations could involve drastic measures, such as prolonged quarantine periods, leading to questions about their practicality and feasibility.

It is crucial to recognize that debate and discourse within scientific circles are inherent to the research process. Critiques play a vital role in refining methods and models, while alternative viewpoints contribute to a diverse comprehension of a problem. After examining both favorable and unfavorable critiques of his work, it is pertinent to delve into an analysis of the present circumstances, taking into account the scientist's methodology, its applicability in this context, and other relevant aspects that contribute to a comprehensive understanding of the situation.

According to the official website of Imperial College of London, a group of scientists led by Professor Ferguson was established in December 2019. I will refrain from delving into conspiracy theories and solely emphasize that the first clinical case of the new virus was recorded only on January 13. Normally, such groups are formed within the first 3-5 days of the onset of an epidemic, not a month before it occurs. Additionally, it is worth noting that the highly contentious

forecast of 80% of the UK population potentially contracting the coronavirus was published on the Imperial College of London website on March 16 (Ferguson et al., 2020). The activities of Ferguson's group during the three months from December 2019 to mid-March 2020 remain unclear. However, it is evident that this prediction emerged shortly after the UK leadership decided against implementing quarantine measures, opting for a collective immunity strategy. In the following analysis, we will scrutinize the main inconsistencies present in the report.

1. The Scientific Article Was Both Written and Published on the Same Date. It is highly unusual in the academic and expert environment. To draw conclusions that impact an entire nation, it is imperative to thoroughly scrutinize the accuracy of the conclusions and methodology. Independent reviewers and editors are usually involved for this purpose. The article explicitly states, "As of March 16, 2020, 164,837 cases and 6,470 deaths have been confirmed worldwide." You can verify the publication date on the website yourself. Such instances are often associated with rush situations where there is an urgent need to publish specific material. However, Ferguson's group had more than three months, so we cannot claim that they lacked sufficient time. Notably, the forecast emerged after the first confirmed cases of coronavirus in the UK. Ideally, such groups are expected to develop tactics to prevent epidemiological situations, but Ferguson's group appeared to fall short of accomplishing this task, or they might not have prioritized it at all.

2. The Article can be Described More as a Manifesto Rather than a Scientific Article. Even Nicholas Lewis, in his post, highlighted the fact that the article was published without peer review, which is quite unusual. Even if there was a time constraint, it would have been feasible to seek independent professionals over the following weeks to edit and review the article. However, this step was not taken, which leaves us with no option but to view the article as the subjective opinion of a group of individuals. Whether these individuals are experts remains a separate and crucial question, but we will not delve into that within the scope of this article.

3. Unfounded Allegations. The article includes several completely unfounded allegations, and there are various examples of such instances throughout the text. To captivate the readers and maintain their attentiveness to the content of a vast analytical paper with numerous graphs and mathematical statistical models, the authors employ a specific trick: they begin with a bold statement without providing any evidence or proof. For instance, they assert that "The global impact of COVID-19 has been profound, and the public health threat it represents is the most serious seen in a respiratory virus since the 1918 H1N1 influenza pandemic." However, throughout the article, the authors fail to substantiate this statement in any manner. This technique is more frequently observed in political journalism rather than scientific writing. Its primary purpose is to garner maximum attention to the material presented.

4. South Asian Model for Predicting the Situation in the UK. It is one of the central issues concerning the Ferguson group. A crucial aspect of any calculations and forecasts is to provide a valid description of the methodology used. Failing to do so may result in simulations rather than well-founded conclusions. However, Ferguson's group seems undeterred by this concern, stating that they modified a customized simulation model developed for pandemic flu planning. The most intriguing aspect is that they obtained data for the forecast from a 2005 study concerning South Asia (Ferguson et al., 2005). Unfortunately, the article does not explain how the mathematical models from South Asia can be transferred to the UK context, given the significant differences in living standards, climate, culture, sociology, mentality, and psychology between these regions.

5. Aristotelian Logic. The calculation method used by the Ferguson group to predict the number of deaths is based on what they call "expert clinical judgment," estimating that 50% of those in intensive care will die. For such a crucial study that impacts the lives of millions of people, it is essential to know who is behind these private opinions. Even without knowing the names of the individuals involved, it is evident that this assumption is merely a subjective opinion. Moreover, the 50% estimate seems to follow a simplistic "either the patient will die or survive" logic, which raises concerns about the validity and accuracy of their approach. I believe there is no need to provide any commentary on the last statement.

Subsequent diagrams and mathematical calculations may hold appeal primarily for individ-

uals like Nicholas Lewis. This statement is not based on my role as a journalist or corresponding member of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. As someone with a background as a graduate and certified master of I.I. Mechnikov ONU, specializing in "economic mathematics," I recognize that achieving the desired statistics can be accomplished by using false initial data as the foundation of any research. Consequently, this approach allows one to have both the model and the required mathematical calculations at their disposal.

Conclusions

The events that unfolded after March 16, such as the deep economic crisis, border closures, draconian quarantine measures, increased domestic violence, partial amnesties, and a surge in criminality, are well known to all. The purpose of this article is not to discredit any specific groups or individuals like the Ferguson group, Nicholas Lewis, or Ukrainian figures in science. Instead, it aims to encourage rational and thoughtful individuals to examine all the facts presented and draw their own conclusions.

It is also worth mentioning the unprecedented financial injections into several European countries, particularly the record-high quantitative easing (QE) in the UK, amounting to 645 billion pounds. Readers are advised to consult their financial advisors to understand the implications of such measures. Additionally, the emergence of Verint class programs, which received support from the Ukrainian government at the level of the Prime Minister on April 8th, raises questions about their impact on individuals' lifestyles. Interested individuals are encouraged to study these programs themselves (*Threat Intelligence Analytics Platform*, 2020).

In conclusion, I would like to quote from Benjamin Franklin: "Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary Safety, deserve neither Liberty nor Safety."

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

References

Bushman, B. J., & Whitaker, J. L. (2017). Media influence on behavior. In *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology* (pp. 571–575). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-809324-5.06481-6

Campbell, A. (2020). An increasing risk of family violence during the Covid-19 pandemic: Strengthening community collaborations to save lives. *Forensic Science International: Reports*, *2*, 100089. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fsir.2020.100089

Chia, T., & Oyeniran, O. I. (2020). Human health versus human rights: An emerging ethical dilemma arising from coronavirus disease pandemic. *Ethics, Medicine and Public Health*, *14*, 100511. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2020.100511

Coronavirus will infect 30 million Ukrainians, we will face a severe COVID-19 scenario. Interview with Olga Golubovskaya. (2021, April). Obozrevatel. https://www.obozrevatel.com/Society/koronavirusom-zarazyatsya-30-mln-ukraintsev-nas-zhdet-tyazhelyij-stsenarij-covid-19-intervyu-s-olgoj-golubovskoj.htm

Goodell, J. W. (2020). COVID-19 and finance: Agendas for future research. *Finance Research Letters*, *35*, 101512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2020.101512

Ferguson, N. M., Cummings, D. a. T., Cauchemez, S., Fraser, C., Riley, S., Meeyai, A., Iamsirithaworn, S., & Burke, D. S. (2005). Strategies for containing an emerging influenza pandemic in Southeast Asia. *Nature*, *437*(7056), 209–214. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature04017

Ferguson, N., Laydon, D. J., Gilani, G. N., Imai, N., Ainslie, K. E. C., Baguelin, M., Bhatia, S., Boon-yasiri, A., Perez, Z. C., Cuomo-Dannenburg, G., Dighe, A., Dorigatti, I., Fu, H., Gaythorpe, K. a. M., Green, W., Hamlet, A., Hinsley, W., Okell, L., Van Elsland, S., . . . Ghani, A. (2020). Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. https://doi.org/10.25561/77482

Health, L. C. & A. (2020). Pandemic school closures: risks and opportunities. *The Lancet Child & Adolescent Health*, *4*(5), 341. https://doi.org/10.1016/s2352-4642(20)30105-x

Lewis, N. (2020). *Imperial College UK COVID-19 numbers don't seem to add up*. Nicholas Lewis. https://nicholaslewis.org/imperial-college-uk-covid-19-numbers-dont-seem-to-add-up/

McGrath, B. M. (2018, November 20). Climate change: Concerns over report on ocean heating. *BBC News*. Retrieved April 10, 2020, from https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-46046067

Mudrick, M., Miller, M., & Atkin, D. (2016). The influence of social media on fan reactionary behaviors. *Telematics and Informatics*, *33*(4), 896–903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.01.005

Protocol No. 16.PDF. (2020, March 21). Official Portal of the KCSA. https://kyivcity.gov.ua/news/protokol__16_postiyno_komisi_teb_ta_ns_pro_zapobigannya_poshirennyu_gostro_respiratorno_khvorobi_COVID-19_sprichineno_koronovirusom_SARS-CoV-2_ta_vvedennya_dodatkovikh_obmezhuvalnikh_zakhodiv_na_teritori_mista_kiyeva_401359/protokol__16/

Schlesinger, P. (2015). Mass media and cultural identity. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 707–711). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-097086-8.95042-6

Schwartz, S. J. (2020). Editorial: Studying the effects of the coronavirus pandemic on intercultural relations. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *76*, 52. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.04.001

Huzhva, A. (2020, April 2). Klitschko's lies about the epidemic. The situation has taken an unexpected turn. *Granite of Science*. https://un-sci.com/ru/2020/04/02/lozh-klichko-ob-epidemii-situacziya-priobrela-neozhidannyj-povorot/

Shuster online. (2020, March 27). *"Between 7 and 22 million people in Ukraine may get the coronavirus,"* Igor Kuzin [Video]. Facebook. https://www.facebook.com/shusteronline/videos/712554612816796/

Threat Intelligence Analytics Platform. (2020, April 3). Cognyte. https://cis.verint.com/product/%20combating-the-covid-19-pandemic

Vaterlaus, J. M., Patten, E. V., Roche, C., & Young, J. A. (2015). #Gettinghealthy: The perceived influence of social media on young adult health behaviors. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *45*, 151–157. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.12.013

Walker, C. (2016). The direction of media influence: Real-estate news and the stock market. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Finance*, *10*, 20–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbef.2016.02.001

Wiedeman, A. M., Black, J. A., Dolle, A. L., Finney, E. J., & Coker, K. L. (2015). Factors influencing the impact of aggressive and violent media on children and adolescents. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *25*, 191–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.04.008

Yang, Y., Zhang, H., & Chen, X. (2020). Coronavirus pandemic and tourism: Dynamic stochastic general equilibrium modeling of infectious disease outbreak. *Annals of Tourism Research*, *83*, 102913. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102913

Author Biography

Costantino Slobodyanyuk is a Presidium Member of EUASU. Associate fellow of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. Head of the Strategic council of the Information Security Institute. He is a Head of Civil Society Organization Kavalyer and editor-in-chief of the Newspaper Unsolved Crimes. Slobodyanyuk is engaged in the studies of online reputation management and security of enterprises.