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Vaccine effectiveness

- Generally estimated as one minus some measure of relative risk, RR, in the vaccinated group compared to the unvaccinated:

\[ VE = 1 - \frac{\text{Risk vaccinated}}{\text{Risk unvaccinated}} = 1 - RR \]

- The groups being compared could be composed of individuals or of populations or communities
Design and analysis of observational studies for estimating vaccine effectiveness go back to the early 1900’s
Section of Epidemiology and State Medicine.

June 4, 1915.
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The Statistics of Anti-typhoid and Anti-cholera Inoculations, and the Interpretation of such Statistics in general.

By Mr. Major Greenwood, jun., and Mr. G. Udny Yule.

Introduction.

Hardly any subjects within the range of preventive medicine are of more immediate importance than the methods of prophylaxis which ought to be adopted with respect to typhoid fever and cholera. Typhoid fever has already been responsible for much illness and many deaths in nearly all the armies on active service, while cholera has taken toll of one at least of our enemies and one of our allies. Further, our troops are now fighting in a part of Europe and Asia which has always been a favourable soil for the development of epidemic cholera and was recently the scene of outbreaks among troops actually engaged in the present war.
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Conditions necessary for valid inference

1. “The persons must be, in all material respects, alike.”
2. “The effective exposure to the disease must be identical in the case of inoculated and uninoculated persons.”
3. “The criteria of the fact of inoculation and of the fact of the disease having occurred must be independent.”
Examples of estimates they made

\[ VE = 1 - \frac{56}{\frac{10378}{272} - \frac{8936}{0.0054}} = 1 - \frac{0.0054}{0.0304} = 0.82 \]
Further estimates of VE for smallpox deaths

largely used by Macdonell, Maynard, and others. One or two such tables were given by Professor Pearson in his original memoir on the method (1900, ii) and a table for deaths amongst vaccinated and unvaccinated small-pox patients is headed in the following form:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of effective vaccination</th>
<th>Strength to resist small-pox when incurred</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cicatrix absent</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cicatrix present</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VE = 0.87,  p < 0.0001
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The present study of pertussis immunization in Grand Rapids had its beginning in 1933 when a study of the practicability of laboratory diagnostic methods in pertussis was undertaken. The results of this study were considered sufficiently promising to warrant the use of the techniques in a controlled series of patients. The patients selected were from the outpatient clinic of the Grand Rapids City Health Department.

In February, 1933, a series was started to observe the protective effect of pertussis vaccine given to a child after exposure to pertussis in his own household. The patient was admitted to the clinic and followed for a period of 12 months. The results were as follows:

1. From the Michigan Department of Health, Bureau of Laboratories, Western Michigan Division, Grand Rapids, Mich.; with the cooperation of the City Health Department of Grand Rapids, John E. Laver, M.D., Health Officer; Fred Miller, M.D., School Physician in charge.
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The importance of conditioning on types of exposure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification according to history of exposure</th>
<th>Definite in own household</th>
<th>Definite in other household</th>
<th>Indefinite</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No history of exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of exposures</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>3542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent.</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of exposures</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>1518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent.</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of exposures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>2124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent.</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
VE_{SAR} = 1 - \frac{29}{143} = 1 - \frac{0.349}{0.894} = 0.61, p < 0.0001
\]
1954: Salk killed poliomyelitis field study in the US in 1,829,916 children nationwide

The Report on the 1954 Poliomyelitis Vaccine Trial was produced by the Poliomyelitis Vaccine Evaluation Center at the University of Michigan, directed by Thomas Francis with Robert Korn as Deputy Director and Robert Voight as Chief of Statistical Operations. Apparently the Report is a joint product of the staff of the Evaluation Center.

The Report was launched upon the world with a volume of publicity probably unprecedented for a scientific work. The Report was used by the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis to push the vaccine into mass use in the spring of 1955. The fact that the vaccine then being pushed differed very importantly from that used in the 1954 trial, in that it did not contain merthiolate, was released to the public only after the fact that some of the vaccine was causing poliomyelitis could no longer be ignored. The ultimate horror came when the vaccine caused poliomyelitis not only in some of those injected but also in associates of those injected. The responsibility for these tragic events, of course, is not that of the authors of this Report; they were concerned solely with the evaluation of the vaccine used in the 1954 trial.

It is impossible not to be impressed with the courage of those who undertook a task of this magnitude. The Report lists 312 State and Local Health Officials who participated in the field trials in the U. S. and 6 others in Canada and Finland. Listed also are 54 physical therapists, 22 epidemiological intelligence officers, 28 laboratories with their principal scientists, and the 17 members of the Advisory Committee.

---
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An Observed Control Study

- Original design plan: “Observed Control Study”
  - Vaccinate children in the second grade.
  - Controls were first and third graders would not be vaccinated, but observed
- Biases
  - Not blinded
  - Age differences
- Study was changed in mid stream
  - Children of the first, second, and third grades would be combined.
    - One half would receive vaccine
    - The other matching half, serving as strict controls, would receive a solution of similar appearance.
  - Fewer than half the children were in the second study
Study results

• VE = 62 percent efficacy (lower 5% confidence limit 51) against paralytic polio in the Observed Study Areas
• VE = 72 percent efficacy (lower 5% confidence limit 61) against paralytic polio in the Placebo Study Areas
• Quotes from Brownlee

“To summarize, 59 per cent of the trial was worthless because of the lack of adequate controls. The remaining 41 per cent may be all right but contains internal evidence of bias in favor of the vaccinated. There was hope that an independent trial would be run in Great Britain under the auspices of the Medical Research Council, but this has been abandoned since they concluded that the vaccine was too dangerous.”

“It is a pity that explicit credit is not given to whomever was responsible for this change. However, only 41 per cent of the trial was rescued and the remaining 59 per cent blundered along its stupid and futile path.”
What we learned from the past

• For vaccine trials, randomization is critical to estimate vaccine efficacy
• For vaccine observational studies there are many factors that need to be dealt with to yield valid and reliable results
  • The unvaccinated comparator group must be selected in a way so that exposure to infection and disease reporting are comparable to those for vaccinated people
  • Given, that the above condition cannot be guaranteed, we may need to adjust for potential confounders and other biases for vaccination and disease outcome
    • Age
    • Prior immunity
    • Health-care seeking behavior
    • Others
• We will deal with all this in this consultation
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