OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 2157-7560
Journal of
Vaccines & Vaccination

Perspective

The Limitations of Relative Risk Reduction in Vaccine Trials

Marc Alison*

Department of Clinical Microbiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

ABOUT THE STUDY

In evaluating the efficacy of medical interventions, particularly vaccines, understanding the appropriate statistical measures is crucial for both healthcare professionals and the public. One such measure, Relative Risk Reduction (RRR), has frequently been used in reporting the efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines. However, while RRR can provide some insight, it can also be misleading if not considered in the broader context of absolute risk and the overall public health impact.

RRR represents the percentage reduction in risk between the treatment group and the control group in a clinical trial. For instance, if a vaccine is said to reduce the risk of contracting COVID-19 by 95%, this figure refers to the RRR. This measure, while highlighting the efficacy of the vaccine in reducing relative risk, does not convey the Absolute Risk Reduction (ARR), which is often more informative for practical decision-making.

Absolute risk reduction, on the other hand, reflects the actual difference in event rates between two groups. For example, if 1% of people in the control group contract COVID-19 and 0.05% in the vaccinated group, the ARR is 0.95%. While the RRR might be 95%, the ARR of 0.95% indicates that less than one in a hundred people benefit from the vaccine, giving a more tangible sense of the vaccine's impact.

The distinction between RRR and ARR becomes particularly significant in populations with low baseline risk. In such contexts, a high RRR might suggest a substantial benefit, whereas the ARR might reveal that the intervention prevents very few cases in absolute terms. This can lead to overestimating the intervention's benefit when RRR is reported without the accompanying ARR or the Number Needed to Treat (NNT).

The NNT, another crucial measure, indicates how many individuals need to receive the intervention to prevent one additional adverse event. In the context of COVID-19 vaccines, a lower NNT means the vaccine prevents more cases per vaccinated individual, making it a valuable measure for understanding real-world effectiveness.

In the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, high RRRs of vaccines were often highlighted, which played a role in promoting vaccine uptake. This was essential for achieving rapid public health benefits. However, as the pandemic progressed and the public's understanding of vaccine efficacy deepened, the importance of also communicating ARR and NNT became clear. These measures help individuals and policymakers make more nuanced decisions, balancing the benefits and risks of vaccination in different population groups.

Moreover, the reliance on RRR without adequate context can inadvertently contribute to vaccine hesitancy. When the public perceives that only relative benefits are being emphasized, it can lead to mistrust, especially if the absolute numbers seem less impressive. Transparency in communication, providing both relative and absolute measures, can foster a more informed and trusting public.

Another aspect to consider is the impact of varying baseline risks in different populations. For example, the risk of severe COVID-19 varies significantly with factors such as age, comorbidities, and geographic location. In high-risk populations, both RRR and ARR are critical in demonstrating substantial benefits of vaccination. Conversely, in lower-risk groups, while RRR might still be high, the ARR will be lower, influencing policy decisions regarding vaccine distribution and prioritization.

In clinical practice, the choice of statistical measures extends beyond public health communication. Healthcare providers must interpret these measures to make patient-centered decisions. For instance, when discussing vaccine options with patients, especially those hesitant about vaccination, presenting ARR and NNT can provide a clearer picture of the benefits and risks. This approach can lead to more personalized healthcare, addressing individual concerns and improving vaccine confidence.

The focus on RRR has also implications for future clinical trial designs and reporting standards. There is a growing call for more comprehensive reporting of both relative and absolute measures

Correspondence to: Marc Alison, Department of Clinical Microbiology, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark, E-mail: marc.alison@lumc.mx

Received: 03-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. JVV-24-26116; **Editor assigned:** 05-Jun-2024, PreQC No. JVV-24-26116 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 19-Jun-2024, QC No. JVV-24-26116; **Revised:** 27-Jun-2024, Manuscript No. JVV-24-26116 (R); **Published:** 03-July-2024. DOI: 10.35248/2157-7560.24.S27.003

Citation: Alison M (2024) The Limitations of Relative Risk Reduction in Vaccine Trials. J Vaccines Vaccin. S27:003.

in scientific literature. This ensures that clinicians, policymakers, and the public receive a balanced view of the evidence, facilitating better decision-making processes.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, while RRR is a useful measure in understanding the efficacy of interventions like COVID-19 vaccines, it should not be used in isolation. Absolute measures such as ARR and NNT provide critical additional context that can enhance the interpretation of trial results and guide more informed public health and clinical decisions. As we continue to navigate the challenges of the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond, clear and comprehensive communication of these measures will remain essential in promoting public health and trust in medical interventions.