

Can Rare Vaccine Adverse Effects Remain Undetected?

ABSURD HEALTH INSTITUTE · 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism · 15 OCTOBER 2026

Abstract

Rare adverse reactions may escape prelicensure trials even when those trials are appropriately designed. Detection power depends on how many people receive the product, event incidence, time at risk and clinical outcome definition. This paper uses the documented myocarditis signal following certain COVID-19 vaccines to explain why rigorous postauthorization surveillance is a normal part of vaccine medicine rather than a concession that all vaccine harms are hidden.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

A trial enrolling thousands may identify common adverse events but have limited capacity to estimate an outcome occurring only a few times per hundred thousand doses. Passive reports can raise hypotheses but require verification; active linked-data systems and self-controlled case designs can help estimate associations. The analysis of myocarditis after particular mRNA products illustrates how age, sex and dose may substantially modify risk. The existence of a true rare adverse event does not establish all alleged events as causal.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

Good signal evaluation specifies latency, case definition, background incidence, risk window and expected disease burden without vaccination. It also examines comparative infection risks and possible confounding by diagnostic intensity. Claims should report absolute as well as relative risks and note the difference between hospitalization, biomarker elevation, confirmed myocarditis and long-term outcomes.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

This question turns on denominators and inference rather than dramatic anecdotes. Suppose an event occurs at a rate far below one in ten thousand exposed people; a licensing trial of several thousand participants may observe none even if the risk is real. The appropriate response is active surveillance and linkage of medical outcomes to accurately dated exposures. Yet the inverse mistake is equally serious: among millions of vaccinated people, many strokes, seizures and new diagnoses will occur afterward by coincidence. A postvaccination event is evidence of temporal order, not necessarily of causation. The methodological task is to estimate excess above expected background risk.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

The methodological danger runs in two directions. Uncritical dismissal of verified signals damages trust and delays risk mitigation; interpreting every temporally associated symptom as caused by vaccination generates misleading fear. Underreporting and stimulated reporting can coexist in passive systems. There is no fixed multiplication factor that converts all spontaneous reports into true incidence.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

A robust investigation should identify a plausible risk window, adjudicate the clinical diagnosis and calculate absolute excess events with uncertainty intervals. The myocarditis experience shows how specific age and product patterns can emerge after deployment. A signal that disappears when ascertainment and background risk are controlled should not be retained as established harm.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

The paper concludes that scientific confidence should increase when monitoring detects and quantifies real harms. The value of a surveillance system lies in its ability to revise product-specific understanding, not in defending a prior narrative. Individual vaccine decisions belong in a context of actual risks and benefits rather than class-wide generalization.

Selected Evidence and Further Reading

1. [Patone et al. Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection](#)
2. [Self-controlled case series design in vaccine safety: a systematic review](#)

Source lineage: Vaccine adverse event surveillance discussions

Editorial note: Conceptual scientific commentary; not an original clinical trial, systematic review, peer-reviewed publication, or medical advice. Hypotheses are not established treatment effects.