

## Assessing vaccine efficacy

Carl S. Ribble

### Introduction

**H**ow can you decide which vaccines to recommend to your clients? The purpose of this presentation is to develop a framework for the practitioner for assessing the value of a vaccine by examining the scientific literature. A logical approach to reading the literature can help differentiate published field trials that could help you in practice from useless or entirely misleading trials. The principles are also extremely useful for carrying out field trials within your own practice.

### Quality information

How do you decide, for example, whether to recommend the use of a new vaccine for the prevention of bovine respiratory disease (BRD)? You must have some information upon which to base your decision. The first step might be to look to the licensing body, Agriculture Canada. **Unfortunately, the fact that a vaccine is licensed and available does not mean that it works.** Prior to the licensing of a new BRD vaccine, the manufacturer must provide information concerning certain legal and labelling details, as well as some indication that the product is safe (will not kill animals) and "effective" (1). "Effectiveness" is usually determined in the laboratory with host challenge studies, wherein vaccinated animals are challenged with a "model" exposure to the specific organism. In most cases these studies involve less than 50 animals (2). The conclusion is obvious: you *cannot* rely on the licensing procedure to ensure *field* efficacy.

The next source of information is the manufacturing company. Has the company made its trial data widely available to practitioners? Some companies are

definitely more open than others, and a few show a genuine commitment to evaluating the usefulness of their vaccine products in the field. If you have access to the manufacturer's data, you can critically evaluate it. You can examine the situations under which the product was tested, the numbers and kinds of animals used in the trial(s), and how the company measured effectiveness. Then you can decide how valid and relevant the trials are for your particular clients.

If a company will not release its data on its product, you are left with nothing but "promises and promotions". **Although advertising quality will almost certainly correlate well with an increasing producer demand for a new vaccine, experience teaches us that it may not correlate well with vaccine efficacy.** What do you do if you have major BRD problems in a herd using this new vaccine? Did the problems occur because your client used an improper vaccination technique? How do you distinguish this situation from one where you have used a fundamentally useless vaccine, and your "technique" is therefore irrelevant?

Tizard suggests that one cause of "vaccine failure" is an ineffective vaccine (3). I maintain this is faulty logic — **a vaccine failure implies that, under "normal" conditions, the vaccine works. But if a vaccine does not work, it cannot fail!** Without SOME data to suggest the new vaccine works, a search for why it "failed" in your clients' herds is pointless.

In the case where you have no manufacturer data to evaluate a new vaccine, I see but two alternatives: (a) tell your clients the product is "untested", the manufacturer has not provided any efficacy data, and they are better to continue with the disease control procedures they are presently using (until you can better evaluate the product); (2) test the vaccine yourself.

Department of Herd Medicine and Theriogenology, Western College of Veterinary Medicine, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W0

This article is one in a series of abridged versions of presentations made at the "Symposium on the use of vaccines in the control of infectious diseases of cattle" at the Halifax '90 CVMA Annual Convention. The symposium was sponsored by, and publication of these proceedings is subsidized by:



**Boehringer Ingelheim**

This article has been edited but not peer-reviewed. Reprints are available from Dr. Frederick W. Harris, Boehringer Ingelheim (Canada) Ltd., 977 Century Drive, Burlington, Ontario L7L 5J8.

### Assessing clinical research

You can develop a mental checklist of key elements to look for when examining the clinical research published for a particular vaccine (Table 1). It can be very useful to keep an actual checklist like this beside you while perusing a recently published trial to help in your critical assessment. I will briefly examine each item on the list.

#### 1. Has the vaccine been laboratory and field-tested in randomized controlled clinical trials?

Again, you need information upon which to base your decision about whether to use a particular vaccine. Has

the vaccine been tested in the laboratory and the field? Do you have access to the trial reports? If you do, you can work through the rest of the checklist with each report.

### **2. Were the control groups concurrent or historical?**

The crucial ingredient in any scientific evaluation of a vaccine is the presence of a *concurrent* (or parallel) control group. At the outset of a trial, animals should be assigned by some (hopefully random) procedure to one of two groups: a vaccinated group and a control (unvaccinated) group. In this way, the control group is formed at the SAME TIME as the vaccinated group. Contrast this with *historical* controls where, for example, the control group is comprised of all animals fed in previous years. Published reports containing historical controls are little more than curious bedtime stories. Too many reasons can be found for a difference in outcome between vaccinates and controls in this situation. Fortunately, these kinds of stories are becoming rare in the veterinary literature.

### **3. How were the trial animals challenged?**

In a laboratory study, ask yourself how closely the challenge model approaches the natural disease: does the challenge model provide a meaningful assessment of how the vaccine will work in the field?

With field trials, note whether the controls got sick. One *Haemophilus somnus* bacterin trial looked at differences between vaccinates and controls using "serologic criteria" (immunodiffusion assay reaction) and nasal cultures, but none of the test animals (control or vaccinated) got sick (4). The conclusion by the authors that "development of a high level of immunity... prevented an outbreak of *Haemophilus somnus* disease" was pure conjecture. The controls did not get sick, indicating a total *absence* of the disease. Without natural challenge, field trials like this tell us very little about the value of the vaccine.

### **4. Was the measure of outcome meaningful?**

The measured outcome should be one that would provide clear evidence that the vaccine does in fact prevent *disease*. Outcomes falling into this category include mortality, morbidity, and production measures like average daily gain. Looking at serological or culture results may be interesting, but they tell little about whether or not the vaccine actually prevents disease or improves production.

Researchers may go to great trouble to set up a field trial and end up with no natural challenge — for whatever reason, none of the animals get sick. These same researchers may go on to publish their serological and culture findings. The resulting paper may be interesting, but it helps little in our assessment of the usefulness of the vaccine in the field.

### **5. Were the biology and epidemiology of the disease considered?**

It may not be enough to just report crude mortality differences, or crude morbidity differences. The outcome may have to be refined to take into consideration certain particulars of the industry, the disease, or

the specific trial itself. Trials which assess vaccinating with a BRD vaccine upon arrival at the feedlot offer an example for consideration. How long will it take for the vaccine to become protective? A day? A week? What do we say about animals that get sick or die *before* this time period? Should these animals be included in the analysis? The authors should at least demonstrate an awareness of this kind of problem, and show some attempt to deal with it in the analysis.

### **6. Was the vaccine assigned randomly?**

Look to see if some kind of randomization procedure was used to assign animals to the vaccinated and control groups. By randomizing, the researchers hope to prevent introducing an "entry" bias into the trial. You want to be reassured that the researchers did not leave all the animals that looked "tough" or sick at trial outset in the control group!

In many situations, authors will report that animals were assigned to vaccination on a "systematic-random" basis, where, in the feedlot for example, a coin was flipped to determine whether the first or second animal through the chute was to be vaccinated; if it turned out to be the first, then every odd animal through the chute was then "systematically" vaccinated; if it turned out to be the second, then every even animal was vaccinated. This is an acceptable procedure. The important point is that the researchers have indicated they used some kind of "fair", random or semi-random, allocation procedure.

If there is no mention of this in the paper, credibility wanes. Try to determine precisely how the groups were chosen, and how the procedure used may have biased the trial results.

### **7. Were blinding techniques used to reduce bias?**

There should be some indication of "blinding", where necessary, to ensure that both the vaccinated and control groups were treated similarly (5). At the very least, it should have been very difficult for the people handling the animals in the trial to have known which were vaccinates and which were controls. Vaccinated animals should not, for example, be identified with a brightly colored eartag!

### **8. What other potentially important biases are evident?**

Pay attention to "trial specifics" and ask yourself what other design characteristics may have biased the researchers in some way. The authors often suggest a few potential biases themselves — you may be able to find more. Identifying the presence of a potential bias does not itself warrant discarding the paper — **all field trials will contain some bias**. You must decide how significant the bias is, and in what direction the bias is likely to have "shifted" the results. The question then becomes: are the biases you have identified significant enough to discredit the entire paper?

### **9. How likely was the result a chance finding?**

The reported statistics should give you a clear understanding of how likely the results were a chance finding. Traditionally, researchers have reported

**Table 1. A vaccine assessment checklist**

1. Has the vaccine been laboratory and field-tested in randomized controlled clinical trials? If so, how many trials, and, in each case:
2. Were the control groups concurrent or historical?
3. How were the trial animals challenged?
4. Was the measure of outcome meaningful?
5. Were the biology and epidemiology of the disease considered?
6. Was the vaccine assigned randomly?
7. Were blinding techniques used to reduce bias?
8. What other potentially important biases are evident?
9. How likely was the result a chance finding?
10. What are the differences between the trial animals and animals in your practice? Are these differences important with respect to the vaccine?

“p values” to indicate whether or not their results were “significant”. Unfortunately, the p value is not that informative. **In clinical trials where no difference between vaccinates and controls was noted, the p value is totally meaningless.**

You will gain far more insight by looking for two things: an estimate of the *magnitude* of the vaccine effect, and a *confidence interval* for that effect (6). This amounts to asking the researchers: “What is your best estimate of vaccine effectiveness and, based on the number of animals in your trial, how accurate is that estimate?” In a trial designed to assess the efficacy of an *Haemophilus somnus* bacterin (7), we reported an incidence rate ratio (IRR) of fatal disease onset for steers from the 2nd to 8th week of the feeding period to be 1.46, with a 95% confidence interval of 1.07 to 2.00. Our IRR “best estimate” suggested that, for every three controls becoming fatally ill during this time, only two vaccinates (a ratio of 1.46:1) became fatally ill. Recognizing that this is a trial carried out on only a *sample* of the total feedlot-calf population in western Canada, we were reasonably confident that the “actual” IRR lies somewhere between 1.07 and 2.00 (the 95% confidence interval).

#### **10. What are the differences between the trial animals and animals in your practice?**

Differences between the sample of animals used in the reported trial and those you deal with in your practice will usually exist. You should note the differences

and ask yourself whether any of these differences could significantly alter the reported effectiveness of the vaccine in your clients' herds. You are essentially asking how relevant the trial results are to your specific situation.

### **A continual process**

The assessment process takes time, and it is not particularly easy: the strong medical and scientific background of a veterinarian is extremely valuable here. And there are no absolutes — a vaccine may work in some management environments but not others. The disease itself may change over the years, rendering a previously useful vaccine impotent. Like the game of “Calvinball”, invented by cartoonist Bill Watterson through his characters Calvin and Hobbes, the rules are always changing: disease is not a static entity, but an evolving dynamic system. Within this uncertain environment, veterinarians must develop a logical approach towards assessing the best information available so that informed recommendations can be made to their clients. Critically assessing manufacturer data and the scientific literature, using a checklist like that presented herein, allows you to make an informed decision about vaccine use for your clients. The process will require continual updating as the nature of your clients' operations change, technology changes, and our understanding of diseases like the BRD complex improves.

### **References**

1. Alexander DC. Regulation of veterinary biologics in Canada. *Can Vet J* 1989; 30: 298.
2. Wilson SH. Why are meaningful field trials difficult to achieve for bovine respiratory disease vaccines? *Can Vet J* 1989; 30: 299-302.
3. Tizard IR. *Veterinary Immunology*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1977: 179.
4. Hall RF, Williams JM, Smith GL. Field evaluation of [a] *Haemophilus somnus* bacterin. *Vet Med/Small Anim Clin (Agripractice)* 1977; Aug: 1368-1370.
5. Ribble CS. Design considerations in clinical trials. *Can Vet J* 1989; 30: 292-294.
6. Rothman KJ. *Modern epidemiology*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1986: 122.
7. Ribble CS, Jim GK, Janzen ED. Efficacy of immunization of feedlot calves with a commercial *Haemophilus somnus* bacterin. *Can J Vet Res* 1988; 52: 191-198.

### **Manuel des taureaux maintenant disponible**

L'ACV a le plaisir de vous faire savoir que le guide pratique intitulé **Évaluation de l'intégrité reproductrice du taureau** du Dr Martin S. Wenkoff existe désormais dans les deux langues officielles.

Ce livre, subventionné par Coopers Agropharm Inc., est conçu pour servir de manuel de référence sur le terrain. À notre connaissance c'est vraiment le premier guide complet et pratique des praticiens dans ce domaine.

On peut obtenir le manuel de l'ACV, **sans frais pour les membres et à 6 \$ pour les non-membres**. Prière de communiquer avec le bureau de l'ACV à Ottawa au (613) 236-1162, fax: (613) 236-9681.