WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "00:12:31.0400000"

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:03.880$ Thank you for for the for the invitation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:03.880 --> 00:00:07.086 I'll be. Brief,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:07.086 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.138$ with the time that I have today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.185$ I'm going to be talking about effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:13.190 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.338$ so going from efficacy to effectiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:15.338 --> 00:00:18.800 I I was a principle investigator in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:18.800 \longrightarrow 00:00:21.245$ randomized clinical trial for fieser

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:21.245 --> 00:00:24.483 an I've participated as a speaker in

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:24.483 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.476$ educational events for both Merck and Sanofi.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:27.476 --> 00:00:29.486 So we're talking about going

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}00{:}29.486 \rightarrow 00{:}00{:}31.500$ from efficacy to effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:31.500 --> 00:00:32.470 Strictly speaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:32.470 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.410$ efficacy and effectiveness have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:34.410 --> 00:00:36.856 very different meanings in the

 $00:00:36.856 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.620$ context of vaccine development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}00{:}38.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40.764$ But there of tentimes they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:40.764 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.375$ used interchangeably, so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:42.375 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.050$ so in terms of similarities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:45.050 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.004$ they both present or represent the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:49.004 \longrightarrow 00:00:52.540$ percentage reduction of disease amongst.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:52.540 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.745$ People who are who are vaccinated but

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:54.745 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.109$ but there are obviously differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:00:57.110 --> 00:00:57.874 Vaccine efficacy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:57.874 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.020$ As you've heard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:00:59.020 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.860$ the previous speakers refer to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:00.860 \longrightarrow 00:01:02.700$ how well the vaccines perform

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}02.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}04.730$ under the most ideal conditions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}04.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}06.635$ and these are mostly randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:06.635 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.397$ clinical trials.

 $00:01:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.764$ These are experimental studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}08.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}10.469$ that are considered the gold

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:10.469 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.969$ standard vaccine effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:11.970 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.986$ which I'll talk about in the few

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:13.986 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.985$ minutes that I have remaining refers

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}15.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}18.477$ to how well a vaccine performs under

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:18.539 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.521$ real world conditions under less than

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:21.521 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.012$ perfectly controlled circumstances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}23.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}25.630$ So what happens when a vaccine?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:25.630 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.850$ Is given to individuals who have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:27.850 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.796$ comorbidities, who are different ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:01:29.796 --> 00:01:32.160 When the very strict criteria of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:32.237 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.661$ all of us who've gotten are some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}34.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}37.098$ us have gotten our covid vaccine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.580$ I counting the interval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:01:38.580 --> 00:01:42.280 did I get this one? You know how many days?

 $00:01:42.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.692$ But as we know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:01:43.692 --> 00:01:46.281 in real in in real practice this

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:46.281 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.196$ is not often adhere to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:48.200 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.398$ so this slide shows you the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:51.400 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.060$ Scheme of randomized clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:01:55.251$ When you have a large group of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:55.251 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.590$ susceptible individuals and those

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}01{:}56.590 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}01{:}58.630$ are randomized to receive or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:01:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.359$ receive the intervention in question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}02{:}00.360 \longrightarrow 00{:}02{:}03.141$ In this case it will be a vaccine and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:02:03.141 --> 00:02:05.892 the direction of the study is looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:05.892 \dashrightarrow 00:02:08.900$ forward in time to try to figure out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:08.900 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.564$ Which the proportion of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:10.564 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.111$ In each one of these groups of individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:14.111 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.959$ who develop disease and is the vaccine works.

 $00:02:17.960 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.102$ Obviously, those who receive the vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}02{:}20.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23.127$ are going to have lower rates of infection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.970$ but even though these studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:24.970 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.442$ are the gold standard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.930$ they have certain disadvantages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:02:27.930 --> 00:02:29.406 Their advantages, well, we've.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:29.406 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.510$ I've mentioned before.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:30.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.360$ They are the gold standard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}02{:}32.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34.155$ Their experimental studies where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:34.155 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.950$ allocation or the intervention is

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}02{:}36.009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}37.890$ given randomly, which minimizes bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:37.890 \longrightarrow 00:02:39.740$ and for the most part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:39.740 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.026$ these studies are blinded, so it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:42.030 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.880$ Really ask helps you an unbiased

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:02:44.880 --> 00:02:46.780 ascertainment of the outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:46.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.640$ but they have disadvantages.

 $00:02:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.010$ They have poor statistical power for things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:52.010 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.380$ diseases that are buried rare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:54.380 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.760$ You need very large samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:56.760 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.952$ They are very costly an oftentimes to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:02:59.952 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.460$ selected population is studied again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:02.460 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.408$ sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:03.408 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.778$ Drawing parallels with Covid vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}03{:}05.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08.160$ Young individuals were not studied.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}03{:}08.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10.530$ Pregnant women were not studied.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}03{:}10.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12.502$ An individuals with significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:12.502 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.474$ comorbidities are oftentimes excluded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:03:14.480 --> 00:03:16.172 The follow-up is limited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00{:}03{:}16.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18.287$ Usually these are conducted for

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:18.287 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.818$ one of three years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

00:03:19.820 --> 00:03:22.697 Again, if you think of covid vaccine,

00:03:22.700 --> 00:03:24.760 everything was done much quicker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:24.760 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.220$ but for the most part there

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:27.220 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.450$ follow-up is limited,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:28.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.916$ and this leads us to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.86054856

 $00:03:30.916 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.738$ about generalizability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:31.740 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.862$ How how did those results from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:34.862 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.640$ randomized clinical trial translate

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.544$ to the patient that we see and an?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:39.550 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.546$ What is the the efficacy in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:42.546 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.590$ the general clinical setting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:44.590 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.684$ So, so the questions that remain

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:03:46.684 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.029$ on answers would be the efficacy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:03:49.030 --> 00:03:50.880 In actual practice, its efficacy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:03:50.880 --> 00:03:53.100 overtime, what happens five years later?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:03:53.100 --> 00:03:55.676 What happens 10 years later and then when

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:03:55.676 --> 00:03:58.277 you start thinking of subgroup analysis,

 $00:03:58.280 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.003$ so populations if all of a sudden

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:01.003 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.577$ cardiac patients seemed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:02.577 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.569$ have a higher rates of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:04.570 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.894$ will it work as well in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:06.894 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.378$ will have that type of comorbidity?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:04:09.380 --> 00:04:10.619 As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:04:10.619 --> 00:04:13.097 different age groups and ethnic groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:13.097 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.849$ which is very important especially now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.290$ In the face of COVID-19,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}04{:}18.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}20.984$ where we see an infection that

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:20.984 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.439$ seems to to affect both in morbidity

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:24.439 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.559$ and mortality in in higher rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}04{:}27.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}30.670$ certain a certain ethnic group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:04:30.670 --> 00:04:32.295 So effectiveness studies and now

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:32.295 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.920$ use the case control methodology,

 $00:04:33.920 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.906$ 'cause that's the one that my

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:35.906 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.150$ collaborators and I have used for many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:38.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.770$ many years, is an observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:39.770 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.720$ ULL study an in this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.718$ This is the schematic of what

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:43.718 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.300$ case control study would be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.162$ and this is the study that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:47.162 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.870$ used to assess effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}04{:}48.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.495$ You select cases you select

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:50.495 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.120$ participants based on the outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}04{:}52.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54.070$ So the direction of the observation

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:54.070 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.370$ is completely the opposite.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:55.370 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.358$ The cases are going to be the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:57.358 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.630$ individuals who develop the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:04:58.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.425$ disease in question controls other

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:00.425 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.861$ persons without the disease.

 $00:05:01.870 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.495$ And then you look backwards in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}04.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}06.588$ To try to ascertain which proportion

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:05:06.588 --> 00:05:09.619 in each one of these groups developed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:05:09.620 --> 00:05:11.590 sorry were that were vaccinated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:11.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.960$ and if the vaccine is effective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:13.960 \longrightarrow 00:05:15.922$ then you would expect fewer of

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:15.922 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.236$ the cases to have been previously

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}18.236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.044$ vaccinated as compared to the controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.450$ And these studies have many advantages

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:23.450 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.650$ there statistically powerful

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:24.650 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.557$ with much smaller sample sizes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}26.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}29.544$ and I'll show you in some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}29.544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32.078$ examples in the next few slides,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:32.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.185$ you don't need longitudinal follow-up

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:34.185 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.290$ because there is no intervention.

 $00:05:36.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.758$ They are ethically acceptable

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:37.758 \longrightarrow 00:05:39.226$ because let's face it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:39.230 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.060$ after a vaccine is licensed

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.524$ and recommended for use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:42.530 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.509$ nobody is going to want to do a randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:45.509 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.055$ trial where some people get something

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:48.055 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.590$ that is recommended and others are

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:05:50.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:53.166$ are going to are going to be withheld,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:05:53.170 --> 00:05:54.638 something that that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:05:54.638 --> 00:05:55.739 scientific groups recommends,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}55.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}57.208$ but they have disadvantages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:05:57.208 --> 00:05:58.309 They're not experimental,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}05{:}58.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}02.335$ and there are susceptible to bias so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:02.340 \longrightarrow 00:06:04.080$ Is it really?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:04.080 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.728$ When we now put this into into context

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:06.728 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.389$ with what's happening with Kovid vaccine,

 $00:06:09.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.304$ even though CDC and many others

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}06{:}11.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13.560$ plan to track the effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:13.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.284$ we know that randomized clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:16.284 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.575$ for covid vaccine have shown that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:19.575 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.910$ vaccine is highly highly effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

00:06:21.910 --> 00:06:25.366 But it remains to be seen if indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:25.366 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.184$ this efficacy of about 90% or higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}06{:}28.184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}30.596$ in the ideal setting will will

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:30.596 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.343$ remained in everyday practice an we

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:33.343 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.127$ know that ongoing studies are needed

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:36.213 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.866$ to be able to address the questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:38.866 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.694$ that from the get go we have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00{:}06{:}41.694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}43.799$ but also unexpected relevant clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:43.799 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.326$ clinical questions that that remain so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859969

 $00:06:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.838$ Our research team at Yale with

00:06:48.838 --> 00:06:50.510 collaborators over many years

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}06{:}50.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52.752$ in other medical centers such as

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}06{:}52.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54.801$ CDC and others have conducted

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:06:54.801 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.917$ studies of effectiveness of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:06:56.920 --> 00:06:59.755 Vaccines for multiple vaccines over the year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:06:59.760 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.808$ and I will share for this talk just

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:02.808 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.849$ one or two studies due to time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:05.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.910$ but show you how results of a study on

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:08.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:11.633$ this slide of effectiveness of varicella

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:11.633 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.599$ vaccine and as you can see here under 1000,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}15.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.030$ subjects were included in the study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}18.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20.262$ and even though the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:20.262 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.900$ participants was small by enrolling cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:22.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.528$ children with varicella and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:24.528 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.749$ controls children without,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:25.750 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.252$ we were able to assess the

 $00:07:28.252 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.920$ effectiveness of this vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}29.920 \to 00{:}07{:}33.175$ With great certainty the the method of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}33.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}36.420$ measure that's used is the Max odds ratio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:36.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.580$ and that's what's used on

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:38.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.876$ case control studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:39.880 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.513$ and we were able to assess the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:43.513 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.990$ effectiveness of the vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.355$ Furthermore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}46.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}48.910$ not only are we able to assess

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:48.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.640$ the overall effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:07:50.640 --> 00:07:53.178 but we are able to target

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:53.178 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.870$ important questions in subgroups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}07{:}54.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.985$ so again using the varicella

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:56.985 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.677$ vaccine as the example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:07:58.680 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.272$ we were able to evaluate the

 $00:08:01.272 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.483$ effectiveness by time elapsed from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}08{:}03.483 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}06.290$ the time of vaccination in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:06.290 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.602$ led in part to changes in actual vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:09.602 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.788$ recommendation in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:11.790 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.646$ Originally this vaccine was

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:13.646 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.430$ recommended just to receive one dose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:16.430 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.346$ And then with data from studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:19.346 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.318$ of effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.166$ the recommendation changed to include two

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:08:24.166 --> 00:08:28.059 doses routinely to Everett to everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:28.060 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.727$ Another one of the of the analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:30.727 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.866$ that can be done an and we're done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}08{:}33.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}35.805$ is questions that arise that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:35.805 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.740$ we didn't even think about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:37.740 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.670$ So in the varicella vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:39.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.828$ in after licensure,

 $00:08:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.868$ there were questions of whether what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}08{:}43.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}47.015$ the ideal age to give it to a child.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:47.020 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.818$ Then again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:47.818 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.010$ at that point it would have been impossible

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:51.086 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.990$ to then go back to the randomized trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.312$ but using the same methodology with

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:56.312 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.470$ data that were already accrued.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:08:58.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.389$ Our team was able to answer this

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:01.389 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.820$ question an address whether the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}09{:}03.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}06.004$ effectiveness in different groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:06.004 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.188$ by age were different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.166$ which ended up not not being different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}09{:}12.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}14.582$ Once a vaccine is licensed and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:14.582 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.990$ recommended for the population in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.184$ as I mentioned,

 $00:09:18.184 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.174$ it's unethical to conduct a

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:20.174 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.420$ randomized clinical trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:21.420 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.736$ so figuring out whether using two

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:09:23.736 --> 00:09:26.587 doses was better than one would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:09:26.587 --> 00:09:28.647 been would have been impossible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:28.650 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.408$ But given the fact that when the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:31.408 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.880$ recommendation for two doses came about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:33.880 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.239$ not every body at once got to doses

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:09:36.239 --> 00:09:38.699 using the case control methodology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.598$ we were able to compare the effectiveness

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}09{:}41.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}43.460$ of individuals with Windows.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:09:43.460 --> 00:09:46.589 Versus Versus 2 doses. So you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:09:46.590 --> 00:09:47.075 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:47.075 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.500$ studies of Affectedness are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:49.500 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.665$ useful in being able to to acquire

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:52.665 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.189$ data like this one,

 $00:09:54.190 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.465$ and then another example from

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:57.465 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.970$ a different study. Is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:09:59.970 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.130$ We can even conduct an be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:02.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.745$ assess effectiveness for individuals who

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:04.745 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.290$ never received the vaccine themselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:07.290 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.318$ and this study was done about

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:09.318 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.005$ 10 years ago when the topic of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:12.005 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.095$ vaccination during pregnancy was not

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:10:14.095 --> 00:10:17.131 well and graced by patients and not

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

00:10:17.131 --> 00:10:19.256 by the entire medical community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:19.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.250$ and the rates of influenza

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:21.250 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.444$ vaccination were low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00{:}10{:}22.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.748$ and for this study we set

NOTE Confidence: 0.86888796

 $00:10:24.748 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.280$ out to evaluate whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:26.362 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.798$ one vaccine given to a pregnant

00:10:28.798 --> 00:10:31.759 mother would be able to protect both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:31.760 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.530$ The mother and the infant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:33.530 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.654$ which is not only very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:35.654 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.070$ in terms of protection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:37.070 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.194$ but also in terms of in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:39.194 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.610$ terms of cost effectiveness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:40.610 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.380$ where you have one vaccine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:42.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.480$ being able to to protect two

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00{:}10{:}44.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}46.629$ individuals for briefly for this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:46.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.400$ We did very similar structure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:48.400 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.320$ A case control study where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:50.320 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.049$ cases were infants who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:52.049 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.979$ hospitalised due to influenza and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:53.979 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.269$ controls were infants who were very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:10:56.269 --> 00:10:58.303 similar who did not have influence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:10:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.788$ And again we look backwards in time.

 $00{:}11{:}00.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}02.642$ But rather than assessing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:02.642 --> 00:11:04.957 Influenza vaccine in the infants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.322$ It was different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:06.322 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.046$ We were assessing influenza vaccination in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:09.046 --> 00:11:12.338 the in their mothers in the pregnant women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.938$ and again the data from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:14.938 --> 00:11:16.237 study greatly greatly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:16.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.005$ It showed that the vaccine given to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:19.005 --> 00:11:21.710 a mother during pregnancy was highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:21.710 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.110$ effective in preventing her infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:24.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.612$ in the first six months of life from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:27.612 --> 00:11:30.482 being admitted with lab documented influence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00{:}11{:}30.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}32.926$ and an these data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:32.930 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.717$ Lead to increases in the rate of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:36.717 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.957$ vaccination during pregnancy and

00:11:38.957 --> 00:11:42.089 I think have helped move forward

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

 $00:11:42.089 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.133$ the vaccination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8919878

00:11:43.140 --> 00:11:45.666 Program so really just sum up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:11:48.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.280$ After randomized clinical trials are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:11:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.250$ conducted in Vaccine Start license,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

00:11:52.250 --> 00:11:54.833 an many other vaccines are going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:11:54.833 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.369$ continue to come through the market.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

00:11:57.370 --> 00:11:59.340 There are questions and our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:11:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.916$ certainties that we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

00:12:00.920 --> 00:12:01.772 At this point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00{:}12{:}01.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04.961$ We can all have them in our heads whatever

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00{:}12{:}04.961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}07.217$ questions concerning Covid vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:07.220 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.590$ There are certainly plenty of controversies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:09.590 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.654$ but we know that many other questions will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:12.654 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.340$ come up questions that we didn't think about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:16.340 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.375$ An observation ull studies that

 $00{:}12{:}18.375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.410$ assess effectiveness of the vaccines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:20.410 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.450$ such as case control studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:22.450 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.634$ can be used successfully to address

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00{:}12{:}24.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.090$ both immediate and long-term

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00{:}12{:}26.149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28.137$ questions regarding these vaccines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8611988

 $00:12:28.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.040$ Thank you very much.