

Comparing Vaccine Risks with Infection Risks

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

Abstract

A risk associated with a vaccine is never fully understood in isolation from the risk of the infection it aims to prevent. This paper argues for a dynamic comparison that varies by age, sex, baseline immunity, disease prevalence, time since vaccination and product. It challenges both the assertion that vaccination is risk-free and the opposite assertion that any measurable vaccine harm settles the net-benefit question.

The Clinical Question and Its Context

Comparative risk involves absolute rates, severity, causal attribution and context. For example, a myocarditis signal after particular mRNA vaccine doses must be considered alongside myocarditis and other harms associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection, using comparable outcome definitions and risk windows. Results from early pandemic waves cannot be assumed to apply unchanged after widespread infection-acquired immunity, variant evolution or updated formulations. An older high-risk patient and a young healthy male may have different risk-benefit profiles.

Proposed Biological or Explanatory Model

A correct comparison distinguishes individual protection, transmission effects and broader public-health outcomes while avoiding simplistic claims from relative-risk ratios alone. Absolute excess cases per dose, hospitalizations prevented, serious complications and uncertainty intervals are more useful than dramatic percentages without denominators. Time horizon matters: short-term reactogenicity, rare acute harm and longer-term disease outcomes occupy distinct categories.

Mechanism-Specific Interpretation

Risk comparison requires a denominator, population and time horizon. A high relative risk of a rare outcome may imply a small absolute excess, while a modest relative increase in a common severe outcome may carry substantial burden. Infection risk itself changes with circulating variants, prior immunity, exposure and available treatment; vaccine risks can vary with product formulation and dose. Therefore, a true statement about one season or age group can become misleading when quoted as a timeless rule for everyone. It is also possible for a vaccine to confer meaningful benefit overall while a particular subgroup faces a different balance.

Competing Explanations and Limits of Inference

Neither side may cherry-pick only favorable time windows, ignore prior infection or use noncomparable clinical endpoints. Evidence concerning one product cannot be generalized to all vaccines, and an observed benefit cannot erase a serious adverse effect in an identifiable subgroup. The relationship between population recommendation and individual preference deserves careful explanation.

Discriminating Observations and Evidence Thresholds

The relevant analytic discipline is matching comparable outcomes and risk windows. Hospitalization due to documented myocarditis should not be compared with any self-reported chest pain, nor should a broad infection outcome be compared with an arbitrarily narrow vaccine outcome. The goal is an understandable absolute-risk table that can change when evidence changes, not a permanent ideological conclusion.

Implications for Interpretation and Future Inquiry

This paper offers readers a framework for making sense of changing evidence without retreating into blanket slogans. Its core standard is reciprocal rigor: the same causal scrutiny must be applied to the vaccine and to the infection. The medically relevant answer is product-, person- and time-specific.

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. [Hviid et al. Measles, Mumps, Rubella Vaccination and Autism: A Nationwide Cohort Study](#)

Source lineage: Vaccine risk-benefit and safety research

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