COVID-19 vaccine and Guillain-Barré syndrome: let’s not leap to associations

This special commentary refers to ‘Epidemiological and cohort study finds no association between COVID-19 and Guillain-Barré syndrome’ by Lunn et al. (doi:10.1093/brain/awaa433).

A worldwide mass vaccination campaign to control the COVID-19 pandemic is imminent. Understanding the epidemiology of rare diseases whose onset will inevitably occur by coincidence following SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, but which have little to no evidence of being caused by them in any significant number of cases, is critical. Failure to appreciate these issues will result in misattribution of adverse events to the vaccination programme. This could lead to poor uptake of vaccines, delay or even withdrawal of vaccines, or vaccine programmes resulting in unnecessary morbidity and mortality.

Global cases of the COVID-19 respiratory illness caused by the virus SARS-CoV-2 have surpassed 50 million, with a pandemic resulting in medical and economic devastation worldwide. As of late November 2020, four vaccines involving over 100 000 participants have displayed favourable efficacy without significant reported side effects in phase 3 trials. At least 67 COVID-19 vaccines are in phase 1–3 trials: six already have limited approval, and 87 are under active animal study investigation (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/science/coronavirus-vaccine-tracker.html accessed 18 November 2020).

Guillain-Barré syndrome (GBS) is an acute inflammatory peripheral nerve disorder resulting in severe and sometimes lasting paralysis; about one-third of patients develop respiratory failure requiring intensive care unit (ICU) admission and ventilation (Leonhard et al., 2019). GBS is fatal in 3–5% of patients, and about two-thirds have residual disability. The lifetime individual risk of acquiring GBS is about 1:1000, and the annual incidence of GBS is ~1.7 persons per 100 000 population (Sejvar et al., 2011; Keddie et al., 2020). Some 1500 cases of
GBS are recorded in the UK each year, or by extrapolation, about 100 000 worldwide. It is thus an alarming illness for the public and healthcare providers.

Around half of those affected by GBS have a preceding history of an identified infection and two-thirds preceding infectious symptoms. The remainder have no overt trigger for their illness. The commonest triggering infection worldwide is gastroenteritis caused by *Campylobacter jejuni* (Doets et al., 2018). Many other infections can also trigger GBS including cytomegalovirus, influenza, *Mycoplasma pneumoniae*, the flaviviruses Zika and dengue, and the alphavirus, chikungunya (Brito Ferreira et al., 2020). Notably, during the recent Zika virus epidemic in Latin America, many countries reported a sharp rise in cases of GBS confirmed by strict epidemiological analysis, a relationship widely considered to be causal (Brito Ferreira et al., 2020).

The possibility of SARS-CoV-2 also driving a global spike in GBS has unsurprisingly been eagerly monitored with many cases and small series already published asserting a causal link. However, a surge in GBS cases after the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic has not been detected as it happened in the Zika virus pandemic. In a recent epidemiological study conducted across the UK, there was no increased incidence in GBS during the first wave of COVID-19, and thus no causal link of COVID-19 to GBS could be made in this population (Keddie et al., 2020) A small increase in GBS incidence might be disguised behind a much larger decrease in GBS cases from other causes. Filosto et al. (2020) published a series of 34 GBS patients from a Northern Italian population of 8.4 million people. They reported a 2.6-fold increase in incidence of GBS, a 3.3-fold decrease in non-COVID-19 associated GBS and calculated a rate of 47.9 cases of GBS per 100 000 COVID-19 infections. However, with such small numbers, the confidence intervals (CIs) of the GBS incidences overlap. Furthermore, using a published Italian Statistical Institute (ISTAT) seroprevalence of COVID-19 for the same period makes the COVID-19 associated rate a maximum of 4.7 cases per 100 000 COVID-19 infections; a small increase may represent a chance finding (Filosto et al., 2020). Thus, whilst one cannot exclude the possibility of a COVID-19–GBS association without case-control studies, there is currently no definitive evidence that there is an appreciable increase in GBS cases with COVID-19.

Why does GBS rear its head in the context of the SARS-Cov-2 pandemic and vaccination programmes? To understand this, we need to revisit the 1976/77 USA/New Jersey/76 vaccination programme that brought GBS to world-wide attention. Following dire warnings
from experts of pandemic ‘swine flu’, President Ford instituted a rapid vaccine development program in the USA to prevent this (Neustadt and Fineberg, 1978). Unfortunately, the vaccine was found to be associated with a spike in cases of GBS with an initial calculation of a relative risk of 7.6 (95% CI 6.7–8.6) in the 6 weeks following vaccination, amounting to an attributable risk of just under one case of GBS per 100 000 vaccinations (Neustadt and Fineberg, 1978; Schonberger et al., 1979). As soon as this was known, the program was halted, but not before implanting the idea of a lasting association between GBS and vaccination (Langmuir, 1979; Langmuir et al., 1984). We must not allow hasty and misattributed associations to result from the occurrence of GBS shortly after COVID vaccination without very careful statistical thought and analysis.

Following the ‘swine flu’ programme, numerous national surveillance studies to identify vaccine-related GBS have been carried out, notably in the 2008/09 H1N1 influenza seasons, because the H1N1 influenza strain was also of swine origin. Any vaccine-related increase in GBS following modern influenza vaccines has been tiny, with the consensus of many robust studies being about one additional case per million vaccinations (10-fold less than in 1976) (Perez-Vilar et al., 2020; Salmon et al., 2020). In one UK GP database study, influenza vaccination was significantly protective, as it is in modelling studies of influenza vaccine where influenza prevalence is >5% and vaccine effectiveness >60% (Hawken et al., 2015). The risk of hospitalization after influenza infection is far greater than these at about 17 per million (Vellozzi et al., 2014), Around 22 000 deaths were attributed to influenza infection in the USA in 2019/20.

Multiple other vaccines including hepatitis B, polio, tetanus, meningococcus, rabies an importantly an orally administered adenovirus vaccine have also previously been alleged to be associated with the occurrence of GBS (McNeil et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2020). No causative links have been conclusively proven despite these individual reports being widely quoted. In a defensive posture, but one that further heightens worries about GBS and vaccines, GBS is recorded as a warning in every vaccination summary of medical product characteristics (SmPC) in the EU or Package Insert (PI) insert in the USA.

All this leads to the relevance of GBS to the current proposed vaccination programme for COVID-19. The world is about to vaccinate at least 1 billion people, and possibly many more if production and logistics allow. The vaccination effort will likely begin in December 2020 and continue for several years. It will be the largest mass vaccination campaign ever undertaken.
in history. Most COVID-19 vaccinations are based on the Sars-CoV-2 spike protein. Sars-CoV-2 has not so far been shown to result in a significant increase in GBS. The vaccines developed to this point are delivered by different routes to natural infection and present the S-protein in unconventional ways. However, they contain no additional immunogenic material known or proven to drive GBS. Thus, although an association of any vaccination to GBS cannot be ruled out and we must remain vigilant to its potential occurrence, it is not be presumptively expected.

Herein lie the statistics: within a population of 1 billion people, one would expect about 17 000 cases of GBS to occur sporadically per annum, of which 1962 would occur in any 6-week period. When considering a more optimistic 4-billion-person immunization programme conducted over 1 year, 68 000 cases of GBS would be expected to occur naturally within this time period, irrespective of any vaccination programme. Of these GBS cases, 13 076 would occur in the 10-week window following double-dose vaccination with injections separated by 4 weeks. It is therefore inevitable that many thousands of sporadic cases of GBS caused by other factors will appear temporally associated with COVID-19 vaccination. But, as any statistician can confirm, this cannot be considered causal.

So why is this so important?

First, the rapid vaccine development, accelerated trial programmes, vaccine production and drug licensing that have been necessary to get us to today put pharmaceutical companies and regulators under the microscope of scientific colleagues, the world’s press, and every member of the concerned public. Rare diseases with potentially severe consequences such as GBS are thus scrutinized and monitored in minute detail for any increase in incidence. These processes must be transparent and open to outside review. This is already occurring through the regulatory monitoring bodies. Cases of GBS, or other neurological disease, will inevitably occur within the 6-week post-vaccination window by chance alone when such large numbers are vaccinated. Decision makers must not stop the vaccination programmes unless there is clear evidence of a genuine excess of cases that has been carefully calculated, and even then, only if it is of sufficient magnitude to exceed the benefits of vaccination.

Second, rigorous and well-designed GBS surveillance programmes with accurate case definition and ascertainment are needed. Criteria developed by the Brighton Collaboration can be used to verify cases and provide reassurance of diagnostic certainty (Fokke et al., 2014). These will be critical to accurate case ascertainment. Where practical, ascertainment programmes should be multi-national and include control groups not receiving vaccines. The
Peripheral Nerve Society (www.pnsociety.com) and the International GBS Outcome Study group (https://gbsstudies.erasmusmc.nl/) will promote an international effort to prospectively register and collate the numerical incidence of GBS and other relevant autoimmune diseases compared to real-time population and vaccination numbers to identify any excess of cases that might lead to real concern about one or more vaccines. These will be critical to determining the risks, if any, of GBS being associated with any of the vaccines. These programmes should also be transparent and open.

Third, governments and medical agencies are about to embark on the most difficult and massive public health intervention in modern history. It will have far-reaching and long-lasting consequences if we get it right, and more if we get it wrong. Everyone, including scientists, publishers, editors and mass media must thus resist the misuse of statistics and epidemiology that could lead to misattribution of cause, without appreciating the lasting negative consequences for ongoing health and ill health of the world’s population.

Responsible citizens understand the value and risk of any vaccine. The individual risk for GBS and other rare complications is likely to be very small indeed, and the benefit of protection against COVID-19 both for individuals and society is far greater. It should be implicit for regulators, pharmaceutical companies, mass media and the general public to understand that rare diseases will inevitably occur by chance during the vaccination window, and that the temporal association between vaccination and GBS onset even in large numbers of individuals within a huge population of billions is not adequate evidence of causation. In those conditions like GBS where minds are preprogrammed to leap to causative assumptions through cognitive bias, this is a particularly vital message to convey.

As part of a larger consortium of neurologists, virologists, vaccinologists, epidemiologists and health-interested agencies that should be immediately convened, we will seek to accurately inform the public, pharmaceutical companies and regulators of this inevitable and important issue.
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