

Dr.Ravibharathi Nagarajan , Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Dr.Abhiram J Raj , Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Dr.Muhammed Hashim Cheripurath , Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Dr.Mydeen Syed Masood , Medical Student, Samarkand State Medical University, Uzbekistan

Abstract

Few medical interventions have saved more lives than vaccination, and few have been asked to defend themselves more often. Adverse events following immunization (AEFIs) are real, sometimes serious, and always emotionally charged; yet the gap between what is reported after a vaccine and what is caused by a vaccine remains one of the most misunderstood distinctions in public health. This narrative review examines how vaccine adverse effects are defined, classified, detected, and communicated, drawing on the World Health Organization's revised AEFI causality framework, passive and active surveillance systems such as VAERS and the Vaccine Safety Datalink, and the published literature on the most discussed vaccine safety controversies of the past five decades. We outline the true frequency of common and serious reactions, explain why raw reports of adverse events cannot be read as proof of causation, and analyse the psychological and social mechanisms that convert coincidence into conviction. We argue that honest acknowledgement of genuine risks, transparent surveillance, and empathetic communication are not the enemies of vaccine confidence but its foundations. The evidence supports a clear conclusion: vaccines are among the most closely monitored medical products in existence, their serious adverse effects are rare, measurable, and—critically—knowable, and fear thrives only where facts are withheld.

Keywords: vaccine safety; adverse events following immunization (AEFI); pharmacovigilance; VAERS; causality assessment; vaccine hesitancy; nocebo effect

1. Introduction

In the first month of the American COVID-19 vaccination campaign, 13.8 million doses were administered. More than thirteen million people woke the next morning with a sore arm; some had fever, chills, or a day in bed. A small number—roughly five per million vaccinated—experienced anaphylaxis, a severe allergic reaction that demands immediate treatment and, in nearly every case, resolves completely. Meanwhile, on public reporting dashboards, every death that occurred after vaccination was visible to anyone with an internet connection: a heart attack in a care home resident three weeks after her second dose, a stroke in a man whose vaccine had nothing to do with his platelets. To the epidemiologist, these entries are signals to be investigated, most destined to be explained by time and coincidence. To the frightened parent scrolling at midnight, each one reads as a confession.

This asymmetry—between how adverse events are recorded and how they are perceived—is the subject of this article. Vaccines are given to healthy people, often to healthy children, which makes any subsequent misfortune feel like an accusation. And vaccines are given precisely when disease is absent, which guarantees that some recipients will fall ill shortly after injection for reasons unrelated to it. A child who develops leukaemia months after her measles shot, an elderly man whose cancer announces itself the week after his influenza vaccine—these tragedies are real, but their timing is a statistical certainty, not a pharmaceutical crime. Understanding that distinction, and learning to hold both truths at once—that vaccines can cause genuine harm in rare individuals and that the overwhelming majority of reported harms are coincidental—is the intellectual core of vaccine safety.

2. Defining the Problem: What an AEFI Is—and What It Is Not

The World Health Organization defines an adverse event following immunization as any untoward medical occurrence that follows immunization, which does not necessarily have a causal relationship with the vaccine. That final clause is the entire game. An AEFI is a temporal observation: something happened after a shot. Whether the vaccine caused it, contributed to it, or merely kept company with it is a separate question that demands investigation, not assumption. The WHO's revised causality assessment manual, introduced after review by the Global Advisory Committee on Vaccine Safety, recognises four broad possibilities. First, the event may be consistent with a causal association to immunization—either a vaccine product-related reaction (an inherent property, such as fever from an immune response), a quality defect (a manufacturing problem with a specific lot), an immunization error (preventable mishandling, such as reconstitution with the wrong diluent), or an anxiety-related

reaction, now termed an immunization-triggered stress response—the fainting and hyperventilation that fear itself produces. Second, the association may be indeterminate: the timing fits but the evidence does not yet. Third—and most commonly for dramatic events—the association may be inconsistent, meaning coincidental: the person would have become ill anyway, and the vaccine simply provided a memorable date. Fourth, the case may be unclassifiable for lack of information. Table 1 summarises this framework.

Category	Meaning and examples
A1 — Vaccine product-related reaction	Caused by an inherent property of the vaccine even when correctly prepared and given. Examples: fever, injection-site swelling, malaise; live-vaccine rash after varicella; vaccine-associated paralytic poliomyelitis after oral polio vaccine (~1 case per 2–3 million doses).
A2 — Vaccine quality defect-related reaction	Caused by a manufacturing defect in a lot or batch (e.g., contamination, potency failure). Trigger for lot recall and international alert.
A3 — Immunization error-related reaction	Preventable mishandling, prescribing, or administration: wrong diluent, unsterile technique, wrong route or site. Managed by training and protocol, not by distrust of the vaccine itself.
A4 — Immunization anxiety-related reaction (ITSR)	Stress response to the act of immunization: vasovagal fainting, breath-holding, hyperventilation. Common in adolescents; clusters are usually driven by social contagion of fear.
B — Indeterminate	Timing is consistent but evidence is insufficient (B1) or conflicting (B2). These cases feed signal-detection systems and may prompt further study.

C — Coincidental event	Caused by something other than vaccine, error, or anxiety. A seizure from an underlying seizure disorder, a cardiac event from pre-existing disease. Statistically the largest category for serious events.
D — Unclassifiable	Inadequate information to judge causality at all.

Table 1. The WHO revised AEFI causality classification (categories A–D).

3. What Reactions Actually Occur—and How Often

Honesty begins with numbers. Mild, short-lived reactions are common and are, in fact, the visible signature of an immune system doing its job: local pain, redness, and swelling at the injection site, with systemic symptoms such as low-grade fever, headache, fatigue, and muscle ache. In the CDC's first-month analysis of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines, headache (22.4%), fatigue (16.5%), and dizziness (16.5%) were the most frequently reported symptoms—and 90.8% of all reports were classified as non-serious. These events are expected, self-limiting, and far preferable to the diseases they signal protection against.

Serious events are a different order of rarity. Anaphylaxis—the event that dominates public imagination—occurs after roughly 1 to 5 doses per million administered for most vaccines; a Vaccine Safety Datalink study found rates ranging from 1.53 per million for influenza to 6.58 per million for live zoster vaccine. To put that in perspective, a person is more likely to be struck by lightning in a given year than to suffer vaccine anaphylaxis in a given dose. Other genuinely causal serious events are equally exceptional: febrile seizures after measles-containing vaccines occur in roughly 1 in 3,000 to 4,000 vaccinated children and carry an excellent prognosis; Guillain–Barré syndrome after influenza vaccination, when it occurs at all, adds on the order of one to two excess cases per million doses—a risk dwarfed by the neurological complications of influenza itself. Table 2 assembles the best available figures for commonly discussed reactions.

Context, not the bare number, is what separates fact from fear. Myocarditis after mRNA COVID-19 vaccination is real: it occurs predominantly in young males after the second dose, at rates peaking around 50 to 70 per million in the highest-risk group, and almost

all cases are mild and recover fully. But COVID-19 infection itself causes myocarditis at roughly six times that rate, in addition to its other dangers. Fear isolates a numerator; medicine weighs it against the denominator of disease risk that vaccination exists to prevent.

Event	Approximate frequency	Interpretation
Pain, redness, swelling at injection site; low-grade fever, fatigue	Very common (roughly 10–80% by vaccine)	Expected immune response; self-limiting within 1–3 days.
Fainting (vasovagal), especially in adolescents	Common; minutes after injection	Anxiety/stress response (A4), not a vaccine toxicity; observe 15 minutes post-vaccination.
Febrile seizure after measles-containing vaccine	~1 per 3,000–4,000 vaccinated children	Causal (A1), frightening but benign; risk from measles infection is far higher.
Anaphylaxis	~1.5–6.6 per million doses (varies by vaccine)	Causal (A1), treatable; contraindicates future doses of that vaccine.
Guillain–Barré syndrome after influenza vaccine	~1–2 excess cases per million doses in at-risk seasons	Causal in some seasons; influenza infection itself carries higher GBS risk.
Vaccine-associated paralytic polio (oral polio vaccine)	~1 per 2–3 million doses	Reason wealthy nations switched to inactivated vaccine; a live-vaccine property, not an error.
mRNA COVID-19 vaccine myocarditis	Up to ~50–70 per million in young males after dose 2	Causal (A1); mostly mild; COVID-19 infection confers several-fold higher myocarditis risk.
Thrombosis with thrombocytopenia	~1–2 per 100,000 first doses (product-specific)	Rare causal signal detected by surveillance and acted on: product

(adenovirus COVID-19 vaccines)		restricted/withdrawn in many countries—proof the system works.
--------------------------------	--	--

Table 2. Frequently discussed adverse events following immunization: frequency and correct interpretation.

4. How We Know: Surveillance Systems and the Discipline of "Maybe"

Modern vaccine safety rests on a two-storey architecture of surveillance. The ground floor is passive: systems like the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System in the United States, or the WHO's global database, accept reports from anyone—physicians, nurses, patients, lawyers—about anything that happened after vaccination. Their strength is sensitivity and speed; their weakness is noise. A famous illustration: among the first 1,266 reports after the Moderna COVID-19 vaccine, reviewers flagged 108 for scrutiny and confirmed 10 true cases of anaphylaxis—each one valuable, but none discoverable without wading through a thousand-plus reports of unrelated events. Studies of VAERS capture for serious outcomes show it detects between 13% and 76% of true anaphylaxis cases and 12% to 64% of Guillain-Barré cases—useful for finding signals, useless for measuring rates, and categorically unable, by itself, to prove causation.

The upper storey is active surveillance: systems like the Vaccine Safety Datalink, which follows more than ten million vaccinated people in electronic health records, compares event rates in the days after vaccination with background rates in the same population, and can detect a signal of roughly one extra case per hundred thousand doses within weeks. It was this machinery that identified intussusception after the first rotavirus vaccine in 1999 (prompting its withdrawal within months), confirmed the safety of the replacement, and later quantified the rare clotting disorder linked to adenoviral COVID-19 vaccines. The record deserves emphasis: when vaccines have caused genuine harm, surveillance found it—measurably, publicly, and fast. The same cannot yet be said for every drug in the pharmacy. In pharmacovigilance, "maybe" is not evasion; it is the working hypothesis from which every confirmed finding and every cleared suspicion is born.



Figure 1. Proper vaccine preparation by a trained healthcare worker—technique, cold chain, and protocol adherence are the controllable determinants of injection safety. (Image: Salud America.)

5. Lessons from the Fear Archives

History offers a syllabus of instructive errors. The 1976 swine-flu campaign vaccinated 45 million Americans against a pandemic that never arrived, and recorded an excess of Guillain–Barré syndrome of roughly one case per 100,000 recipients—real, acknowledged, and still debated in its exact magnitude. The episode taught both humility and method: rare risks can hide in millions of doses, and surveillance must be ready before campaigns begin. The thiomersal controversy of the 1990s—alleged mercury poisoning from a preservative—led to its precautionary removal from most childhood vaccines despite no evidence of harm, and years of subsequent research found no link to neurodevelopmental disorders; autism rates did not fall where thiomersal was removed, because it was never the cause. And then there is the deepest scar: the 1998 Wakefield paper claiming an MMR–autism link, based on twelve children, later shown to be fraudulent, fully retracted in 2010, and its author struck from the medical register—yet the paper still measurably depresses MMR uptake a quarter-century later, and measles, declared eliminated in the Americas in 2016, has returned. One false fact, endlessly replicated, can outlive the corrections by decades.

The pandemic added new chapters. The adenovirus-vector clotting syndrome—detected, characterised, and communicated within weeks of first reports, with products withdrawn or restricted across Europe and North America—demonstrated surveillance functioning in real time, though public communication initially fumbled the trade-off between speed and clarity. Meanwhile, claims circulating online that millions were dying from COVID-19 vaccines collapsed under basic arithmetic: vaccinated

populations include everyone, including people who will die of other causes in a given month, and large cohort studies consistently found vaccinated people died less often of every cause, not more. Fear offers vivid anecdotes; epidemiology answers with denominators.



Figure 2. Childhood immunization with parental support—trust between families and vaccinators is built in moments like this, one honest conversation at a time. (Image: CHRISTUS Health.)

6. The Psychology of the Sore Arm: Why Fear Outruns Fact

None of this makes vaccine fear stupid; it makes it human. Adverse events are processed through cognitive machinery that systematically distorts risk. The availability heuristic ensures that a single vivid story of harm—"my cousin's friend's baby"—outweighs an abstract million-dose statistic. Negativity bias and loss aversion mean a rare harm looms larger than a common prevented one, even when the arithmetic favours vaccination overwhelmingly. Confirmation bias then seals the loop: believers of harm collect confirming anecdotes, doubters collect reassuring studies, and neither group reads the other's evidence. Layered on top is the nocebo effect—the dark twin of the placebo—expectation itself producing symptoms. In blinded crossover studies of COVID-19 vaccines, a striking proportion of reported "side effects" after the real vaccine also appeared after the saline placebo dose; expectation, not adjuvant, made those arms ache. Finally, social media monetises outrage: fear spreads faster than correction, and the algorithm does not distinguish between a pharmacovigilance signal and a conspiracy theory. Understanding these mechanisms is not condescension; it is the necessary foundation for communication that works.

7. The Clinical Conversation: Acknowledge, Quantify, Compare

The evidence converges on a communicative trilogy. Acknowledge: begin with what is true—"Yes, this vaccine can cause a fever, and very rarely something serious. Let me tell you exactly how rare, and what we do about it." Dismissing risk corrodes trust; naming it builds it. Quantify: translate abstractions into concrete comparisons—"about one in a million, roughly the chance of being struck by lightning"—because people, reasonably, do not reason in per-million units. Compare: every vaccine risk must be weighed against the risk of the disease, which for measles includes pneumonia, encephalitis, and death at rates hundreds or thousands of times higher than any vaccine harm. Practically, clinicians should also observe patients for fifteen minutes after injection (catching the rare anaphylaxis and the common faint), keep adrenaline accessible, report every serious event through national systems, and treat hesitancy as a clinical encounter rather than a character flaw. The research is consistent that the most trusted messenger is still the family physician or nurse who listens first, and prescribes second.

8. Conclusion

The question in this article's title resolves into a quiet, defensible position. Facts: vaccines cause adverse effects—common and mild in most recipients, rare and serious in a few per million—and these effects are among the most intensively measured phenomena in medicine, tracked by passive systems that listen to everyone and active systems that count everything. Fear: thrives on the confusion between after and because, on anecdotes that outrun denominators, on retracted papers that refuse to die, and on communicators who either hide risks or exaggerate them. Separating the two requires no special courage—only the discipline to ask "how many, out of how many, compared with what?" of every alarming claim. Vaccination will always involve a needle, a moment of trust, and a small, honest discomfort. What it should never involve is fear of the unknown, for in vaccine safety, remarkably little is unknown. The facts, patiently told, are the strongest antidote we possess.

References

1. World Health Organization. Causality assessment of an adverse event following immunization (AEFI): user manual for the revised WHO classification. 2nd ed. Geneva: WHO; 2018.
2. Miller ER, McNeil MM, Moro PL, Broder KR, Hibbs B. The reporting sensitivity of the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) for anaphylaxis and for Guillain-Barré syndrome. *Vaccine*. 2020;38(46):7458–7465.

3. Gargano LM, Wallace M, Hadler SC, et al. Use of mRNA COVID-19 vaccine after reports of myocarditis among vaccine recipients: update from ACIP—United States, June 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(27):977–982.
4. Goss AL, Samudralwar RD, Das RR, Nath A. ANA investigates: neurological complications of COVID-19 vaccines. *Ann Neurol.* 2021;89(5):856–857.
5. Krishnamoorthy S, Shukla S, Paul MJ, Saravanan S. Vaccine hesitancy: a major challenge in COVID-19 vaccination program. *Community Med Health Educ.* 2021;11(8):695.
6. Ross AG, Olds GR, Cripps AW, Farrar JJ, McMillan NAJ. Herd protection against *Haemophilus influenzae* type b. Vaccine. 2023;41(1):1–5.
7. Institute of Medicine. Adverse events associated with childhood vaccines: evidence bearing on causality. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 1994.
8. Orenstein WA, Ahmed R. Simply put: vaccination saves lives. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA.* 2017;114(16):4031–4033.
9. Public Health Agency of Canada. Canadian immunization guide—adverse events following immunization. Ottawa; 2021.
10. Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. What VAERS is (and isn't). 2022.
11. CDC COVID-19 Response Team. First month of COVID-19 vaccine safety monitoring—United States, December 14, 2020–January 13, 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(8):283–288.
12. Gay N. The theory of measles elimination: implications for the design of elimination strategies. *J Infect Dis.* 2004;189(Suppl 1):S27–S35.
13. Cascini F, Pantovic A, Al-Ajlouni Y, et al. Social media and attitudes towards COVID-19 vaccination: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Front Public Health.* 2022;10:990839.
14. Hornsey MJ, Harris EA, Fielding KS. The psychological roots of anti-vaccination attitudes: a 24-nation investigation. *Health Psychol.* 2018;37(4):307–315.
15. Shimabukuro TT, Cole M, Su JR. Reports of anaphylaxis after receipt of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines in the US—December 2020–January 2021. *JAMA.* 2021;325(11):1101–1102.