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Letter to the Editor

Questioning the Effectiveness of Oral Cholera Vaccine in Port-au-Prince Slums

Dear Sir:

Oral cholera vaccination (OCV) has been validated by the World Health Organization (WHO) as a valuable tool to complement water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) activities in cholera prevention for high-risk areas and populations.1 We read with great interest the recent study published by Sévère and others,2 which evaluated the effectiveness of a mass OCV campaign targeting approximately 70,000 inhabitants in several slums of Port-au-Prince, Haiti, between April and June 2012. The authors reported a 75% vaccine coverage and, using a cohort design, a striking 97.5% vaccine effectiveness in the 37 months postvaccination, whereas controlled clinical trials have measured OCV vaccine efficacy around 57% [95% confidence interval, 44–67%] during the first 2 years.3 Although it was expected that 56% of cholera cases would occur among vaccinated individuals according to the WHO screening method,4 the same proportion was 5% in the Sévère and others cohort.

A thorough analysis of this study shows that the authors did not evaluate the isolated effectiveness of OCV. They rather estimated its combined effectiveness together with WASH-associated measures. To assess the importance of such methodological bias, we computed provided data using a bias-indicator cohort analysis, as previously described in another methodological bias, we computed provided data using a bias-indicator cohort analysis, as previously described in another methodological bias, we computed provided data using a bias-indicator cohort analysis, as previously described in another methodological bias, we computed provided data using a bias-indicator cohort analysis.4 However, vaccine effectiveness results are hampered by many biases that are difficult to ponder in observational studies. Consequently, effectiveness results shall neither be confounded with the experimentally measured vaccine efficacy, nor replace the proper evaluation of vaccine impact on the course of an epidemic.

Finally, as stated by the WHO position paper on cholera vaccines5 and suggested by our additional analysis of Sévère and others data, WASH activities remain the cornerstone of cholera control and elimination strategies. In Haiti, money is currently lacking to sustain the nationwide reactive program of community awareness and water treatment, and only a tiny fraction of the resources requested by the National Plan for Cholera Elimination in Haiti, 2013–20226 for long-term water and sanitation infrastructures has been pledged so far. Such spectacular but biased OCV effectiveness results shall not even more divert stakeholders and donors from funding these crucial short and long-term WASH programs.
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