

The Susceptible Host Hypothesis in Vaccine Adverse Reactions

ABSURD Health Institute · Volume Two · Research Essay 48

Research series: 07 · Vaccine safety, evidence and methodological criticism

Abstract

Population-average safety estimates cannot reveal every individual risk pattern. Certain recognized vaccine reactions vary by age, sex, product or medical history. This paper explores whether more refined immunologic or genetic host phenotypes could sometimes explain concentrated adverse-event susceptibility, while avoiding the claim that such phenotypes have already been validated for most disputed outcomes.

The biologically susceptible host

Rare adverse reactions may be concentrated in identifiable susceptible hosts even when average population safety is favorable.

Host response depends on innate and adaptive immune activity, prior antigen exposure, inflammatory state, age and concurrent medical conditions. Some vaccine contraindications already reflect known susceptibility—for example, prior severe allergic reaction to a relevant component. Product-specific myocarditis patterns after mRNA vaccination demonstrate that aggregate rates can conceal meaningful demographic variation. Such observations justify stratification, but they do not prove a general “toxin-sensitive genotype.”

An interpretable susceptibility model specifies an outcome before searching for biomarkers. It must distinguish a cause of baseline disease from a cause of the vaccine-attributable increment in disease. A genetic association present in patients with spontaneous myocarditis may not be specific to postvaccination myocarditis. Discovery cohorts need independent replication and clinically meaningful discrimination before biomarkers guide individual care.

When a small subgroup could carry elevated risk

A plausible susceptibility model starts with an outcome known to vary across subgroups. For myocarditis, age and sex differences after certain vaccine products suggest that risk is not uniform. The next question is whether pre-existing biology adds reliable information beyond those obvious factors. Biomarkers might involve prior immune exposures, inflammatory history or other characteristics, but a biological story is not enough. Rare adverse events mean that even a test with good relative prediction could have poor positive predictive value. A risk marker must be sufficiently precise to help rather than simply label thousands of healthy people vulnerable.

An adverse reaction can depend on host characteristics such as age, immune status, prior exposure, genetic background or concurrent illness. Host susceptibility is not a controversial concept in

principle; the difficult task is to identify reliable predictors of an actual vaccine-related outcome rather than merely observe that patients differ biologically. Rare immune-mediated reactions offer potential models, but mechanisms do not generalize automatically across products with different platforms and antigens.

A susceptible-host hypothesis should specify a phenotype before selecting cases. For instance, an independently defined autoimmune history, medication exposure or genetic marker could be tested as an effect modifier in a sufficiently large dataset. If the association is discovered only after searching hundreds of candidate biomarkers in a handful of adverse-event reports, the result is especially vulnerable to chance. Replication in populations with different exposure prevalence is necessary to establish a useful marker.

Age, genetic background, immune history, comorbidity and previous reactions can modify risk, but subgroup hypotheses easily generate false discoveries. An established precedent for individual susceptibility to some immune-mediated adverse events does not justify attributing unrelated chronic disease broadly to vaccination. The research challenge is to define a biological mediator that predicts an outcome before administration, not retrospectively label every adverse case as unusually susceptible.

Predeclared markers and external validation

The practical benefit of identifying susceptibility would be better risk stratification while retaining protection against infection where possible. The harms include false labeling, inappropriate denial of useful vaccination and anxiety generated by unvalidated tests. A sound research program must measure both. The presence of biological individuality is not proof that an unspecified “fragile terrain” explains a reported event; a useful susceptibility claim requires an explicit prediction about who, under what exposure, is at increased risk for a defined harm.

What susceptibility would look like. A credible modifier changes the risk of a defined adverse event under a defined exposure. It might be a specific immune deficiency, prior reaction or medically recognized contraindication; it should not be a nonspecific declaration that someone's “terrain is weak.” Risk markers may be powerful for one product and irrelevant to another. Translating the concept into clinical decisions requires sensitivity, specificity and a meaningful absolute-risk difference.

The discovery trap. If a small case series is tested against a large panel of metabolites and genetic variants, some differences will appear by chance. Researchers need prespecified candidates where possible, adjustment for multiple testing and external validation. A positive biomarker from the day of the reaction can also reflect the reaction itself rather than preexisting susceptibility. Pre-exposure sampling and longitudinal designs offer more persuasive evidence.

Risk stratification has costs. An imperfect screening rule could exclude people who would benefit from vaccination or falsely reassure people whose risk comes from another mechanism. Therefore any proposed susceptibility assay should be judged by net clinical benefit and alternatives for protection, not merely by correlation. The theoretical insight that hosts differ biologically is sound; the research achievement would be finding a reliable, actionable interaction without exaggerating its prevalence

or clinical utility.

Collect cases with rigorous outcome verification and appropriate exposed controls, then predefine immune or genetic markers in discovery and validation samples. A model must improve absolute risk prediction enough to inform a real clinical decision without withholding protection on unsupported grounds. Replication is essential because rare outcomes are particularly prone to unstable subgroup estimates.

The hypothesis should be treated as weaker when researchers search retrospectively through hundreds of variables and report only the most attractive signals. Independent validation is nonnegotiable before using biomarkers to advise vaccine decisions. A known serious allergic reaction or a documented product-specific contraindication is qualitatively different from a speculative inherited “toxin-sensitive” phenotype. Precision means preserving that evidence distinction.

A susceptibility hypothesis is only useful before the adverse event

A clinician may encounter a striking adverse reaction in one recipient while millions of others tolerate a product. A plausible biological explanation is heterogeneous host susceptibility, but simply naming the affected person “susceptible” after the event explains nothing. Prediction must precede exposure. A proposed marker could involve a documented immune mechanism, a verified prior reaction or a specific medical condition; it should be evaluated prospectively for sensitivity, specificity and absolute risk. If the baseline event is extremely rare, even a marker with an impressive relative association might produce many false alarms. A validation study should therefore ask whether the information changes the best clinical decision while maintaining protection from the infection itself. The strongest argument accepts both realities: average safety findings can be reassuring, and particular reactions can still warrant biological explanation. Unsupported broad claims about genetic or autoimmune susceptibility are not made more compelling by the absence of a current test.

Avoid explaining every case retrospectively

Host susceptibility is a valuable clinical concept only when its components can be independently identified and shown to modify a defined risk. Broad categories such as poor detoxification, weak immunity or fragile terrain are not adequate biomarkers by themselves. A proposed marker should be present before the event and predict something clinically meaningful beyond known contraindications and risk factors. Small post-event case series are poor foundations for wide screening because the reaction itself can change inflammatory and metabolic measurements. An appropriately powered prospective or carefully designed retrospective study would need replication and estimates of absolute risk. The harm of an inaccurate test includes exclusion from effective infection prevention or unnecessary fear. The most interesting outcome would be a narrow, validated risk phenotype paired with a safer prevention strategy. Anything less should remain a research hypothesis rather than a claim that broad groups are biologically unable to tolerate vaccination.

There are strong reasons for caution: multiple comparisons can produce spurious genetic signals, rare-event studies may be underpowered, and testing can generate needless anxiety. Population findings for one vaccine cannot be generalized to others with different components. The best current evidence does not support a simple inherited susceptibility profile for vaccine-caused autism, and

vaccine-autism causation has not been established.

The paper should encourage product- and outcome-specific precision pharmacovigilance rather than blanket assertions about “vaccine-damaged children.” A host-risk model is credible only when it improves prediction beyond available demographic and clinical factors and when its use creates measurable benefit.

Sources and research leads

1. Patone et al. [Risks of myocarditis, pericarditis, and arrhythmias associated with COVID-19 vaccination or SARS-CoV-2 infection](#)
2. Andersson et al. [Aluminum-Adsorbed Vaccines and Chronic Diseases in Childhood: A Nationwide Cohort Study](#)

Editorial status: Third-pass conceptual research manuscript. The argument has been individually strengthened and shared boilerplate removed. Original reference leads were retained; a complete independent source-by-source scholarly verification has not been performed. No new clinical trial data are presented.