# Article information:

Oxford Covid vaccine 'safe and effective' study shows - BBC News  
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-55228422>

# Article summary:

1. The Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine is safe and effective, providing good protection against illness and death.

2. The data suggests it can reduce spread of Covid, with an overall effectiveness of 70%, a lower one of 62% and a high of 90%.

3. The UK has pre-ordered 100 million doses of the Oxford vaccine, which is cheaper than some other Covid vaccines and easier to store and distribute.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article “Oxford Covid Vaccine 'Safe and Effective' Study Shows - BBC News” provides an overview of the results from advanced trials of the Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine. The article is generally reliable in its reporting, as it cites independent scientists who have assessed the paper, as well as experts who provide their opinion on the results. However, there are some potential biases that should be noted.

First, the article does not present both sides equally when discussing the efficacy levels for the vaccine. While it mentions that different doses were used in one part of the trial, it does not explore any possible counterarguments or risks associated with this approach. Additionally, while it mentions that more cases were seen in the group that did not receive the vaccine, it does not provide any evidence to support this claim or explore any potential reasons why this may be true.

Second, while the article does mention that regulators are considering the jab for emergency use, it does not discuss any potential risks associated with this decision or explore any counterarguments from those who may oppose its use in such a manner. Additionally, while it mentions that older people are most at risk of severe Covid illness, it does not provide any evidence to support this claim or explore any potential implications for those over 55 who received only half a dose during trials.

Finally, while the article states that AstraZeneca will make three billion doses for the world next year, it does not discuss how these doses will be distributed or what criteria will be used to determine who receives them first. It also fails to mention any potential risks associated with mass production and distribution of such a large number of doses in such a short period of time.

In conclusion, while generally reliable in its reporting on the results from advanced trials of the Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine, this article could benefit from exploring potential risks associated with different dosing regimens and mass production and distribution of such a large number of doses in such a short period of time. Additionally, further evidence should be provided to support claims made about efficacy levels for different age groups as well as protection against asymptomatic infection among those who did not receive the vaccine.

# Topics for further research:

* Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine risks
* Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine efficacy levels for different age groups
* Oxford/AstraZeneca Covid vaccine protection against asymptomatic infection
* Mass production and distribution of Covid vaccines
* Covid vaccine distribution criteria
* Risks associated with different dosing regimens for Covid vaccines
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