

WEEKLY EPIDEMIOLOGICAL REPORT

A publication of the Epidemiology Unit

Ministry of Health231, de Saram Place, Colombo 01000, Sri LankaTele: + 94 11 2695112, Fax: +94 11 2696583, E mail: epidunit@sltnet.lkEpidemiologist: +94 11 2681548, E mail: chepid@sltnet.lkWeb: http://www.epid.gov.lk

Vol. 50 No. 39

23rd- 29th Sep 2023

Assessment of Vaccine Herd Protection: Lessons learned from vaccine trials Part II

This is the second article of a series of 3 articles on the "Assessment of Vaccine Herd Protection: Lessons learned from vaccine trials".

Assessment of Vaccine Herd Protection using examples from Cholera & Typhoid Vaccine Studies

Vaccine Herd Protection can be assessed either via:

- Cluster randomized trials
- Individually randomized trials &
- Nonrandomized (observational) studies

While randomized trials are useful to avoid bias, non-randomized studies may be the only designs acceptable from an ethical, logistical and financial point of view and are also valuable to show the real-world impact of vaccination

Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trials

Groups of individuals are randomized to receive the study vaccine (intervention clusters) or the control agent (control clusters), usually in a blinded manner, in Cluster-Randomized Control Trials (CRCT). Potential units of randomization are diverse and include workplaces, clinics, hospitals, schools, households etc. Further, some members of the clusters may choose to not receive the study vaccine or control agent. Indirect and total protection is assessed by comparing sub-samples within the clusters.



*Participation bias is avoided by comparing those who receive the study vaccine with those who receive the control agent (all study participants) to assess total protection; while those who chose not to receive the study vaccine are compared with those who chose not to receive the control agent (all nonparticipants) to assess indirect protection. Thus, estimates are based on concurrent comparisons of groups that are similar by virtue of cluster randomization, hence strengthening the credibility of inferences made from CRCTs. (figure 1)

A CRCT was conducted in Kolkata, India, where slum-dwellers who were 2 years of age or older were randomly assigned to receive a single dose of either typhoid Vi polysaccharide vaccine (intervention) or inactivated hepatitis A vaccine (control agent), according to geographic clusters, with 40 clusters in each of the 2 study arms.8

Page

1



Figure 1. Evaluation of vaccine protection in cluster-randomization trials [17]

Contents

1. Assessment of Vaccine Herd Protection Lessons learned from vaccine trials Part II

2. Summary of selected notifiable diseases reported $(16^{\text{th}} - 22^{\text{nd}} \text{ September } 2023)$	3
3. Surveillance of vaccine preventable diseases & AFP (16 th – 22 nd September 2023)	4

ANKA ZUZ

WER Sri Lanka - Vol. 50 No . 39

Primary endpoint of this trial was to assess the total Vi vaccine protection against typhoid fever when the vaccine was given under realistic public health conditions. Rates of typhoid episodes during the ensuing 2 years of surveillance was compared across different groups to calculate the Indirect Vaccine Protection (IVP), Total Vaccine Protection (TVP) & Overall Vaccine Protection (OVP). (table 1)

Results revealed (during 2 years of follow up), that TVP was 61% (95%CI: 41%-75%), IVP was 44% (95%CI: 2%-69%), and OVP was 57% (95%CI: 37%-71%). Further, the Vi (typhoid vaccine) coverage was around 60%, making the population impact of OVP *equivalent* to that for a vaccine with 100% direct protection but not conferring herd protection.

In contrast, a similar clinical trial in Karachi, Pakistan with similar study design and follow up period was conducted, with the difference being that children between the ages of 2-16 years were only vaccinated. Results revealed TVP of 57% (95%CI: 6%-81%) among children 5-16 years of age but none among children between ages of 2-5 years of age. This study also did not detect a statistically significant IVP and OVP either. This difference in results between the studies carried out in Kolkata and Karachi have been ascribed to the non-inclusion of adults as vaccine recipients in the Karachi site, potentially allowing continued transmission of typhoid fever in the intervention clusters.

These differences in outcome in 2 rather similar **CRCTs** shows the importance of study design. A) The disease of interest shouldn't ideally be transmitted to a great extent by groups not targeted for the vaccination within the chosen clusters, as this could have an effect on estimation of vaccine-induced herd effects. B) The intercluster migration of participants should be minimal, as this could change the vaccine recipient to nonvaccinee composition of the clusters and alter estimates of herd protection. C) Sample size needs to be considered carefully and adequate number of clusters need to be allocated to prevent imbalance in baseline factors between vaccinated and control clusters.

Several variations to **CRCTs** to assess vaccine herd protection have come up recently such as the double randomization design or fried-egg design.⁹

Adapted from the following Sources

- Clemens, J., Deen., J. (2021). Assessment of Vaccine Herd Protection: Lessons learned from Cholera and Typhoid vaccine trials. *The Journal of Infectious Diseases*, 224(S7): S764-9.
- Clemens, J., Shin, S., Ali, M. (2011). New approaches to the assessment of vaccine herd protection in clinical trials. *Lancet Infect Dis;* 11:482–7.
- Healy, C.M., Rench, M.A., Baker, C.J. (2011). Implementation of cocooning against pertussis in a high-risk population. *Clin Infect Dis*; 52:157–62.
- Ali, M., Clemens, J. (2019). Assessing vaccine herd protection by killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccines using different study designs. *Front Public Health*;7: 211.
- Jeuland, M., Cook, J., Poulos, C., Clemens, J., Whittington, D.; DOMI Cholera Economics Study Group (2009). Costeffectiveness of new-generation oral cholera vaccines: a multisite analysis. *Value Health*;12: 899–908.
- Løchen, A., Croucher, N.J., Anderson, R.M. (2020). Divergent serotype replacement trends and increasing diversity in pneumococcal disease in high income settings reduce the benefit of expanding vaccine valency. *Sci Rep;10*: 18977
- 7. Smith, P.G. (2010). Concepts of herd protection and immunity. *Procedia Vaccinol*; 2: 134–9.
- Sur, D., Ochiai, R.L., Bhattacharya, S.K., et al. (2009). A cluster randomized effectiveness trial of Vi typhoid vaccine in India. N Engl J Med; 361: 335–44.
- Hayes, R.J., Alexander, N.D., Bennett, S., Cousens, S.N. (2000). Design and analysis issues in cluster-randomized trials of interventions against infectious diseases. *Stat Methods Med Res;* 9: 95 –116.
- Ali, M., Emch, M., von Seidlein, L., et al. (2005). Herd immunity conferred by killed oral cholera vaccines in Bangladesh: a reanalysis. *Lancet*; 366: 44–9.
- Longini IM Jr., Nizam A, Ali M, Yunus M, Shenvi N, Clemens JD. (2000). Controlling endemic cholera with oral vaccines. *PLoS Med*; 4:e336.
- 12.Khatib, A.M., Ali, M., von Seidlein, L., et al. (2012). Effectiveness of an oral cholera vaccine in Zanzibar: findings from a mass vaccination campaign and observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*;12: 837–44.

Table 1. Typhoid Vi Vaccine Effectiveness Estimates From a Cluster-Randomized Trial in Kolkata, India [26, 27]

Vaccine Protection	Number of Persons	Number of Typhoid Fever Episodes	Rate per 1000 Person-Years	% VE (95% CI)
Total				
Typhoid vaccine recipients	18 869	34	0.9	61 (41-75)
Hepatitis A vaccine recipients	18 804	96	2.7	<i>P</i> < .0001
Indirect				
Nonvaccinees in the intervention clusters	12 206	16	0.7	44 (2-69)
Nonvaccinees in the control clusters	12 877	31	1.3	P < .0429
Overall				
All residents in the intervention clusters	31 075	50	0.8	57 (37-71)
All residents in the control clusters	31 681	127	2.1	<i>P</i> < .0001

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; VE, vaccine effectiveness

<u>Prepared by:</u> Dr Dhivya A Nathaniel Registrar in MD Community Medicine Epidemiology Unit

Tab	le 1	: S	elec	ted	noti	fiab	le di	isea	ses	rep	orte	ed b	уM	edic	al C	Offic	ers	of H	leal	th	16 th	- 22	nd S	ep 2	2023	3 (3	8 th	Nee	k)
	*	100	100	200	100	100	100	100	100	100	93	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	66	
VRCD	*	40	6	63	89	28	62	38	32	59	67	36	51	17	27	99	1	31	29	28	30	37	67	30	36	33	51	42	
Leishmania-	-	9	40	2	25	259	ო	С	511	156	2	0	-	10	7	~	00	5	444	19	499	357	38	151	160	36	0	:743	
	Β	0	ო	0	0	00	0	0	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	~	0	20	0	20	16	ი	5	20	7	0	120 2	
tis	4	37	102	87	23	7	23	24	17	18	15	2	Ø	12	2	33	47	29	171	61	43	17	40	71	133	75	34	131	
leningi	8	~	7	2	~	0	-	0	0	-	-	0	0	0	0	2	4	-	2	с	0	0	~	e	4	5	0	43	
M N	◄	259	233	422	230	54	151	281	126	256	156	19	2	23	14	84	70	62	450	93	207	75	141	61	178	384	112	:143	
nickenpo	8	9	ო	16	12	2	10	16	ς	Ø	2	2	0	2	2	4	~	2	10	~	с	2	e	0	4	17	e	134 4	-
5	∢	0	0	~	2	0	0	~	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	~	2	0	0	17	_
luman	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	~	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	~	
-	-	5	16	10	с	9	5	2	0	2	2	0	~	2	~	8	~	с	7	~	4	13	81	24	16	9	0	238	
/iral	B	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	~	0	0	~	~		0	~	0	9	
Typhus V		0	10	2	51	14	63	70	68	31	503	7	5	Ø	9	~	2	15	16	œ	30	9	51	35	27	41	~	1071	
		0	2	0	2	0	2	9	~	~	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	20	
rosis .		266	477	711	241	126	121	764	253	449	12	ω	36	30	36	82	114	64	327	77	242	154	290	458	1003	575	49	6965	
eptospi	8	7	18	26	4	0	2	00	4	7	0	0	-	0	0	4	0	0	9	9	0	с	00	4	25	00	~	142	
<u>ت</u> :-	∢	42	5	16	17	27	49	28	6	18	30	16	0	17	12	18	53	67	7	2	8	, -	44	5	19	15	0	505 、	
ood Po		0	0	5	0	0	0	~~	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	~	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
ver F	∢	2	7	~	10	-	ი	5	-	-	12		-	0	4	5		-	-	-	-	-	0	0	2	2	0	64	
teric Fe	ш	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
t En	A	~	0	ŝ		ŝ	4	e e	с С	~		0	0	~	~	00	~	~	-01	ŝ	~	0	-0	0	-01		0	0	
cephali	۵	-	-			0		1	0	0		0		0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	-	14	
Ē	∢	4	6			4	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	2	0	0	3	10	0	1	1	2	0	4	
sentery	۵	4	÷.	5	ж	7	13(4(1	Ъ,	3 <u>6</u>	0,		Ę	÷	16	0,	5	ŝ	30	÷	1	30	5	4	5	6	.06	
ă	∢	0	0	10	4	0	с С	0	10		0	0	0	0	2	9 2	8	0	0	0	0	7	3	0	3	0	0	1 20	
Fever	В	11593	1168(4115	6124	1343	235	2330	1265	1616	2008	80	82	152	117	2149	218	1996	2611	289(678	527	96	618	1923	2685	1678	61691	
Dengue	A	73	58	58	132	19	n	49	7	35	25	с С	~	3	0	0	2	2	22	13	10	4	20	10	23	36	4	624	
RDHS		Colombo	Gampaha	Kalutara	Kandy	Matale	NuwaraEliya	Galle	Hambantota	Matara	Jaffna	Kilinochchi	Mannar	Vavuniya	Mullaitivu	Batticaloa	Ampara	Trincomalee	Kurunegala	Puttalam	Anuradhapur	Polonnaruwa	Badulla	Monaragala	Ratnapura	Kegalle	Kalmune	SRILANKA	

WER Sri Lanka - Vol. 50 No. 39

Source: Weekly Returns of Communicable Diseases (esurvillance.epid.gov.Ik). T=Timeliness refers to returns received on or before 22nd Sep, 2023 Total number of reporting units 358 Number of reporting units data provided for the current week: 358 C⁴⁴⁴-COMpleteness • A = Cases reported during the current week. B = Cumulative cases for the year.

23rd- 29th Sep 2023

WER Sri Lanka - Vol. 50 No. 39

Table 2: Vaccine-Preventable Diseases & AFP

23rd- 29th Sep 2023

16th-22nd Sep 2023 (38th Week)

Disease	No. of Cases by Province										Number of cases during same	Total number of cases to date in	Total num- ber of cases to date in	Difference between the number of cases to date	
	W	С	S	Ν	Е	NW	NC	U	Sab	week in 2023	week in 2022	2023	2022	in 2023 & 2022	
AFP*	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	72	53	35.8 %	
Diphtheria	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 %	
Mumps	00	02	01	00	00	00	01	00	02	06	01	180	68	164.7 %	
Measles	52	03	07	01	00	01	02	01	05	72	00	493	17	2800 %	
Rubella	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	05	00	0 %	
CRS**	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	02	00	0 %	
Tetanus	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	06	05	100 %	
Neonatal Tetanus	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	0 %	
Japanese Enceph- alitis	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	02	01	100 %	
Whooping Cough	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	00	07	01	600 %	
Tuberculosis	96	27	08	07	10	39	17	05	14	223	162	6797	5006	35.7%	

Key to Table 1 & 2

Provinces: W: Western, C: Central, S: Southern, N: North, E: East, NC: North Central, NW: North Western, U: Uva, Sab: Sabaragamuwa.

RDHS Divisions: CB: Colombo, GM: Gampaha, KL: Kalutara, KD: Kandy, ML: Matale, NE: Nuwara Eliya, GL: Galle, HB: Hambantota, MT: Matara, JF: Jaffna,

KN: Killinochchi, MN: Mannar, VA: Vavuniya, MU: Mullaitivu, BT: Batticaloa, AM: Ampara, TR: Trincomalee, KM: Kalmunai, KR: Kurunegala, PU: Puttalam, AP: Anuradhapura, PO: Polonnaruwa, BD: Badulla, MO: Moneragala, RP: Ratnapura, KG: Kegalle.

Data Sources:

Weekly Return of Communicable Diseases: Diphtheria, Measles, Tetanus, Neonatal Tetanus, Whooping Cough, Chickenpox, Meningitis, Mumps., Rubella, CRS, Special Surveillance: AFP* (Acute Flaccid Paralysis), Japanese Encephalitis

CRS** =Congenital Rubella Syndrome

NA = Not Available



Comments and contributions for publication in the WER Sri Lanka are welcome. However, the editor reserves the right to accept or reject items for publication. All correspondence should be mailed to The Editor, WER Sri Lanka, Epidemiological Unit, P.O. Box 1567, Colombo or sent by E-mail to chepid@sltnet.lk. Prior approval should be obtained from the Epidemiology Unit before publishing data in this publication

ON STATE SERVICE

Dr. Samitha Ginige Actg. CHIEF EPIDEMIOLOGIST EPIDEMIOLOGY UNIT 231, DE SARAM PLACE COLOMBO 10