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## 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 as-
sessed 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. ${ }^{8}$


Figure 1. Evaluation of vaccine protection in cluster-randomization trials [17].
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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 $57 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 37 \%-71 \%$ ). 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 $57 \%$ ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ : 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 noninclusion 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. ${ }^{9}$
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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 | 18869 | 34 | 0.9 | $61(41-75)$ |
| Hepatitis A vaccine recipients | 18804 | 96 | 2.7 | $P<.0001$ |
| Indirect |  | 16 |  |  |
| Nonvaccinees in the intervention clusters | 12206 | 31 | 0.7 | $44(2-69)$ |
| Nonvaccinees in the control clusters | 12877 |  | 1.3 | $P<.0429$ |
| Overall |  | 50 | 0.8 | $5(37-71)$ |
| All residents in the intervention clusters | 31075 | 127 | 2.1 | $P<.0001$ |
| All residents in the control clusters | 31681 |  |  |  |

Abbreviations: Cl , confidence interval; VE , vaccine effectiveness.

[^0]Table 1: Selected notifiable diseases reported by Medical Officers of Health 16 th 22 $^{\text {nd }}$ Sep 2023 (38 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Week)


Table 2: Vaccine-Preventable Diseases \& AFP
$16^{\text {th- }} 2^{\text {nd }}$ Sep 2023 (38 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Week)


## 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

# Number of Malaria Cases Up to End of September 2023, 
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All are Imported!!!
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