Beyond efficacy: The full public health impact of vaccines

Mitra Saadatian-Elahi^{a*}, Olaf Horstick^b, Robert F. Breiman^c, Bradford D. Gessner^d, Duane J Gubler^e,
Jacques Louis^f, Umesh D. Parashar^g, Roberto Tapia^h, Valentina Picot^f, Jean-Antoine Zinsou^k,
Christopher B. Nelson^k

^a Hospices Civils de Lyon, Groupement Hospitalier Edouard Herriot, 5 Place d'Arsonval, 69437 Lyon
cedex 03 –France

^b Institute of Public Health, University of Heidelberg, Germany

^c Emory Global Health Institute, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

^d Agence de Médecine Préventive, Paris-France

^e Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School, 8 College Road, Singapore, 169857, Singapore

^f Fondation Mérieux, 17 rue Bourgelat 69002 Lyon - France

^g National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and
Prevention, Atlanta GA.

^h Fundación Carlos Slim, Mexico.

^k Sanofi Pasteur, Vaccination Policy Department, 2 Avenue du Pont Pasteur - 69367 - Lyon cedex 07 –
France

Corresponding author

Dr. Mitra SAADATIAN-ELAHI

Groupement Hospitalier Edouard Herriot

Service d'Hygiène, Epidémiologie et Prévention

Bâtiment 1

5, place d'Arsonval

69437 Lyon cedex 03

27 Phone: +33 (0)4.72.11.07.18

28 Fax: +33 (0)4.72.11.07.26

29 E-mail: mitra.elahi@chu-lyon.fr

30

31

32

33

ABSTRACT

There is an active discussion in the public health community on how to assess and incorporate, in addition to safety and measures of protective efficacy, the full public health value of preventive vaccines into the evidence-based decision-making process of vaccine licensure and recommendations for public health use. The conference “Beyond efficacy: the full public health impact of vaccines in addition to efficacy measures in trials” held in Annecy-France (June 22-24, 2015) has addressed this issue and provided recommendations on how to better capture the whole public health impact of vaccines.

Using key examples, the expert group stressed that we are in the midst of a new paradigm in vaccine evaluation, where all aspects of public health value of vaccines beyond efficacy should be evaluated. To yield a wider scope of vaccine benefits, additional measures such as vaccine preventable disease incidence, overall efficacy and other outcomes such as under-five mortality or non-etilogically confirmed clinical syndromes should be assessed in addition to traditional efficacy or effectiveness measurements. Dynamic modelling and the use of probe studies should also be considered to provide additional insight to the full public health value of a vaccine. The use of burden reduction and conditional licensure of vaccines based on collection of outcome results should be considered by regulatory agencies.

Key words

Vaccine efficacy, vaccine preventable disease incidence, vaccine effectiveness, vaccine probe analysis, beyond vaccine efficacy, conference report

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, vaccine efficacy, i.e. the percentage reduction of disease in a vaccinated group compared to an unvaccinated group, has been used as the primary benchmark for vaccine licensure. However, efficacy provides a measure of proportionate reduction, is limited to etiologically confirmed disease, and focuses on individual level effects; consequently, it does not capture the full public health impact of a vaccination program. In addition to preventing infection in individuals, the ultimate goal of vaccination is to achieve a significant public health impact in the catchment population. Thus, there is a need to provide a broader measure of impact beyond efficacy and safety that encompasses the capacity of a vaccination program to reduce infection transmission, disease burden (incidence, mortality, sequelae), the pressure on health systems and health inequities between populations, as well as measure coverage and mechanisms of action, all of which help determine a vaccine's impact [1, 2]. Additionally, the full public health impact will require additional measures, such as vaccine preventable disease incidence (VPDI), number needed to vaccinate, and a wider range of outcomes, such as under-five mortality, impact on syndromic disease, and indirect vaccine effects, as well as additional analytic or design strategies, such as dynamic modelling (i.e. statistical approaches used to express and model the behaviour of a system overtime) and the use of probe studies (i.e. that attempt to estimate the impact of vaccines against syndromes or disease states). These issues are often lost in regulatory discussions, where there is a focus on risk: benefit ratios, as measured only by vaccine efficacy and safety. The relevance of these issues is highlighted herein with reference to pneumococcal, rotavirus, malaria and dengue vaccines.

To consider approaches to expand regulatory and policy discussions towards integrating disease burden reduction and vaccine efficacy/effectiveness measurements, the Fondation Mérieux organized a conference from June 22-24 2015 entitled: "Beyond efficacy: the full public health impact of vaccines in addition to efficacy measures in trials" in Annecy, France ("Les Pensières" Conference Centre). A multi-disciplinary group of experts drawn from academia, industry, international organizations and public health institutes gathered to discuss the public health impact of vaccination

on preventable disease burden in the contexts of vaccine licensure, developing evidence-informed immunization program policy for public sector vaccination programs and of developing communication strategies for target populations. Key issues addressed included:

- The concept of moderately effective vaccines and the limits of vaccine efficacy
- Preventable disease burden outcomes and measurement
- Key examples from the past and potential examples from the future
- The role of modelling and probe studies in assessing preventable disease burden
- The potential for regulatory agencies to consider preventable disease burden as a criterion for vaccine licensure

This report provides a summary of selected issues discussed by participants, key findings and recommendations for future approaches to addressing the full health impact of vaccines.

GENERAL CONCEPTS AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES

In the vaccine licensure pathway, randomized clinical trials, including those used for phase III trials, are designed to assess vaccine efficacy that is defined as: “the proportionate reduction of the incidence of the target infection in vaccinated subjects compared to controls” [3]. However, it is equally important to assess vaccine effectiveness, generally assessed in phase IV trials, which is defined as the actual performance of a vaccine at population level, or the balance of benefits and risks following introduction of a vaccine into routine immunization programs [3]. Both vaccine efficacy and effectiveness can be based on individual or cluster-randomized designs and can report direct and indirect effects of vaccines. Direct effect is the direct protective effect in a vaccinated subject. Indirect effects correspond to the reduction of infection or disease transmission in unimmunized subjects due to the presence of immune individuals [4, 5]. Total vaccine effectiveness is the combined effects of the chosen vaccination strategy and direct protective effect in vaccinated subjects while overall vaccine effectiveness (i.e. herd effect) is the effect of vaccine in the population with immunized and unimmunized subjects as compared to if the population had not had the vaccination strategy [6].

108 Documentation of the overall vaccine effect (i.e. herd effect) is increasingly required as countries
109 introduce new vaccines into their immunization programs. Its assessment is usually implemented
110 post-licensure, but can face difficulties in the developing world due to the lack of adequate
111 infrastructure for immunization records, surveillance and laboratory confirmation of the target
112 disease. In these countries, cluster-randomized or group-randomized studies can be performed to
113 evaluate vaccine effectiveness in parallel to vaccine efficacy during phase III vaccine trials. Schools
114 [7], communities [8, 9], dwellings or premises [10], and contagious geographical neighbourhoods [11,
115 12] have been used as clusters in vaccine trials to assess herd protection. Cluster randomization
116 allows more direct examination of the herd effect but requires minimal level of transmission
117 between clusters, knowledge of the population before randomization and larger sample size.
118 Extrapolation of the results to other clusters could be performed by using mathematical modelling.
119 Assessment of vaccine effectiveness characterizes the vaccine performance when implemented in a
120 public health program, but it does not tell the full story of the impact of vaccines on disease burden.
121 Indeed, most studies cannot have etiologic confirmation of 100% of true cases due to the limited
122 sensitivity or specificity of laboratory tests for some pathogens. The inability to accurately document
123 vaccine impact on disease burden using directly measured etiologically-confirmed cases is
124 problematic since policymakers consistently mention the burden of etiologically-confirmed clinical
125 disease as one of the most important factors in priority setting.
126 Measures beyond efficacy, such as vaccine preventable disease incidence (VPDI), may provide further
127 information to inform economic assessment of vaccines. VPDI is defined as: outcome incidence in an
128 unvaccinated population X vaccine effectiveness. It is a combined measure of vaccine effectiveness
129 (or efficacy) and the baseline disease burden [13]. The measurement of VPDI during clinical trials in
130 addition to traditional efficacy or effectiveness measurements can overcome limitations related to
131 suboptimal sensitivity or lack of diagnostic tests, and allow measurement of the total burden of
132 disease preventable by vaccine regardless of whether disease is etiologically confirmed or clinically
133 suspected. Vaccine efficacy is usually used to confirm that a vaccine works, and thus is best

documented against etiologically confirmed disease. By contrast, VPDI is used to estimate total disease burden reduction from a vaccine and is thus optimally calculated from vaccine impact on syndromic disease, as this approach also measures the contribution of the pathogen to the causal chain of illness regardless of where in the chain the pathogen occurs.

Vaccine probe studies

Vaccine probe studies emerged in the past 15 years and are particularly useful for pathogens for which the true burden may be hidden due to the absence of accurate laboratory testing or limited sensitivity of available diagnostics. Vaccine probe studies can estimate VPDI, as well as the proportion of a syndrome caused by the pathogen, ideally, via randomized clinical trials [13] (note that while less precise, VPDI can also be estimated post licensure by evaluating changes in outcome incidence during the pre- and post-vaccine period and using time-series analysis can also be used). Probe analysis has been used for several vaccines with known efficacy to assess the total burden of disease preventable by vaccine whether disease burden is etiologically confirmed or documented clinically [14-16].

Another measure of some interest to public health discussions of vaccine utility is the calculation of syndromic etiologic fraction, defined as the vaccine effectiveness against syndromic disease divided by effectiveness against etiologically confirmed disease. For example, in a randomized controlled trial of pregnant women in Bangladesh, inactivated influenza vaccine given to mothers reported an effectiveness among young infants of 62.8% (95%CI: 5-85.4) against etiologically confirmed disease and an effectiveness of 28.9% (95%CI: 6.9-45.7) for all clinically documented febrile respiratory infection [17]. The calculated etiologic fraction would be $28.9\%/62.8\%=46\%$, and provides an estimate of the fraction of febrile respiratory illness due to influenza.

Similar calculations can be done for the efficacy of pneumococcal conjugated vaccine (PCV) in reducing radiologically confirmed pneumonia (defined as pleural effusion or alveolar infiltrate) in children. Bacteriologic studies from children with pneumonia [18-22] reported PCV-vaccine

effectiveness against radiologically confirmed pneumonia (i.e., pneumonia with an alveolar consolidation or pleural effusion) ranging from -2% in the USA to 37% in the Gambia (Table 1). Taking the example of the Gambia, If PCV prevents 50% of cases of invasive pneumococcal disease and 37% of radiologically confirmed pneumonia, then the etiologic fraction of radiologically confirmed pneumonia due to vaccine serotype pneumococcal disease was 74%, assuming that the efficacy against invasive pneumococcal disease and radiologically confirmed pneumococcal pneumonia is similar. If, however, efficacy against severe pneumococcal pneumonia is actually lower than what it is for invasive disease, then the proportion of pneumonias due to pneumococcus would be estimated to be even higher. As for flu in Bangladesh, the vaccine probe approach has provided information beyond that available from measuring vaccine effectiveness alone.

Vaccine probe analysis may also add evidence to potential health impact of a vaccine with low efficacy (e.g. malaria) by demonstrating impact against non-specific syndromes (like fever) or outcomes (like hospitalizations, antimicrobial use or clinic visits). Another potential area for the use of vaccine probe analysis is to estimate the overall VPDI in areas where this information is lacking. This would provide the data needed for Ministries of Health and Finance to evaluate the health impact value of introducing a vaccine into an immunization program. Assumptions for a typhoid conjugate vaccine probe study with primary outcome of hospitalization with 5 days of fever showed that such trials are feasible and could overcome many current limitations in estimating overall typhoid burden [23].

Modelling

Many decisions on the introduction of new vaccines into immunization programs are guided by economic analyses. The two main models used to evaluate cost-effectiveness of vaccination programs are static (decision analysis) models and dynamic models (e.g. the SIR Model). The two models are otherwise identical except that the former account only for direct protection of vaccines while the latter take account of changes in infection risk to unvaccinated persons resulting from a decreased population transmission [25]. As reported by a review of modelling approaches, the vast

majority of economic evaluations of vaccines use static models, meaning that they do not take into account the indirect impact of vaccination programs [24].

The importance of incorporating the indirect effect of vaccination in the assessment of vaccine cost-effectiveness has been investigated in several studies that compared dynamic and static approaches. Comparison of the two models with regard to mass immunization of infants with varicella vaccine showed that as compared to static approach, dynamic models predicted a higher number of cases prevented, a concomitant increase in the average age at infection, and inter-epidemic periods [25]. These effects are common to many vaccine preventable diseases, particularly many childhood diseases that stimulate relatively long-term immunity. Other vaccine (disease) specific effects such as serotype replacement following PCV vaccination [26] are also important factors that could impact vaccination programs and are not fully captured by static models. Timing of vaccination is another element with major impact on cost-effectiveness of vaccination in the context of outbreaks and again static models are not appropriate for this purpose because optimizing schedules depends on total and not just direct disease prevention. The use of dynamic models also provided evidence that a cholera vaccination coverage of 50% in Bangladesh would reduce the number of cholera cases in unvaccinated subjects by 89% [27]. Thus, investment in use of dynamic models to capture indirect effects of vaccines, particularly those with high coverage rate, is crucial because they affect distribution of disease in the population and influence optimal vaccination strategy. This will lead to more appropriate decision making worldwide.

CASE STUDIES

Pneumococcal conjugate vaccines

Streptococcus pneumoniae (*S. pneumoniae*) causes a variety of clinical diseases ranging from non-severe otitis media and sinusitis to invasive pneumococcal diseases (IPD), including bacteremia, septicemia and meningitis with high mortality risk. Nasopharyngeal carriage plays an important role in transmission. Prevention of vaccine serotype pneumococcal diseases is promoted by pneumococcal conjugated vaccines (PCV) containing 7 (PCV-7; Prevnar™), 10 (PCV10 Synflorix™) or

13 (PCV-13; Prevnar13TM) serotypes. Estimation of the overall burden of disease preventable by vaccine faces some difficulties related to poor sensitivity of blood culture for identifying pneumococcal pneumonia (since most pneumococcal pneumonia is non-bacteremic), etiological assignment (pneumonia) and overlapping clinical presentations (otitis media). The Finnish Invasive Pneumococcal disease vaccine effectiveness trial (FinIP) is a phase III/IV probe vaccine design, cluster-randomized, double-blind trial in children <19 months that aimed at investigating vaccine effectiveness of the pneumococcal Haemophilus influenzae protein D conjugate vaccine (PHID-CV10) and absolute rate reduction against 1) laboratory-confirmed IPD and 2) clinically suspected IPD, hospital-diagnosed pneumonia and otitis media by use of diagnoses coded in hospital discharge and antimicrobial purchases registries [28, 29]. PCV effectiveness was the highest for laboratory-confirmed IPD and decreased substantially for less specific outcomes such as clinical pneumonia and otitis media, while the VPDI value increased in the opposite way. Indeed, the VPDI per 100,000 person-years was 75 for laboratory-confirmed IPD, 205 for non-laboratory-confirmed but clinically suspected IPD, 340 for hospital-diagnosed pneumonia, and 12000 for any antimicrobial outpatient prescription mainly due to otitis media [28, 29]. The higher rate of preventable disease among clinical rather than laboratory-confirmed diseases indicate that vaccine has greater public health value and cost-effectiveness than would be estimated from assessment of laboratory-confirmed illness alone. Where laboratory diagnostics are poor, laboratory confirmed disease rates may more substantially underestimate pneumococcal disease burden. In Finland, PCV-10 was introduced to the national immunization program in September 2010 for children born from June 2010 (2+1 schedule at 3, 5 and 12 months of age) without catch-up. The impact of this vaccine in Finnish children has been evaluated by a population-based, observational follow-up study of 2 cohorts (eligible and older ineligible children) [30]. The results showed significant reduction (80%; 95%CI: 72-85) in the overall rate of vaccine-serotype IPD among eligible children and a 48% (95%CI: 18-69) reduction among ineligible unvaccinated children due to herd immunity. The VPDI value for laboratory-confirmed IPD, non-laboratory-confirmed IPD and pneumonia were 50, 122 and 90 per 100,000 children-years (age

3-42 months), respectively. These estimates are lower than what has been reported by the FinIP trial and illustrate the added value of vaccine probe studies and assessment of VPDI for the evaluation of overall vaccine benefits.

Rotavirus vaccines

Rotavirus is the leading cause of severe diarrhoea and accounts for about one-third of all diarrhoea-related hospitalizations among children <5 years of age. Two licensed oral rotavirus vaccines (Rotarix and RotaTeq) are currently used in more than 75 countries around the world. Rotavirus VE against severe rotavirus gastroenteritis in high and middle income countries ranged from 84% to 98% [31-37]. By contrast, vaccine effectiveness was only moderate (51% to 64%) in Africa and in less developed areas of Asia [38-40]. Many potential factors such as malnutrition, presence of concomitant infections (in particular enteric infections), and environmental enteropathy could interfere with the performance of these vaccines. Yet even with lowered vaccine effectiveness, the higher disease burden in these settings might mean that vaccine has a greater public health impact in low-income countries than in high-income settings. In this case, VPDI might be a more appropriate marker of the real impact of vaccination program as it is related to the etiologically specific disease incidence. This has been demonstrated by a randomized-placebo controlled trial that showed lower vaccine effectiveness in Malawi than in South Africa (49.4% vs. 72%); while the number of prevented episodes of severe rotavirus gastroenteritis was greater in Malawi than in South Africa (67 vs. 42 per 1000 infants vaccinated per year) [38]. Moreover, VPDI value in these African countries was greater than those estimated in high and middle income countries where vaccine effectiveness was higher.

Malaria vaccine

Plasmodium falciparum and other malaria species caused 198 million cases (124-284 million) in 2013 584,000 (367,000-755,000) deaths [41]. It is a global problem in the tropics but due to the high density of the parasite in Africa, the highest transmission rates and about 90% of mortality are on the African continent [42]. Currently, the only candidate malaria vaccine close to licensure is RTS,S/AS01 that is directed against the pre-erythrocytic stage of the parasite (i.e. before its entry into the red

blood cells). Based on one of the severe malaria definitions used in the trial, vaccine efficacy during the 12 months after vaccination was 38% among infants vaccinated at 6-12 weeks of age and 47% among children vaccinated at 5-17 months of age. While efficacy was relatively low compared to other vaccines used in African national immunization programs, the high background malaria incidence meant that these efficacies equated to a reduction of 900 and 2300 severe malaria cases per 100,000 study subjects, respectively [43, 44], a substantially higher severe disease burden reduction than that calculated for some routine infant immunizations [45]. No definite, protective effect against death was demonstrated in the clinical trials, possibly because almost no malaria deaths occurred in either arm due to improvements in clinical management in the trial setting.

There are other arguments backed-up by epidemiological data that suggest RTS,S may have additional benefits. Several studies have reported that malaria infection predisposes the infected individual to bacteraemia. This hypothesis has been tested in a matched case-control study of Kenyan children in which cases were those with invasive bacterial disease [46]. The authors reported a significant inverse relationship between the malaria-protective phenotype of sickle-cell trait (HbAS) and bacteraemia (odds ratio 0.36; 95% CI: 0.20-0.65). Beside, longitudinal data [46] showed that a decline in bacteraemia paralleled a decrease in malaria admission [47], reinforcing this hypothesis.

Malaria reduction may also impact all-cause mortality. Following extensive malaria control interventions in Bioko Island, Equatorial Guinea, under-5 mortality has been reduced by 2/3, from 152 per 1,000 births (95% CI = 122-186) to 55 per 1,000 (95% CI = 38-77; hazard ratio = 0.34 [95% CI = 0.23-0.49]) [48]. This study assessed non-vaccine interventions and observed impacts may not necessarily apply to vaccines. Nevertheless, it provides suggestive evidence that an effective malaria vaccine could potentially prevent cases and deaths for which malaria is a sufficient cause and many more deaths for which malaria is a necessary but not sufficient part of the causal chain. In sum, the example of RTS,S provides an important message that even a vaccine with relatively low efficacy could have huge impact on overall population morbidity and mortality, a feature that which has to be taken into consideration in addition to vaccine effectiveness.

Dengue vaccine

Dengue is one of the most important emerging infectious diseases of the 21st century. Dengue epidemiology has changed in the past 40 years as the result of expanding geographic distribution of both the viruses and mosquito vectors, increased epidemic activity, the development of hyperendemicity and the emergence of severe disease [49, 50]. The observed dramatic increase in the frequency and magnitude epidemic dengue is driven by population growth, urbanization, environmental changes and modern transportation (i.e. globalization). Primary prevention through vector control has failed due to only partially effective prevention and control tools and inappropriate implementation and assessment [51]. New dengue disease burden estimates put the global at-risk population at 3.6 billion, with 390 million infections and 21, 000 deaths annually, the latter being most probably underestimated [52]. Vaccine development for dengue has been hampered by several factors including the perceived need for a balanced protection against all 4 serotypes, lack of funding and limited understanding of dengue virology and pathogenesis. Currently, three dengue vaccines are in phase 2 and 3 clinical trials. One vaccine has completed phase III clinical trials, and showed efficacy against laboratory-confirmed clinical dengue (65%), hospitalized dengue (80%) and severe dengue (93%) [53]. The vaccine demonstrated variable efficacy against the four dengue serotypes (47-83%) but was highly effective (52-81%) in persons with previous exposure to dengue [53]. The majority of children in hyperendemic areas have already been infected with dengue at least once, and since infections with the third and fourth serotypes are generally mild or asymptomatic [54, 55], a dengue vaccine with this efficacy profile should have a significant public health impact by preventing severe disease, decreasing health care utilization, particularly the hospitalization rate, and by having a priming effect in populations with previous dengue infection. Further study is required to confirm i) whether the vaccine virus will induce the same level of immunity as natural infection, ii) the role of virus strains with variable virulence and epidemic potential, iii) the role of temporal distribution of infection with different serotypes and iv) the paucity of knowledge about the disease severity in 3rd and 4th dengue infections and the immunity induced

by the vaccine in these individuals. While this efficacy profile can help reduce the burden of disease and achieve public health objectives, successful dengue prevention and control is likely to be obtained only by using the vaccine in combination with other new innovative tools in the pipeline as well as already existing tools and strategies [56] implemented by various public health agencies. Programmatic demonstration projects may be useful to show how the full impact of these coordinated interventions can be achieved. To facilitate this new paradigm for dengue prevention and control, a new initiative, the Partnership for Dengue Control (PDC), was created in July 2013 at an international consensus conference attended by a cross-sectional representation of the global dengue and public health communities, including representatives from academic institutions, international health agencies, NGOs, and the private sector [56].

REGULATORY CHALLENGES

Regulatory authorities evaluate the potential benefits of an effective vaccine, against the potential risk of adverse effects following immunization. Blinded randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are considered as the ‘Gold Standard’ for assessing vaccine efficacy because they provide rigorous control for biases and rely on laboratory-confirmed clinical outcomes, at least for a part of the study population. However, they are expensive, and may require large sample size in particular for uncommon outcomes.

The European regulatory framework allows the benefit/risk (B/R) assessment of vaccines to rely on post-approval evidence of population benefit in lieu of pre-approval individual efficacy. Indeed, several vaccines have already been approved in Europe in the absence of vaccine efficacy data, relying either on non-inferiority to licensed vaccines (PCV10, PCV13, conjugate serogroup C meningococcal vaccine) or on surrogate markers of protection (influenza, HPV). Effectiveness and vaccine impact data for these vaccines have been post-approval commitments and have been included in label updates. For future vaccines for HIV, dengue, Ebola, malaria, and others, vaccine efficacy may not be easily shown. , In these cases, relying on surrogate markers of protection, vaccine effectiveness and impact data are important to be considered in pre- and post-approval phases of

vaccine licensure. Mechanisms exist already in Europe for early dialogue with European regulators. The European pilot project on adaptive pathway, set-up by the European Medicine Agency (EMA), supports the selection of a pathway of product development and potential earlier access to medicines through early dialogue involving all stakeholders [57]. Criteria for candidate selection are 1) an iterative development plan that starts in a well-defined subpopulation for conditional marketing authorization; 2) real world data following approval to supplement clinical trial; 3) input of all stakeholders and 4) unmet medical need. Acceptance (i.e. conditional approval) or rejection in pilot phase has no inference about the final approval. In cases where the vaccine is not intended for European countries (e.g., dengue and malaria), regulatory processes and options exist for European authorities/EMA to make available their vaccine assessment experiences.

The US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has not defined a specific threshold for vaccine efficacy or a particular endpoint. However, there is a possibility for regulatory acceptance of vaccines with moderate efficacy. Vaccines can be licensed on the basis of immune response when correlates of protection are known. Moreover, expedited regulatory pathways are available for vaccines meeting unmet medical needs. The US FDA expedited regulatory pathways to accelerate vaccine licensure are 1) fast track program (e.g. pneumococcal vaccines and HPV vaccine); 2) breakthrough therapy (e.g. meningitis B vaccine); 3) priority review; 4) accelerated approval (e.g. influenza vaccine) and 5) emergency use authorization.

These data show that alternative regulatory process already exist and could be used in a more systematic way for vaccine licensure. The use of burden reduction as an addition to vaccine efficacy for vaccines with moderate efficacy or effectiveness is a key issue that should be taken into consideration.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is an active discussion in the public health community on how to assess and incorporate the full public health value of preventive vaccines into the evidence-based decision-making process of vaccine licensure and public health use. As has been highlighted for pneumococcal, rotavirus,

368 malaria, and dengue vaccines, consideration of vaccine preventable disease incidence (VPDI), indirect
369 effects of vaccination, assessment of impact on alternative outcomes such as under age five years
370 mortality, and use of dynamic modelling and innovative study designs such as probe studies, can
371 provide additional insight to the public health value of a vaccine.

372 Similar to influenza vaccines, many current vaccines have moderate efficacy even against etiologically
373 confirmed outcomes. Nevertheless, for vaccines with moderate efficacy or for which all pathogenic
374 strains are not included in the vaccine, a disease burden and economic impact reduction may justify
375 their introduction into national immunization programs or private markets. However, absence of
376 sufficient data may delay vaccine introduction into immunization programs. The slow introduction of
377 Hib vaccine in low and middle income countries is one example. As noted above, vaccine efficacy fails
378 to capture the whole public health impact of vaccines and may be relatively low even when
379 preventable disease burden is high. In this regard, measures beyond efficacy may be more
380 appropriate and could have a role for both vaccine licensure and policy recommendations.

381 Vaccines should be evaluated based on their public health impact against syndromes or disease
382 states, not the pathogen alone. Other parameters may need to be considered for both licensure and
383 policy recommendation. For example, the evaluation of VPDI against clinical and laboratory-
384 confirmed outcomes in addition to vaccine effectiveness against confirmed disease allows a more
385 complete assessment of a vaccines public health value and thus its potential economic impact. VPDI
386 is determined by both disease epidemiology and vaccine performance. Therefore, it may have more
387 variability across settings than vaccine effectiveness (although vaccine effectiveness can vary based
388 on issues such as concurrent malnutrition, HIV infection, and high intestinal microbial load). This
389 could limit the use of VPDI by regulatory agencies. Modelling is also a valuable tool, but dynamic
390 models should be privileged due to their capacity to predict the impact of a vaccine on the overall
391 disease burden.

The expert group concluded by stressing that we are in an era of a new paradigm in vaccine evaluation where all aspects of public health value of vaccines beyond efficacy should be evaluated.

This new paradigm implies the following:

- Large scale clinical trials, e.g. RCTs, may reach their feasibility limits.
- Not all benefits of vaccines are fully explained by vaccine effectiveness, an issue of particular importance for vaccines with moderate efficacy. Other parameters and outcomes (VPDI for example) may need consideration for both licensure and policy recommendation.
- Alternative regulatory pathways involving stakeholders should be considered as a process for LMICs.
- A larger number of Phase IV trials that are more relevant for the estimation of VPDI should be introduced.
- Conditional licensure of vaccines based on collection of outcome results should be considered. This would lower the financial barriers to development of new vaccines and thus increase portfolio of vaccines to be developed and introduced.
- Adding post-marketing information to the label (e.g. economic impact, disease burden) should be more settled. However, such labelling may not be as applicable for local decision-making by national immunization programs. From this perspective, the broader effect of vaccine on health outcomes when coordinated with other interventions should be considered and coordinated by relevant national agencies.
- While the regulatory process focuses on collecting the minimum information necessary to establish benefit-risk, a substantial body of additional information is necessary to inform policy. To have a wider scope of vaccine benefits, improvement should occur in risk assessment, partnership and coalition building across interventions, and data sharing. The ADVANCE (Accelerated Development of Vaccine benefit-risk Collaboration in Europe) project is a good example of a partnership that was set-up to build an integrated and sustainable framework for continuous vaccine effect monitoring. Moreover, laboratory and capacity

418 building for vaccine impact assessment – usually with a solid surveillance foundation – at
419 country-level should be reinforced.

Key messages

- We are in an era of a new paradigm in vaccine evaluation where all aspects of public health value of vaccines beyond efficacy should be evaluated and incorporated into public health decision making.
- Public health priorities are focused on reducing disease burden in a population, and various factors beyond efficacy determine public health impact. Therefore, preventable disease burden should be integrated into regulatory and policy discussions pre- and post-licensure. This could be achieved by:
 - Additional measures: VPDI, overall vaccine efficacy, indirect effects
 - Additional outcomes: all cause under age five years mortality or non-etiological confirmed clinical syndromes (e.g. fever for typhoid, dengue, malaria or radiologically confirmed pneumonia for PCV)
 - Additional methods: dynamic mathematical models, probe studies

420

421 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

422 The authors express their gratitude to all speakers who shared their findings. Thanks are also due to
423 Cindy Grasso (meeting coordinator) and the staff of the Mérieux Foundation conference center for
424 outstanding local organization. The organization of this meeting was made possible through support
425 from Sanofi Pasteur.

426

427 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

428 CBN and JAZ are employee of Sanofi Pasteur. BDG works for AMP which receives grant support from
429 Crucell, GSK, Hilleman Laboratories, Merck, Pfizer, and Sanofi Pasteur. Other authors declare that
430 they have no conflicts of interest to report.

431

432

433

REFERENCES

- [1] Imai N, Dorigatti I, Cauchemez S, Ferguson NM. Estimating dengue transmission intensity from sero-prevalence surveys in multiple countries. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2015; 9(4):e0003719. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003719.
- [2] Mukandavire Z, Smith DL, Morris JG Jr. Cholera in Haiti: reproductive numbers and vaccination coverage estimates. *Sci Rep*. 2013; 3: 997. doi: 10.1038/srep00997.
- [3] Clemens J, Brenner R, Rao M, Tafari N, Lowe C. Evaluating new vaccines for developing countries. Efficacy or effectiveness? *JAMA*. 1996; 275(5):390-7.
- [4] Fine P, Eames K, Heymann DL. Herd immunity": a rough guide. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011; 52(7):911-6. doi: 10.1093/cid/cir007.
- [5] Clemens J, Shin S, Ali M. New approaches to the assessment of vaccine herd protection in clinical trials. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2011; 11(6):482-7. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70318-2.
- [6] Halloran ME. The Minicommunity Design to Assess Indirect Effects of Vaccination. *Epidemiol Method*. 2012; 1(1):83-105.
- [7] Lehtinen M, Apter D, Baussano I, Eriksson T, Natunen K, Paavonen J, Vänskä S, Bi D, David MP, Datta S, *et al*. Characteristics of a cluster-randomized phase IV human papillomavirus vaccination effectiveness trial. *Vaccine*. 2015; 33(10):1284-90. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.12.019.
- [8] Kwong JC, Pereira JA, Quach S, Pellizzari R, Dusome E, Russell ML, Hamid JS, Feinberg Y, Winter AL, Gubbay JB, *et al*.; Public Health Agency of Canada/Canadian Institutes of Health Research Influenza Research Network (PCIRN) Program Delivery and Evaluation Group. Randomized evaluation of live attenuated vs. inactivated influenza vaccines in schools (RELATIVES) pilot study: a cluster randomized trial. *Vaccine*. 2015; 33(4):535-41. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.11.044.
- [9] Loeb M, Russell ML, Moss L, Fonseca K, Fox J, Earn DJ, Aoki F, Horsman G, Van Caesele P, Chokani K, *et al*. Effect of influenza vaccination of children on infection rates in Hutterite communities: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2010; 303(10):943-50. doi: 10.1001/jama.2010.250.

- [10] Sur D, Lopez AL, Kanungo S, Paisley A, Manna B, Ali M, Niyogi SK, Park JK, Sarkar B, Puri MK, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of a modified killed-whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in India: an interim analysis of a cluster-randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009; 374(9702):1694-702. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61297-6.
- [11] Ali M, Sur D, You YA, Kanungo S, Sah B, Manna B, Puri M, Wierzb TF, Donner A, Nair GB, *et al.* Herd protection by a bivalent killed whole-cell oral cholera vaccine in the slums of Kolkata, India. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013; 56(8):1123-31. doi: 10.1093/cid/cit009.
- [12] Sur D, Ochiai RL, Bhattacharya SK, Ganguly NK, Ali M, Manna B, Dutta S, Donner A, Kanungo S, Park JK, *et al.* A cluster randomized effectiveness trial of Vi typhoid vaccine in India. *N Engl J Med*. 2009; 361(4):335-44. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0807521.
- [13] Feikin DR, Scott JA, Gessner BD. Use of vaccines as probes to define disease burden. *Lancet*. 2014; 383(9930):1762-70. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)61682-7.
- [14] Peto TJ, Mendy ME, Lowe Y, Webb EL, Whittle HC, Hall AJ. Efficacy and effectiveness of infant vaccination against chronic hepatitis B in the Gambia Hepatitis Intervention Study (1986-90) and in the nationwide immunisation program. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2014; 14:7. doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-14-7.
- [15] Chiang CJ, Yang YW, You SL, Lai MS, Chen CJ. Thirty-year outcomes of the national hepatitis B immunization program in Taiwan. *JAMA*. 2013; 310(9):974-6. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.276701.
- [16] Gessner BD, Sutanto A, Linehan M, Djelantik IG, Fletcher T, Gerudug IK, Ingerani, Mercer D, Moniaga V, Moulton LH, *et al.* Incidences of vaccine-preventable *Haemophilus influenzae* type b pneumonia and meningitis in Indonesian children: hamlet-randomised vaccine-probe trial. *Lancet*. 2005; 365(9453):43-52.
- [17] Zaman K, Roy E, Arifeen SE, Rahman M, Raqib R, Wilson E, Omer SB, Shahid NS, Breiman RF, Steinhoff MC. Effectiveness of maternal influenza immunization in mothers and infants. *N Engl J Med*. 2008; 359(15):1555-64. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0708630.

- [18] Black SB, Shinefield HR, Hansen J, Elvin L, Laufer D, Malinoski F. Postlicensure evaluation of the effectiveness of seven valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2001; 20(12):1105-7.
- [19] Klugman KP, Madhi SA, Huebner RE, Kohberger R, Mbelle N, Pierce N; Vaccine Trialists Group. A trial of a 9-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in children with and those without HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2003; 349(14):1341-8.
- [20] Cutts FT, Zaman SM, Enwere G, Jaffar S, Levine OS, Okoko JB, Oluwalana C, Vaughan A, Obaro SK, Leach A, *et al.*; Gambian Pneumococcal Vaccine Trial Group. Efficacy of nine-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine against pneumonia and invasive pneumococcal disease in The Gambia: randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2005; 365(9465):1139-46.
- [21] Hansen J, Black S, Shinefield H, Cherian T, Benson J, Fireman B, Lewis E, Ray P, Lee J. Effectiveness of heptavalent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in children younger than 5 years of age for prevention of pneumonia: updated analysis using World Health Organization standardized interpretation of chest radiographs. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2006; 25(9):779-81.
- [22] Lucero MG, Dulalia VE, Nillos LT, Williams G, Parreño RA, Nohynek H, Riley ID, Makela H. Pneumococcal conjugate vaccines for preventing vaccine-type invasive pneumococcal disease and X-ray defined pneumonia in children less than two years of age. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2009; (4):CD004977. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD004977.
- [23] Gessner BD, Halloran ME, Khan I. The case for a typhoid vaccine probe study and overview of design elements. *Vaccine*. 2015; 33 Suppl 3:C30-C35. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.03.085.
- [24] Kim SY, Goldie SJ. Cost-effectiveness analyses of vaccination programmes: a focused review of modelling approaches. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2008; 26(3):191-215.
- [25] Brisson M, Edmunds WJ. Economic evaluation of vaccination programs: the impact of herd-immunity. *Med Decis Making*. 2003; 23(1):76-82.

510 [26] Feikin DR, Kagucia EW, Loo JD, Link-Gelles R, Puhon MA, Cherian T, Levine OS, Whitney CG,
511 O'Brien KL, Moore MR; Serotype Replacement Study Group Serotype-specific changes in invasive
512 pneumococcal disease after pneumococcal conjugate vaccine introduction: a pooled analysis of
513 multiple surveillance sites. *PLoS Med.* 2013; 10(9):e1001517. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1001517.

514 [27] Longini IM Jr, Nizam A, Ali M, Yunus M, Shenvi N, Clemens JD. Controlling endemic cholera with
515 oral vaccines. *PLoS Med.* 2007; 4(11):e336.

516 [28] Palmu AA, Jokinen J, Borys D, Nieminen H, Ruokokoski E, Siira L, Puumalainen T, Lommel P,
517 Hezareh M, Moreira M, *et al.* Effectiveness of the ten-valent pneumococcal *Haemophilus influenzae*
518 protein D conjugate vaccine (PHiD-CV10) against invasive pneumococcal disease: a cluster
519 randomised trial. *Lancet.* 2013; 381(9862):214-22. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61854-6.

520 [29] Palmu AA, Jokinen J, Nieminen H, Syrjänen R, Ruokokoski E, Puumalainen T, Moreira M,
521 Schuerman L, Borys D, Kilpi TM. Vaccine effectiveness of the pneumococcal *Haemophilus influenzae*
522 protein D conjugate vaccine (PHiD-CV10) against clinically suspected invasive pneumococcal disease:
523 a cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet Respir Med.* 2014; 2(9):717-27. doi: 10.1016/S2213-
524 2600(14)70139-0.

525 [30] Jokinen J, Rinta-Kokko H, Siira L, Palmu AA, Virtanen MJ, Nohynek H, Virolainen-Julkunen A,
526 Toropainen M, Nuorti JP. Impact of ten-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccination on invasive
527 pneumococcal disease in Finnish children--a population-based study. *PLoS One.* 2015;
528 10(3):e0120290. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0120290.

529 [31] Payne DC, Boom JA, Staat MA, Edwards KM, Szilagyi PG, Klein EJ, Selvarangan R, Azimi PH,
530 Harrison C, Moffatt M, *et al.* Effectiveness of pentavalent and monovalent rotavirus vaccines in
531 concurrent use among US children <5 years of age, 2009-2011. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2013; 57(1):13-20. doi:
532 10.1093/cid/cit164.

533

534 [32] Cortese MM, Immergluck LC, Held M, Jain S, Chan T, Grizas AP, Khizer S, Barrett C, Quaye O,
535 Mijatovic-Rustempasic S, *et al.* Effectiveness of monovalent and pentavalent rotavirus vaccine.
536 Pediatrics. 2013; 132(1):e25-33. doi: 10.1542/peds.2012-3804.

537 [33] Cortese MM, Leblanc J, White KE, Jerris RC, Stinchfield P, Preston KL, Meek J, Odofin L, Khizer S,
538 Miller CA, *et al.* Leveraging state immunization information systems to measure the effectiveness of
539 rotavirus vaccine. Pediatrics. 2011; 128(6):e1474-81. doi: 10.1542/peds.2011-1006.

540 [34] Staat MA, Payne DC, Donauer S, Weinberg GA, Edwards KM, Szilagyi PG, Griffin MR, Hall CB,
541 Curns AT, Gentsch JR, *et al.*; New Vaccine Surveillance Network (NVSN). Effectiveness of pentavalent
542 rotavirus vaccine against severe disease. Pediatrics. 2011; 128(2):e267-75. doi: 10.1542/peds.2010-
543 3722.

544 [35] Boom JA, Tate JE, Sahni LC, Rench MA, Hull JJ, Gentsch JR, Patel MM, Baker CJ, Parashar UD.
545 Effectiveness of pentavalent rotavirus vaccine in a large urban population in the United States.
546 Pediatrics. 2010; 125(2):e199-207. doi: 10.1542/peds.2009-1021.

547 [36] Vesikari T, Karvonen A, Prymula R, Schuster V, Tejedor JC, Cohen R, Meurice F, Han HH, Damaso
548 S, Bouckenoghe A. Efficacy of human rotavirus vaccine against rotavirus gastroenteritis during the
549 first 2 years of life in European infants: randomised, double-blind controlled study. Lancet. 2007;
550 370(9601):1757-63.

551 [37] Vesikari T, Matson DO, Dennehy P, Van Damme P, Santosham M, Rodriguez Z, Dallas MJ, Heyse
552 JF, Goveia MG, Black SB, *et al.*; Rotavirus Efficacy and Safety Trial (REST) Study Team. Safety and
553 efficacy of a pentavalent human-bovine (WC3) reassortant rotavirus vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2006;
554 354(1):23-33.

555 [38] Madhi SA, Cunliffe NA, Steele D, Witte D, Kirsten M, Louw C, Ngwira B, Victor JC, Gillard PH,
556 Cheuvart BB, *et al.* Effect of human rotavirus vaccine on severe diarrhea in African infants. N Engl J
557 Med. 2010; 362(4):289-98. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa0904797.

558

559 [39] Zaman K, Dang DA, Victor JC, Shin S, Yunus M, Dallas MJ, Podder G, Vu DT, Le TP, Luby SP, *et al.*
560 Efficacy of pentavalent rotavirus vaccine against severe rotavirus gastroenteritis in infants in
561 developing countries in Asia: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2010;
562 376(9741):615-23. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60755-6.

563 [40] Armah GE, Sow SO, Breiman RF, Dallas MJ, Tapia MD, Feikin DR, Binka FN, Steele AD, Laserson
564 KF, Ansah NA, *et al.* Efficacy of pentavalent rotavirus vaccine against severe rotavirus gastroenteritis
565 in infants in developing countries in sub-Saharan Africa: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-
566 controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2010; 376(9741):606-14. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60889-6.

567 [41] WHO World Malaria report 2014. Last accessed in October 6th 2015. Available at:
568 http://www.who.int/malaria/publications/world_malaria_report_2014/report/en/

569 [42] Guerra CA, Gikandi PW, Tatem AJ, Noor AM, Smith DL, Hay SI, Snow RW. The limits and intensity
570 of *Plasmodium falciparum* transmission: implications for malaria control and elimination worldwide.
571 *PLoS Med*. 2008; 5(2):e38. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.0050038.

572 [43] The RTS,S Clinical Trials Partnership. First results of phase 3 trial of RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine in
573 African children. *New Engl J Med* 2011;365:1863-75. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1102287.

574 [44] RTS,S Clinical Trials Partnership. A phase 3 trial of RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine in African infants.
575 *New Engl J Med* 2012;367:2284-95. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1208394.

576 [45] Gessner BD, Feikin DR. Vaccine preventable disease incidence as a complement to vaccine efficacy
577 for setting vaccine policy. *Vaccine* 2014; 32:3133-8. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.04.019.

578 [46] Scott JA, Berkley JA, Mwangi I, Ochola L, Uyoga S, Macharia A, Ndila C, Lowe BS, Mwarumba S,
579 Bauni E, *et al.* Relation between *falciparum* malaria and bacteraemia in Kenyan children: a
580 population-based, case-control study and a longitudinal study. *Lancet*. 2011; 378(9799):1316-23. doi:
581 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60888-X.

582

583 [47] O'Meara WP, Bejon P, Mwangi TW, Okiro EA, Peshu N, Snow RW, Newton CR, Marsh K. Effect of
584 a fall in malaria transmission on morbidity and mortality in Kilifi, Kenya. *Lancet*. 2008;
585 372(9649):1555-62. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61655-4.

586 [48] Kleinschmidt I, Schwabe C, Benavente L, Torrez M, Ridl FC, Segura JL, Ehmer P, Nchama GN.
587 Marked increase in child survival after four years of intensive malaria control. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*.
588 2009; 80(6):882-8.

589 [49] Gubler DJ. Dengue, Urbanization and Globalization: The Unholy Trinity of the 21(st) Century.
590 *Trop Med Health*. 2011; 39(4 Suppl):3-11. doi: 10.2149/tmh.2011-S05.

591 [50] Messina JP, Brady OJ, Pigott DM, Brownstein JS, Hoen AG, Hay SI. A global compendium of
592 human dengue virus occurrence. *Sci Data*. 2014; 1:140004. doi: 10.1038/sdata.2014.4.

593 [51] Horstick O, Tozan Y, Wilder-Smith A. Reviewing dengue: still a neglected tropical disease? *PLoS*
594 *Negl Trop Dis*. 2015; 9(4):e0003632. doi: 10.1371/journal.pntd.0003632.

595 [52] Bhatt S, Gething PW, Brady OJ, Messina JP, Farlow AW, Moyes CL, Drake JM, Brownstein JS,
596 Hoen AG, Sankoh O, *et al*. The global distribution and burden of dengue. *Nature*. 2013;
597 496(7446):504-7. doi: 10.1038/nature12060.

598 [53] Hadinegoro SR, Arredondo-García JL, Capeding MR, Deseda C, Chotpitayasunondh T, Dietze R,
599 Ismail HI, Reynales H, Limkittikul K, Rivera-Medina DM, *et al*.; CYD-TDV Dengue Vaccine Working
600 Group. Efficacy and Long-Term Safety of a Dengue Vaccine in Regions of Endemic Disease. *N Engl J*
601 *Med*. 2015 Jul 27. [Epub ahead of print].

602 [54] Olkowski S, Forshey BM, Morrison AC, Rocha C, Vilcarromero S, Halsey ES, Kochel TJ, Scott TW,
603 Stoddard ST. Reduced risk of disease during postsecondary dengue virus infections. *J Infect Dis*. 2013;
604 208(6):1026-33. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jit273.

605 [55] Gibbons RV, Kalanarooj S, Jarman RG, Nisalak A, Vaughn DW, Endy TP, Mammen MP Jr,
606 Srikiatkachorn A. Analysis of repeat hospital admissions for dengue to estimate the frequency of
607 third or fourth dengue infections resulting in admissions and dengue hemorrhagic fever, and
608 serotype sequences. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2007; 77(5):910-3.

609 [56] Gubler D. The partnership for dengue control - A new global alliance for the prevention and
610 control of dengue. Vaccine 2015;33(10):1233. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2015.01.002.
611 [57] 27th annual EuroMeeting. Development, Innovation, Access, and Patient safety. Last accessed in
612 October 6th 2015. Available at:
613 [https://www.diaglobal.org/tools/content.aspx?type=eopdf&file=%2Fproductfiles%2F3175365%2F15](https://www.diaglobal.org/tools/content.aspx?type=eopdf&file=%2Fproductfiles%2F3175365%2F15101_pgm.pdf)
614 [101_pgm.pdf](https://www.diaglobal.org/tools/content.aspx?type=eopdf&file=%2Fproductfiles%2F3175365%2F15101_pgm.pdf)
615
616

617 **Speakers & Chairs**

618 Baylor Norman
619 Biologics Consulting Group, Inc., USA
620
621 Black Steven
622 Center for Global Health, University of Cincinnati Children's Hospital, USA
623
624 Breiman Robert
625 Emory Global Health Institute, USA
626
627 Dellepiane Nora
628 World Health Organization, Switzerland
629
630 Dull Peter
631 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, USA
632
633 Edmunds John
634 London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
635
636 Gubler Duane J
637 Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School, USA
638
639 Horstick Olaf
640 Institute of Public Health, University of Heidelberg, Germany
641
642 Logini Ira
643 University of Florida, USA
644
645 Lopez Anna-Lena
646 Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Philippines
647
648
649 Marsh Kevin
650 African Academy of Sciences, Kenya
651
652 Martins Helder
653 SIVAC, Mozambique
654
655 Nelson B Christopher
656 Sanofi Pasteur, France
657
658 Palu Arto
659 National Institute for Health and Welfare, Finland
660
661 Parashar Umesh
662 Centre for Disease Control, USA
663
664 Vandendriessche Frank
665 PhaRA, Belgium
666

667
668 Wilder-Smith Annelies
669 Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Singapore
670

671 Zinsou Jean-Antoine
672 Sanofi Pasteur, France
673
674

675 **Participants**

676
677 Aguado De Ros M. Teresa
678 Vaccines and immunization consultant, Switzerland
679
680

681 Baehner Frank
682 Takeda Pharmaceuticals International GmbH, Switzerland
683

684 Batoosingh Karen
685 Dengue Company, Sanofi Pasteur, Denmark
686

687 Beard Frank
688 National Centre for Immunisation Research and Surveillance of Vaccine Preventable Diseases,
689 Australia
690

691 Botting Carla
692 PATH, USA
693

694 Chataway Mark
695 Hyderus / Baird's CMC, United kingdom
696
697

698 Chotpitayasunondh Tawee
699 Queen Sirikit National Institute of Child Health, Thailand
700

701 Cohen Jean-Marie
702 Open Rome, France
703

704 Esparza Jose
705 Institute of Human Virology, University of Maryland School of Medicine, USA
706

707 Karafillakis Emilie
708 London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom
709

710 Farlow Andrew
711 University of Oxford, United Kingdom
712

713 Ferreira Germano
714 P-95 Pharmacovigilance and Epidemiology, Belgium
715

716 Flasche Stefan
717 LSHTM, United kingdom

718
 719
 720 Fletcher Mark-Andrew
 721 Pfizer Vaccines, France
 722
 723 Groome Michelle
 724 Respiratory and Meningeal Pathogens Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa
 725
 726 Jaenisch Thomas
 727 Section Clinical Tropical Medicine, Department of Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg University Hospital,
 728 Germany
 729
 730 Knerer Gerhart
 731 Takeda Vaccines, United Kingdom
 732
 733 Lang Jean
 734 Sanofi Pasteur, France
 735
 736 Lee Bennett
 737 Takeda Pharmaceuticals International (Vaccines), Switzerland
 738
 739 Louis Jaques
 740 Fondation Mérieux, France
 741
 742 Moulin Anne-Marie
 743 CNRS, France
 744
 745 Mogasale Vittal
 746 International Vaccine Institute, Korea
 747
 748 Munier Aline
 749 Agence de Médecine Préventive, France
 750
 751 Ohannessian Robin
 752 Université Lyon 1, France
 753
 754 Oriol Mathieu Valerie
 755 Janssen Infectious Diseases and Vaccines, Netherlands
 756
 757 Pagliusi Sonia
 758 DCVMN International, Switzerland
 759
 760 Picot Valentina
 761 Fondation Mérieux, France
 762
 763 Pitzer Virginia
 764 Yale School of Public Health, USA
 765
 766 Rimolo Natalia
 767 Fondation Mérieux, France
 768
 769 Saadatian-Elahi Mitra

770 Fondation Mérieux, France
771
772 Seida Ahmed Adel
773 Microbiology and Immunology Department, Cairo University, Egypt
774 seida_aa@cu.edu.eg
775
776 Teyssou Rémy
777 Fondation Mérieux, France
778
779
780 Tin Tin Htar Myint
781 Pfizer Europe, France
782
783 Tomori Oyewale
784 Nigerian Academy of Science, Nigeria
785
786 Van Effelterre Thierry
787 GlaxoSmithKline Vaccines, Belgium
788
789 Weil John
790 Takeda Vaccines, Switzerland
791
792
793