



Evaluation of vaccine derived poliovirus type 2 outbreak response options: A randomized controlled trial, Karachi, Pakistan



Ali Faisal Saleem^{a,*}, Mohammad Tahir Yousafzai^{a,*}, Ondrej Mach^b, Asia Khan^a, Farheen Quadri^a, William C. Weldon^c, M. Steven Oberste^c, Syed S. Zaidi^d, Muhammad M. Alam^d, Roland W. Sutter^b, Anita K.M. Zaidi^a

^a Aga Khan University, Karachi, Pakistan

^b Polio Eradication Department, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland

^c Division of Viral Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, USA

^d National Institute of Health, Islamabad, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 4 January 2018

Received in revised form 6 February 2018

Accepted 10 February 2018

Available online 21 February 2018

Keywords:

Polio virus 2

Polio outbreak response

Polio vaccines

ABSTRACT

Background: Outbreaks of circulating vaccine derived polioviruses type 2 (cVDPV2) remain a risk to poliovirus eradication in an era without live poliovirus vaccine containing type 2 in routine immunization. We evaluated existing outbreak response strategies recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) for control of cVDPV2 outbreaks.

Methods: Seronegative children for poliovirus type 2 (PV2) at 22 weeks of life were assigned to one of four study groups and received respectively (1) one dose of trivalent oral poliovirus vaccine (tOPV); (2) monovalent OPV 2 (mOPV2); (3) tOPV together with a dose of inactivated poliovirus vaccine (IPV); or (4) mOPV2 with monovalent high-potency IPV type 2. Stool and blood samples were collected and assessed for presence of PV2 (stool) and anti-polio antibodies (sera).

Results: We analyzed data from 265 children seronegative for PV2. Seroconversion to PV2 was achieved in 48, 76, 98 and 100% in Groups 1–4 respectively. mOPV2 was more immunogenic than tOPV alone ($p < 0.001$); and OPV in combination with IPV was more immunogenic than OPV alone ($p < 0.001$). There were 33%, 67%, 20% and 43% PV2 excretors in Groups 1–4 respectively. mOPV2 resulted in more prevalent shedding of PV2 than when tOPV was used ($p < 0.001$); and tOPV together with IPV resulted in lower excretion of PV2 than tOPV alone ($p = 0.046$).

Conclusion: mOPV2 was a more potent vaccine than tOPV. Adding IPV to OPV improved immunological response; adding IPV also seemed to have shortened the duration of PV2 shedding. mIPV2 did not provide measurable improvement of immune response when compared to conventional IPV. WHO recommendation to use mOPV2 as a vaccine of first choice in cVDPV2 outbreak response was supported by our findings. Clinical Trial registry number: NCT02189811.

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Background

In 2017, there were 22 reported cases of poliomyelitis caused by wild poliovirus type 1 (WPV1) detected in two remaining endemic countries (Afghanistan and Pakistan) [1]. WPV2 is considered eradicated and WPV3 was last detected in 2012, in Nigeria [2,3].

Complete poliovirus eradication, however, requires the disappearance of not only WPVs but of all polioviruses from human

* Corresponding authors at: Department of Pediatrics and Child Health, Aga Khan University, Stadium Road PO Box 3500, Karachi 74800, Pakistan.

E-mail addresses: ali.saleem@aku.edu (A.F. Saleem), tahir.yousafzai@aku.edu (M.T. Yousafzai).

populations, including those resulting from use of oral poliovirus vaccine (OPV). The Polio Eradication & Endgame Strategic Plan 2013–2018 provides a framework for interruption of WPV transmission in remaining endemic foci and lays out plan for the new polio endgame, which includes the sequential withdrawal of Sabin virus strains contained in OPV vaccine, starting with type 2, and the introduction of inactivated poliovirus vaccine (IPV), for risk mitigation purposes [4].

The switch from trivalent OPV (tOPV) to bivalent OPV (bOPV) without type 2 poliovirus (PV2) was conducted in a globally synchronized manner in April 2016. As of May 2016, there were no countries still using type 2-containing OPV in routine immunization; however, the World Health Organization (WHO) maintains

a stock of monovalent type 2 OPV (mOPV2) reserved for outbreak response in case of outbreaks of type 2 circulating vaccine derived poliovirus (cVDPV2) or accidental release of WPV2 in the post-switch era [5]. The use of mOPV2 must be authorized by the Director General of WHO. In addition to mOPV2, monovalent inactivated poliovirus vaccine type 2 (mIPV2) with 4-times higher PV2 antigenic potency than standard IPV has been evaluated in clinical trials and found to be safe and immunogenic; however, mIPV2 has not been licensed, is considered experimental, and is not part of the outbreak response toolkit recommended by WHO [6,7].

As per WHO's Poliovirus Outbreak Response Guidelines, bOPV and IPV or mOPV2 and IPV are tools for control of WPV1 or cVDPV2 outbreaks respectively [8]. Since the switch from tOPV to bOPV in April 2016 until December 2017, there were 44 separate incidents when VDPV2 was detected either in children or from environmental samples [1]. In 12/44 incidents, mOPV2 was authorized to be used to control the outbreak and in 7/44 incidents, IPV was used [1,9]. The decision regarding what outbreak response tools should be deployed is based on the assessment of risk of poliovirus circulation, and risk of exportation to other countries.

In the post-switch era, the risk of emergence and spread of cVDPV2 is two-fold, from unrecognized foci seeded before the tOPV to bOPV switch such as long-term excretors among immunodeficient individuals, or from post-switch use of PV2-containing live vaccine such as mOPV2 or left-over tOPV.

To assess the available tools for cVDPV2 outbreak response, we analyzed a subset of data obtained from a larger study that was conducted by the same investigators as this analysis in Pakistan and was entitled "Immunogenicity of Different Routine Poliovirus Vaccination Schedules: a Randomized Controlled Trial". That study had two objectives: to assess the immunogenicity of different routine immunization schedules; and to assess different poliovirus outbreak response strategies. Here, we present the data obtained to assess the polio outbreak response strategies.

2. Methods

The study was conducted in four low-income areas in and around Karachi (4 peri-urban, contiguous coastal villages: Rehri Goth, Bhains Colony, Ali Akber Shah and Ibrahim Hydri) where the Aga Khan University's Department of Paediatrics and Child Health has a well-established demographic surveillance system (DSS) which captures population size, pregnancies and births. The population of the study area according to the last census from 2015 was 294,171. Each area has a Primary Health Center (PHC) operated by the Department of Paediatrics and Child Health Research Program of the Aga Khan University, which also provides Expanded Programme on Immunizations (EPI) services.

2.1. Selection of study participants

Expectant women were approached at home during pregnancy or immediately after delivery by health center staff and information about the trial and an invitation to participate in the study were given. Inclusion criteria included healthy newborns with birth weight ≥ 2.0 kg, informed consent from parent or guardian, and residence in the service area of the study clinic, with no plans to move during the study period. Newborns who had any clinical sign of illness using the WHO Integrated Management of Neonatal and Childhood Illness assessment tool, required hospitalization, or were at risk of immunodeficiency (through a family history screen) were excluded from the trial.

After enrollment into "Immunogenicity of Different Routine Poliovirus Vaccination Schedules: a Randomized Controlled Trial", children were randomized to receive one of four different polio pri-

mary immunization schedules, with one dose of poliovirus vaccine administered at birth, 6, 10, and 14 weeks of age. The four schedules were 1: IPV, IPV, IPV, IPV; 2: bOPV, bOPV, bOPV, bOPV; 3: bOPV, bOPV, bOPV, bOPV+IPV; 4: tOPV, tOPV, tOPV, tOPV [10].

Some of the enrolled children had remained seronegative for poliovirus type 2 (PV2) at 22 weeks of age; and these children formed the study set for this analysis. We divided the seronegative children into four different groups and administered poliovirus vaccines to them at 22 weeks of age: in group 1 they received one dose of tOPV; group 2 received mOPV2; group 3 received tOPV together with IPV; and group 4 received mOPV2 together with mIPV2 (Table 1). The allocation to OPV alone or OPV+IPV groups was random; however, the allocation to tOPV or mOPV2 groups was not: the trial started while permission to use mOPV2 and mIPV2 was being processed and therefore those children enrolled before the permission was granted (in November 2015) had been randomized into tOPV or tOPV+IPV groups (Group 1 or 3); and those children enrolled after November 2015 had been randomized into mOPV2 or mOPV2+mIPV2 groups (Group 2 or 4).

2.2. Study Procedures, and definitions

Peripheral blood (2 mL) was collected at 22, 23 and 26 weeks of age. Blood specimens collected at the sites were allowed to clot, centrifuged to separate serum, and transported to the Infectious Disease Research Laboratory (IDRL) at the Aga Khan University where they were stored at -20°C until shipment to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia, USA, where the sera were tested for presence of poliovirus neutralizing antibodies using standard neutralization assays [11].

Seropositivity was defined as reciprocal titers of poliovirus neutralizing antibodies ≥ 8 ; seroconversion was defined as a change from seronegative to seropositive (from reciprocal titer of <8 to ≥ 8).

PV2 priming in children who had previously received IPV but remained seronegative at 22 weeks of age was inferred for children who had an anamnestic immune response (seroconversion) within 7 days of vaccination.

Stool specimens were collected at the primary care clinic or at children's homes on week 22 (before study vaccine administration) and on week 23 and were stored at IDRL at $+4^{\circ}\text{C}$ for a maximum of one week until shipment to WHO Regional Reference Laboratory for polio at the National Institute of Health in Islamabad, Pakistan, where they were tested for the presence of poliovirus using standard poliovirus detection methodology [12]. Presence or absence of PV2 in stool samples was reported.

Adverse events following vaccination were identified by site investigators and reviewed by the principal investigator. Children were observed for 30 min following the administration of the vaccine for immediate adverse events; parents were instructed to immediately report back to the health centers if adverse events occurred after the initial observation period. Serious adverse events were reported for review to the Data and Safety Monitoring Board and the Ethical Review Committee.

IPV and mIPV2 were produced by Bilthoven Biologicals B.V., the Netherlands, and presented in 1-dose vials (0.5 mL), tOPV (20-dose vials) and mOPV2 (20-dose vials) were produced by Sanofi Pasteur in vials for oral administration.

2.3. Sample size and analysis

Target sample size for each arm in the "Immunogenicity of Different Routine Poliovirus Vaccination Schedules: a Randomized Controlled Trial" study was calculated to be 190 newborns with a minimum analyzable sample size of 110 per arm, accepting $\alpha = 0.05$ and power = 80%, and assuming at least 20% difference

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/8485877>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/8485877>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)