

HHS Public Access

Author manuscript *Vaccine*. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 March 25.

Published in final edited form as:

Vaccine. 2021 October 22; 39(44): 6460-6463. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.09.051.

Prevalence of indications for adult hepatitis A vaccination among hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases, Three US States, 2016–2019

Megan G. Hofmeister^{a,*}, Mark K. Weng^a, Douglas Thoroughman^{b,c}, Erica D. Thomasson^{c,d}, Shannon McBee^d, Monique A. Foster^a, Jim Collins^e, Cole Burkholder^e, Ryan J. Augustine^a, Philip R. Spradling^a

^aDivision of Viral Hepatitis, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States

^bKentucky Department for Public Health, Frankfort, KY, United States

^cCareer Epidemiology Field Officer Program, Division of State and Local Readiness, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, United States

^dBureau for Public Health, West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources, Charleston, WV, United States

^eDivision of Communicable Diseases, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, Lansing, MI, United States

Abstract

Background: Safe and effective hepatitis A vaccines have been recommended in the United States for at-risk adults since 1996; however, adult vaccination coverage is low.

Methods: Among a random sample of adult outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases from three states that were heavily affected by person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks, we assessed the presence of documented Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) indications for hepatitis A vaccination, hepatitis A vaccination status, and whether cases that were epidemiologically linked to an outbreak-associated hepatitis A case had received postexposure prophylaxis (PEP).

Results: Overall, 74.1% of cases had a documented ACIP indication for hepatitis A vaccination. Fewer than 20% of epidemiologically linked cases received PEP.

Conclusions: Efforts are needed to increase provider awareness of and adherence to ACIP childhood and adult hepatitis A vaccination and PEP recommendations in order to stop the current person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks and prevent similar outbreaks in the future.

^{*}Corresponding author at: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, US12-3, Atlanta, GA 30333, United States. lxn7@cdc.gov (M.G. Hofmeister).

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Keywords

Hepatitis A; Hepatitis A vaccines; Postexposure prophylaxis; Disease outbreaks; United States

1. Introduction

Hepatitis A is a vaccine-preventable disease of the liver, typically acquired through fecaloral transmission of the hepatitis A virus (HAV) from direct person-to-person contact or consumption of contaminated food or water. Hepatitis A (HepA) vaccines are safe and highly effective (94%–100% efficacy in protecting against clinical hepatitis A with singleantigen HepA vaccines) and were first licensed in the United States in 1995 [1–3]. In 1996, the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommended vaccination for adults at increased risk for HAV infection or adverse consequences of infection (e.g., people who use drugs, men who have sex with men [MSM], international travelers, and people with chronic liver disease) [3]. Recently, ACIP expanded the indications for adult hepatitis A vaccination to include people experiencing homelessness (2019) and people living with HIV (2020) [3].

Postexposure prophylaxis (PEP) with single-antigen HepA vaccine or immune globulin effectively prevents infection with HAV when administered within two weeks of exposure [3]. ACIP recommends PEP as soon as possible for adults exposed to HAV within the past two weeks who have not previously completed the HepA vaccine series [3]. The efficacy of PEP administered more than two weeks after exposure has not been established.

Since 2016, the United States has experienced person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks that are unprecedented in the vaccine era. Infections have spread primarily through close contact among people who use drugs—a group recommended for hepatitis A vaccination by ACIP for 25 years—and people experiencing homelessness [3,4]. As of September 10, 2021, state health departments reported >42,000 outbreak-associated cases [4]. We sought to identify opportunities for improving adult hepatitis A vaccination coverage before and during the ongoing person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks.

2. Methods

Previously, we conducted a cross-sectional observational study of hepatitis A outbreakassociated cases with onset between July 1, 2016 and June 10, 2019 [5]. Eligibility for inclusion in the analysis was residency in Kentucky, Michigan, or West Virginia and designation by the respective health department as a person-to-person outbreak-associated hepatitis A case. For that analysis, state outbreak and hospital records were abstracted for a 10% simple random sample of outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases from three heavilyaffected states.

For this analysis, we examined data collected during the cross-sectional observational study for the presence of documented ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination among adults, hepatitis A vaccination status, and whether cases that were epidemiologically linked to an outbreak-associated hepatitis A case had received PEP. ACIP indications were

assessed retrospectively. We examined the presence of all ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination in the current 2020 ACIP recommendations, including homelessness and living with HIV, which were not in place during the study period. Hepatitis A vaccination status was based on self-report or documentation (in the medical record or state immunization registry) of ever receiving a HepA dose. Cases were considered epidemiologically linked if they were a close contact (e.g., household or sexual) of a known hepatitis A outbreak-associated case.

We calculated descriptive statistics detailing potential opportunities for improving adult hepatitis A vaccination before and during the ongoing person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks. Percentages were calculated by using all participants (including those with missing data) in the denominator to err on the side of generating conservative estimates.

CDC determined this analysis, using existing deidentified data provided by jurisdictions as part of hepatitis A outbreak investigations and response efforts, did not constitute research involving human subjects; IRB review was not required.

3. Results

We identified 817 hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases via generation of the 10% random sample. Of these, 812 were adults with documented information on ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination (467 from Kentucky, 92 from Michigan, and 253 from West Virginia). No cases included in the analysis had verifiable documentation of having received the full 2-dose hepatitis A vaccination series before becoming infected. One hundred and forty-one cases were epidemiologically linked to a known hepatitis A case.

Overall, 74.1% (602/812) of adult cases had a documented ACIP indication for hepatitis A vaccination (Table 1). When restricted to ACIP recommendations during the study period, 73.2% of adult cases had documentation of an ACIP indication for hepatitis A vaccination (73.0% of Kentucky residents [341/467], 68.5% of Michigan residents [63/92], and 75.1% of West Virginia residents [190/253]) (Table 1). Two longstanding ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination (i.e., those recommended since 1996) were the most prevalent indications for hepatitis A vaccination in the study population: use of injection or noninjection drugs (459/812, 56.5%) and preexisting chronic liver disease (437/812, 53.8%) (Table 1). The other longstanding ACIP indications were less common in the study population: MSM was identified for 2.9% of male cases (15/509) while international travel was identified for 0.1% of cases (1/812) (Table 1). Newer ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination that were approved after the study period ended but applied retrospectively to the analytic sample included homelessness (92/812, 11.3%) and living with HIV (2/812, 0.2%) (Table 1). Overall, more than one-third of adult cases had multiple ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination (42.1% overall [342/812]; 42.4% of Kentucky residents [198/467], 33.7% of Michigan residents [31/92], and 44.7% of West Virginia residents [113/253]) (Table 1).

Among 141 hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases epidemiologically linked to a known hepatitis A case, 8.5% (12/141) received PEP (Table 2). Of those epidemiologically linked

cases with known PEP status, 13.6% of Kentucky residents (6/44), 21.4% of Michigan residents (3/14), and 60.0% of West Virginia residents (3/5) received PEP (Table 2). However, 66.7% of PEP recipients in each state received PEP outside the recommended window (Table 2).

4. Discussion

Since 2016, person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks that are unprecedented in the vaccine era have impacted the United States. We analyzed a random sample of adult hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases from three heavily-affected states and found that there were substantial opportunities for improving adult hepatitis A vaccination – both before and during the outbreaks.

Approximately three-quarters of the adult cases identified had a documented ACIP indication for hepatitis A vaccination, yet none had verifiable documentation of receiving the 2-dose vaccination series before infection. Consistent with our study results, self-reported hepatitis A vaccination coverage among adults in the United States is low, even among risk groups specifically recommended for hepatitis A vaccination by ACIP. In 2017, according to data from the National Health Interview Survey, only 10.9% of adults 19 years reported receiving 2 HepA doses [6]. The same survey also examined hepatitis A vaccination coverage improved compared to the general adult population, but was still low at 20.8% [6]. According to a recent National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey study, among US-born adults aged 20 years during 2007–2016, 24.9% of participants with hepatitis B or hepatitis C, 26.9% of participants who reported injection drug use, and 34.8% of participants who identified as MSM reported ever being vaccinated against hepatitis A, respectively [7].

The risk-based ACIP recommendations for adult hepatitis A vaccination involve hard-toreach populations that might have limited access to routine health care or preventive services. Since 2016, jurisdictions—including the three involved in this study—have developed and implemented nontraditional vaccination strategies and innovative staffing models (e.g., holding satellite vaccination clinics at facilities providing services to hard-toreach populations, such as correctional facilities, syringe services programs, and homeless shelters; and expanding the authority of emergency medical technicians and pharmacists to administer hepatitis A vaccine) to provide HepA vaccine to adults recommended for vaccination during the person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks [8–10]. However, such efforts are labor and resource intensive.

The ACIP has recommended universal hepatitis A vaccination of all children aged 12–23 months since 2006 [11]. This recommendation has the potential to improve population coverage by eliminating barriers associated with risk-based adult hepatitis A vaccination. However, according to the most recent National Immunization Survey-Child data available, coverage with 2 HepA doses by age 35 months was only 76.9%, one of the lowest series completion coverage rates among ACIP-recommended childhood vaccinations [12]. Despite the low national coverage rate, from 2017 to 2019, the coverage rate with

Hofmeister et al.

2 HepA doses among children 19–35 months of age held steady in West Virginia and improved approximately 8% in Kentucky and 18% in Michigan, suggesting that public health messaging about the hepatitis A outbreaks improved provider awareness of the need to vaccinate against hepatitis A [CDC, unpublished data]. State vaccination requirements can be important tools for achieving and maintaining high vaccination coverage rates. As of 2020, though, only 24 states had a childhood (childcare or school) hepatitis A vaccine mandate [13]. Although the participants in our study cohort were too old to benefit from the universal childhood hepatitis A vaccination recommendation, comprehensive implementation of the universal childhood recommendation (and the 2020 catch-up recommendation for those aged 2–18 years [3]) will be vitally important to prevent a future recurrence of the widespread person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks currently affecting the United States.

Despite being highly effective when administered as recommended within two weeks of exposure, PEP was infrequently administered to cases we identified that were epidemiologically linked to known outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases. This may be indicative of the difficulty public health staff experienced in attempting to reach the underserved populations most heavily affected by these outbreaks, and the reluctance of outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases to identify their potential contacts by name. When PEP was administered, it was given outside the recommended window twice as often as it was given appropriately within the recommended window. These findings underscore the need to improve awareness of hepatitis A PEP recommendations among public health professionals and clinicians.

Our study has several limitations. First, risk factor data abstracted to determine the presence of documented ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination were largely self-reported and subject to recall and social desirability biases. Consequently, the results may underestimate the actual prevalence of preexisting ACIP indications for hepatitis A vaccination. We conducted a sensitivity analysis restricted to those with non-missing data and found that 97.4% of cases eligible for inclusion had documentation of an ACIP indication for hepatitis A vaccination. Second, we retrospectively assessed documentation of the most recent ACIP indications for vaccination (e.g., people experiencing homelessness and people living with HIV). Although these were not official ACIP recommendations for adult hepatitis A vaccination during the study period, CDC did provide an outbreak-specific recommendation in 2017 to vaccinate people experiencing unstable housing or homelessness against hepatitis A in the context of person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks [4,14]. Additionally, the difference between the prevalence of any ACIP indication restricted to those officially in effect during the study period versus any ACIP indication assessed overall was approximately 1%, suggesting that including the retrospective assessment of the most recent indications for vaccination did not substantially alter the study results. Third, it is possible that the hepatitis A vaccination status of some adult hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases included in the analysis was misclassified. Health department staff conducting case investigations inquired about hepatitis A vaccination status, cross-referenced state immunization registries, and reviewed medical records when available. However, some outbreak-associated cases were lost to follow-up and unable to be interviewed. Fourth, whether PEP was offered (and patient responses to such offers) was not consistently

Hofmeister et al.

captured. As a result, we were unable to account for attempted PEP administration that was refused by patients in the PEP analysis. Finally, the representativeness of the study might be limited because only three states experiencing person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks were included. However, Kentucky, Michigan, and West Virginia accounted for 40% of publicly-reported person-to-person hepatitis A cases nationally at the end of the study period in June 2019.

In summary, we identified substantial opportunities for improving adult hepatitis A vaccination, both before and during the person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks in Kentucky, Michigan, and West Virginia. Nearly 75% of the adult cases included in this study had a documented indication for vaccination; appropriate, timely vaccination could have prevented substantial hepatitis A morbidity and mortality during the person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks. Continued implementation of nontraditional vaccination strategies should be prioritized to reach at-risk adult populations involved in the ongoing outbreaks. Fewer than 20% of patients who should have received PEP because they were epidemiologically linked to a known hepatitis A case received PEP; of those who did, two-thirds received PEP outside the recommended two-week window when PEP is effective. Efforts are needed to increase provider awareness of and adherence to ACIP childhood and adult hepatitis A vaccination and PEP recommendations in order to stop the current person-to-person hepatitis A outbreaks and prevent similar outbreaks in the future.

Acknowledgments

The authors extend their gratitude to Holly Hill, MD, PhD, and Laurie Elam-Evans, PhD, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, for their assistance with National Immunization Survey-Child data and analysis; the Kentucky Department for Public Health, Division of Epidemiology and Health Planning, Reportable Diseases Section; the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services - Surveillance and Infectious Disease Epidemiology Section; the West Virginia Bureau for Public Health Hepatitis A Outbreak Response Team; and local health department and hospital medical record department staff in Kentucky, Michigan, and West Virginia.

Abbreviations:

HAV	hepatitis A virus
НерА	hepatitis A vaccine(s)
ACIP	Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices
MSM	men who have sex with men
PEP	postexposure prophylaxis

References

- Innis BL, Snitbhan R, Kunasol P, Laorakpongse T, Poopatanakool W, Kozik CA, et al. Protection against hepatitis A by an inactivated vaccine. JAMA 1994;271:1328–34. [PubMed: 8158817]
- [2]. Werzberger A, Mensch B, Kuter B, Brown L, Lewis J, Sitrin R, et al. A controlled trial of a formalin-inactivated hepatitis A vaccine in healthy children. N Engl J Med 1992;327(7):453–7.
 [PubMed: 1320740]

Hofmeister et al.

- [3]. Nelson NP, Weng MK, Hofmeister MG, Moore KL, Doshani M, Kamili S, et al. Prevention of hepatitis A virus infection in the United States: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, 2020. MMWR Recomm Rep 2020;69(5):1–38.
- [4]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Widespread person-to-person outbreaks of hepatitis A across the United States. 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/hepatitis/outbreaks/2017March-HepatitisA.htm [accessed 17 September 2021].
- [5]. Hofmeister MG, Xing J, Foster MA, Augustine RJ, Burkholder C, Collins J, et al. Hepatitis A person-to-person outbreaks: epidemiology, morbidity burden, and factors associated with hospitalization - Multiple States, 2016–2019. J Infect Dis 2020. 10.1093/infdis/jiaa636.
- [6]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vaccination coverage among adults in the United States, National Health Interview Survey, 2017: hepatitis A vaccination. 2019. https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/imz-managers/coverage/adultvaxview/pubsresources/NHIS-2017.html#box2. [accessed 1 December 2020].
- [7]. Yin S, Barker L, Ly KN, Kilmer G, Foster MA, Drobeniuc J, et al. Susceptibility to hepatitis A virus infection in the United States, 2007–2016. Clin Infect Dis 2020. 10.1093/cid/ciaa298.
- [8]. The County of San Diego. Hepatitis A outbreak after action report; 2018. https://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/cosd/ SanDiegoHepatitisAOutbreak-2017-18-AfterActionReport.pdf [accessed 28 December 2020].
- [9]. Philadelphia Department of Public Health Division of Disease Control. Hepatitis A outbreak response update report; 2020. https://hip.phila.gov/Portals/_default/HIP/EmergentHealthTopics/ HepA/PDPH_HepatitisAOutbreak_ResponseUpdate_01.23.2020.pdf [accessed 28 December 2020].
- [10]. Snyder MR, McGinty MD, Shearer MP, Meyer D, Hurtado C, Nuzzo JB. Outbreaks of hepatitis A in US communities, 2017–2018: Firsthand experiences and operational lessons from public health responses. Am J Public Health 2019;109(S4):S297–302. [PubMed: 31505154]
- [11]. Fiore AE, Wasley A, Bell BP. Prevention of hepatitis A through active or passive immunization: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). MMWR Recomm Rep 2006;55:1–23.
- [12]. Hill HA, Yankey D, Elam-Evans LD, Singleton JA, Pingali SC, Santibanez TA. Vaccination coverage by age 24 months among children born in 2016 and 2017 - National Immunization Survey-Child, United States, 2017–2019. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2020;69(42):1505–11.
 [PubMed: 33090985]
- [13]. Immunization Action Coalition. Hepatitis A vaccine mandates for child care and K-12. 2019. https://www.immunize.org/laws/hepa.asp [accessed 28 December 2020].
- [14]. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Outbreak-specific considerations for hepatitis A vaccine administration; 2020. https://www.cdc.gov/hepatitis/outbreaks/ InterimOutbreakGuidance-HAV-VaccineAdmin.htm [accessed 22 December 2020].

\mathbf{r}
a.
-
~
0
-
~
\leq
5
L L
F
IUE
nut
anus
anusc
anuscr
anuscrij

Author Manuscript

Table 1

Prevalence of documented Advisory Committee for Immunization Practices indications for hepatitis A vaccination among adult hepatitis A outbreakassociated cases - Kentucky, Michigan, and West Virginia, 2016-2019.¹

Specific indications in effect during study period1 (0.1)0 (0.0)People traveling to or working in countries that have high or intermediate1 (0.1)0 (0.0)Men who have sex with men 2 15 (2.9)4 (1.4)Men who have sex with men 2 15 (2.9)2 60 (55.7)People with chronic liver disease 3 437 (53.8)260 (55.7)Prople with chronic liver disease 3 594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Any indication594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Prople with chronic liver disease 3 594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Any indications594 (73.2)260 (55.7)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Multiple indications594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Prople experiencing homelessness2 (13.2)50 (10.7)Prople living with HIV2 (0.2)1 (0.2)Any indications94 (11.6)51 (10.9)Multiple indications0 (0.0)0 (0.0)Overall0 (0.0)0 (0.0)0 (0.0)		
People traveling to or working in countries that have high or intermediate $1(0.1)$ $0(0.0)$ Men who have sex with men ² $15 (2.9)$ $4 (1.4)$ Men who have sex with men ² $437 (5.5)$ $260 (55.7)$ People who use injection or noninjection drugs $437 (5.3)$ $260 (55.7)$ People with chronic liver disease ³ $315 (3.8)$ $341 (73.0)$ Multiple indications $315 (38.8)$ $311 (38.8)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $315 (38.8)$ $181 (38.8)$ People experiencing homelessness $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People living with HIV $2 (0.2)$ $1 (0.2)$ Any indications $94 (11.6)$ $51 (10.9)$ Multiple indications $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$		
Men who have sex with men 2 15 (2.9)4 (1.4)People who use injection or noninjection drugs459 (56.5)260 (55.7)People with chronic liver disease 3 437 (53.8)260 (55.7)Any indication594 (73.2)341 (73.0)Any indications315 (38.8)341 (73.0)Multiple indications implemented after the study period and assessed315 (38.8)181 (38.8)Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed92 (11.3)50 (10.7)People experiencing homelessness92 (11.3)50 (10.7)People living with HIV2 (0.2)1 (0.2)Any indications0 (0.0)0 (0.0)Overall0.000 (0.0)	0 (0.0) 1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
People who use injection drugs $459 (56.5)$ $260 (55.7)$ People with chronic liver disease ³ $437 (53.8)$ $260 (55.7)$ Any indication $594 (73.2)$ $241 (73.0)$ Any indications $594 (73.2)$ $341 (73.0)$ Multiple indications $315 (38.8)$ $341 (73.0)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $315 (38.8)$ $181 (38.8)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People experiencing homelessness $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People living with HIV $2 (0.2)$ $1 (0.2)$ Any indications $94 (11.6)$ $51 (10.9)$ Multiple indications $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$	4 (1.4) 11 (17.5)	0 (0.0)
People with chronic liver disease 3 $437 (53.8)$ $260 (55.7)$ Any indication $594 (73.2)$ $341 (73.0)$ Any indications $594 (73.2)$ $341 (73.0)$ Multiple indications $315 (38.8)$ $311 (73.0)$ Multiple indications implemented after the study period and assessed $315 (38.8)$ $341 (73.0)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People experiencing homelessness $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People living with HIV $2 (0.2)$ $1 (0.2)$ Any indications $94 (11.6)$ $51 (10.9)$ Multiple indications $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$	260 (55.7) 47 (51.1)	152(60.1)
Any indication $594 (73.2)$ $341 (73.0)$ Multiple indications $315 (38.8)$ $315 (38.8)$ $311 (73.0)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $315 (38.8)$ $181 (38.8)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People experiencing homelessness $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People living with HIV $2 (0.2)$ $1 (0.2)$ Any indication $94 (11.6)$ $51 (10.9)$ Multiple indications $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$	260 (55.7) 32 (34.8)	145 (57.3)
Multiple indications $315 (38.8)$ $181 (38.8)$ Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ rerospectively $92 (11.3)$ $50 (10.7)$ People experiencing homelessness $2 (0.2)$ $1 (0.2)$ Any indication $94 (11.6)$ $51 (10.9)$ Multiple indications $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$ Overall $0 (0.0)$ $0 (0.0)$	341 (73.0) 63 (68.5)	190 (75.1)
Specific indications implemented after the study period and assessed92 (11.3)50 (10.7)People experiencing homelessness92 (11.3)50 (10.7)People living with HIV2 (0.2)1 (0.2)Any indication94 (11.6)51 (10.9)Multiple indications0 (0.0)0 (0.0)Overall000	181 (38.8) 27 (29.3)	107 (42.3)
People experiencing homelessness 92 (11.3) 50 (10.7) People living with HIV 2 (0.2) 1 (0.2) Any indication 94 (11.6) 51 (10.9) Multiple indications 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)		
People living with HIV 2 (0.2) 1 (0.2) Any indication 94 (11.6) 51 (10.9) Multiple indications 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0) Overall 0 0	50 (10.7) 10 (10.9)	32 (12.6)
Any indication 94 (11.6) 51 (10.9) Multiple indications 0 (0.0) 0 (0.0) Overall 0 0	1 (0.2) 1 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
Multiple indications0 (0.0)0 (0.0)Overall	51 (10.9) 11 (12.0)	32 (12.6)
Overall	0 (0.0) 0 (0.0)	$0\ (0.0)$
Any indication 602 (74.1) 346 (74.1)	346 (74.1) 64 (69.6)	192 (75.9)
Multiple indications 342 (42.1) 198 (42.4)	198 (42.4) 31 (33.7)	113 (44.7)

Vaccine. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 March 25.

² Restricted to adult male cases. Overall n = 509; Kentucky n = 295, Michigan n = 63, West Virginia n = 151.

(laboratory evidence of prior exposure or current infection, or hepatitis C diagnosed in the medical record), alcoholic liver disease, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, autoimmune hepatitis, or cirrhosis. ³Defined, for the purposes of the analysis, as history of hepatitis B (laboratory evidence of prior exposure or current infection, or hepatitis B diagnosed in the medical record), history of hepatitis C

~
1
2
0
-
~
\geq
0)
~
_
~
0
0
-
<u> </u>
0
+

Author Manuscript

Table 2

Postexposure prophylaxis administration among hepatitis A outbreak-associated cases epidemiologically linked to a known hepatitis A case - Kentucky, Michigan, and West Virginia, 2016-2019 (n = 141).¹

	Overall, n (%)	Kentucky, n (%)	Michigan, n (%)	West Virginia, n (%)
Proportion of epidemiologically linked outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases that did not receive PEP	51 (36.2)	38 (52.8)	11 (78.6)	2 (3.6)
Proportion of epidemiologically linked outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases that did receive PEP	12 (8.5)	6 (8.3)	3 (21.4)	3 (5.5)
PEP was administered outside the recommended window ²	8 (66.7)	4 (66.7)	2 (66.7)	2 (66.7)
Proportion of epidemiologically linked outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases with unknown PEP status	78 (55.3)	28 (38.9)	0(0.0)	50 (90.9)

 \int_{R} Restricted to those who were designated as epidemiologically linked to a known hepatitis A outbreak-associated case (n = 141 overall; n = 72 for Kentucky, n = 14 for Michigan, n = 55 for West Virginia).

 2 Restricted to those epidemiologically linked outbreak-associated hepatitis A cases that did receive PEP.