2-Dose Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccination Schedules

Lauri Markowitz, MD NCHHSTP/CDC

Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices 6/25/2014



National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD and TB Prevention

Division of STD Prevention

Overview

- Background
- Recommendations/regulatory approvals
- Data on 2-dose schedules
- Countries using 2-dose schedules
- Considerations for the US
- Work Group plans

Background HPV vaccines licensed in the United States

	Quadrivalent (HPV4) (Gardasil)	Bivalent (HPV2) (Cervarix)
HPV types	6, 11, 16, 18	16,18
Adjuvant	AAHS	ASO4
Licensed	Females and males ages 9-26 yrs	Females ages 9-25 yrs
Schedule	3 doses (0,2,6 months)	3 doses (0,1,6 months)

AAHS: 225 μ g amorphous aluminum hydroxyphosphate sulfate AS04: 500 μ g aluminum hydroxide and 50 μ g 3-O-desacyl-4'monophosphoryl lipid A

Background Data required for licensure of currently available HPV vaccines

Efficacy trials in 15-26 year olds

Endpoints – precancer lesions

Bridging immunogenicity trials in 9-15 year olds

 Licensure in this age group based on non-inferior antibody response compared with women in efficacy trials

Background GMTs one month after 3rd dose of HPV4, by age at enrollment



Giuliano, et al. JID 2007

Background HPV vaccines - immunogenicity

- Main basis of protection is neutralizing antibody
- The minimum protective antibody threshold not known
- Vaccination induces antibody titers higher than natural infection
- In clinical trials, some HPV4 vaccinees lost detectable HPV 18 antibody*, but no loss of protection

*by competitive Luminex immunoassay

Interest in 2-dose or alternative schedules

- Global interest in simplified schedules for HPV vaccine
- More convenient for providers, parents and vaccinees
- Facilitate implementation
 - Reduce logistical challenges
 - Decrease resource needs

Immunologic basis of HPV vaccination schedules

- 3-dose schedule (0, 1-2, 6 months) can be considered a "prime-prime-boost"
- 2-dose schedule (0,6 months) can be considered "primeboost"
- Memory B cells require at least 4-6 months to mature and differentiate into high-affinity B cells*
 - 6 month interval between first and last dose allows last dose to efficiently reactivate memory B cells

*Siegrist. Chapter 2. Vaccine Immunology. In Vaccines 2013

WHO's Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) on Immunization, April 2014

- SAGE recommends a 2-dose HPV vaccination schedule for girls, if vaccination is initiated prior to 15 years of age
 - Minimal interval between 2 doses is 6 months
 - Interval may be extended to 12 months if facilitates administration
- 3-dose schedule remains necessary if immunization is initiated after the 15th birthday
- 3-dose schedule (at 0, 1-2, 6 months) remains recommended for immunocompromised individuals, including those known to be HIV-infected

http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/meetings/2014/april/report_summary_april_2014/en/ http://www.who.int/immunization/sage/meetings/2014/april/presentations_background_docs/en

Regulatory approval for 2-dose HPV vaccination schedules

□ HPV2

Europe (EU and 5 other), Africa (18), Latin America (13), Asia (14)

HPV4

Europe (EU), Africa (1), Latin America (8), Asia (1)

Consideration for 2-dose HPV vaccination schedules in the US-Regulatory issues

- HPV2 no submission to FDA
- □ HPV4 no plans for submission to FDA
- □ 9vHPV
 - No data on 2 dose schedules included in BLA currently under consideration by FDA
 - 2 vs 3 dose trial initiated by manufacturer*

BLA, Biologics License Application; 9vHPV, investigational 9-valent HPV vaccine

Data on 2-dose schedules for HPV2 and HPV4

- Immunogenicity
- Efficacy (post hoc analyses)
- Effectiveness

Data on 2-dose schedules for HPV2 and HPV4

Immunogenicity

Efficacy (post hoc analyses)

Effectiveness

Immunogenicity studies comparing 2 and 3 doses of HPV vaccine

Study	Country	Vaccine	Design Age and doses	Schedules	Longest followup
Romanowski (048) Hum Vaccin 2011* Hum Vaccin 2014	Canada/ Germany	HPV2	9-142 doses9-143 doses15-253 doses	0,6 0,1,6 0,1,6	24 mos 48 mos
Puthanakit (070) EUROGIN 2013 ESPID 2014	Multi- national	HPV2	9-142 doses9-142 doses15-253 doses	0,6 0,12 0,1,6	~12 mos
Lazcano-Ponce Vaccine 2014	Mexico	HPV2	9-102 doses9-103 doses18-243 doses	0,6 0,1,6 0,1,6	21 mos
Dobson JAMA 2013	Canada	HPV4	9-132 doses9-133 doses16-263 doses	0,6 0,2,6 0,2,6	36 mos
Sankaranarayanan EUROGIN 2013	India	HPV4	10-18 2 doses 10-18 3 doses	0,6 0,2,6	18 mos

Differences in proportions seroconverting or seropositive: girls receiving 2 doses & women receiving 3 doses

Income stratum, HPV type Study name, sample date after 1st do	ose	Difference in proportion seropositive (95% CI)	n 2-dose 3-dose) schedule schedu	e Schedules, months le (age group, years)
<i>High income, HPV16</i> Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 7 montl Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 24 mor	hs ths	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02) 0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	65/65 111/11 64/64 101/10	1 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25) 1 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25)
Canada1, quadrivalent, 7 months Canada1, quadrivalent, 24 months Canada1, quadrivalent, 36 months	1	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01) 0.00 (-0.01, 0.01) 0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	243/243 246/24 195/195 189/18 86/86 86/86	 6 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26) 9 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26) 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26)
Multinational2, bivalent, 7 months	+	0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	540/540 432/43	2 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25)
<i>Middle income, HPV16</i> Mexico, bivalent, 7 months Mexico, bivalent, 21 months		0.00 (-0.00, 0.00) 0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	1016/1016 317/31 976/976 298/29	7 0, 6 (9-10) vs. 0, 1, 6 (18-24) 8 0, 6 (9-10) vs. 0, 1, 6 (18-24)
High income, HPV18				
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 7 mont Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 24 mor	hs	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02) 0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	64/64 114/11 63/63 103/10	4 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25) 3 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25)
Canada1, quadrivalent, 7 months Canada1, quadrivalent, 24 months Canada1, quadrivalent, 36 months		0.00 (-0.01, 0.01) 0.06 (-0.01, 0.13) 0.07 (-0.04, 0.18)	243/243 264/26 174/195 168/20 74/86 76/96	 4 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26) 2 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26) 0, 6 (9-13) vs. 0, 2, 6 (16-26)
Multinational2, bivalent, 7 months		0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	536/536 432/43	2 0, 6 (9-14) vs. 0, 1, 6 (15-25)
Middle income, HPV18				
Mexico, bivalent, 9-10 vs 18-24 y		0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	1016/1016 317/31	7 0, 6 (9-10) vs. 0, 1, 6 (18-24)
Mexico, bivalent, 9-10 vs 18-24 y		0.00 (-0.00, 0.00)	976/976 298/29	8 0, 6 (9-10) vs. 0, 1, 6 (18-24)
	105 0 .05	I I .1 .2 D)ifference in propor	tions seropositive
	Favours 3 doses	Favours 2 doses	F F F F F F F.	

D'Addario, et al. Systematic review prepared for SAGE 2014

Canada1 = Dobson; Canada/Germany1 = Romanowski (Protocol 048) Multinational 2= Protocol 070

Weighted mean differences between GMCs*: girls receiving 2 doses & women receiving 3 doses



D'Addario, et al. Systematic review prepared for SAGE 2014

Canada1 = Dobson; Canada/Germany1 = Romanowski (Protocol 048) 16 Multinational2 = Protocol 070

Differences in proportions seroconverting or seropositive between girls receiving 2 or 3 doses

Income stratum, HPV type Study name, sample date after 1st dose	Difference in proportion seropositi∨e (95% CI)	2-dose schedule	3-dose schedule	Schedules, months
High income, HPV16		1		
Canada/Germany1, month 7	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	65/65	67/67	0, 6 ∨s. 0, 1, 6
Canada/Germany1, month 24	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	64/64	61/61	0, 6 ∨s. 0, 1, 6
Canada1, month 7	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	243/243	251/251	0, 6 vs. 0, 2, 6
Canada1, month 24	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	195/195	186/186	0, 6 vs. 0, 2, 6
Canada1, month 36	0.00 (-0.02, 0.02)	86/86	83/83	0, 6 vs. 0, 2, 6
High income, HPV18				
Canada/Germany1, month 7	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	64/64	68/68	0, 6 ∨s, 0, 1, 6
Canada/Germany1, month 24	0.00 (-0.03, 0.03)	63/63	63/63	0, 6 ∨s. 0, 1, 6
Canada1, month 7	0.00 (-0.01, 0.01)	243/243	252/252	0, 6 ∨s. 0, 2, 6
Canada1, month 24	-0.05 (-0.11, 0.00)	174/195	176/186	0, 6 vs. 0, 2, 6
Canada1, month 36	-0.09 (-0.18, -0.00)	74/86	79/83	0, 6 vs. 0, 2, 6
2105 0 .05 .1	l .2 Differei	nce in propo	rtions seropo	ositi∨e
Favours 3 doses Favours 2	doses		·	

17

Weighted mean differences between GMCs: girls receiving 2 or 3 doses, 1 month after last dose



D'Addario, et al. Systematic review prepared for SAGE 2014 Canada1 = Dobson; Canada/Germany1 = Romanowski (Protocol 048) 18

Comparison of different interval 2-dose schedules, HPV2 vaccine

Income stratum, HPV type Study name, vaccine, age group	Weighted meanSchedules,difference (95% CI)months (dosage)
High income, HPV16, 9-14 year old	
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 9-14 y	0.72 (0.47, 0.97) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
High income, HPV18, 9-14 year old	
Canada/Germany1, bivalent	0.47 (0.20, 0.74) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
High income, HPV16, other ages	
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 15-19 yrs	0.76 (0.48, 1.04) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 20-25 yrs	0.55 (0.23, 0.87) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.318)	0.67 (0.46, 0.88)
High income, HPV18, other ages	
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 20-25 yrs	• 0.43 (0.05, 0.81) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
Canada/Germany1, bivalent, 15-19 yrs	• 0.72 (0.42, 1.03) 0, 6 (20 μg) vs. 0, 2 (20 μg)
Subtotal (I-squared = 26.3%, p = 0.244)	0.60 (0.32, 0.88)
-1.5 -15 0	.5 1 1.5 Weighted mean difference between GMCs
Favours snorter Interval	Favours longer Interval

D'Addario, et al. Systematic review prepared for SAGE 2014

Canada/Germany1 = Romanowski (Protocol 048)

Bivalent HPV vaccine (HPV2): data on 2-dose schedules

Immunogenicity data

- Study HPV-048^a (Canada/Germany)
- Study HPV-070^b (Multinational)

Efficacy data

- Post hoc analysis of Costa Rica efficacy trial^c
- Post hoc analysis of GSK pivotal efficacy trial (unpublished)

^aRomanowski et al, Hum Vaccin 2011 and 2014 ^bPuthanakit et al, EUROGIN 2013 ^cKreimer et al, JNCI 2011

HPV2 immunogenicity trial: 2 vs 3 doses (protocol 048)

- Dose ranging and 2 vs 3 dose trial
- 48 month follow-up: licensed formulation in 2 groups
 - 2 doses in 9-14 year olds and 3 doses in 15-25 year olds

- All subjects remained seropositive for HPV16 and 18 by ELISA at month 48
- GMTs non-inferior for 2 dose group compared with 3 dose group
- Antibody kinetics similar in both groups

HPV 18 GMTs



Romanowski et al, Hum Vaccin 2014

Natural infection: GMT in subjects who had cleared a natural infection Plateau: GMT at the plateau level (Month 45–50) after vaccination

HPV2 immunogenicity trial: 2 vs 3 doses (protocol 070)



*referred to as "multinational" in SAGE review <u>http://www.gsk-clinicalstudyregister.com</u>

HPV2 immunogenicity trial: 2 vs 3 doses (protocol 070)

HPV 16 GMTs at 1 month and 6 months after last dose



ELISA, initially seronegative participants

Puthanakit et al. ESPID 2014

Post-hoc evaluation of efficacy against persistent infection, HPV2 trial, Costa Rica

- RCT in women aged 18-25 yrs; 20% received less than 3 doses
- Endpoint was incident infection that lasted at least 10 months*

Doses	Arm	Ν	Events	%	VE	(95% Cl)
3 doses	HPV	2957	25	0.8%	90.00/	(71.1, 87.7)
	Control	3010	133	4.4%	80.9%	
2 doses	HPV	422	3	0.7%	0/ 10/	
	Control	380	17	4.5%	04.170	(30.2, 90.3)
1 dose	HPV	196	0	0.0%	100.09/	(66 F 100)
	Control	188	10	5.3%	100.0%	(00.5, 100)

*Excludes women DNA positive to HPV16/18 and those with no follow-up; Median time of follow-up post first dose, 4.2 yrs

Kreimer A, et al. JNCI 2011

Post-hoc evaluation of efficacy against 6 month persistent infection, HPV2 trial (protocol 008)

- Pivotal RCT in 15-25 yr old females (N=18,729)
- 997(5%) received 2 doses

Doses	Arm	Ν	Events	VE	(95% Cl)
3 doses	HPV	5427	35	02 70/	$(01\ 1\ 05\ 6)$
	Control	5339	521	93.1%	(91.1,93.0)
2 doses	HPV	117	0	1009/	(22.1, 100)
	Control	118	7	100%	(55.1, 100)

*HPV-naïve at enrollment, with follow-up information

Quadrivalent HPV vaccine (HPV4): data for 2-dose schedules

Immunogenicity data

- 2 doses in younger adolescents vs 3 doses in young women^a
- Alternative 3-dose schedules in girls 11 to 13 years^b

^aDobson, et al. JAMA 2013 ^bNeuzil, et al. JAMA 2011 and LaMontagne, et al. JID 2014

HPV4: 2-dose vs 3-dose immunogenicity trial, Canada



HPV4: 2-dose vs 3-dose immunogenicity trial (36 month results)

HPV Type	2 dose 9-13 yrs	/3 dose 16-26 yrs	2 dose 9-13 yr	s/3 dose 9-13 yrs
	GMTratio	(95% Cl)	GMTratio	(95% Cl)
HPV 6	1.36	(0.97, 1.90)	0.64	(0.46, 0.90)
HPV 11	1.43	(1.03, 1.99)	0.73	(0.52, 1.02)
HPV 16	1.70	(1.16, 2.49)	0.81	(0.55, 1.20)
HPV 18	1.46	(0.88, 2.41)	0.43	(0.26, 0.73)

• Main analysis comparing 2-dose 9-13 yrs with 3-dose 16-26 yrs

- Non-inferiority criteria met
- Antibody response generally higher in the 9-13 yr olds
- Analysis comparing 2-dose and 3-dose 9-13 yrs
 - Non-inferiority lost for HPV 18 by 24 months and HPV 6 by 36 months

HPV4: 2-dose vs 3-dose immunogenicity trial HPV 16 and 18 GMTs



Green = 3 dose women; Black = 2 dose girls, Red = 3 dose girls

From: Dobson, et al, JAMA 2013

HPV4: Randomized trial of alternative 3-dose schedules, Vietnam



Results

- GMTs1 month post dose 3
 - 0,3,9 and 0,6,12 schedules: non-inferiority criteria met for all types
- GMTs 29-32 months post dose 3
 - All schedules: non-inferiority criteria met for all types

HPV4: Randomized trial of alternative 3-dose schedules, post dose 2 GMTs

- Serology sample drawn pre and post dose 3
- Trend for higher antibody levels pre dose 3 with increasing intervals between dose 1 and dose 2

Schedule (months)	Pre dose 3 HPV 16 GMT (95% Cl)	Months between dose 2 & blood draw
0,2,6	657 (573,752)	4
0,3,9	881 (776,999)	6
0,6,12	921 (748, 1133)	6
0,12,24	1581 (1373,1821)	12

Data on 2-dose schedules for HPV2 and HPV4

Immunogenicity
 Efficacy (post hoc analyses)
 Effectiveness

Post-licensure monitoring of HPV vaccine impact

- Population level impact on some early outcomes* has been demonstrated in countries with high as well as those with low or moderate vaccine coverage
 - Australia
 - Denmark
 - Germany
 - New Zealand
 - Scotland
 - Sweden
 - United Kingdom
 - United States

*HPV vaccine type prevalence, genital warts, cervical lesions

Studies that examined HPV vaccine effectiveness by number of doses

Study	Country /vaccine	Design	Outcome
Gertig BMC Med 2013	Australia HPV4	Retrospective cohort study using linked registry data	Cytological and histological cervical abnormalities
Crowe BMJ 2014	Australia HPV4	Case-control study using linked registry data	Histologically confirmed high grade cervical lesions
Herweijer JAMA 2014	Sweden HPV4	Open cohort using nationwide health data registers	Condyloma
Kavanagh BJC 2014	Scotland HPV2	Cross section of women screened for cervical cancer	HPV prevalence

Challenges and Limitations:

- Outcomes in 'catch-up' population
- Differences between 2 and 3 dose recipients
- Evaluations do not examine 0,6 month 2-dose schedule

HPV4: Effectiveness for prevention of cervical abnormalities, Australia

Outcome/doses	No. woman doses	No.of abnormalities	Rate	Hazard Ratio
CIN3/AIS				
unvaccinated	15,192	61	2.8	1.0
1 dose	2,568	12	4.3	1.40 (.75, 2.61)
2 doses	3,412	11	2.7	0.87 (.46, 1.67)
3 doses	21,199	47	1.5	0.53 (.36, .77)
CIN2				
unvaccinated	15,192	87	4.0	1.0
1 dose	2,568	16	5.7	1.29 (.76,2.20)
2 doses	3,412	18	4.4	0.99 (.59, 1.64)
3 doses	21,199	88	2.9	0.70 (.52, .94)

HPV4: Effectiveness study in Australia (cont.)

• Compared with women who received 3 doses:

- Women who received 1 or 2 doses
 - Younger age at first screening (earlier sexual debut)
 - Older at vaccination
 - Lower SES

HPV4: Effectiveness study for prevention of cervical abnormalities, Australia (case - control study)

	Controls	High grade cases	Adjusted OR
11-27 yrs			
unvaccinated	53,032	729	Ref
1 dose	9,535	114	0.95 (.77, 1.16)
2 doses	10,850	100	0.79 (.64, .98)
3 doses	22,987	119	0.54 (.43, .67)
15-18 yrs			
unvaccinated	9,918	101	Ref
1 dose	2,564	22	0.86 (.54, 1.37)
2 doses	4,195	31	0.77 (.51, 1.16)
3 doses	15,367	59	0.43 (.31, .62)

HPV4: Effectiveness for prevention of condyloma, Sweden

- □ Open cohort of all females aged 10 24 yrs living in Sweden
- □ Followed 2006 2010 using population-based health registers
- □ >1 million females; 20,383 genital wart cases

Number of doses	Incidence ratio	(95% CI)
Unvaccinated	Ref	-
1 dose	0.31	(.20, .49)
2 doses	0.29	(.21,40)
3 doses	0.18	(.15, .22)

Girls vaccinated at 10-16 years

Main analysis used 3 months between vaccination and case counting

With a time
 <u>></u>5 months, no statistically significant difference in the risk of condyloma between 2 and 3 doses recipients

HPV2: Effectiveness for prevention of HPV vaccine type prevalence, Scotland

- Cross sectional study, women aged 20 21 yrs presenting for cervical cancer screening
- \Box 4729 samples tested from 2009 2012
- Data linked to immunization registries

Number of doses	Adjusted OR	(95% Cl)
Unvaccinated	Ref	-
1 dose	0.95	(.51, 1.76)
2 doses	0.68	(.42, 1.12)
3 doses	0.43	(.34, .55)

Summary: 2-dose schedules

Immunogenicity

- HPV2 and HPV4: GMTs non-inferior after 2 doses given 6 mos apart in young adolescent girls compared with 3 doses (0,1-2,6 mos) in 15-26 yr olds
- HPV2 and HPV4: GMTs lower but non-inferior after 2 doses (0,6 mos) compared with 3 doses (0,1-2,6 mos) in young adolescents; HPV4: non-inferiority lost for HPV 6 and 18 at later time points
- <u>HPV2 and HPV4</u>: GMTs higher with longer interval between doses for 2-dose schedules

Summary: 2-dose schedules

Efficacy

- <u>HPV2</u>: 2 small post-hoc efficacy analyses found high efficacy with 2 doses
- <u>HPV4</u>: More data available in future from study in India?

Effectiveness

- 4 post-licensure effectiveness evaluations evaluated number of doses: HPV4 (3 studies) and HPV2 (1 study)
- Lower effectiveness found for 2 vs 3 doses
- However, there are limitations and challenges with post licensure effectiveness evaluations:
 - 2-dose recipients did not receive 0,6 month schedule
 - Differences between 2-dose and 3-dose recipients
 - Outcomes in 'catch-up' population

Remaining questions

- Differences in duration of protection for 2- and 3-dose schedules?
 - Longer follow-up will be available from some studies
 - Modeling studies suggest*
 - If 2-dose schedules protect for 20 years, then the benefits of the 3rd dose are small
 - If 2 doses protect for 10 years, then the 3rd dose may prevent as many cancers as the first 2 doses

Examples of national/provincial programs with 2-dose or "extended 3-dose" (0, 6, 60 months) schedules

Quebec, Canada

- Implemented extended HPV4 3-dose schedule in 2008
- Changed to HPV4 2-dose schedule in 2013

British Columbia, Canada

Changed from HPV4 3-dose schedule to extended HPV4 3-dose schedule in 2010

Mexico

Using extended 3-dose schedule (since national program 2012)

Switzerland

Changed from 3-dose to 2-dose schedule for 11-14 yr olds in 2012

England

• Will change from HPV4 3-dose to HPV4 2-dose schedule in fall of 2014*

Regulatory consideration of 2-dose HPV vaccination schedules in the US

- HPV2 no submission to FDA
- □ HPV4 no plans for submission to FDA
- □ 9vHPV
 - No data on 2 doses included in BLA currently under consideration by FDA
 - 2 vs 3 dose trial initiated by manufacturer

9vHPV - 2 vs 3 dose trial

- Immunogenicity trial
- □ Start date: 12/2013; last visit: 7/2015
- □ 5 arms (N=1500)
 - 2 doses 0,6 months: 9-14 yr old girls
 - 2 doses 0,6 months: 9-14 yr old boys
 - 2 doses 0,12 months: 9-14 yr old girls and boys
 - 3 doses 0,2,6 months: 9-14 yr old girls and boys
 - 3 doses 0,2,6 months: 15-26 yr old women

Summary HPV vaccine WG plans

Review and consider 9vHPV as 3-dose schedule

 Consider 2-dose schedules when data from 2 vs 3 dose trial of 9vHPV available

Other options discussed:

- Consider a 2-dose schedule now for HPV2 and HPV4 in 9-14 year-olds
- If a 2-dose schedule is recommended, options when 9vHPV licensed?
 - Wait until there are data for a 2-dose schedule before considering recommendations for 9vHPV
 - Recommend 9vHPV as 3-dose schedule
 - Recommend 9vHPV as 2-dose schedule, with no data

National estimated vaccination coverage levels among adolescents 13-17 years, NIS-Teen 2006-2012



National estimated HPV vaccination coverage, by number of doses among females 13-17 years, NIS-Teen 2007-2012



Source: MMWR.2013;62;685-93

Estimated ACIP timeline

ACIP Date	Торіс
Feb 2014	Attribution of types in HPV-associated disease 9vHPV clinical trial data
June 2014	9vHPV clinical trial data Policy questions to be addressed
Oct 2014	GRADE 9vHPV Economic analyses 9vHPV clinical trial data (Immunogenicity: males 16-26 years) Recommendation options
Feb 2015	Estimated earliest possible vote on 9vHPV
Oct 2015	Potential data from 9vHPV 2-dose trial

Acknowledgements

Harrell Chesson Robin Curtis Eileen Dunne Susan Hariri Mona Saraiya Shannon Stokley Elizabeth Unger

ACIP HPV Vaccine WG

Thank you

For more information please contact Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

1600 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30333 Telephone, 1-800-CDC-INFO (232-4636)/TTY: 1-888-232-6348 E-mail: cdcinfo@cdc.gov Web:www.cdc.gov

The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.



National Center for HIV/AIDS, Viral Hepatitis, STD & TB Prevention Division of Sexually Transmitted Disease Prevention