

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES  
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE  
CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

MINUTES OF MEETING

Immunization Practices Advisory Committee  
February 12-13, 1992  
Atlanta, Georgia

The Immunization Practices Advisory Committee (ACIP) met in Auditorium A at the Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, Georgia, on February 12-13, 1992. Those in attendance are listed below:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Dr. Samuel L. Katz, Chairman  
Dr. Katherine Edwards  
Dr. Neal Halsey  
Dr. Carlos E. Hernandez  
Dr. Gregory R. Istre  
Dr. Carlos Ramirez-Ronda  
Dr. Rudolph Jackson  
Dr. Mary E. Wilson

Ex Officio Members

Dr. Carolyn Hardegrave (FDA)  
Dr. John R. La Montagne (NIH)

Liaison Representatives

Dr. Pierce Gardner (ACP)  
Dr. Caroline B. Hall (AAP)  
Dr. Edward A. Mortimer, Jr. (AMA)  
Dr. Georges Peter (AAP)  
Dr. Michael Peterson (DoD)  
Dr. William Schaffner, II (AHA)  
Dr. Susan E. Tamblyn (NACI)  
Dr. Ronald C. Van Buren (AAFP)

Executive Secretary

Dr. Claire V. Broome

NAVY ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH CENTER

Capt. S. William Berg

ARMED FORCES EPIDEMIOLOGY BOARD

Capt. W.M. Parsons, MSC, USN

HHS STAFF PRESENT

Maj. Rob Lipnick, O

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Dr. Regina Rabinovi

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

Office of the General Counsel

Mr. Kevin M. Malone

Office of Health and Safety

Dr. Naima Abd Elgha

Epidemiology Program Office

Dr. Dan Fishbein  
Dr. Melinda Wharton

Center for Infectious Diseases

Dr. Miriam J. Alter  
Ms. Inger Baker  
Dr. Nancy Cox  
Ms. Henrietta Hall  
Dr. Harold Margolis  
Mr. James Miller  
Ms. Michele Pearson  
Ms. Helen Regnery  
Mr. Tom Toror  
Dr. Ted Tsai

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL (Cont'd)  
Center for Prevention Services

Dr. Robert Chen	Dr. Lauri Markowitz
Dr. Stephen Cochi	Ms. Anne Mellinger
Dr. Susan Davis	Ms. Susan Mims
Ms. Rosamond Dewart	Dr. Bernard Moriniere
Dr. Vance Dietz	Dr. Walter Orenstein
Mr. Gary Euler	Mr. Mark Papania
Ms. Judy Gantt	Dr. Peter Patriarca
Dr. Jacqueline Gindler	Dr. Desiree Rodgers
Dr. Mark Grabowsky	Mr. Stephen Sepe
Ms. Penima Haber	Dr. Raymond Strikas
Dr. Stephen Hadler	Dr. Peter Strebel
Dr. Alan Hinman	Mr. Roland Sutter
Ms. Sonja Hutchins	Dr. Steve Wassilak
Ms. Donna Jones	Mr. John Watson
Dr. Charles LeBavor	Dr. David J. West
Ms. Susan Lee	Dr. Walter Williams
Mr. Arthur Manoharan	

OTHERS PRESENT

Mr. L. Barreto, Connaught Labs  
Mr. Robert Byrd, Associated Press  
Dr. Pinya Cohen, Connaught Labs  
Mr. Corry Dekker, Uniron Corp.  
Mr. Ingram Douglas-Hall, SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceut als  
Dr. Geoffrey Evans  
Dr. Lisa Ford, Lederle Praxis  
Ms. Carol Frankel, Medeva International  
Ms. Jana Froeschle, Connaught Laboratories  
Ms. Rose Mary Hoy, Merck Vaccine Division  
Dr. Clare Kahn, SmithKline Beecham  
Dr. David Krause, SmithKline Beecham  
Dr. Saul Krugman, New York University Medical Center  
Mr. Toni Krzesowski, Parke-Davis  
Ms. Lin Wenlii, AMVAX, Inc.  
Ms. Anne Mather, Clayton, Georgia  
Mr. Charles Marwick, Journal of the American Medical Association  
Mr. Carlton Meschievitz, Connaught Labs  
Mr. Frank McCarthy, Wyeth Ayerst Laboratories  
Mr. David McClintock, Lederle-Praxis  
Mr. Andrew Murdin, Connaught Labs Ltd.  
Dr. David Nalin, Merck  
Dr. Pearay L. Ogra, Child Health Center, Galveston  
Mr. Peter Paradiso, Lederle Praxis  
Mr. Stanley Plotkin, Pasteur-Merieux  
Dr. Ciro de Quadros, Pan American Health Organization  
Mr. Hal Rathfon, Smith Kline Beecham  
Ms. Jane Scott, Lederle Laboratories  
Mr. Irwin Shapiro, Tanabe USA  
Dr. Judith Shindman, Connaught Laboratories, Ltd.  
Mr. Howard R. Six, CLI  
Mr. Dan Soland, CLI  
Dr. Jo White, Merck Sharpe & Dohme Research Labs  
Ms. Carolyn Weeks-Levy, Lederle Laboratories  
Mr. Chris Zurawsky, Infectious Disease News, SLACK, Inc.

# IMMUNIZATION PRACTICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA  
FEBRUARY 12-13, 1992  
AUDITORIUM A

## AGENDA

February 12, 1992

8:30 a.m.	Welcome and Opening Remarks	Dr. Samuel Katz Dr. Claire Broome
8:45 a.m.	Acellular Pertussis Vaccines: Supplementary Draft ACIP Statement on Connaught/Biken DTaP Vaccine	Dr. Steve Wassilak
9:00 a.m.	Polio Eradication and Measles Reduction in the Americas	Dr. Ciro de Quadros
10:00 a.m.	Japanese Encephalitis Vaccine	Dr. T. F. Tsai
10:30 a.m.	BREAK	
11:00 a.m.	Hepatitis A	Dr. Craig Shapiro
12:00 p.m.	Immunization of the Immunocompromised	Dr. Mark Grabowsky Dr. Ben Chen
12:45 p.m.	LUNCH	
1:45 p.m.	Meningococcal Disease in Canada	Dr. Susan Tamblyn Dr. John Wenger
2:00 p.m.	Reevaluation of Polio Vaccine Policy	Dr. Steve Cochi Dr. Ben Chen Dr. Vance Dietz Dr. Neil Halsey Dr. Owen Kew Dr. Percy Ogra Dr. Peter Strebel Dr. Ronald Sutter
2:45 p.m.	BREAK	
3:15 p.m.	Reevaluation of Polio Vaccine Policy (continued)	
4:45 p.m.	ACIP Statements: Purpose, Audiences, Length, and Format	Dr. Richard Goodman
5:30 p.m.	ADJOURN	

February 13, 1992

8:30 a.m.	Influenza Vaccine: Partial Strain Selection Information	Dr. Nancy Cox
	Surveillance and Special Studies	Dr. Louisa Chapman Dr. Joe Keenan
	Influenza Vaccine Supply and Distribution	Dr. Ray Strikas
	Revision of ACIP Influenza Vaccine Recommendations	Dr. Louisa Chapman Dr. Ali Khan
	False Positive Serologic Reactions for HIV, HTLVI and HCV After Influenza Vaccination	Dr. Joanna Suffington Dr. Jay Epstein
10:00 a.m.	BREAK	
10:30 a.m.	Report of the BCG Subcommittee	Dr. Pierce Gardner Dr. Dixie Rider Dr. Robin Leebner
11:15 a.m.	Assessment of Immunization Levels in Preschool Children	Dr. Betty Hill
11:40 a.m.	Vaccine Injury Compensation Program	Mr. Thomas J. Balbier, Jr. Dr. Geoff Evans
12:00 p.m.	Standards for Immunization Practice	Dr. Roger Bernier
12:15 p.m.	National Vaccine Program Update	Dr. Ken Baker CANCELLED
12:30 p.m.	ADJOURN	

2/6/92

## Executive Summary

On February 12-13, 1992, the ACIP convened at the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) to discuss the status of numerous vaccine-preventable diseases and vaccine-related issues. Dr. Samuel Katz presided as Chairperson; Dr. Claire Broome was Executive Secretary of the ACIP Committee. Gloria Kovach, the new staff specialist for the ACIP, was introduced to the Committee.

Acellular pertussis vaccines were the first subject for discussion. CDC's Dr. Steven Wassilak reported that the ACIP statement on this subject was at the printers; that Connaught had presented information for licensure of their acellular pertussis vaccine product for the fourth and fifth doses on November 12; and that the Lederle product was licensed on December 17. The price is \$15.56 per dose.

Dr. Ciro de Quadros, director of the Expanded Programme on Immunization for the Americas with the Pan American Health Organization (PAHO), updated the Committee on the polio eradication effort in the Western Hemisphere. He explained PAHO's system of negative reporting of cases of acute flaccid paralysis (AFP). Among 20,000 health units, 80% now report each week. If a unit is not reporting at least one case of AFP per 100,000, this indicates something is wrong with surveillance. Dr. Quadros also stated that this surveillance indicates that Guillain-Barre syndrome (GBS) is much more common than once believed in children under 5 years old.

Regarding the eradication effort, Mexico, Brazil, and Central America reported no cases in 1991. The dates of onset for the last cases were April 16, 1991, for Colombia and September 5, 1991, for Peru. Colombia has been the target of an intensive mop-up operation. One million households were visited within a 2-week period twice last year. The Minister of Health is launching another house-to-house campaign on February 17. And another major campaign, termed "the Last Inch," is about to be launched in Peru. Two million households will be visited from February 29 to March 8. This house-to-house effort will be repeated in May. Children under 5 years of age will get another dose of oral poliovirus (OPV).

PAHO has also just established surveillance for neonatal tetanus. They've learned that, of 14 districts, only about 10% are at high risk for this disease.

Dr. de Quadros also updated the ACIP on the measles initiative in the English-speaking Caribbean. Cuban led the way in attempting to eliminate the disease by vaccinating all children 1-15 years of age. The four to six cases still being reported each year from Cuba are probably not really measles.

Subsequently, the Ministers of the Caribbean countries adopted an

initiative to eliminate measles by 1995, using the Cuban strategy. In May, 1991, all the islands except Jamaica immunized children 9 months to 15 years regardless of previous vaccination status. Coverage was nearly 100%. In 1991, there were only three confirmed cases of measles in the Caribbean; all were imported from the United States. For 1992 thus far, only one case has been reported, also in a traveler from abroad.

As a result, an initiative to eliminate measles from the Central American countries by 1997 has been announced. Brazil is also launching a major campaign for measles elimination and will be immunizing all of its children from 1-14 years old. Chile and Argentina are also launching such projects.

As a result of all this interest, a meeting is being convened on February 28 to review what's happening in the region regarding measles and to see what PAHO can do to coordinate efforts.

Following Dr. de Quadros' presentation, Dr. Neal Halsey reported that at a meeting on February 11 at PAHO headquarters in Washington, D.C., new technical developments in measles antibody assays that will allow the diagnosis of laboratory confirmed measles with a single blood test were announced. Dr. William Bellini's laboratory, which has been instrumental in developing this technology, has agreed to provide the training and the resources to put this technology into the Caribbean and several other Latin American laboratories within the next couple months.

Japanese Encephalitis (JE) vaccine was discussed by CDC Dr. Ted Tsai. He reviewed experience from adverse events surveillance in Okinawa, Japan, begun after a mass immunization campaign against JE. The campaign was launched after an outbreak of three cases of JE occurred in active-duty Marine personnel on Okinawa last year.

CDC's Dr. Harold Margolis introduced a series of speakers to discuss the performance of hepatitis A vaccines in various stages of clinical trial and the epidemiology of this disease in the United States. Dr. David Nalin from Merck Sharp & Dohme presented results of his company's experiences with the Merck inactivated vaccine. The vaccine has been well tolerated, with only expected mild, local and transient reactions. What's more, a two-dose regimen yielded titers higher than those seen after immune serum globulin (IG).

Dr. David Krause of SmithKline Beecham, presented data on that company's candidate HM175-strain vaccine. First human trials were begun in 1988. To date, there have been 67 studies in 18 countries, involving 50,000 subjects. In terms of overall reactogenicity, about one-half of vaccinees report no symptoms after the first dose. The most common general symptoms are malaise or fatigue. Clinical trials on several thousand adults reveal that the seroconversion rate is 96% one month after the first dose and 100% after a second dose.

Dr. Charles Hoke from Walter Reed Army Institute of Research explained that soldiers are the heaviest consumers of IG in fact, Operation Desert Storm exhausted all IG supplies in the United States. He reported results of a field efficacy trial in Thailand of an inactivated hepatitis A vaccine. The SmithKline strain was used with approximately 20,000 5- to 14-year-old children; 20,000 received placebos. Thirty cases of hepatitis A occurred. Of these, 29 occurred in children who had received the placebo, and 1 in a children who had received the vaccine.

CDC's Dr. Craig Shapiro said that with two apparently safe, immunogenic, and efficacious vaccines available, the United States may soon be facing whether to license a vaccine for use in this country. He said that ideally this decision should be based on the epidemiology of hepatitis A in this country. Historically, there are periodic, nationwide epidemics of hepatitis A. There are significant geographic variations in the disease. Asymptomatic infection predominates in infants and children, but greater symptomatic disease and higher case-fatality rates occur in older adults. Racial/ethnicity data indicate that the disease is least prevalent among Asians and highest among American Indians. The most commonly reported risk factor for hepatitis A is contact--household or sexual--with an adult patient with hepatitis.

CDC's Dr. Robert Chen presented a draft ACIP statement on the use of vaccines and immune globulins in persons with altered immunocompetence. He explained changes. The Committee voted to leave out the column entitled "Routine (Not Immunocompromised)" in Table 2; to add a column on solid organ transplant recipients to the same table; and to mention in the statement that an ACIP statement on bone marrow transplantation is forthcoming.

Dr. Susan Tamblyn from the Canadian surveillance program discussed an outbreak of meningococcal disease in Canada. The proportion of cases attributed to Group C has increased from 26% of cases in 1983 to 63% of isolates by 1990. A unique Group C clone, T 15, is being isolated from an increasing proportion of cases--three-quarters in 1991. This clone appears to be the clone that was mainly responsible for clusters of disease that were seen in 1991.

Tremendous demand for vaccine was prompted by three deaths in teenagers in little over a week in Ottawa this past December. Then in early January two more cases, one fatal, occurred in Ottawa, prompting the decision to hold mass, publicly funded vaccinations in Ottawa and a number of other affected regions in Canada. Vaccine uptakes were very high--over 90% in Prince Edward Island. Very few adverse reactions have been reported. The Ontario Ministry of Health's passive surveillance system received 200-250 reports for the 140,000 doses administered. These were mostly local reactions.

CDC's Dr. Jay Wenger reported on the epidemiology of meningococcal

disease in Canada. He said it appears that particularly in children 10-19 years old, the rates of disease were in the range of 15-20/100,000--20 times normal. Given these data and the report of meningococcal disease in a traveler to Ottawa, CDC issued a limited Travelers' Advisory about January 17 suggesting that children 2-19 who were going to be in Canada for 3 days or longer should consider immunization. The clone causing disease in Canada is isolated throughout the United States.

Reevaluation of polio vaccine policy dominated the meeting for over 2 hours. Numerous speakers presented new information to be considered in an evaluation of the ACIP polio vaccination policy. CDC's Dr. Steve Cochi said that at least four options are possible: 1) to continue primary reliance on OPV (the present policy); 2) change to primary reliance on inactivated polio vaccine (IPV); 3) change to a mixed schedule of IPV, followed by OPV; and 4) no stated preference. When an Institute of Medicine committee considered the issue 4 years ago, it endorsed option #1, but proposed reconsidering the issue after additional data became available and after IPV was combined with DTP in a licensed product.

Presentations were made on the circulation of wild viruses in the country; the levels of immunity to poliovirus in adults and preschool children, especially those in inner cities; the extent of OPV vaccine virus spread to contacts of recipients; and the mixtures of IPV and OPV that would yield maximum benefit.

In reference to the last item, results of numerous studies were presented. They confirm that schedules using OPV or eIPV only, or sequential schedules with eIPV followed by OPV, are very effective in inducing antibodies to all three poliovirus serotypes, resulting in seroprevalence levels of virtually 100% after two to three doses and high GMTs. One study suggested that at least two doses of eIPV are needed before OPV to protect against recipient vaccine-associated paralytic disease. OPV-immunized children also had better intestinal, but similar pharyngeal immunity compared with eIPV-immunized children. OPV is an excellent boosting agent after eIPV; OPV given after three doses of eIPV induced a more augmented humoral response than OPV given after three doses of OPV. And finally, incorporation of at least one dose of eIPV at the start of the immunization schedule tends to increase systemic as well as local antibody production.

Two meetings on prospects for new polio vaccines were summarized by CDC's Dr. Olin Kew. One was a World Health Organization (WHO) meeting held in Geneva March 12-13, 1990. The other was an FDA-sponsored international workshop on poliovirus attenuation held December 9-10, 1991, in Bethesda. Dr. Kew said that attenuation involves a small number of substitution mutations; the poliovirus genome is exceptionally plastic; and attenuation involves differential growth in intestinal but not neural cells. Also



discussed were new approaches for OPV safety testing such as Chumakov's molecular tests, cellular assays, and transgenic mice. Dr. Kew said that the bottom-line conclusions from both meetings were that excellent progress has been made, but more needs to be done, and that no one is going to depart radically from the Sabin strains.

The manufacturers of combined DTP/eIPV vaccines next presented data. Dr. Carleton Meschievitz from Connaught/Pasteur demonstrated a dual-chamber syringe design so that thimerosal, a preservative in DTP, does not interfere with the poliovirus. The entry phase of Connaught's study of its vaccine is to be completed this month; submission of data to the FDA is planned for October.

Peter Paradiso, Lederle/Praxis, explained its priorities, particularly the combination products. Their liquid form of a DTP/HbOC combination vaccine, Tetramune™, has been fairly extensively studied as part of a three-dose, primary series (nearly 7,000 infants have received this vaccine). A license application has been submitted to FDA. The safety profile is excellent, and the immunogenicity is as good or better in the combined product.

Lederle has also combined its acellular pertussis vaccine with its HbOC combination vaccine for the 15-month dose. Final studies are completed; immunogenicity and safety studies have been initiated. Lederle hopes to file for license by year-end.

Following the polio presentations, Dr. Katz asked the Committee to assimilate all the information they had received in the context of the following: a) the policy question--Should we consider the reintroduction of IPV to precede OPV? b) Multivalent vaccines, which might combine *Hemophilus b* conjugate, hepatitis B, OP, eIPV; and c) whether the expense, time and change in policy are anachronistic in light of the move to eradicate polio within 8 years?

Dr. Richard Goodman, Editor of the *MMWR*, discussed the purpose, audiences, length, and format of ACIP statements. His primary concern was whether they are becoming too long and complex to be usable and readable. CDC has undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of the entire *MMWR* series, including a readership survey designed to characterize the audience and how it uses the publication. The evaluation is slated to be completed in about 18 months.

Several ACIP members and members of the audience commented that immunization divisions at the State level clearly need the technical statements although 95% of their questions are not that complicated; the detailed, "encyclopedic" knowledge is needed for the other 1%-5% of cases. Several people urged that the *MMWR* readership survey be sure to include State immunization divisions.

The Committee heard seven presentations on influenza vaccine. CDC's Dr. Nancy Cox said that the WHO strain selection meeting was not scheduled until the next week so she would be presenting only partial information on the strains selection for the 1992-93 influenza vaccine. The FDA Vaccine Advisory Committee met at the end of January. Based on data from a variety of laboratories present at the meeting, it was decided that the current influenza A(H3N2) component (A/Beijing/353/89 virus) would remain in next year's vaccine. As for influenza A(H1N1), for the first time since 1986-87, a variant that is different from A/Taiwan/01/87 has been identified. As for B viruses, virus isolates characterized thus far have been related to B/Panama.

Dr. Louisa Chapman said that the 1991-92 influenza season has been characterized by abrupt onset, the dominance of influenza A(H3N2) among circulating subtypes, and widespread reports of dramatic outbreaks among school children, beginning in October, superseded by reports of outbreaks among adult populations beginning in mid-November. Excess mortality was first evidenced in late December.

CDC's Dr. Joseph Kent presented information from nursing home outbreaks in New York, Ohio, and Connecticut. The investigations raised the question of whether the ACIP statement should recommend that the optimal timing of influenza vaccination activities be moved up substantially.

CDC's Dr. Raymond Strikas discussed CDC's findings about influenza vaccine supply and distribution, particularly during the last influenza season, prompted by widespread media reports of flu vaccine shortages. First, Federal, State and local government vaccine distribution accounts for less than 15% of the doses of influenza vaccine distributed. In 1991, manufacturers have produced 32 million doses--a 12.7% increase over the amount produced in 1990. A CDC survey of 55 immunization grant programs throughout the country was undertaken to determine the extent of vaccine shortages during the 1990-91 influenza season. On December 14, seventeen programs needed vaccine, for a net need of about 136,000 doses. However, eight programs had a surplus. Of the 50 States that did not purchase vaccine, 9 had some shortages. Wyeth-Ayerst Laboratories bottled an additional 650,000 doses that were available in December. All of these doses of vaccine have now been sold.

Revision of ACIP Influenza Vaccine Recommendations followed this discussion. Dr. Chapman returned to lead the Committee through suggested changes to the ACIP flu statement. Most were relatively minor, involving insertion of clarifying words or phrases, all highlighted on a handout. One of these--involving whether "child care facilities" should be spelled out as an example of an essential community service that might benefit from vaccination--caused considerable discussion. The Committee asked Dr. Chapman to draft a clear statement about the appropriateness of vaccinating

staff of institutions to minimize disruption of major services.

A proposed substantive word change to the document regarding vaccinating persons with known hypersensitivity to egg or other components of the influenza vaccine (i.e., thimerosal) was then introduced. CDC's Dr. Ali Khan reported on his investigation of these two areas. He said that only a minute amount of residual egg protein is in the influenza vaccine and that only rarely have these minute amounts been associated with anaphylaxis. Having a history of allergy to eggs, however, is an unreliable predictor of reactions to flu vaccine. Allergic individuals can be safely immunized if results of preliminary skin testing to influenza vaccines are negative. Even individuals who have positive intradermal skin testing to influenza vaccine may be successfully vaccinated. A desensitization protocol has been developed that has allowed some researchers to vaccinate children with physician-documented egg allergies and positive skin test results. But desensitization will not prevent anaphylaxis or other type I and type IV mediated reactions. Reports of anaphylaxis after influenza vaccination have been infrequent: 1-5 reports per year, though 20-25 million doses of vaccine distributed a year.

Dr. Khan then summarized his investigation of thimerosal. He said that it was apparent that a) exposure to vaccines containing thimerosal can lead to induction of hypersensitivity; b) most patients who have positive patch tests or intradermal tests to thimerosal do not develop local reactions to thimerosal administered as a component of vaccine; c) although vaccination will be safe for the vast majority of people with ocular or skin-test sensitivity, thimerosal can cause severe, but treatable hypersensitivity.

Dr. Chapman then led a discussion about changes to the ACIP flu statement pertinent to Dr. Khan's report. The proposed addition on thimerosal--basically as summarized above--was added, unchanged.

Both CDC suggestions about egg hypersensitivity concerned adding phrases about consulting "a physician, preferably a clinical allergist or immunologist." In each instance, the committee decided to recommend only consultation with a physician. Mention of undergoing appropriate skin testing was debated extensively. Consequently, Dr. Broome proposed that the subject of skin testing be added to the agenda for an upcoming ACIP meeting, since it had generated so many questions. The Committee agreed.

Discussion then turned to remaining proposed changes in the ACIP influenza document. The first concerned target groups for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination; members asked Dr. Chapman to rewrite this section. Next, the Committee adopted the revision to propose that the optimal timing of influenza vaccination activities be in the period October 15-November 15.

False-Positive Serologic Reactions for HIV, HTLV-1, and Influenza Vaccination were reported on by CDC's Dr. Joanna Buffington. In early December the FDA received reports from approximately 20 blood centers of 90 donors testing repeatedly reactive to two or more of the ELISA screening tests for antibodies to HIV, HTLV-1 and hepatitis C virus. These did not confirm positive with more specific tests. Sixty of the 90 donors reported receiving the 91-92 influenza vaccine prior to their donation. Although there was and is no association between disease and either getting a flu shot or donating blood, the publicly perceived risk of danger was a potential public health problem.

She gave the following results of a pilot study undertaken by the American Red Cross: a) Initial investigation revealed multiple false seroreactivity at two centers, first occurring in April, 1991, the month they changed manufacturers for their anti-HBV screening kits; b) The incidence of multiple false activity increased dramatically in October and November, 1991, incident with peak flu vaccination season; c) Although flu vaccination appeared to be significantly associated with this phenomenon, many cases reported no vaccination history; and d) The finding that donors who were retested several weeks after testing positive were subsequently found to be negative, suggests that the reaction may be transient.

To determine the extent and timing of these reactions, surveillance forms have been sent to almost 200 blood centers in the United States. A large case-control study involving approximately 15 centers is planned.

Dr. Pierce Gardner, liaison representative to the Committee from the American College of Physicians, reported that the B Working Group has a preliminary draft, and hopes to present a more final one at the June ACIP meeting.

Assessment of immunization levels in preschool children was next on the agenda. CDC's Dr. Betty Zell said that analysis of retrospective school immunization surveys reveals that the vast majority of children get into the immunization system prior to their second birthday, with the majority of these children receiving their first immunization prior to their first birthday b) if these children could be kept in the immunization system, coverage levels would increase considerably; c) an apparent problem is the fourth DTP; OPV3 and DTP4 should be given together 23%-63% of children receive their OPV 3 before their first birthday.

Dr. Geoff Evans, Deputy Director and Chief Medical Officer of the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program since January, gave a presentation on that program. For pre-1988 cases, 4,095 petitions have been filed. There are 210 post-1988 petitions. A total of 346 awards, totaling \$200.2 million, have been made as of last week. But relatively few cases from the prospective period have

been adjudicated. Awards for death cases are fixed at \$250,000 plus attorney fees. The average award for pre-1988 injury cases is \$1 million. The program predicts a tremendous shortfall of \$152.2 million. It will run out of money for the next fiscal year in the next month or two. The law's original shutdown provision--that if one of the portions of the program ran out of money, the program would stop within 6 months--has been repealed so that the program is retrospective portion is without funding, the prospective portion remains viable.

Eighty-five percent of cases are injuries; the rest are deaths. The program concedes about one-third of cases; the rest go to U.S. Claims Court. The program prevails in 40% of those cases. The program is regularly denied its viewpoint with SIDS cases.

Because of the looming fiscal crisis with the program, Dr. Mason appointed a task force last summer with two functions: 1) to come up with legislative proposals beginning with nonscientific kinds of proposals; 2) to form a scientific subgroup. The legislative group made several propositions, some of which have been adopted into law. The scientific subgroup, headed by Dr. Kenneth Bart, made suggested revisions to the Aids to Interpretation, based largely on an Institute of Medicine report issued last July. Those revisions were then presented to a specially formed subcommittee of the National Vaccine Advisory Committee (NVAC) and presented with its report in November. Those recommendations were then forwarded on to the Advisory Commission on Childhood Vaccines.

CDC's Dr. Roger Bernier gave a progress report of where we are in getting consensus for the publication of the new Standards for Immunization Practice. NVAC, in its review of the standards in November, asked for two changes. Dr. Bernier is working to resolve those issues before finalizing a draft. He is optimistic that the document will be finished in 30-60 days--before the next NVAC meeting in April. The ACIP would then see the final report at the June meeting.

Dr. Bernier gave ACIP members a working draft. The two points brought out by NVAC are: 1) should package inserts be mentioned, not just ACIP and the Red Book, as sources of information; 2) two new standards have been added (see pages 18-19 of handout).

There was considerable discussion about the third item under the Contraindication Table (page 16 of handout). It was pointed out that "administration of multiple live virus vaccines (MMR, V & MMR) within 30 days of one another if not given on the same day" is a theoretical risk, not a true contraindication. The ACIP didn't have quorum to vote, but the sense of those present was that the ACIP did not want this policy guideline listed as a true contraindication, but as a footnote.

Dr. Broome summarized Dr. Kenneth Bart's prepared update on the

National Vaccine Program. The acellular pertussis efficacy trial will begin shortly in Sweden. The budget initiatives for the next budget cycle have a continuing emphasis on infrastructure repair for vaccine delivery, surveillance for adverse events, and an initiative to accelerate vaccine development for STDs and TB and the Children's Vaccine Initiative. NVAC has created new subcommittees to deal with policy and management barriers and adult immunization. The National Vaccine Program office and CDC are working with the Health Care Financing Administration to review and make recommendations on Medicare and Medicaid regulations and guidelines as they relate to immunization coverage.

Dr. Broome reminded ACIP members that the dates of upcoming meetings are June 9-10 and October 21-22. The meeting adjourned at 12:22 p.m. A summary of requested follow-up actions appears at the end of the minutes.

The ACIP convened in Auditorium A of the CDC, Atlanta, Georgia, on February 12, 1992, at 8:35 a.m. Samuel Katz, M.D., W. Burt C. Davison Professor, Duke University Medical Center, presided as Chairperson.

In attendance were representatives of the pharmaceutical industry, media, academia, and interested groups, as well as members of national government agencies.

#### Welcome and Opening Remarks

Dr. Sam Katz, Chairman, opened the meeting by announcing that Dr. Mary Lou Clements and Dr. David Fraser would not be able to attend today's meeting. Dr. Katz then asked all persons in attendance to introduce themselves and to give their affiliations.

Dr. Katz then introduced Dr. Claire Broome, the Executive Secretary of the ACIP Committee. She introduced Gloria Kovach, the new staff specialist for the ACIP.

Dr. Broome also reported that three ACIP statements have been published since the October ACIP meeting, plus an ACIP report on the first acellular DTP is at the printers. This represents a substantial amount of committee work, for which Dr. Broome thanked members. She also reiterated that when members have agenda suggestions or comments to make about a particular topic, to address them to the presenter, but to copy her office.

Dr. Katz noted that he has one complaint for the editors of the *MMWR*, namely, that the subject of an ACIP statement needs to be listed as that in that publication's front-page table of contents, not as a "Notice to Readers," which can easily be missed. Dr. Broome said that this criticism had been formally discussed with the *MMWR* editors and would be acted upon.

#### Acellular Pertussis Vaccines: Supplementary Draft ACIP Statement on Connaught/Biken DTP Vaccine

Dr. Steve Wassilak, Division of Immunization (IM), National Center for Prevention Services (NCPS), reported that the draft ACIP statement on acellular pertussis vaccine (DTaP) is at the printers. At the October meeting, there had been one unresolved concern, namely, whether this vaccine should be given at all as the first three doses in children who were 2 years of age or older. There were dissenting opinions about this issue. Shortly after that meeting, the American Association of Pediatrics (AAP) Committee on Infectious Diseases met, debate continued, and consensus was reached. The conclusion was that DTaP should be recommended only for use as the fourth and fifth doses, regardless of a child's age. Dr. Katz agreed that CDC was then cleared to publish the statement. This statement, provided to Committee members, is what has been sent to the printers. Also provided is a draft ACIP update to fill

in the holes about the fine points of the Connaught vaccine's use. Dr. Wassilak asked that any comments about the fine points of use of this vaccine be submitted within 2 weeks.

On November 12, Connaught presented information for licensure of their product for the fourth and fifth doses. When Connaught would obtain licensure is not certain. It could be any time within the next several months; CDC expects it before the next meeting. This ACIP update would be published in the weekly MMWR upon product licensure. The Lederle product was licensed on December 17; the MMWR announcement was published on December 20. The price for the acellular DTP product was \$15.56 dose in the private sector, which includes \$4.56 F.E.T.

Dr. Katz asked Dr. Wassilak if there were any differences being proposed in the update. Dr. Wassilak said no, but pointed out that Connaught, as opposed to Lederle, has data for use at 15 months and 16 months of age. Nevertheless, the recommendations that came out of the ACIP in October for the other product, including the range, will also apply for this product.

#### Polio Eradication and Measles Reduction in the Americas

Next, Dr. Ciro de Quadros, Regional Advisor for the Pan American Health Organization's (PAHO) Expanded Programme on Immunization (EIP), updated the Committee on the polio eradication effort in the Western Hemisphere. Although the EPI was begun in 1974, it was not launched in the Region of the Americas until 1977, at which time vaccine coverage was very low. By 1984, polio incidence had reached the lowest historical level, <0.1/100,000. About 11 out of the 48 countries had achieved this level of control. However, many countries with high populations didn't have these low rates, and active surveillance was not in place. At this time, PAHO began to think in terms of eradicating polio in the Americas. In 1985, an initiative to eradicate this disease from the Western Hemisphere was proposed and approved by the Directing Council of PAHO.

The major concerns to accomplish this were the necessary political and social will, vaccine efficacy and stability, and surveillance. Strategies to accomplish this were establishing an interagency coordinating committee and a Technical Advisory Group, decentralization of resources, and publication of a PAHO Field Guide for Eradication. Specific vaccination strategies included routine delivery of oral poliovirus vaccine (OPV) through established health services; application of National Vaccination Days with OPV (two per year); and mop-up operations in areas of risk.

Countries were classified as to whether they were polio-infected (indigenous cases reported within the previous 3 years) or polio-free. The latter group was divided into high risk (i.e. vaccine coverage in children <1 year old is below 80% in any geographical



unit within the previous 3 years) or low risk. Case definitions were also refined and included suspected cases (acute illness in an individual under age 15), probable (suspected case with acute flaccid paralysis [AFP] with 10 weeks to 1 year based on analysis of laboratory specimens and follow-up clinical exam) and confirmed (wild poliovirus isolate or vaccine associated).

A system of negative reporting of cases of AFP was also begun. Among 20,000 health units, 80% now report on time each week. This very efficient system never existed before and can be used for cholera surveillance as well. If a unit is not reporting at least 1 case of AFP per 100,000, this is a "red light" that something is wrong with the surveillance, since that has been determined to be the background rate of AFP. (Note: Dr de Quadros said that it used to be believed that Guillain-Barre syndrome [GBS] was not very common in children under 5. Their surveillance system indicates that GBS--which accounts for 60%-65% of the AFP cases--is much more common than believed.) Another indicator for surveillance is the proportion of AFP cases for which stool samples are submitted for analysis. Some 80% of AFP cases have stool samples submitted, Dr. de Quadros said. Finally, virologists meet every 8 months to review problems with surveillance.

In terms of the status of the eradication effort thus far, Dr. de Quadros said that, by 1990, there were a total of only confirmed 24 cases of polio in the Americas. In 1991, Mexico, Brazil, and Central America reported no cases. The dates of onset for the last cases were April 16, 1991, for Colombia and September 5, 1991, for Peru.

Colombia has been the target of an intensive mop-up operation. One million households were visited within a 2-week period twice last year. It was so successful that on February 17, the Minister of Health is launching another house-to-house visit. And a major campaign, termed "the Last Inch," is about to be launched in Peru, site of the last known polio case. Last week the government of Peru announced a plan of action to visit and vaccinate 10 million households (two-thirds of the area) from February 29-March 8. This house-to-house immunization effort will be repeated in May. Children under 5 years of age will get another dose of OPV.

He said that the initial major concerns about the polio eradication effort--about political and social will, vaccine efficacy, and surveillance--have been removed. Some \$112 million has been donated by a variety of external agencies, illustrating that the political will exists to solve this problem. Finally, Dr. de Quadros reiterated the general criteria for the certification of eradication: no confirmed cases in 3 years; no wild virus isolated from the environment or AFP cases; program evaluation. (Dr. de Quadros also urged Canada and the United States to start thinking about environmental sampling.) Coverage in the Americas is now

about 80% for all the EPI vaccines.

### *Neonatal Tetanus Surveillance*

PAHO has also just established surveillance for neonatal tetanus. Of 14 districts, only about 10% are at high risk for neonatal tetanus.

### *Measles Reduction in the Americas*

Next, Dr. de Quadros updated the Committee on the measles initiative in the English-speaking Caribbean. Vaccine was introduced into the region in 1982, and very high coverage was obtained within a very few years. Cuba led the way in attempting to eliminate the disease, by vaccinating all children 1-15 years of age. The 4-6 cases still being reported each year from that country are probably not really measles, Dr. de Quadros said.

Subsequently, the Ministers of the Caribbean countries adopted an initiative to eliminate measles by 1995, using the Cuban strategy. In May, 1991, termed Measles Elimination Month, all the islands except Jamaica immunized children 9 months to 15 years of age regardless of previous vaccination status. Coverage achieved was "incredible"--nearly 100%. In 1991, there were only three confirmed cases of measles in the Caribbean; all were imported from the United States. For 1992 so far, only one case has been reported, also in a traveler from abroad.

As a result, an initiative to eliminate measles from the Central American countries by 1997 has been announced. Brazil is also launching a major campaign for measles elimination, and will be immunizing all of its children from 1-14 years old (some 10 million children). Chile and Argentina are also launching such projects. As a result of all of this interest in measles elimination, a meeting is being convened on February 28 to review what's happening in the region regarding measles and to see what PAHO could do to coordinate efforts.

Dr. De Quadros reported in his summation that a major concern is whether to include in the measles surveillance system all rash and fever illnesses or only those that meet the case definition, so that the system is not flooded with too much information. Another concern is whether paired sera should be used--which are extremely difficult to obtain in developing countries.

After Dr. de Quadros' talk, Dr. Halsey reported that at a meeting on February 11 at PAHO headquarters in Washington, D.C. it was reported that there are new technical developments in measles antibody assays that will allow the diagnosis of laboratory confirmed measles with a single blood test. Dr. William Bellini's laboratory, which has been instrumental in developing this technology, has agreed to provide the training and the resources to

put this technology into the Caribbean and several other Latin American laboratories within the next couple of months. Careful evaluations will be performed to determine how reliable this test is. (Predictions are 90%, if the specimen is provided within 15 days.)

Subsequent Committee discussion indicated that the best means of mobilizing private physicians to the measles elimination campaign in the Caribbean are the media. The fact that no legal obstacles exist in South America to mount such universal campaigns was also pointed out as a critical factor in their success. Concern was raised about repeatedly immunizing with MMR. Dr. de Quadros said 1.8 million susceptibles have accumulated since the last campaign. The campaigns would not need to be repeated if the Western Hemisphere would be vaccinated and a high level of coverage maintained. Dr. Walter Orenstein, IM, said that measles activity in the United States is down 95% from reports at this time last year, and that CDC is only aware of one major current outbreak, in Corpus Christi, Texas. He said that \$46 million has been allocated during FY 1992 for infrastructure and service delivery. CDC is now eliciting comprehensive plans from immunization programs throughout the country.

#### Japanese Encephalitis Vaccine

Dr. Ted F. Tsai, Division of VectorBorne Infectious Diseases (DVBD), National Center for Infectious Disease (NCID), reviewed experience from adverse events surveillance in Okinawa, Japan, begun after a mass immunization campaign against Japanese encephalitis (JE). The campaign was launched after an outbreak of three cases of JE occurred in active-duty Marine personnel on Okinawa last year. Although there were no deaths, these were relatively severe cases: one patient remains in a semi-vegetative state, and another has significant psychomotor retardation. After this outbreak, the U.S. Navy promulgated a mass immunization campaign of 9,000 active-duty personnel (predominantly Marines) and 2,000 dependents.

Surveillance revealed 30 cases of urticaria and/or angioedema following JE vaccine, and a case-control study of these allergic reactions was performed. About half of the reactions occurred after the first dose of the vaccine. There are differences between first- and second-dose reactions: a) the interval between immunization and the onset of symptoms was 12-24 hours in first-dose reactors versus 4-6 days in second-dose reactors; b) age differences; c) possibly more first-dose reactions in non-Caucasians. A past history of drug or hymenoptera allergy or other urticarial reactions was associated with a threefold greater risk. However, a past history of asthma, allergic rhinitis, or atopic dermatitis without history of urticarial reactions carried no increased risk. The rate of reactions appears to have been higher among dependents, one-half of whom were children.

One death temporally associated with JE vaccine was reported in a 21-year-old man who previously had a history of unexplained rash, chronic diarrhea, and oral yeast infection. (Tests for AIDS were negative.) Anaphylaxis was a possibility. He was found dead 60 hours after receipt of his first dose of JE. He had also received the third dose of plague vaccine the day he was found dead. Autopsy did not determine any specific cause of death. Serum aspartate aminotransferase, which is sometimes markedly elevated with anaphylaxis, was reported to be undetectable.

In response to questions from the Committee, Dr. Tsai said that about 10% of sudden deaths in men of this age have no detectable etiology. Dr. Berg, from the Navy Environmental Health Center, said that there are at least two cases of unexplained deaths every year in service personnel. Dr. Tsai also clarified that there may be no specific findings on autopsy for death by anaphylaxis. Walter Reed is going to review the autopsy data, but it may take several months.

There was extended discussion about the adverse reactions and interpretations of this death and the advice about JE vaccination that should be given to travelers. Finally, Dr. Katz halted discussion saying the Committee was not ready to come to any final decision on an ACIP statement on this vaccine--especially since it isn't even licensed yet in this country. He asked Dr. Tsai to point out other areas the Committee members needed to know about for them to study for homework. Dr. Tsai said the other proposals were primarily editorial changes. Dr. Katz asked that any notes on handouts be written up and mailed to Committee members. The deadline for returning comments was mid-March. Dr. Connaught Laboratories offered to submit the product insert submitted to the FDA; Dr. Katz said that would be extremely helpful.

This discussion also brought out the suggestion that information for travelers about the use of vaccines that are not licensed for use in this country might be an appropriate *MMWR* article.

### Hepatitis A

Dr. Harold Margolis, Division of Viral and Rickettsial Diseases (DVRD), NCID, reported that hepatitis A--with over 31,000 cases reported in 1990 in the United States--is a significant public health problem. He introduced a series of speakers to discuss the performance of vaccines in various stages of clinical trials and the epidemiology of hepatitis A in the United States.

First to speak was Dr. David Nalin, Director of Clinical Research, Merck Sharp & Dohme Research Laboratories, who presented results of his company's experience with the Merck inactivated hepatitis A vaccine. Phase-1 and -2 studies have been conducted among 1,265 adults and 774 children. In the Monroe, New York, protective-

efficacy, randomized, double-blind study, 50 adults and 569 children were enrolled. In a total of 2,658 individuals vaccinated to date with this vaccine, Merck has had no serious adverse reactions. The vaccine has been well tolerated, with only expected mild, local and transient reactions. A two-dose regimen yielded titers higher than those seen after immune serum globulin (IG).

In the Monroe trial, seronegative participants received either a placebo or 25 ng of hepatitis A vaccine. There were 25 clinical cases of hepatitis A, most occurring in persons receiving the placebo. Of those occurring in persons who received hepatitis A vaccine, none occurred 2 weeks after receipt of vaccine. Merck is planning flexibility of schedules for the booster doses to be compatible with other vaccines and existing regimens.

Dr. David Krause, Director, Medical & Scientific Services, SmithKline Beecham Pharmaceuticals, next presented data on that company's candidate HM175-strain hepatitis A vaccine. Its antigen content in an adult dose is 720 Elisa units, which gives seroconversion rates of 100% after one dose. First human trials were begun in 1988. To date, there have been 67 studies in 18 countries, involving 50,000 subjects. In terms of overall reactogenicity, about one-half of vaccinees report no symptoms after the first dose. The most common general symptom is malaise or fatigue. Soreness at the injection site is the most common local symptom. Reactogenicity rates compare favorably with those for hepatitis B vaccine. Clinical trials on several thousand adults reveal that the seroconversion rate is 96% one month after the first dose and 100% after a second dose. There are virtually no nonresponders. The evidence that this vaccine is protective is very strong: a) antibody quality, b) the antibody titer produced by two doses is approximately 5-10 times higher than that produced by IG, c) animal studies at the NIH, revealed that vaccinated chimps were totally protected, and d) field trials, which are now under way. Several questions remain to be answered about this vaccine: a) the long-term duration of immunity provided; b) the effect of simultaneous administration with other pediatric vaccines; and c) and the efficacy in a postexposure setting. Studies are planned or ongoing to answer all of these questions.

Dr. Charles Hoke, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, explained that since World War II soldiers have been the heaviest consumers of IG to protect them against hepatitis A. In fact, operation Desert Storm exhausted all IG supplies in the United States. Thus, there's a lot of interest in the hepatitis A vaccine in the military. Dr. Hoke reported results of a field efficacy trial in Thailand of an inactivated hepatitis A vaccine among Thai children, conducted by Dr. Bruce Innis, with the Armed Forces Research Institute for Medical Sciences. The SmithKline HM-175-derived strain was used in this study; it was administered at 0, 1 month, and 12 months, but efficacy data are based on just two doses. Approximately 20,000 5- to 14-year-old children receive vaccine;

20,000, placebos. The case definition used was an illness compatible with viral hepatitis severe enough to cause absenteeism from school and elevated antibody. Among 5,000 illnesses that were evaluated, 30 cases of hepatitis A occurred. Of these, 29 occurred in children who had received placebo (145/100,000) and 1 occurred in a child who had received the vaccine (5/100,000; efficacy, 97%). In the ensuing discussion period, Dr. Hoke said that with an earlier vaccine made at Walter Reed and first given to people in 1986, people were successfully vaccinated with four doses or a total of 8 mg of antigen. That amount is extremely immunogenic--that's less than 1/5,000 of the antigen in the hepatitis B vaccine.

Next, Dr. Craig Shapiro, DVRD, NCID, summarized the epidemiology of hepatitis A in this country. With two apparently safe, immunogenic, and efficacious vaccines available--one already commercially available in Europe--the United States may soon be faced with making decisions on how to use hepatitis A vaccine in this country. Ideally, these decisions should be based on the epidemiology of hepatitis A in this country, he said. Historically, there are periodic, nationwide epidemics of hepatitis A. There are significant geographic variations in the disease, with the West having the highest rates, and the South and East, the lowest. Asymptomatic infection predominates in infants and children, but greater symptomatic disease and higher case fatality rates occur in older adults. Racial/ethnicity data indicate that the group with the lowest rates of disease are Asians, followed by whites, blacks, and finally, American Indians, who have a rate about 10-fold higher than average. The most commonly reported risk factor for hepatitis A is contact--household or sexual--with a patient with hepatitis A. Other risk factors are drug use, day care (either among children or employees--this category accounts for about 10% of cases), international travel, and being exposed as part of a water or foodborne outbreak. For about 40% of reported cases, no risk factor is identifiable. About 38% of the general population in the United States are seropositive for antibodies to the virus, based on testing of sera from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey II.

To translate these epidemiologic data into strategies for vaccine use, public health officials and policy-makers need to decide what they want to accomplish with this vaccine, such as protection of specific groups as opposed to general vaccination. For example, some of the more accessible risk groups, such as international travelers, don't really account for a large percentage of hepatitis A cases. Also, do we want to think in terms of eradicating hepatitis A infection, since the virus only has a single prototype, and there's no significant animal reservoir? Finally, several issues are still unresolved: long-term protection; efficacy in postexposure mode; combined vaccines; cost-efficacy data; and feasibility of delivery.

In the ensuing discussion, Dr. Shapiro was asked about economic

impact data. He said this area was being studied. In a study, of whom 12% are hospitalized, the impact can be significant in terms of direct and indirect costs. Committee members emphasized that the percentage of hepatitis A cases linked to day care may be greater than is reflected by surveillance data, that parents may get the disease from asymptomatic day-care children, and that the link to the day care may not be recognized.

It was also learned during the discussion that the Merck hepatitis A vaccine will be submitted for licensure in Europe within a year. The Product License Application should be filed within the next 12 months. Dr. Hoke said SmithKline also expects to file in the third quarter of this year.

### Immunization of the Immunocompromised

Drs. Mark Grabowsky and Robert Chen, IM, NCPS, presented a draft ACIP statement on the use of vaccines and immune globulins in persons with altered immunocompetence for discussion by the Committee. The principal changes in this version are reorganization of sections and some minor changes in content. For example:

--the introduction was so written that a practicing clinician can read it and then refer directly to the accompanying tables.

--Immunocompromised persons have been divided into three groups in this draft: severely immunocompromised, due to HIV infection; persons with HIV infection; and persons with conditions which cause limited immune deficit (e.g., asplenia, renal failure) that may require use of special vaccines but which do not contraindicate use of any particular vaccine.

--Section III now includes a discussion and table concerning the use of immune globulins, as requested by the Committee.

Dr. Katz then asked if there were any questions or comments on the new draft. The following suggestions were made:

--relook at page 3, which appears to be internally inconsistent.

--The section on page 6 on BCG may need refinement. Dr. Grabowsky said they were waiting to do that until the BCG Working Group met.

--on page 9, first paragraph, 2nd sentence, change "unselected accordingly" to "that they are not protected against hepatitis B"; in next paragraph, last sentence, reconsider phrasing since it may imply persons should be tested for *N. meningitidis* and such testing is not available.

--in the definition section, further clarify what "use, if indicated" means on tables.

--on Table 2, leave out column "Routine" (Not

Immunocompromised)." This was agreed upon by vote of the committee.

--clarify whether you're talking about previously non-immunized persons or not (Dr. Nalin's point)

--make sure the terms introduced on page 1 are consistently adhered to (for example, it isn't readily clear to the reader, on page 5, in the OPV section, which categories the subjects who are "immunodeficient" and "immunosuppressed" fall into.

--distinguish further between adults and children.

--add a column on solid organ transplant recipients (who are about to become immunocompromised) to Table 2 and perhaps add to definitions on page 1.

--on page 5, under MMR, clarify whether a .5 mL or .25-mL dose of IG is to be administered to symptomatic HIV patients; also, change the last sentence to "There is clearly decreased immunogenicity if vaccination is given less than three months after IG administration."

--on page 10, review role of tetanus antitoxin, which is a horse serum product, and the implication that the "same dosages and schedules" are needed for immunocompromised and immunocompetent persons. The last point generated considerable discussion. Dr. Grabowsky pointed out that this section was from an existing ACIP statement and that CDC had avoided making new recommendations in this compilation statement.

--The statement should at least give recognition that some other prestigious groups (PAHO, WHO) may disagree with CDC's statements for use of some vaccines (e.g., OPV) and may employ other strategies for other countries. This suggestion was generally agreed upon by Committee members.

May is targeted for the final draft of this ACIP statement. There was discussion about whether it should be held up until the Committee has heard from Dr. Donnenberg about bone marrow transplantation (after which a new set of ACIP recommendations would be published regarding that subject). The consensus of the group was to mention in this ACIP statement that a bone marrow special issue is forthcoming. There was agreement that the bone marrow transplant statement would be reviewed at the next meeting and published separately.

#### Meningococcal Disease in Canada

Dr. Susan Tamblyn from the Canadian surveillance program discussed meningococcal disease in Canada. In recent years the number of cases of this disease has increased, though rates have remained low. However, the proportion attributed to Group C has increased dramatically: from 26% of cases in 1983 to 63% of isolates by 1990. A unique Group C clone, ET 15, is being isolated from an increasing proportion of cases--three-quarters in 1991. This clone caused several outbreaks in Ontario in 1989 in school-aged children, and it appears to be the clone that is mainly responsible



for the clusters of disease that were seen in 1991.

In a 2-day period in early December, Ottawa had four cases occur in teenagers; two died. Within a week, a teenager at a nearby school died of group C disease. Chemoprophylaxis was extended to everybody at the two affected schools, followed by school vaccination. Tremendous media coverage attended these events, which in turn created demand for vaccine in affected and nonaffected areas. Then in early January, two more cases, one fatal, occurred in Ottawa. This prompted the decision to hold mass, publicly funded vaccinations in Ottawa and in a number of affected regions in Quebec. This campaign was coordinated by provincial epidemiologists and local authorities, with consultation provided by the LCDC, the Canadian equivalent of CDC. Ottawa, Quebec, Prince Edward Island, and British Columbia held such vaccinations for varying age-groups.

There was not enough vaccine available; Connaught quickly brought in more from Swiftwater. The Canadian Bureau of Biologicals sought additional sources in Europe through SmithKline and Merieux. Program delivery went very smoothly. Vaccine uptakes are very high--over 90% in Prince Edward Island, for example. Very few adverse reactions have been reported. The Ontario Ministry of Health's passive surveillance system received 200-250 reports for the 140,000 doses administered (<.2%). These were mostly local reactions.

Dr. Jay Wenger, Division of Bacterial Diseases (DBD), NCID, discussed the epidemiology of meningococcal disease in Canada and the United States. He said it appeared that during the recent outbreaks in Canada, particularly in children 10-19 years, the rates of disease were in the range of 15-20/100,000, which is twenty times normal. Given these data, and the report of meningococcal disease in a traveler to Ottawa, CDC issued a limited travelers' advisory on January 17 that suggested that children 2-19 who were going to be in Canada for 3 days or longer should consider immunization. Although there was some concern about vaccine supply, since a large amount of vaccine had been shipped to Canada, Connaught and the FDA helped solve this problem. Dr. Wenger added that the clone causing disease in Canada has been identified in the United States. Several studies to evaluate risk of meningococcal disease are under way among children and college-age students.

### Reevaluation of Polio Vaccine Policy

For 2-plus hours, speakers presented new information to be considered in a re-evaluation of the ACIP polio vaccination policy.

#### *Points for Committee Consideration*

Dr. Steve Cochi, IM, said that in 1988 the Institute of Medicine (IOM) conducted a review of polio vaccination policy in the United

States. The IOM Committee had examined four options: 1) to continue primary reliance on OPV (the present policy); 2) to change to primary reliance on IPV; 3) to change to a mixed schedule of IPV, followed by OPV; and 4) to state no preference. The IOM Committee endorsed option #1, but voted to reconsider after IPV was combined with DTP in a licensed product. The ACIP subsequently endorsed these conclusions. In addition, the IOM proposed several research questions in 1988: 1) Is wild virus circulating in the country? 2) What are the levels of immunity in adults? 3) What are the levels of immunity in preschool children, especially those in inner cities? 4) To what extent in the United States does OPV vaccine virus spread to contacts of recipients? and 5) What mixtures in schedules of IPV and OPV would yield the maximum benefit?

*Question #1: Is wild poliovirus circulating in the United States?*  
Dr. Cochi said that epidemiological evidence from studies of imported cases (recent immigrants or travelers) indicates that only two cases occurred from 1985-1991, with the most recent such case occurring in 1986. Particularly with the polio control effort in the Americas, imported cases are less and less of a threat to the United States.

*Question #2: What are the levels of immunity to poliovirus in adults?*

Dr. Cochi said that there have been two studies of immunity in young adults. One, of Army recruits, was published in *JAMA* last fall. It showed that 97.5% were seropositive for type 1, 99.3% for type 2; and 87.3%, for type 3. The second study was a Massachusetts serosurvey, performed in 1982 in sixth-, tenth-, and twelfth-grade students. At a screening titer of 1:2, the seroprevalence to types 1 and 2 was 100%, and 99.9%, to type 3.

*Question #3: What are the levels of immunity to poliovirus in preschool children, especially those in inner cities?* Two presentations addressed this question. Dr. Vance Dietz, M.D., CDC, summarized OPV coverage data from nine retrospective immunization coverage surveys of school children in nine cities in 1990. These provided information on the immunization status of approximately 800 current kindergartners and first-graders when they were 12 months and 24 months of age. Coverage levels at 12 months of age were <90% in all nine cities for OPV2 and OPV3. At 24 months of age, coverage levels for OPV3 were <90% in all nine cities. With the exception of Cleveland and St. Louis, levels for OPV2 are also <90%. Even for children 5 years of age, only two cities--Cleveland and El Paso--had OPV3 coverage rates of 90% or above.

Next, Dr. Chen presented polio seroprevalence data from two studies of inner-city preschoolers in Detroit and Houston. The first study showed that among both vaccinated and unvaccinated children the data for both sites were very similar, revealing moderately high

seroprevalence that is generally higher for poliovirus type 2 than type 1, which in turn is greater than for type 3. The second study involved small numbers of nonimmunized children who were found to have very low seroprevalence rates (usually <50%). This study again showed that type 2 seroprevalence was dominant, probably due to contact spread from OPV vaccine. However, the study suggests that contact spread from OPV alone does not result in very high titers in this inner-city population.

*Question #5: What mixtures of IPV and OPV would yield the maximum benefit?* Four studies have been published on this subject since the 1988 review.<sup>14</sup> Dr. Roland Sutter summarized the major findings of these studies.

**Study #1 (McBean et al.)<sup>1</sup>:** A total of 1,111 children ages 8-13 weeks in Baltimore City and County, and Prince George's County, Maryland, were randomly assigned to three vaccination groups between November 1980 and July 1983. Group A received three doses of eIPV produced by Institute Merieux; Group B received the standard OPV produced by Lederle; and Group C received eIPV produced by Connaught. Vaccines were administered at 2, 4, and 18 months of age, and blood was collected at 2, 4, 6, 12, and 20 months of age and tested at the FDA for neutralizing antibodies against the three poliovirus serotypes. After two doses of eIPV, virtually 100% of children had detectable antibodies to all three poliovirus serotypes, a rate 7%-8% higher than after two doses of OPV. A third dose of eIPV after a 14-month interval raised GMTs to all three serotypes to significantly higher levels than after OPV. The most important finding of this study was that at least two doses of eIPV are probably needed before OPV to protect against recipient vaccine-associated paralytic polio.

**Study #2 (Onorato, et al.)<sup>2</sup>:** This study examined the mucosal immunity induced by three doses of either eIPV or OPV. A total of 143 eIPV and 117 OPV recipients were enrolled; these included children from the previous study and from well-child clinics in Baltimore and Prince George's County. The most important confirmatory finding of this study was that OPV-immunized children had better intestinal, but similar pharyngeal immunity compared with eIPV-immunized children. However, intestinal immunity is not an all-or-nothing phenomenon. Onorato et al. showed also that resistance to excretion is dependent on challenge virus dosage for both the OPV and eIPV groups. Intestinal immunity induced by OPV can also be overcome by a sufficient dose of challenge virus. In addition, excretion of poliovirus was highly correlated with a serologic response. However, the excretion rates in the pharynx were similar in the OPV and eIPV groups, suggesting that pharyngeal immunity was similar in the groups.

**Study #3 (Modlin et al.)<sup>3</sup>:** This study examined the humoral immune response to a challenge dose of monovalent type 1 OPV.

Children ages 19 to 52 months from a public and a private health clinic in Maryland, as well as from study #1, were enrolled; they had a history of either three doses of eIPV or three doses of OPV administered at 2, 4, and 18 months and a challenge dose of monovalent P1 OPV between 19 and 52 months of age. The most important finding of this study was that OPV given after three doses of eIPV resulted in a more augmented humoral response compared to OPV given after three doses of OPV.

**Study #4 (Faden et al.)<sup>4</sup>:** This study was the first to directly compare two different sequential schedules of eIPV followed by OPV with schedules using eIPV or OPV alone. Small numbers of children (16-53 in each group) were assigned to four groups: OPV-OPV-OPV; IPV-IPV-IPV; IPV-OPV-OPV; or IPV-IPV-OPV. All schedules resulted in high seroprevalence rates after two doses of either OPV, eIPV, or EIPV followed by OPV. The GMTs were highest in the eIPV-OPV-OPV group, particularly poliovirus type 2. The mucosal immunity was highest in the group that received only OPV, and lowest in the group that received eIPV only. However, the excretion rates of poliovirus 1 month after receipt of the third dose of vaccine at 13 months of age were not significantly different in the study group. The most important finding of this study was that incorporation of at least one dose of eIPV at the start of the immunization schedules tends to increase systemic as well as local antibody production.

**Ogra Study:** Dr. Pearay Ogra, senior author of the Faden study, next summarized another recently published study of his.<sup>5</sup> His data and observations from previous studies suggest that "wild (virulent) virus or development of reversion during replication of OPV in the gut may provide a more potent stimulus for induction of mucosal immune response than attenuated parent strains of the vaccine viruses."<sup>5</sup> In addition, preceding receipt of eIPV may lead to increased excretion of revertants.

**Denmark Data:** Following Dr. Ogra's presentation, Dr. Katz said the ACIP was examining this subject in an attempt to reduce 6-10 vaccine-associated cases of polio each year. Pointing out that Denmark has had a combined schedule since 1968 (three doses of IPV, followed by three doses of OPV), he asked Dr. Sutter to comment on that country's vaccine-associated cases. Dr. Sutter said that since 1968 there have been only two cases of vaccine-associated polio in contacts, not recipients. Thus, the risk of vaccine-associated illness in Denmark is roughly one-half of that in the United States.

**Halsey Study of Sequential eIPV-OPV Schedules:** Dr. Halsey then introduced Dr. Halsey to present information from an additional, in progress study that looks at three different sequential eIPV-OPV schedules and compares them with the standard OPV schedule and standard IPV schedules alone. Neutralizing antibody responses,

development of nasopharyngeal antibodies at 15 months of age, and response to challenge with OPV at 18 months of age are under study. Boosts in antibody are being seen in all groups; the largest boost upon challenge with OPV at 18 months occurred primarily in the children who had received only one previous dose of OPV or no previous OPV at that time. Dr. Halsey said more data should be available from this study in 1-1/2 years.

*Question #4: To what extent in the United States today has OPV vaccine virus spread to contacts of recipients?* Next, Dr. Peter Strebel, NCPS, reported on the recent epidemiology of poliomyelitis in the United States. He said poliomyelitis caused by wild virus has been virtually nonexistent since 1980; vaccine-associated cases are now the predominant form of this disease in this country. Since the introduction of OPV in 1961, the incidence of vaccine-associated paralytic polio has remained stable, at approximately 1 case per 2.5 million doses. Since 1980, 80 vaccine-associated cases were reported (8 per year), no indigenous cases, and 32 imported cases. Of the vaccine-associated, 30 were OPV recipient contacts, 4 were classified as community-acquired, and 1 occurred in immunologically abnormal persons. In terms of vaccination history, 87% of recipient cases occurred after receipt of the first dose of OPV. Of contact cases, 66% were unvaccinated. Persons at elevated risk of vaccine-associated illness are infants and contacts who are inadequately vaccinated; and immunologically abnormal individuals, predominantly children with humoral immune deficiencies of the humoral system.

Dr. Strebel also discussed the potential impact of a sequential eIPV-OPV schedule on the occurrence of vaccine-associated polio. He said that the rationale for use of eIPV varies according to case category. The high immunogenicity of eIPV should protect against recipient vaccine-associated polio. Moreover, eIPV decreases the duration and intensity of polio virus shedding after challenge with OPV, and hence should reduce the transmissibility of vaccine virus to contacts. For immunologically abnormal infants, some protection against vaccine-associated disease should result from a delay in the scheduled administration of the first dose of OPV to 6 months. This delay would increase the likelihood of detecting immunodeficiency problems, which are a contraindication to OPV use. In short, if a schedule of two doses of eIPV followed by OPV for the third and fourth doses were instituted, and all the recipient vaccine-associated cases (related to the administration of the first and second dose of OPV), but only half of the contact cases and half of the immunologically abnormal cases were prevented by such a strategy, the reduction in vaccine-associated illness would be approximately 70%.

#### *Potential New Polio Vaccines*

Next, Dr. Cochi said that any discussion of polio vaccination policy must include prospects for new polio vaccines that are

safer, less prone to reversion, and more immunogenic.

**Meetings:** In the last 1-1/2 years, two meetings have addressed new oral polio vaccines. One was a WHO meeting on new polio vaccines held in Geneva on March 12-13, 1990. The other, an FDA-sponsored international workshop on poliovirus attenuation held December 9-10, 1991, in Bethesda.

Dr. Olen Kew, DVRD, NCID, then summarized these meetings. Although enhanced immunogenicity is on everybody's "wish list," he noted that the problem may well be that humans just do not respond well to type 3 antigen. Greater genetic stability and improved thermostability are also desired. The following are suggested questions for further research: 1) What is a mechanism of attenuation at the cellular level (neural cells vs. intestinal cells?) 2) What are the physiologic blocks in neural cells? 3) How does the mouse model, which does have a lot of advantages, compare with the monkey neurovirulence test and human intestinal infection? 4) If such vaccine strains were available, how would seed stocks be prepared? How would they be manufactured? 5) What would be the possible clinical trials of new OPV strains?

Many of these issues were discussed at the USFDA workshop in Bethesda. Conclusions were: 1) attenuation involves a small number of substitution mutations; 2) the poliovirus genome is exceptionally plastic; and 3) attenuation involves differential growth in intestinal but not neural cells. Also discussed were new approaches for OPV safety testing, such as Chumakov's molecular tests, cellular assays, and transgenic mice. Dr. Kew said the excellent bottom-line conclusions from both meetings were that progress has been made, but more needs to be done, and that no one is going to depart radically from the Sabin strain. In response to a question, Dr. Kew said that he's not aware that anyone knows how to enhance immunogenicity by genetic engineering, the most challenging of the desired properties on the wish list.

**Manufacturers' Product Updates:** Dr. Cochi then introduced the last piece of the puzzle in the polio vaccine update--status reports from the manufacturers of combined DTP/eIPV vaccines. Dr. Carleton Meschievitz from Connaught/Pasteur demonstrated a dual-chamber syringe design so that thimerosal, a preservative in DTP, does not interfere with the polio virus. Connaught's study design, built around 414 subjects: 207 of whom were randomized to receive the DTP/eIPV combination at 2 and 4 months of age; 207 of whom were randomized to receive DTP and eIPV at two separate sites. At 15 to 20 months of age, each of the groups will be randomized to receive either eIPV or OPV. The entry phrase is to be completed this month. Submission of data to the FDA is planned for October. Dr. Meschievitz also summarized the Danish history with this schedule (already discussed, in which only two cases of vaccine-associated polio have been reported since 1968) and Prince Edward Island's 25-year experience with IPV/OPV. (With 50,000 children vaccinated, no

cases of polio have been reported.)

Next, Dr. Peter Paradiso, Lederle/Praxis, updated that company's priorities, particularly the combination products. In the past several years, it has focused on currently recommended products, acellular DTP, *Hemophilus influenzae b* conjugate (HbOC), and eIPV. Such a combined product is several years away. Lederle is also looking at inactivation of the Sabin strains--i.e., making a Salk vaccine from Sabin strains. Lederle's liquid form of a DTP/HbOC combination vaccine, Tetramune™, has been fairly extensively studied as part of a three-dose, primary series (nearly 7,000 infants have received this vaccine); a license application has been submitted to FDA. The safety profile is excellent, and the immunogenicity is as good or better in the combined product.

Lederle has also combined its acellular pertussis vaccine with its HbOC combination vaccine for boosters at 15 months. Formulation studies are complete; immunogenicity and safety studies have been initiated. Lederle hopes to file for license by year end. Dr. Paradiso also said that Lederle is working to reduce vaccine-associated cases with studies of Pfizer strain sequences.

#### *Further Points for Committee Discussion*

Dr. Cochi then re-addressed the Committee, asking them to consider the following points for discussion: 1) Have the research questions raised by the Institute of Medicine been adequately addressed? 2) Are there issues other than those raised by the Institute that still need to be addressed? 3) If DTP-IPV is licensed, is the ACIP prepared to consider a change to a sequential IPV/OPV schedule?

Dr. Katz thanked Dr. Cochi and the presenters for preparing the information on this subject for the Committee. Then Dr. Katz asked the Committee to assimilate all the information they received this afternoon, in the context of 1) the policy question--should we consider the reintroduction of IPV to precede OPV? 2) multivalent vaccines, which might combine *H. flu b* conjugate, hepatitis B, DTP, eIPV; and 3) whether the expense, time and change in policy would be anachronistic in light of the move to eradicate poliomyelitis within 8 years?

A Committee member asked if there were any studies looking at wild virus in sewage. Dr. Kew responded that there is no environmental sampling going on in the United States, but that if you know what to look for, we now have the techniques to detect wild virus at 1 part per million.

#### ACIP Statements

Next, Dr. Richard Goodman, Editor of the *MMWR*, discussed the

purpose, audiences, length, and format of ACIP statements. His primary concern was whether they are becoming too long and complex to be usable and readable. Supplements were introduced in 1965; originally approximately two per year were published; by 1989, 25% of space in the weekly issue was being taken up by ACIP statements and other recommendations, so these became supplementary, under the name "Recommendations and Reports." The primary audience for the MMWR series (circ. 51,500) are public health practitioners and health-care professionals.

He illustrated the growing length of ACIP statements by showing the average page length of measles, hepatitis and mumps statements in 1972 and 1989:

Statement	1972	1989
measles	3 pages	17 pages
hepatitis	4 pages	26 pages
mumps	2 pages	9 pages

Acknowledging the valid reasons for the increasingly technical nature of the report (e.g., more immunizing agents, increased knowledge about risks and adverse effects, more complicated schedules, change in audience), Dr. Goodman asked the Committee to consider the impact such length was having on usability. He said that some of the ACIP statements could now be described as monographs.

Dr. Goodman asked whether longer statements should be accompanied by a brief set of recommendations and a table to illustrate them. He urged the Committee to consider if the statements are the appropriate format to reach the intended audience.

In response to a question, Dr. Goodman said that CDC has undertaken a comprehensive evaluation of the entire MMWR series, including a readership survey designed to characterize the audience and how it uses the publication. The evaluation is slated to be completed in about 18 months.

In an ensuing discussion, several people commented that State immunization divisions resoundingly make clear that they need the technical statements. This is true despite the fact that 95% of their questions are not that complicated; the detailed, "encyclopedia" knowledge is needed for perhaps only 1%-5% of cases, but when it's needed, it's really needed. Several people urged that the MMWR readership survey be sure to include State immunization divisions.

Dr. Georges Peter, liaison with the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), was asked if the Red Book, which has also been growing in length, has faced this question. He acknowledged that it has been a concern, but one readily addressed because the reasons for the increased length are so apparent. He said occasionally a review



will say the Red Book is too long, but he has never had a reader say this.

One Committee member said that one state health department synopsisizes the statements for the public health nurses because there's a real need for a concise statements for this group, who work with most cases. It was also suggested that a concise table be published in the *MMWR* coincident with a separate, detailed ACIP statement.

The meeting was adjourned for the day at 5:40 p.m. It reconvened on February 13 at 8:05 a.m.

### Influenza Vaccine

The Committee heard seven presentations on influenza vaccine. Dr. Nancy Cox, the new Chief of CDC's Influenza Branch, told the Committee that Nancy Arden had rejoined the Influenza Program as Chief of the Epidemiology Section.

### *Strain Selection Information*

Dr. Cox informed the Committee that the WHO strain selection meeting was not scheduled until the next week so she would be presenting only partial information on the strains selected for the 1992-93 influenza vaccine. The FDA Vaccine Advisory Committee met at the end of January. Based on data from a variety of laboratories present at that meeting, it was decided that the current influenza A(H3N2) component (A/Beijing/353/89 virus) would remain in next year's vaccine. For the first time since 1986-87, an influenza A(H1N1) variant that's different from A/Taiwan/01/86 has been identified. Thus far, about one-third of virus isolates are antigenically similar to this new variant, A/Texas/36/91. Influenza B activity has been minimal in the West this year; however, major outbreaks have occurred in schools in China, Japan, and Korea. Virus isolates characterized thus far have been related to B/Panama/45/90, the current influenza B vaccine component.

### *Surveillance in the Current Influenza Season*

Dr. Louisa Chapman, DVRD, NCID, said that the 1991-92 influenza season has been characterized by abrupt onset, the dominance of influenza A(H3N2) among circulating subtypes, and widespread reports of dramatic outbreaks among school children, beginning in October, superseded by reports of outbreaks among adult populations beginning in mid-November. Excess mortality was first evident in late December. Over 99% of the 5,181 viruses reported to the WHO Collaborating and HCFA Surveillance Laboratories combined between October 1, 1991, and Feb. 1, 1992, have been influenza A. Of the 2,739 influenza A isolates subtyped, 83% have been H3N2.

### *Nursing Home Outbreaks*

Dr. Joseph Kent, DVRD, NCID, presented information from three nursing home outbreaks (in New York, Ohio, and Connecticut) investigated by public health officials. Dr. Kent emphasized the early appearances of these outbreaks. The New York influenza A (H3N2) outbreak occurred from December 9, 1991, to January 10, 1992, among 337 nursing home residents. Fifty-two of 95 (18%) vaccinated residents met the case definition for illness, as did 13/42 (31%) unvaccinated residents. The calculated best estimate for VE was 43% for preventing clinical illness and 45% for preventing pneumonia.

The Connecticut nursing home outbreak was also caused by influenza A(H3N2) and occurred between December 7-January 5. Nineteen of 60 vaccinated residents and 15/34 unvaccinated ones met the case definition. The VE for preventing clinical illness was 88%.

The Ohio outbreak, from November 10-December 2, was the first influenza outbreak in an adult population reported to CDC for the season. The outbreak was also due to influenza A(H3N2) and was characterized by the CDC laboratories as A/Beijing. For 335 residents met the case definition, for an attack rate of 13.4%. Ninety-three percent of residents were vaccinated November 13-15 during a vaccination campaign--too late to prevent the outbreak. The staff, on the other hand, had been vaccinated earlier, during the first week of November. Based on a nonrandom sample of 24% of the 660 employees, 58% reported having been vaccinated. Illness that met a case definition occurred in 6/89 vaccinated staff and 14/67 unvaccinated staff, giving an estimated VE for preventing illness among healthy adults of 68%. Although this nursing home had complied with ACIP recommendations and had a very high rate of immunizations, this outbreak began prior to their immunization program.

Dr. Kent then presented data indicating that in three of the last four seasons when influenza A(H3N2) predominated, the pneumonia & influenza mortality curve has exceeded the epidemic threshold in late December or early January, reflecting significant influenza A activity among the elderly by early to mid December.

#### *Vaccine Supply and Distribution*

Dr. Raymond Strikas, NCPS, then presented a brief discussion of CDC's findings about influenza vaccine supply and distribution over the past 6 years, and a more detailed discussion of the subject during the last influenza season, prompted by widespread media reports of flu vaccine shortages in the 1991-92 season.

Overall, influenza vaccine distribution to U.S. civilians is accomplished by private enterprise. From 1985-1989, Federal, State, and local government vaccine distribution accounted for less than 15% of the doses distributed. This is markedly different from other vaccines: 40% to 55% of polio, DTP, and MMR vaccines are

purchased with public funds.

This year, very early onset of flu-related illness among school children, school closings in some states, and warnings of increased influenza activity all served to increase demand for the vaccine. Manufacturers had produced 32 million doses of the vaccine in 1991, a 12.7% increase over the amount produced from 1990, and a 33% increase over the amount used in 1990. (Manufacturers say that 25% of doses are returned after most influenza seasons; CDC data indicate returns range from 8.4% to 15%.)

A CDC survey of 55 grant immunization programs throughout the country was undertaken to determine the extent of vaccine shortages during the 1990-91 season. Of these programs, 25 had purchased vaccines with State funds this past year. At the time of the survey, December 14, seventeen programs needed vaccine, for a net need of about 136,000 doses. Eight programs had a surplus. Of the 30 States that did not purchase vaccine, 9 had some shortages. Wyeth-Ayerst laboratories bottled an additional 650,000 doses of influenza vaccine that were available in December. All of these doses of vaccine have now been sold.

CDC plans to continue to work with vaccine manufacturers to assess possible problems in distribution, perhaps through use of an electronic bulletin board.

#### *Revision of ACIP Influenza Vaccine Recommendations*

Dr. Louisa Chapman returned to lead the Committee through suggested changes to the ACIP flu statement. Most were relative minor, involving insertion of clarifying words or phrases, all highlighted on a handout. One of these--involving insertion of the bold-faced phrase into the following sentence, caused considerable discussion:

Persons who provide essential community services and students or other persons in institutional settings (e.g., schools, colleges and child care facilities) may be considered for vaccination to minimize disruption of routine activities during outbreaks.

Dr. Halsey proposed that the Committee accept Dr. Carol Hall's recommendation to make a clear statement about the staff of institutions, since Committee members all agreed they are an appropriate group to be vaccinated to minimize disruption of major services. (It was emphasized that this, together with immunization of the elderly and others at high risk of influenza, was the goal of the influenza control program.) Dr. Chapman was asked to rewrite this phrase.

Dr. Chapman then introduced for discussion a proposed substantive wording change to the document regarding vaccinating persons with known hypersensitivity to eggs or other components of the influenza

Since an estimated 18 million people in the United States use contact lenses, a not insignificant number may consider themselves allergic to thimerosal, and therefore ineligible for vaccination with a vaccine containing it. In one study, 10/46 hospital employees who were potential recipients of hepatitis vaccine reported ocular sensitivity to thimerosal-containing ocular solutions; the sensitivity resolved after they switched to a solution not containing this compound. All nine of those individuals who consented to vaccination were successfully vaccinated.

A literature review suggests that hypersensitivity reactions to vaccines containing thimerosal are rare. Dr. Khan could locate only four reports of patients who had systemic reactions to it. There have been approximately a dozen case reports and letters to the editor describing individual patients who have been reported to have had hypersensitivity reactions to the thimerosal component of hepatitis B vaccine, and similar reports of local reactions to DTP and dT. No reported local reactions to influenza vaccination have been attributed to thimerosal hypersensitivity. The prevalence of cell-mediated contact dermatitis due to thimerosal varies from 1.3% to 16.3% in select populations. Only a small percentage of those individuals who demonstrate skin sensitivity to thimerosal have a history of clinically significant reactions.

In summary, Dr. Khan said that it was apparent that a) exposure to vaccines containing thimerosal can lead to induction of hypersensitivity; b) most patients who have positive patch tests or intradermal tests to thimerosal do not develop hypersensitivity reactions to thimerosal administered as a component of vaccine; c) although vaccination will be safe for the vast majority of people with ocular or skin-test sensitivity, rarely thimerosal can cause severe, but treatable hypersensitivity reactions.

Dr. Chapman then led a discussion about changes to the ACIP flu statement pertinent to Dr. Khan's report. The proposed addition on thimerosal was added, with minor changes. Based on committee discussion and FDA comments, it reads as follows:

The potential exists for hypersensitivity reactions to any vaccine component. Although exposure to vaccines containing thimerosal can lead to induction of hypersensitivity, most patients do not develop reactions to thimerosal administered as a component of vaccines, even when patch or intradermal tests for thimerosal indicate hypersensitivity. When it has been reported, hypersensitivity to thimerosal has usually consisted of local delayed type hypersensitivity reactions.

Dr. Khan's references were handed out; the Committee was asked to review them soon and let Dr. Chapman know if they disagree about their inclusion in the document.

Both CDC suggestions about egg hypersensitivity concerned adding phrases about consulting "a physician, preferably a clinical allergist or immunologist." In each instance, the Committee decided to recommend only consultation with a physician. Mention of undergoing appropriate skin testing was debated extensively. Dr. Nalin suggested that the document mention that if a person with sensitivity is to receive vaccine, the physician should have on hand the wherewithal to treat shock. (This is the current standard of medical care in the community regarding all vaccines, and is not unique to influenza vaccine.) Dr. Chapman was asked to pull together proposed alternative wordings and to circulate them next week among the Committee, so comments can be returned rapidly for May publication of the document. Dr. Peters also suggested that amantadine be mentioned as an alternative to vaccine for persons with a history of hypersensitivity to the vaccine or its components.

Dr. Nalin said package inserts have changed regarding adverse reactions and reassurance should be given. Dr. Chapman agreed to rewrite this paragraph and circulate it within the Committee.

However, Dr. Broome proposed that the subject of hypersensitivity to vaccine components be added to the agenda for an upcoming ACIP meeting, since it had generated so many questions. The Committee agreed to put it on the agenda.

Discussion then turned to remaining proposed changes in the document. The first concerned target groups for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination, with the following bold-faced condition so that the ACIP does not falsely assure that there's no need to consider additional vaccination with pneumococcal vaccine:

The target group for influenza and pneumococcal vaccination overlap considerably. Both vaccines can be given at the same time at different sites without increasing side effects. However influenza vaccine must be given each year, whereas pneumococcal vaccine is generally given only once to all but those at highest risk of fatal pneumococcal disease. (refs.)

Next, the Committee discussed the following proposed substantial change to the statement: that the optimal timing of influenza vaccination activities be in the period October 15-November 15. Although there was lengthy discussion about what dates should be recommended, and whether the somewhat lengthy reasoning should be included, it was finally decided leave it as proposed in the handout with minor modifications.

At mid-morning break, Dr. Broome was asked about the status of the report on GBS. She said CDC is working hard to complete the report, complete with an outside review as requested by the ACIP, and hopes to present a final review at the June ACIP meeting.

that it was necessary.

Before the next presentation, Dr. Broome said she could get together a "to do" list for the committee because there was quite a bit of homework to do. She reminded members that it is appropriate to send comments to the different programs, with a copy to her.

#### Assessment of Immunization levels in Preschool Children

Dr. Betty Zell, IM, CDC, said that analysis of retrospective school immunization surveys reveals that a) the vast majority of children get into the immunization system prior to their second birthday, with the majority of these children receiving their first immunization prior to their first birthday b) if these children could be kept in the immunization system, coverage levels would increase considerably; c) an apparent problem is the fourth DTP; OPV3 and DTP4 should be given together; 23%-63% of children receive their OPV 3 before their first birthday.

#### Vaccine Injury Compensation Program

Dr. Geoff Evans, Deputy Director and Chief Medical Officer of this program since January, gave this presentation. Mr. Thomas E. Balbier, Jr., was not able to attend. As background, Dr. Evans explained that the program consists of two portions: a retrospective portion, for cases in which the vaccine was given prior to October 1, 1988; and a prospective portion, for shots given on or after that date. For pre-1988 cases, 4,095 petitions have been filed. There are 210 post-1988 petitions. A total of 346 awards, totaling \$200.2 million, have been made as of last week. But relatively few cases from the prospective period have been adjudicated. Awards for death cases are fixed at \$250,000 plus attorney fees. The average award for pre-1988 injury cases is \$1 million. The program predicts a tremendous shortfall--\$152.2 million. It will run out of money for the next fiscal year in the next month or two. The law's original shutdown provision--that if one of the portions of the program ran out of money, the program would stop within 6 months--has been repealed so that even if the retrospective portion is without funding, the prospective portion remains viable.

Eighty-five percent of cases are injuries; the rest are deaths. The program concedes about one-third of cases; the rest go to U.S. Claims Court. The program is successful in 40% of the cases. The program is regularly denied its viewpoint with SIDS cases.

Because of the looming fiscal crisis with the program, Dr. Mason appointed a task force last summer with two functions: 1) to come up with legislative proposals beginning with nonscientific kinds of proposals; 2) to form a scientific subgroup. The legislative group made several propositions, some of which have been adopted into

circulate it among the Committee members.

I hereby certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the foregoing summary of minutes is accurate and complete.

*Samuel L. Katz*

Samuel L. Katz, MD, Chairman

Date: 11 May 1992