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## Mumps Symptoms

- Acute, viral illness that can present with -Classic:
- Parotitis (60-70\%)
- Orchitis (30\% in post-pubertal males)
- Fever


## - Other:

- Non-specific respiratory symptoms (40-50\%)
- Other salivary gland swelling (10\%)
- Complications:
- Deafness (4\%)
- Aseptic meningitis (1-15\%)
- Encephalitis (0.03\%)
- Asymptomatic (30\%)


## Mumps Vaccine in the United States

- Licensed in 1967
- Composition
- Live, attenuated mumps virus
- Jeryl Lynn strain
- Genotype A
- Effectiveness estimates ${ }^{1}$
-1 Dose: ~77\% (49-88\%)
-2 Doses: ~88\% (66-95\%)
${ }^{1}$ Schaffzin JK et al. Pediatrics. 2007;120:e862-8, Marin M et al. Vaccine. 2008;26:3601-7, Cohen C et al. Emerg Infect Dis. 2007;13:12-7, Deeks SL et al. CMAJ. 2011;183:1014-20, Dominguez A et al. Vaccine.
2010;28:3567-70, Sartorius B et al. Euro Surveill. 2005;10:191-3, Harling R et al. Vaccine. 2005;23:4070-4


## Reported Characteristics of Mumps in Pre-vaccine Era

- Peak incidence in 5-9 year-olds ${ }^{1}$
- $90 \%$ of children infected by age $14^{1}$
- Most cases in late winter-spring²
- No remarkable geographic patterns ${ }^{3}$
- Most adult disease was associated with outbreaks in the military ${ }^{2,3}$
- Significant cause of aseptic meningitis ${ }^{4}$

[^0]
## Mumps Incidence in the Pre-vaccine Era 1922-1967



## Mumps, United States, Vaccine Era 1968-2011

Period of the Resurgence, 1983-1992


## Observations on the Period of the Resurgence

- 1986-87 resurgence attributed to an increase in susceptibility among older children who
- had not been vaccinated,
- but who had been spared previous disease exposure by declining mumps incidence ${ }^{1}$
- During 1988-92, outbreaks associated with 1-dose vaccine failure were first reported ${ }^{2-4}$

[^1]
## 1989 ACIP MMR Recommendation ${ }^{1}$

- In December 1989, ACIP recommended a second dose of measles vaccine for improved measles control.
- Suggested it be administered as MMR, stating that "Mumps revaccination is particularly important."
- Effectively, this was a recommendation for a second dose of mumps vaccine



## Observations on the First National Outbreak

- First multi-state outbreak attributable to 2dose vaccine failure
- Young adults 18-24 years of age were most affected
- Most were college students
- Almost all had had 2 doses of vaccine
- Most had received them >10 years previously
- Dormitory living and freshman class status were risks
- Geographically focused
- Sudden onset and sudden decline of cases


## 2006 ACIP Mumps Recommendation ${ }^{1}$

- Formal recommendation for 2 doses of a mumps-containing vaccine for
-School-aged children (grades K-12)
-Adults in high risk groups
- Healthcare facility workers
- International travelers
- Students at post-high school educational institutions


## Period of the Second National Outbreak, 2009-2011



## Observations on the Second National Outbreak

- 97\% of cases occurred within an Orthodox Jewish community
- Adolescent (13-17 years of age) males were the most affected group
- Approximately $90 \%$ had 2 doses of vaccine
- Unique schools settings and large households were conducive to mumps transmission
- Boys attend yeshiva, beginning ~age 12
- "Chavrusa" style learning
- Prolonged, intense exposures likely overcame protection afforded by the vaccine


## Guam 2010 Mumps Outbreak

- Middle school children (9-14 years of age) represented the most affected age group
- Among kindergarteners through middle school children attending public school, $\geq 95 \%$ had received 2 doses of MMR


## Recent Mumps Vaccine Performance

## Postlicensure Vaccine Effectiveness Comparison of 1 vs 2 Doses

| Outbreak Studied | Age Group | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ \text { Dose } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ \text { Doses } \end{gathered}$ | Reference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada outbreak 2009/2010 | $\begin{gathered} 17-20 \\ 14-18 \\ 6-15 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77 \\ & 49 \\ & 77 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88 \\ & 66 \\ & 84 \end{aligned}$ | Deeks et al., CMAJ 2011 |
| Spain outbreaks 2005/2007 | 4-12 | 85 | 89 | Dominguez et al., Vaccine 2010 |
| US (Iowa) outbreak 2006 | $\begin{aligned} & 18-25 \\ & 18-25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 82 \\ & 64 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \\ & 88 \end{aligned}$ | Marin et al., Vaccine 2008 |
| UK outbreak 2004/2005 | 2-12 | 88 | 95* | Cohen et al., EID 2007 |
| Small outbreak US 2005 | -7-49 | 80 | 92 | Schaffzin et al., Pediatrics 2007 |
| Small outbreak Sweden 2004 | 5-24 | 65 | 91 | Sartorius et al., Euro Surveill 2005 |
| UK outbreak 1998/1999 | 1-18 | 64 | 88 | Harling et al., Vaccine 2005 |
| Median |  | 77 | 88 |  |
| Range |  | 49-88 | 66-95 |  |

[^2]Age-specific Vaccine Effectiveness Estimates for 1 and 2 Doses of MMR Vaccine, UK, 2004-05 Outbreak


# Mumps Vaccine Duration of Immunity - 2 Doses 

- Correlates of protection are not well defined
- Seropositivity declines over time ${ }^{1}$
- Neutralizing antibody titers decline over time ${ }^{2}$
- Cellular immunity declines less than seropositivity over time (if at all) ${ }^{3}$

[^3]
# More Than Waning Immunity At Play in Recent Outbreaks 

- Waning immunity does not explain
-Geographic focal nature
-Oldest vaccinated cohorts not always most affected
- Intense exposure settings account for these features


## Summary of Mumps Disease in the United States

- Prior to use of the mumps vaccine, mumps was a universal disease of childhood
- Use of the mumps vaccine reduced disease levels >95\%
- Current 2-dose schedule is sufficient for mumps control in the general population, but outbreaks can occur in well vaccinated communities
- Intense exposure settings and waning immunity appear to be risk factors for secondary vaccine failure
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