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Rotavirus (RV) infection

- A viral gastrointestinal disease
- Transmitted via fecal-oral route
  - Person-to-person
  - Fomites: contaminated surfaces
- Hardy organism that is highly infectious
  - Virus remains viable on fomites for days
  - Low infective dose and high stool concentrations
Clinical Manifestations

• Wide spectrum of illness

• Incubation period 1-3 days

• Canadian community based study of RV\textsuperscript{1}
  • 2/3 of children: fever, diarrhea, vomiting (all 3 for at least 1 day)
  • Average duration of illness: 8 days (range 6-10 days)

• Greater severity than other viral causes of gastroenteritis\textsuperscript{2}

• Mortality rare in Canada; common in developing world

Pre-vaccine era disease burden

- Not a reportable disease

- Canadian data on healthcare utilization for RV
  - 1 in 7 will seek health care services
  - 1 in 20 will visit in ER
  - 1 in 62 will be hospitalized

- Canadian children hospitalized for RV
  - 49% had significant dehydration
  - 19% clinical sepsis
  - 7% seizures
  - Majority: no underlying health problems
  - Median hospital stay: 3.4 days

2. Le Saux N et al. PIDJ 2010 29(9):879-82.
Mortality rate per 100,000 in children < 5 years due to Rotavirus: 2008
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Rotavirus mortality rate in children younger than 5 years, 2013
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Ten countries with highest number (and percent global total) of child rotavirus deaths, 2013

Global total = 215,000

Source: Estimated rotavirus deaths, WHO IVB as of April 2016
Canadian RV vaccination programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nov 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Apr 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Aug 11, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Nov 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Sept 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dec 1, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Oct 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunavut</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Both Rotarix™ (RV1) and RotaTeq® (RV5) available
- 10/13 jurisdictions
- All using Rotarix™

Globally > 70 countries have introduced


PublicHealthOntario.ca
Impacts of RV programs

• Dramatic reductions in hospitalizations following program implementation have been documented
  • 50 to 94% reductions in RV AGE hospitalizations in children < 5 years\textsuperscript{1-3}
  • 17 to 55% reductions in all cause AGE hospitalization in children < 5 years\textsuperscript{1,2,4,5}

• Indirect effects also demonstrated
  • Reduction in AGE among age-eligible, unvaccinated children\textsuperscript{3}
  • Reductions in stool percent positivity among adults\textsuperscript{6,7}
  • AGE hospitalization reductions for teens\textsuperscript{8} and some adult age groups\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{1}Field EJ, et al. Pedi\textit{atrics}. 2010; 126(3):e506–12.
Rotavirus Vaccine Legacy

• 1999 – RotaShield® (tetravalent rhesus-human reassortant vaccine) removed from US market due to >30X risk of intussusception (excess risk of 1 in 5,000-10,000 vaccinees)

• Requirement of new vaccine trials to enroll 60,000 infants in new trials to be sufficiently powered to identify risk

• 2 pivotal trials each with 60-70,000 infants, no evidence of increased intussusception

Vesikari T NEJM 2006; 354:23-33, Ruiz-Palacios GM NEJM 2006;354;11-22
Post-marketing safety surveillance: Intussusception

• Suggests small, increased risk of intussusception, mainly 1-7 days after first dose

• Mexico (RV1): excess risk of 1/51,000 infants after dose 1

• Australia (RV1 and RV5): 2 studies, both with positive findings
  • Excess risk of 5.6 /100,000 infants (large national study)

• US (RV1 and RV5): Negative and positive findings
  • No signal: Vaccine safety datalink study >750,000 doses of RV5
  • Excess risk of 0.74/100,000 infants 3-6 days after dose 1 from VAERS

• Safety surveillance a key component of RV vaccine program introduction

Intussusception

- One portion of the bowel slides (telescopes) into another leading to bowel obstruction
- Usually occurs in infants between 5 and 10 months, idiopathic
- Background rate about 34/100,000 infants, but varies\(^1\)
- Treatment: radiological (air enema) or surgical reduction
- Mortality rare in Canada/US; high in countries with limited access to treatment (about 20%)

Assessing Rotavirus Vaccine Safety in Canada with Regard to Intussusception using Administrative Data

Study Objectives

Research Question:

Has there been a change in intussusception (IS) incidence among infants in Canada since the introduction of publicly-funded RV vaccine programs?

Specific Objectives:

1. To determine background hospitalization rates for IS among infants < 1 year of age in Canada
2. To compare rates of IS among infants in provinces and territories (PTs) before and after introduction of publically funded vaccination programs
Methods

• CIHI DAD from 2002 to 2013 used to identify infants < 1 yr admitted with a diagnosis of IS (ICD-10 code K56.1, and ICD-9 code 560)

• Denominator data for infants < 1 year, stratified by age in months, obtained from Statistics Canada

• All PTs except Quebec included, and divided into regions based on geography, size and vaccine program introduction date

• Rates adjusted for calendar year, age (in months), sex and P/T by Poisson regression

• Rates of IS admission before and after rotavirus vaccine program introduction compared
  • BC, Saskatchewan, Ontario, PEI, Yukon included as P/Ts with program
Overall annual IS admission rates in Canadian infants by year adjusted for age group, sex and region

- Annual IS hospitalization rates ranged from 20-30 / 100,000 infants
- No evidence of a trend over time.
Results

Annual IS rates in infants by age group (in months) adjusted for calendar year, sex and region

- IS admission rates: highest in 4-8 month-olds
- Lowest in <2 month-olds and 10-12 month-olds
- Males > females
Rates by program period

IS admission rates:

• **After** RV vaccine program introduction 22.4 (95% CI: 18.3, 27.4) per 100,000 infants

• **Before** program introduction 23.4 (95% CI: 21.5, 25.4) per 100,000 infants

No evidence in a change in IS rates over time and/or before/after program introduction
## Sensitivity Analysis: Estimated IS Rates before versus after RV Program Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Estimate of Rate of IS (95% CI)</th>
<th>p-value for difference before versus after</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>Before 23.4 (21.5, 25.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 22.4 (18.3, 27.4)</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-&lt;8 months-olds</td>
<td>Before 35.1 (32.0, 38.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 31.9 (24.8, 41.0)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-&lt;6 month-olds</td>
<td>Before 34.3 (30.5, 38.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 31.6 (23.1, 43.1)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-&lt;4 month-olds</td>
<td>Before 31.5 (26.4, 37.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After 27.6 (17.1, 44.5)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations/Conclusions

• IS cases treated without hospital admission were not included which is a limitation

• Baseline IS hosp rates 20-30 /100,000 infants <1yr, consistent with other studies

• Rates higher in males, and in infants 4-8 months old

• No evidence of a change in rate after implementation of routine rotavirus immunization programs

• In 2015 in Ontario: 3 intussusception cases reported after RV vaccine (rate 1.1 / 100,000 doses distributed)
Population-level impact of Ontario’s infant rotavirus immunization program: evidence of direct and indirect effects
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Objectives

• To evaluate the direct and indirect effects of RV immunization in Ontario on hospitalizations and emergency department (ED) visits for acute gastroenteritis (AGE)

• Focus on health services utilization (counted events, not individuals)

• Examined population level impact of program for all Ontarians (all ages)
Methods: Program Impact

• Longitudinal population-based cohort study examining healthcare utilization for AGE

• Datasets were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES
  • Hospitalizations data from Discharge Abstract Database (DAD) of the Canadian Institutes for Health Information (CIHI)
  • ED visits from National Ambulatory Care Reporting System (NACRS)
Outcome definitions (ICD-10 codes)

• Rotavirus AGE (RV AGE)
  • *rotaviral enteritis*, A08.0
  • Validated in both United States (ICD 9)\(^1,2\) and Australia (ICD 10)\(^3\)

• Composite outcome (“overall AGE”)
  • *rotaviral enteritis* (A08.0)
  • *other viral gastroenteritis* (A08.3)
  • *viral intestinal infection, unspecified* (A08.4)
  • *other specified intestinal infections* (A08.5)
  • *other gastroenteritis and colitis of infectious and unspecified origin* (A09)
  • *noninfective gastroenteritis and colitis, unspecified* (K52.9)

Statistical analysis

• Study period
  • Pre-program period: August 1, 2005 – July 31, 2011
  • Public program period:
    • Published: August 1 2011 – March 31, 2013

• Descriptive analysis: examined crude age-specific average monthly rates of AGE outcomes

• Statistical analysis: negative binominal regression model to assess the trend in monthly rates of AGE
  • Adjusted for age, seasonality and secular trends
  • Indicator variable for vaccine period

Wilson et al. PLOS One May 11 2016. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0154340
RESULTS
Event counts over study period

- RV-AGE events
  - 2,465 hospitalizations
  - 373 ED visits

- Overall AGE events
  - 127,294 hospitalizations
  - 734,130 ED visits
Unadjusted monthly RV AGE hospitalization rates in children < 24 months
Unadjusted monthly overall AGE hospitalization rates in children < 24 months

August 2006: Private vaccine availability

August 2011: Publicly funded vaccine program introduction
## Rate ratios for Hospitalizations (relative to pre-vaccine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>RV AGE RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Overall AGE RR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unadjusted</strong></td>
<td>0.23 (0.14-0.39)</td>
<td>0.50 (0.43-0.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted</strong>*</td>
<td>0.29 (0.22-0.39)</td>
<td>0.68 (0.62-0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age stratified</strong> **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>0.21 (0.11-0.40)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.65-0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23 months</td>
<td>0.27 (0.16-0.48)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.53-0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 months</td>
<td>0.48 (0.27-0.87)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.52-0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>0.31 (0.16-0.60)</td>
<td>0.65 (0.5-0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 years</td>
<td>0.25 (0.13-0.50)</td>
<td>0.70 (0.61-0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-44 years</td>
<td>0 (0-)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.51-0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>0 (0-)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.51-0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=65 years</td>
<td>0.57 (0.10-3.15)</td>
<td>0.80 (0.72-0.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted for age, seasonality and secular trends
**Adjusted for seasonality and secular trends
## Rate ratios for ED visits (relative to pre-vaccine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Impact</th>
<th>RV AGE RR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Overall AGE RR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unadjusted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.27 (0.13-0.56)</td>
<td>0.76 (0.64-0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.32 (0.20-0.52)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.85-0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age stratified</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>0.76 (0.30-1.91)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.78-1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23 months</td>
<td>0.23 (0.08-0.63)</td>
<td>0.84 (0.69-1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-35 months</td>
<td>0.60 (0.15-2.36)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.68-0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>0.12 (0.02-0.60)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.69-0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19 years</td>
<td>0.16 (0.04-0.60)†</td>
<td>0.91 (0.82-1.01)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-44 years</td>
<td>0.30 (0.02-4.58)</td>
<td>1.02 (0.93-1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64 years</td>
<td>0 (0-.)‡</td>
<td>1.03 (0.94-1.13)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=65 years</td>
<td>0.80 (0.05-14.15)</td>
<td>0.99 (0.90-1.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted for age, seasonality, secular trends
**Adjusted for seasonality and secular trends
† Due to small cell sizes for these age strata, a warning message from SAS was issued noting it had to increase its standard iterations in order to generate the RR estimate via Maximum Likelihood estimation. In doing so, the convergence criterion was lowered. Caution is advised when interpreting these RR estimates.
Summary and Limitations

• Magnitude of impact similar to other investigators

• Benefits conferred to older children and adults
  • Adds to growing literature confirming indirect effects
  • Very important for cost-effectiveness analyses

• Usual caveats around administrative data
  • Misclassification (important as RV management is syndromic)
  • Studies utilizing administrative data rely on comparability of diagnostic coding practices over time
QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION