



King's Research Portal

DOI: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.06.080

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link to publication record in King's Research Portal

Citation for published version (APA):

Castanon, A., & Sasieni, P. (2020). Evidence of HPV vaccination efficacy comes from more than clinical trials. *Vaccine*, *38*(35), 5569-5571. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.06.080

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

•Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research. •You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain •You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

- 1 Evidence of HPV vaccination efficacy comes from more than clinical trials
- 2 Peter Sasieni and Alejandra Castanon
- King's College London | Faculty of Life Sciences & Medicine | School of Cancer &
 Pharmaceutical Sciences | Cancer Prevention Group
- 5 Innovation Hub, Guys Cancer Centre, Guys Hospital, Great Maze Pond, London
- 6 SE1 9RT
- 7 Corresponding author contact details
- 8 Alejandra Castanon
- 9 Cancer Prevention Group
- Innovation Hub, Guys Cancer Centre, Guys Hospital, Great Maze Pond, LondonSE1 9RT
- 12 E: alejandra.castanon@kcl.ac.uk
- 13 T: 0207 848 5422
- 14 A recently published article by Claire Rees and colleagues[1] argues that clinical
- trials investigating HPV vaccination have generated significant uncertainties,
- undermining claims of efficacy in these data. They conclude that there are too few
- 17 data to prove that HPV vaccine prevents cervical intraepithelial neoplasia grade 3 or
- 18 worse (CIN3+). In this short piece we argue that whilst Rees and colleagues provide
- valid criticisms of the trials of HPV vaccination and point out some of the gaps in our
- 20 understanding of how HPV infection causes cervical cancer, their conclusions and
- the way they have been reported in newspapers is quite misleading. We discuss the
- 22 huge amount of non-trial research evidence that enables most scientists to conclude
- that HPV vaccination will prevent most cervical cancers. We also address the key
- 24 conclusion points raised in the Rees article.

25 **Observational research evidence of HPV vaccine efficacy**

- Epidemiological studies have estimated that about 70% of cervical cancer is caused by HPV types 16 and 18.[2, 3] They have also shown that persistence of the HPV infection is needed for the development of cervical cancer. Whilst there are some uncertainties of exactly how the virus causes cancer, we do understand what is going on at a molecular level.[4] High-risk HPV types drive cell division in neoplasia through the ability of their E7 and E6 proteins to bind and degrade pRb and p53 – the two most potent tumour suppressor genes
- Out of 5 randomised controlled trials the lowest observed efficacy against persistent infection with the HPV types targeted by the vaccine in HPV naïve women was 90.3% (96.1% CI: 87.3-92.6).[5] Further these trials showed substantial protection against closely related types up to 8 years post vaccination.[5-10] Efficacy against
- 37 CIN2+ associated with HPV16/18 in girls who were HPV negative at first dose is
- near perfect: meta-analysis of the trials shows that vaccination prevented 99% (95%)
- ³⁹ CI 95% to 100%) of such disease.[11]

There is mounting evidence that antibody responses after two doses [12] of the vaccine are comparable to those after three (as originally licensed) and that one dose[13] is also effective at preventing high-grade disease suggesting greater vaccine effectiveness than previously anticipated.

Cohort studies and surveillance statistics show dramatic falls in the proportions of
young women infected with these HPV types in countries that have implemented
HPV vaccination.[14-22] In England the prevalence of HPV16/18 in sexually active
females aged 16-18years prior to vaccination was 15% this has dropped to 2%
among those offered vaccination at age 12-13 years. Further in 2018, among 584
women tested at ages 16-18years there was no HPV detected (0%, 95%CI 0.0%0.6%).[23]

Many years ago, a gynaecologist in New Zealand did not think CIN3 needed to be 51 52 treated. A third of his patients developed cervical cancer over the next 10-15 53 years.[24, 25] The randomised controlled trials showed a reduction in the precancerous lesions that are most likely to progress to cancer (i.e. CIN3). This was 54 shown for all CIN3 lesions in all women vaccinated aged 15 to 25 years (45.6%, 55 95%CI: 28.8-58.7). The effect was strongest among CIN3 lesions associated with 56 HPV types 16 and 18 and in women who had not been infected with HPV before 57 they were vaccinated (100%, 95%CI: 85.5-100).[26] Others have found that CIN3 58 with HPV16 is more likely to progress to cancer than CIN3 with other HPV types[27] 59 and that the prevalence of HPV types other than 16 and 18 among invasive cervical 60

61 cancers is low (21%).[28]

78

79

80

81

In addition to the randomised controlled trials, real world data from studies in countries with HPV vaccination programmes have shown a substantial reduction in CIN3 in vaccinated cohorts.[15, 29] A recently published study linking data between the cervical cancer registry and immunization registries reported an incidence rate ratio of 0.26 (0.16-0.42) for CIN3+ among women vaccinated at age 9-14y compared to unvaccinated women.[30]

68 Except in very rare cases, it takes at least 8 years to develop cervical cancer after getting an HPV infection and cervical cancer is very rare under the age of 24. Since 69 most vaccination programmes were introduced in 2008/09 for women aged 11-70 15years, it is generally too soon to see an impact of HPV vaccination on cervical 71 cancer rates. However, women in Finland who were vaccinated as part of one of the 72 original HPV vaccine trials have been followed. In the HPV vaccinated group there 73 were no cervical cancers whereas in a comparison group (that was nearly twice as 74 large) there were eight cases.[31] Preliminary data from Sweden also suggest a 75 substantial reduction in cervical cancer incidence rates among vaccinated 76 women.[32] 77

Various groups have carefully modelled what levels of screening are appropriate for women who have been vaccinated against HPV as adolescents. The answer depends somewhat on which HPV vaccine the woman has had (there are three commercially available vaccines), but most researchers estimate that between 1 and

- 3 screens over a lifetime (compared with 12 currently recommended) would provide
- 83 an extremely high level of protection.[33-35]

A very small number of cervical cancers are not caused by HPV. Vaccination will not prevent these very rare cancers. However, without screening rates of cervical cancer would be dramatically higher.[36] In the UK it is estimated that without screening (over the past 30 years) there would be some 4,700 women diagnosed with cervical cancer each year (three times more than currently observed).[37] With HPV vaccination and minimal screening that number might be reduced to 250 in 50 years from now.[33]

- 91 Response to key messages of the Rees paper
- 92 1. It is uncertain whether HPV vaccination prevents cervical cancer. As explained above whilst it is mostly too soon to see an impact on cervical 93 cancer incidence, we know so much about the natural history of cervical 94 95 cancer, that it is inconceivable that it will not have a substantial impact. In fact, the impact of vaccination in the population is probably greater than one might 96 97 predict from the trials because by vaccinating a high proportion of the 98 population, women who have not been vaccinated also receive some protection (herd immunity). Such head immunity has been observed in 99 Australia, Scotland and England.[17, 38, 39] 100
- We do not have enough data on the impact of the vaccine on CIN3. There is
 plenty of data and it has been summarised in two meta-analyses: one of
 randomised controlled trials[14] and one of real-world data.[40]
- 3. RCTs may overestimate efficacy because a) testing was done too often, b) 104 trials used endpoints that are not clinically relevant; and c) subgroups were 105 over-analysed. Most trials used persistent infection. If the trials evaluated 106 infection at a single point in time, frequent testing might be a valid criticism, 107 but they did not. It is established that HPV persistence is the best predictor of 108 future CIN3.[41] The link between CIN3 and cancer is widely recognised. 109 Cervical screening programmes prevent cervical cancer by detecting and 110 treating CIN3. Many of the trials also showed impact on CIN3. Other than in 111 women already infected with HPV, the vaccines worked uniformly well in all 112 subgroups. 113
- 114 4. The trials were not relevant to the real world because many of the women were older. There is plenty of real-world evidence on women who were 115 vaccinated before exposure to HPV[15, 17, 30] and several trials comparing 116 the antibody response in women vaccinated at different ages.[9, 26] The 117 authors claim that HPV epidemiology varies globally and that none of the 118 studies have been conducted in Africa. Most of the cervical cancer in sub-119 Saharan Africa is caused by HPV types 16 and 18. Cervical cancer is the 120 most common female cancer in most of Sub-Saharan Africa with some of the 121 highest rates anywhere in the world. Vaccination of adolescent girls would 122 clearly prevent those infections and thereby prevent cervical cancer which has 123 poor survival in most of Africa. 124
- Cross-protection and HPV-type substitution. There is concern about HPV-type substitution, however this is being very closely monitored and the latest
 evidence from the UK does not suggest an increase in the prevalence of other HPV types.[17] In addition to the clinical trials data, real world evidence has

- shown decreases in non-vaccine HPV types among vaccinated women.[15,17]
- 6. Trials report relative rather than absolute effects and none provided numbers 131 *needed to vaccinate.* All the trials present the data so that absolute effects 132 can be calculated. But they are not relevant for establishing efficacy. The 133 relative efficacy is reasonably generalisable and can then be applied to 134 135 populations with different levels of HPV infection and cervical cancer to calculate the likely absolute benefit. Further, the absolute benefit depends 136 critically on the duration of follow-up. There are numerous modelling studies 137 that estimate the likely impact of HPV vaccination on the lifetime risk of 138 cervical cancer in various countries.[42] 139
- 140 There remain some unanswered questions such as how often vaccinated women
- need to be screened and whether there is a need for a vaccine booster dose.
- 142 Modelling studies and data from Scotland show that it does not really make sense to
- 143 continue to screen cohorts vaccinated before exposure to HPV at the same
- 144 frequency. We also know that (unlike with other vaccines) there is absolutely no sign
- of waning efficacy 12 years after vaccination[43] and more data on long-term
- 146 protection accrues each year.
- Dr Rees is quoted in the Guardian as saying: "We found insufficient data to clearly
 conclude that HPV vaccine prevents the higher-grade abnormal cell changes that
- can eventually develop into cervical cancer". This is a little like saying that there is no
- evidence that a child knows anything about physics having been given a mark of
- zero on a test because she forgot to put her name on the paper when in fact she
- answered virtually all the questions correctly and would have had a score of 90%!
- **Declaration of Interest statement**: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
- **Funding:** P.S. and A.C. are funded by Cancer Research UK under grant
- 155 [C8162/A27047]

156 **References**

- 1571.Rees, C.P., P. Brhlikova, and A.M. Pollock, Will HPV vaccination prevent cervical cancer? J R158Soc Med, 2020: p. 141076819899308.
- Clifford, G.M., et al., Human papillomavirus types in invasive cervical cancer worldwide: a
 meta-analysis. Br J Cancer, 2003. 88(1): p. 63-73.
- 1613.Munoz, N., et al., Epidemiologic classification of human papillomavirus types associated with162cervical cancer. N Engl J Med, 2003. 348(6): p. 518-27.
- Doorbar, J., et al., *Human papillomavirus molecular biology and disease association*. Rev
 Med Virol, 2015. **25 Suppl 1**: p. 2-23.
- 1655.Szarewski, A., et al., Efficacy of the human papillomavirus (HPV)-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted166vaccine in women aged 15-25 years with and without serological evidence of previous167exposure to HPV-16/18. Int J Cancer, 2012. 131(1): p. 106-16.
- 168 6. Harper, D.M., et al., Sustained efficacy up to 4.5 years of a bivalent L1 virus-like particle
 169 vaccine against human papillomavirus types 16 and 18: follow-up from a randomised control
 170 trial. Lancet, 2006. 367(9518): p. 1247-55.
- 171 7. Roteli-Martins, C.M., et al., Sustained immunogenicity and efficacy of the HPV-16/18 AS04-
- adjuvanted vaccine: up to 8.4 years of follow-up. Hum Vaccin Immunother, 2012. 8(3): p.
 390-7.

| 174 175 176 | 8. | Naud, P.S., et al., Sustained efficacy, immunogenicity, and safety of the HPV-16/18 ASO4- adjuvanted vaccine: final analysis of a long-term follow-up study up to 9.4 years post- vaccination. Hum Vaccin Immunother, 2014. 10 (8): p. 2147-62. |
|-------------------|-----|--|
| 177 | 9. | Wheeler, C.M., et al., Efficacy, safety, and immunogenicity of the human papillomavirus |
| 178 | | 16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine in women older than 25 years: 7-year follow-up of the phase |
| 179 | | 3. double-blind, randomised controlled VIVIANE study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2016. 16(10): p. |
| 180 | | 1154-1168. |
| 181 | 10. | Malagon, T., et al., Cross-protective efficacy of two human papillomavirus vaccines: a |
| 182 | | systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2012. 12 (10): p. 781-9. |
| 183 | 11. | Arbyn, M., et al., Prophylactic vaccination against human papillomaviruses to prevent |
| 184 | | cervical cancer and its precursors. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2018. 5: p. CD009069. |
| 185 | 12. | Bergman, H., et al., Comparison of different human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine types and |
| 186 | | dose schedules for prevention of HPV-related disease in females and males. Cochrane |
| 187 | | Database Syst Rev. 2019. 2019 (11) |
| 188 | 13 | Brotherton LM, et al., Is one dose of human nanillomavirus vaccine as effective as three?: A |
| 189 | 10. | national cohort analysis Panillomavirus Res 2019 8 n 100177 |
| 190 | 14. | Drolet, M., et al., Population-level impact and herd effects following the introduction of |
| 191 | | human nanillomavirus vaccination programmes: undated systematic review and meta- |
| 192 | | analysis. Lancet. 2019. |
| 193 | 15. | Palmer, T., et al., Prevalence of cervical disease at age 20 after immunisation with bivalent |
| 194 | - | HPV vaccine at age 12-13 in Scotland: retrospective population study. BMJ, 2019. 365 : p. |
| 195 | | 11161. |
| 196 | 16. | Pollock, K.G., et al., Reduction of low- and high-grade cervical abnormalities associated with |
| 197 | | high uptake of the HPV bivalent vaccine in Scotland. Br J Cancer. 2014. 111 (9): p. 1824-30. |
| 198 | 17. | Mesher, D., et al., The Impact of the National HPV Vaccination Program in England Using the |
| 199 | | Bivalent HPV Vaccine: Surveillance of Type-Specific HPV in Young Females, 2010-2016. J |
| 200 | | Infect Dis, 2018. 218 (6): p. 911-921. |
| 201 | 18. | Dillner, J., et al., Decline of HPV infections in Scandinavian cervical screening populations |
| 202 | | after introduction of HPV vaccination programs. Vaccine, 2018. 36 (26): p. 3820-3829. |
| 203 | 19. | Purrinos-Hermida, M.J., et al., Direct, indirect and total effectiveness of bivalent HPV vaccine |
| 204 | | <i>in women in Galicia, Spain.</i> PLoS One, 2018. 13 (8): p. e0201653. |
| 205 | 20. | Dunne, E.F., et al., Reduction in Human Papillomavirus Vaccine Type Prevalence Among |
| 206 | | Young Women Screened for Cervical Cancer in an Integrated US Healthcare Delivery System |
| 207 | | in 2007 and 2012-2013. J Infect Dis, 2015. 212 (12): p. 1970-5. |
| 208 | 21. | Kahn, J.A., et al., Substantial Decline in Vaccine-Type Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Among |
| 209 | | Vaccinated Young Women During the First 8 Years After HPV Vaccine Introduction in a |
| 210 | | <i>Community.</i> Clin Infect Dis, 2016. 63 (10): p. 1281-1287. |
| 211 | 22. | Machalek, D.A., et al., Very Low Prevalence of Vaccine Human Papillomavirus Types Among |
| 212 | | 18- to 35-Year Old Australian Women 9 Years Following Implementation of Vaccination. J |
| 213 | | Infect Dis, 2018. 217 (10): p. 1590-1600. |
| 214 | 23. | Public Health England, Surveillance of type-specific HPV in sexually active young females in |
| 215 | | England, to end 2018., in Health Protection Report Volume 14 Number 2. 2020. |
| 216 | 24. | McIndoe, W.A., et al., The invasive potential of carcinoma in situ of the cervix. Obstet |
| 217 | | Gynecol, 1984. 64 (4): p. 451-8. |
| 218 | 25. | McCredie, M.R., et al., Natural history of cervical neoplasia and risk of invasive cancer in |
| 219 | | women with cervical intraepithelial neoplasia 3: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet Oncol, |
| 220 | | 2008. 9 (5): p. 425-34. |
| 221 | 26. | Lehtinen, M., et al., Overall efficacy of HPV-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine against grade 3 |
| 222 | | or greater cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: 4-year end-of-study analysis of the randomised, |
| 223 | | double-blind PATRICIA trial. Lancet Oncol, 2012. 13(1): p. 89-99. |

- 224 27. Vink, M.A., et al., Clinical progression of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: 225 estimating the time to preclinical cervical cancer from doubly censored national registry 226 data. Am J Epidemiol, 2013. 178(7): p. 1161-9. 227 28. Lagheden, C., et al., Nationwide comprehensive human papillomavirus (HPV) genotyping of 228 invasive cervical cancer. Br J Cancer, 2018. 118(10): p. 1377-1381. 229 29. Herweijer, E., et al., Quadrivalent HPV vaccine effectiveness against high-grade cervical 230 lesions by age at vaccination: A population-based study. Int J Cancer, 2016. 138(12): p. 2867-231 74. Racey, C.S., et al., Cervical Intraepithelial Neoplasia Rates in British Columbia Women: A 232 30. 233 Population-Level Data Linkage Evaluation of the School-Based HPV Immunization Program. J 234 Infect Dis, 2020. 221(1): p. 81-90. 235 Luostarinen, T., et al., Vaccination protects against invasive HPV-associated cancers. Int J 31. 236 Cancer, 2018. 142(10): p. 2186-2187. 237 Lei J, P.A., Elfström KM, Dillner J, Sparén P. Effectiveness of HPV vaccination against invasive 32. 238 cervical cancer. 2019. 239 33. Landy, R., et al., What cervical screening is appropriate for women who have been 240 vaccinated against high risk HPV? A simulation study. Int J Cancer, 2017. 241 34. Kim, J.J., et al., Optimal Cervical Cancer Screening in Women Vaccinated Against Human 242 Papillomavirus. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2017. 109(2). 243 Naber, S.K., et al., Cervical Cancer Screening in Partly HPV Vaccinated Cohorts - A Cost-35. 244 *Effectiveness Analysis.* PLoS One, 2016. **11**(1): p. e0145548. 245 Vaccarella, S., et al., 50 years of screening in the Nordic countries: quantifying the effects on 36. 246 cervical cancer incidence. Br J Cancer, 2014. 111(5): p. 965-9. 247 37. Castanon, A., et al., Prediction of cervical cancer incidence in England, UK, up to 2040, under 248 four scenarios: a modelling study. Lancet Public Health, 2018. 3(1): p. e34-e43. 249 38. Cameron, R.L., et al., Human Papillomavirus Prevalence and Herd Immunity after 250 Introduction of Vaccination Program, Scotland, 2009-2013. Emerg Infect Dis, 2016. 22(1): p. 251 56-64. 252 39. Tabrizi, S.N., et al., Assessment of herd immunity and cross-protection after a human 253 papillomavirus vaccination programme in Australia: a repeat cross-sectional study. Lancet 254 Infect Dis, 2014. **14**(10): p. 958-66. 255 40. Garland, S.M., et al., Impact and Effectiveness of the Quadrivalent Human Papillomavirus 256 Vaccine: A Systematic Review of 10 Years of Real-world Experience. Clin Infect Dis, 2016. 257 **63**(4): p. 519-27. 258 41. Schiffman, M. and N. Wentzensen, Human papillomavirus infection and the multistage 259 carcinogenesis of cervical cancer. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev, 2013. 22(4): p. 553-60. 260 42. Brisson, M., et al., Impact of HPV vaccination and cervical screening on cervical cancer 261 elimination: a comparative modelling analysis in 78 low-income and lower-middle-income 262 countries. Lancet, 2020. 263 43. Kjaer, S.K., et al., A 12-Year Follow-up on the Long-Term Effectiveness of the Quadrivalent 264 Human Papillomavirus Vaccine in 4 Nordic Countries. Clin Infect Dis, 2018. 66(3): p. 339-345.
- 265