

1 Article

2 Determining factors for pertussis vaccination policy: 3 A study in 5 EU countries

4 Anabelle Wong^{1,2,3*}, Annick Opinel¹, Simon Jean-Baptiste Combes^{4,5}, Julie Toubiana^{6,7,8} and
5 Sylvain Brisse^{6,7}

6 ¹ Institut Pasteur/Inserm/UVQS, UMR 1181 Biostatistics, Biomathematics, Pharmacoepidemiology and
7 Infectious Diseases (B2PHI), 25 rue du Dr Roux, F- 75724 Paris Cedex 15, France.

8 ² EHESP, F-35000 Rennes, France.

9 ³ ScHARR, the University of Sheffield, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 4DA, United Kingdom.

10 ⁴ Univ Rennes, EHESP, CNRS, ARENES – UMR 6051, F-35000 Rennes, France.

11 ⁵ French Collaborative Institute on Migration, 93322 Aubervilliers, France.

12 ⁶ Institut Pasteur, Unit Biodiversity and Epidemiology of Bacterial Pathogens, 25 rue du Dr Roux, F- 75724
13 Paris Cedex 15, France.

14 ⁷ National Reference Center for Whooping cough and other Bordetellosis, Institut Pasteur, 25 rue du Dr
15 Roux, F- 75724 Paris Cedex 15, France.

16 ⁸ Université de Paris, Department of General Paediatrics and Infectious Diseases, Necker-Enfants malades
17 University Hospital, AP-HP, 135 rue de Sevres, 75015, Paris, France.

18 * Correspondence: anabelle.wong@eleve.ehesp.fr

19 Received: date pending; Accepted: date pending; Published: date pending

20 **Abstract:** Pertussis vaccination policy varies across Europe, not only in the type of vaccine – whole
21 cell (wP) vs. acellular (aP1/2/3/5) – but also in the schedule and recommendation for parents. This
22 study aims to investigate the determining factors for the type of vaccine, immunization schedule
23 and maternal immunization recommendation. From March to May 2019, experts in national health
24 agencies and major academic or research institutions from Denmark, France, Poland, Sweden and
25 the UK were invited to a semi-structured interview. Thematic analysis was performed on the
26 transcripts using a codebook formulated by 3 coders. Inter-coder agreement was assessed. Fifteen
27 expert interviews were conducted. The identified driving factors for pertussis vaccine policy were
28 classified into three domains: scientific factors, sociological factors, and pragmatic factors. The
29 determining factors for the type of vaccine were prescriber’s preference, concern of adverse events
30 following immunization (AEFI), effectiveness, and consideration of other vaccine components in
31 combined vaccines. The determining factors for infant schedule were immunity response and the
32 potential to improve coverage and timeliness. The determining factors for maternal immunization
33 were infant mortality and public acceptability. To conclude, socio-political and pragmatic factors
34 were, besides scientific factors, important in determining the vaccine type, schedule of childhood
35 immunization and recommendations for parents.

36 **Keywords:** *Bordetella pertussis*; whooping cough; vaccination policy; national immunization
37 program

38
39

40 1. Introduction

41 Whooping cough is an acute respiratory infection characterized by repeated, intense cough
42 bouts that can last for 2 to 3 months [1]. In 1906, the pathogen causing whooping cough was found to
43 be a Gram-negative bacterium, *Bordetella pertussis* (*B. pertussis*) [2]. It is highly contagious and
44 spreads via droplets of the coughs or sneezes of an infected person [1]. Before vaccines became
45 available, it was a major cause of infant mortality [3].

46 The earliest vaccines against pertussis were inactivated whole cell pertussis vaccines (wP)
47 developed in 1930s to 1950s; routine pertussis vaccination in children less than 12 months started in

48 the late 1950s in Europe [4]. wP have been replaced by acellular pertussis vaccines (aP) in many
49 European countries since the 1990s [2,5]. aP do not contain the whole bacterium but only antigens; it
50 was suggested that aP have lower reactogenicity and are better accepted [3].

51 After more than half a century, whooping cough has yet to be eradicated and there are signs for
52 resurgence despite routine childhood immunization [3,6] with high coverage [5]. Some authors have
53 hypothesized that the resurgence is due to short-lived protection from aP compared to wP [6,7].
54 Nevertheless, the waning of immunity from aP cannot explain all of the resurgence. For example, in
55 the Netherlands and in Denmark, the incidence of whooping cough began to surge before wP were
56 replaced by aP in the national immunization program [6,8]. Evidence from recent research supports
57 the adaptation of *B. pertussis* to vaccine-induced immunity through antigen evolution [7,9]. Most
58 notably, some strains of pertussis no longer produce pertactin (PRN) [3,4,5,10], a protein that enables
59 the bacteria to attach to the lining of human's airway [11] and which is one of the components used
60 in 3-component (aP3) and 5-component (aP5) vaccines [3,4,5,10,11]. The PRN-negative characteristic
61 appears to give *B. pertussis* an advantage in surviving in aP-vaccinated populations [5,11,12,13].
62 However, other vaccine components continue to provide protection against *B. pertussis*. Currently,
63 there is no evidence that the PRN-negative strains cause more severe pertussis infection [14,15] and
64 one study showed that the proportion of apnea was lower among PRN-negative cases [12].

65 Pertussis vaccination is an indispensable strategy towards disease control and prevention.
66 However, the dynamics of vaccination policy are complex. Understanding determinants of vaccine
67 policy is a step forward in the optimization of national immunization efforts. The scope of this study
68 focuses on the relationships of the content and context of pertussis vaccination in Europe. The
69 content is defined as i) the type of vaccine, ii) national immunization schedule and iii)
70 recommendations for pregnant women in pertussis vaccination; while the context comprises
71 determining factors for the policy.

72 The type and schedule used in the national immunization programs in Europe have evolved
73 since the introduction of pertussis vaccine in 1950s (Appendix A) [3,4,6,16-50], leading to
74 considerable heterogeneity in pertussis vaccination policies across Europe. Currently, the most
75 common type of vaccine used in Europe is multi-component aP (aP2/3/5). Two-component aP (aP2)
76 contains two antigens: pertussis toxoid (PT) and filamentous hemagglutinin (FHA); aP3 contains the
77 additional antigen PRN; and aP5 contains PT, FHA, PRN, and fimbriae (Fim) types 2 and 3 [4]. While
78 France allows the use of all three types of multicomponent aP, Denmark had until recently relied
79 exclusively on a 1-component aP vaccine (aP1) that contains only PT [51]; whereas Poland remains
80 the only country in Europe that uses wP in the national childhood immunization scheme [46]. Given
81 the existing evidence on efficacy and safety of pertussis vaccines and the similar profiles of
82 *B. pertussis* strains circulating in Europe [3,4,5,9,10], such diverse vaccination policies across Europe
83 lead to the hypothesis that pertussis immunization strategy is not solely determined by scientific
84 factors but may also be influenced by socio-historical factors as well as pragmatic reasons.


85 Two main patterns of the first series of pertussis immunization schedules for children are
86 currently used in Europe [16]: i) the accelerated schedule: 2/3/4 or 2/4/6 month with or without the
87 4th dose before the age of 2 years; and ii) the long schedule: 2/4/11 or 3/5/12 month.

88 The accelerated schedule consists of 3 doses of vaccines in the first 6 months of life whereas the
89 3 doses of vaccines in the long schedule are given in a span of 11 to 12 months [52]. The
90 immunization schedules vary among countries using the same type of vaccine. The initiation of
91 infant immunization can be at 2 or 3 months. Studies conducted in the 1990s did not offer conclusive
92 evidence. Some studies suggested higher serological response using the long schedule [53,54];
93 however, no good serological correlate of protection has been identified [52]. Systematic review also
94 found no good data for the comparison of different schedules in terms of effectiveness [52]. Besides,
95 the evidence of the age of infant immunization initiation having an impact on immunogenicity or
96 effectiveness is limited [52]. Under such circumstances, the observation of the variation of infant
97 immunization schedule further supports the hypothesis that pertussis immunization strategy is
98 influenced by factors other than existing evidence in efficacy or effectiveness. This study aimed to
99 investigate the factors that determined the pertussis immunization strategy in European countries
100 that have distinctive vaccination policies.

101 2. Materials and Methods

102 2.1. Selection of countries

103 Official reports from national health agencies and scientific and medical journals were reviewed
104 [3,4,6,16-50] to provide information on the current pertussis vaccination policy in 11 EU countries
105 that have participated in any one of the 4 EuPertStrain studies (Appendix A). The
106 EuPertStrain studies were established within the European network in 2011, aiming to monitor
107 changes in the European *B. pertussis* populations in order to optimize vaccine strategies [3,4,5,10].
108 Figure 1 shows the type of vaccine used and the first series schedule of childhood immunization in
109 11 EU countries. Five of these countries were then selected for a qualitative study based on the type
110 of vaccine being used, different recommendations for parents, and different schedules for childhood
111 immunization.
112
113



114

115 **Figure 1.** The type of vaccine used, the first series immunization schedule and recommendations for
116 parents in 11 EU countries (*NL started recommendations for maternal vaccination during the
117 study).

118 Denmark and Poland were selected due to the unique immunization agents used. The UK was
119 selected as it is the first country in Europe to have implemented mass vaccination for pregnant
120 women [1]. France was selected due to its recommendation for the cocooning strategy – a strategy
121 that aims to fill the vulnerable gap for pertussis infection in children between 0 to 6 weeks by
122 vaccinating the individuals in close contact with the newborn [16,33]. Owing to a unique history of
123 using aP1 exclusively in Gothenburg from 1996 to 1999 [50] and its “vaccine vacuum” from 1979 to
124 1996, Sweden was also included in this study to contribute information about vaccine policy
125 evolution. In terms of childhood immunization schedule, Poland and the UK adopted the
126 accelerated schedule while Denmark, France and Sweden followed the long schedule.

127 2.2. Methods for interviews

128 Semi-structured interviews with experts in selected countries were conducted to gain
129 understanding on the factors determining pertussis vaccination policy. Key informants were
130 selected due to their role, experience and knowledge in the field of childhood immunization [55].
131 The purpose of a semi-structured interview was to encourage expert participants to share their
132 observation and understanding about the phenomenon in vaccination policy making. Experts were

133 identified in the process of literature review and via searching the official websites of major
134 academic and national institutions in selected countries. Individuals who fulfilled the inclusion
135 criteria (Table 1) were recruited. Further informants were recruited by snowball sampling because
136 sampling in this study was purposive and it aimed at maximum variation of information [56]. The
137 sampling frame aimed to recruit experts from different professional backgrounds within the same
138 country and to obtain representation from experts involved in policy decisions as well as those who
139 were not involved in the national decision process. Interviews were conducted in person or via
140 Skype or phone when a face-to-face meeting could not be arranged. The interviews followed a set of
141 open-ended questions in the topic guide developed based on Boyce and Neale's template [57]. The
142 interviews were audio-recorded and transcripts were produced based on the audio-file. The
143 transcripts were sent back to participants for checking and signing as an endorsement of accuracy.
144 Upon receiving the endorsed transcript, the audio-recording would be deleted. In cases where the
145 expert had not sent back an endorsed transcript, draft transcript was used for analysis while
146 pending future transcript endorsement to trigger the deletion of the audio-file. The transcripts were
147 anonymized by the allocation of a transcript ID.

148 **Table 1.** Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participant recruitment.

Inclusion Criteria
1) Have work experience of 3 years or above in the field related to vaccination policy or pertussis research in the country;
2) Have professional knowledge on pertussis vaccine or vaccination policy in the country;
3) Are able to communicate effectively in English;
4) Are willing to participate and have given informed consent.
Exclusion Criteria
1) Vaccine manufacturers and their employees;
2) Withdrawn consent during or after interview.

149
150 Demographic information and characteristics of participants were summarized by descriptive
151 statistics. Thematic content analysis was performed on the anonymized transcripts using a codebook
152 formulated based on grounded theory. It means that the codebook did not rely on any pre-existing
153 theory but consisted of recurrent concepts emerged from the interviews; therefore the codebook was
154 considered grounded in data [58]. The process of coding was guided by the 3-stage approach
155 proposed by Campbell and colleagues [59]. In the first stage, a codebook by one knowledgeable
156 coder was developed based on all transcripts. A knowledgeable coder was defined as a coder who
157 had insights on all transcripts. This codebook was used by three independent analysts to code two
158 pilot transcripts: one from the interview with a health scientist and the other with a social scientist.
159 As the vocabulary used and the concepts brought up by experts with these professional
160 backgrounds can vary significantly, the code used would vary accordingly. The second stage
161 involved adjudicating coding disagreement through discussion [59]. In this stage, the codebook was
162 refined as ambiguous and overlapping codes were deleted and necessary new codes created based
163 on the consensus of the three coders. Inter-coder agreement was assessed after pilot coding. In the
164 third stage, the codebook was deployed to the full set of anonymized transcripts by one
165 knowledgeable coder once inter-coder agreement was established. All codes were arranged into
166 categories and plotted for conceptualization. All transcripts were processed in R version 3.5.1 and
167 RStudio version 1.1.456 using the package "RQDA".

168 Inter-coder agreement was assessed using Krippendorff's alpha, which is a generalized version
169 of inter-rater agreeability statistic that can be applicable in nominal data and in situations where
170 there are more than 2 observers [60]. The interpretation of Krippendorff's alpha was based on the
171 guideline drawn up by Landis and Koch [61].

172

173 2.3. *Ethical approval*

174 The study has obtained approval from the Ethical Committee (EC) of the University of
175 Sheffield, UK. Regarding the nature and study design of this study, EC approval or notification was
176 not required in Denmark, France, Poland and Sweden. Further to EC requirements in selected
177 countries, this study observed and complied with the EU General Data Protection Regulation
178 (GDPR) as well as the country-specific regulations if the scope of such regulation applied.

179 3. Results

180 From March to May 2019, 34 experts were contacted, and 15 interviews had been conducted by
181 the end of May, 2019. The 15 experts had experience ranging from 5 to 35 years and the median year
182 of experience was 18 years. Table 2 shows more demographic information including country,
183 professional background and whether the expert was involved in the vaccination policy process.

184 Among the 19 non-responders, 6 declined for not having sufficient knowledge or experience in
185 the topic, not being actively involved in related duties anymore, or being too occupied with other
186 priorities. The characteristics of the non-responders were analyzed. Non-responders more often
187 came from Sweden and the UK (n=15); and were more often experts in the field of social and
188 political science (n=10).

189
190

Table 2. Demographic characteristics of participants.

Demographic characteristics		N
Total		15
Country	Denmark	3
	France	4
	Poland	2
	Sweden	3
	UK	3
Professional background	Social & Political Science	4
	Epidemiology & Medicine	7
	Microbiology & Immunology	4
Involvement in Policy Process	Yes	9
	No	6

191

192

193 3.1. *Inter-coder agreement*

194 Inter-coder agreement among the three coders was assessed using Krippendorff's alpha (Table
195 3). Disagreements among coders came from the inconsistency within one coder as well as the
196 inter-coder differences in the interpretation and application of the coding guidelines [60].

197 Table 3. Inter-coder agreement in pilot coding using two transcripts.

Transcript Profile	Coding Unit	Krippendorff's alpha ^[60]	Interpretation ^[61]
Epidemiology & Medicine	75	0.621	Substantial
Social & Political Science	57	0.598	Moderate
Total	132	0.616	Substantial

198


199 The Krippendorff's alpha based on the health scientist's transcript was slightly higher than that
200 based on the social scientist's transcript. The small difference between the Krippendorff's alphas of
201 the 3 coders based on the 2 transcripts also suggested that the levels of agreement among coders
202 were similar when interpreting discussions offered by experts of different backgrounds. The overall

203 inter-coder agreement by Krippendorff's alpha was 0.616, indicating substantial agreement
204 according to Landis and Kock's interpretation framework (Table 2) [61].

205 3.2. Determining factors of pertussis vaccination policy

206 The determining factors referred to the reasons for the change in policy or the ground for
207 policies remaining unchanged. These factors were identified from the interviews and triangulated
208 by experts from the same country.

209 The codes derived from the transcripts were categorized into three domains: scientific factors,
210 sociological factors, and pragmatic factors. Figure 2 shows the determining factors for pertussis
211 vaccination policy under different domains.
212



213

214 **Figure 2.** Determining factors of pertussis vaccination policy: (a) scientific factors; (b) sociological
215 factors; (c) pragmatic factors.

216 3.3.1. Type of vaccine

217 Regarding the change from wP to aP, a range of reasons were mentioned. While most experts
218 (n=10) believed the concern of adverse events following immunization (AEFI) was causing the
219 change, some experts who were involved in the decision making process pointed out other more
220 proximal reasons (n=5) for the change in the type of vaccine being used in the national immunization
221 program.

222 Experts in France stated that the prescriber's preference contributed to the change. According to
223 the experts, the country recommended using wP in the first series of childhood immunization until
224 2004; however, since the introduction of aP booster for the age group of 11 to 14 years in 1998 in
225 France and subsequent availability of aP, many general practitioners and pediatricians prescribed aP
226 for the prime vaccination of the infants. According to the experts, due to increasing consumption of
227 aP and decreasing demand of wP, manufacturers decided to produce only aP instead of maintaining
228 two production lines. That ultimately caused the change in recommendation from using wP to aP in
229 the immunization for all age groups.

230 Experts in Sweden pointed out the fact that despite a high coverage of wP before the change,
231 pertussis cases in infants were not reduced. Therefore, the wP vaccine was deemed ineffective and
232 the national pertussis immunization program was suspended from 1979 to 1996. It was resumed
233 when aP became available and after its effectiveness had been proven.

234 In the UK, wP was recommended for the infant immunization program until 2004. According to
235 the experts, coverage of the vaccine program plummeted due to concern about AEFI in the 1970s and
236 1980s, but confidence was restored in wP given abundant efforts in independent review about the
237 safety of the wP vaccine, leading to increased and sustained high coverage . The change from wP to
238 aP was actually driven by the need of an inactivated polio vaccine, which was available in a
239 multivalent vaccine that contained an aP component.

240 Poland was the only country in the EU that is still using wP. According to the experts in Poland,
241 the wP used had desirable effectiveness and did not induce concern about AEFI. As the vaccine was
242 produced in the country, the supply was stable. It was also a more affordable option.

243 Regarding the switch from aP1 to aP2/3/5, experts from Sweden shared that it was the tender
244 process that drove the change. As aP1 vaccines were only produced in Denmark, since the
245 manufacturer did not participate in the tender process, it was not available for selection in the
246 Swedish national immunizations program. Before this study commenced, Denmark was the only
247 country that had been using aP1 [51] since the change from wP to aP in 1997. However, experts in
248 Denmark reported in the interview during this study that the country has just changed from using
249 aP1 to aP2/3/5 and the reason was also due to aP1 manufacturer stopping its participation in the
250 tender process.

251 3.3.2. Immunization schedule

252 Concerning the accelerated and long schedule for infant immunization, most experts regarded
253 it to be a decision based on clinical data from trials of the vaccines and the authorized posology
254 recommended by manufacturers. However, since both schedules were proven to be effective and the
255 recommendation by the World Health Organization (WHO) also allows certain flexibility [62],
256 countries made their decisions based on various factors and priorities.

257 Experts from Denmark and Sweden, where long schedule (3/5/12 month) was used, shared that
258 such decision was based on data from clinical trials within the country and that such schedule
259 allowed desirable immunogenicity and effectiveness.

260 *“That was in the 80s, we looked at the pertussis trial and we found that the immune response is the best if*
261 *you give the vaccine at 2-month intervals instead of 1-month intervals. And it’s better to start at the age of 3*
262 *month compared to 2 month...” (Sweden expert)*

263 France adopted the accelerated schedule in 1995 but has changed to a long schedule in 2013.
264 However, in 2013, France used a long schedule that consisted of three doses at 2, 4, 11 month instead
265 of the 3/5/12 month standard long schedule. According to the experts, an earlier initiation of
266 immunization was due to the concern of cases in very young infants – those who might be infected
267 by pertussis before receiving the first dose of vaccine at the age of 3 month according to the standard
268 long schedule.

269 *“And in France, we decided to adopt such a schedule but we did not want to start at 3 month because we*
270 *knew that if you start one month later, you will have more pertussis cases. So we chose to start at 2 months...”*
271 *(France expert)*

272 The accelerated schedule (2/3/4 month) was used in the UK. Experts shared that when the 3rd
273 dose of primary pertussis vaccination was closer to an older infant age around 11 month; there was a
274 drop-off in uptake of that 3rd dose. By adopting the accelerated schedule, coverage was increased
275 and timeliness of the three doses of first series of vaccine was improved.

276 *“The advantage of having an accelerated course is that you’re not only offering protection at an earliest*
277 *infant age but also we’ve found that you’re more likely to achieve higher uptake, when you’re offering it at an*
278 *earlier age.” (UK expert)*

279 3.3.3. Maternal vaccination

280 A consensus was observed among experts from different countries that the main reason for
281 recommending vaccination during pregnancy was an epidemic or increased infant death.

282 *“...we have no, well, very few infant deaths. And that is the major marker for introducing the vaccination*
283 *in pregnancy, of course. We had an epidemic in 2016. And that’s prompted, the Health Authority to think about*

284 *renewing the vaccination strategies. And vaccination in pregnancy was one of them although we haven't*
285 *implemented it."* (Denmark expert)

286 *"So now it has changed in favor of maternal vaccination. Pertussis is not a big problem for the moment,*
287 *but in case there will be an increase of infants infected with pertussis, I think there will be a change in the*
288 *program towards this recommendation."* (Sweden expert)

289 *"We experienced a very significant increase in overall rate of disease across the entire population, but*
290 *particularly in those very young babies. And we had an increase in pertussis deaths, we had 14 deaths from*
291 *pertussis in 2012. So the introduction of the maternal program was very much introduced and prompted by the*
292 *increased rate of disease. We've done it as an emergency program..."* (UK expert)

293 In countries where infant deaths remained low, such as Denmark and Sweden, experts
294 suggested that maternal vaccination would enter the policy discussion when pertussis-related infant
295 deaths increased. In the UK, where a major epidemic with increased infant deaths occurred in 2012,
296 such strategy was adopted as a response to the emergency.

297 However, there were also recurrent concerns about such policy. These concerns included
298 acceptability of maternal immunization by health care professional (HCP) and by the general public
299 and the limited data on immunity blunting, which is a phenomenon where trans-placentally
300 acquired antibody lowers the immune response to infant immunization [19].

301 *"Well, it's typical that one reason why we didn't jump at that strategy is that we have the question mark of*
302 *what will be the acceptance rate of such a strategy."* (France expert)

303 *"...we have an investigation in the public health agency a couple of years ago. At that time, there was some*
304 *hesitancy. They were looking for more data. There's some kind of blunting or immune response in the children."*
305 (Sweden expert)

306 3.3.4. Other important discourse: policy implementation

307 During the interviews, some experts (n=2) expressed that pertussis vaccination was not a
308 frequently debated topic in the country as vaccination debates focused on other vaccines, such as
309 HPV vaccines.

310 Some experts (n=3) offered a discussion on the paradigm of vaccination policy process. In
311 Poland, there was recently a vote in parliament about abolishing mandatory vaccination, which was
312 triggered by citizens' petition; and in France, there had been a citizen consultation before the country
313 expanded mandatory vaccination in 2018 from 3 vaccines to 11 vaccines. Those events led countries
314 to discuss themes related to public-professional and public-authority relationship. Some experts
315 shared that they were concerned about how policy was made would have an impact on the
316 perception, attitude or behavior of the general public regarding vaccination or towards HCP:

317 *"And something that might fuel distrust towards the expert professionals, in Poland at least, is the*
318 *strength and unquestionability of the consensus already existing among professionals."* (Poland expert)

319 The use of mandatory vaccination may lead some people to be more radical:

320 *"...that doesn't mean they were against vaccines, it just means that they were against mandatory*
321 *vaccination... is it going to push part of the people who are hesitant towards a more radical stance, you know,*
322 *going to very private schools, where they look the other way and don't really check whether the children are*
323 *vaccinated? And the issue is whether it's going to create small pockets of severely under-vaccinated people..."*
324 (France expert)

325 According to the some experts, mandatory vaccination may be seen as a way to restore public
326 confidence in vaccines in France and as the consensus or approval of the authority and professionals
327 in Poland. Other countries found voluntary vaccination based on national recommendation a better
328 suiting strategy. Some experts also expressed doubts about the message or implication conveyed by
329 vaccine mandates:

330 *"I can't see a reason for introducing a compulsory element to this because it's a program that's already*
331 *very well delivered and very well received. So I can't see a role for mandating in our population at this time.*
332 *And I doubt it would improve uptake, and it could be counterproductive."* (UK expert)

333 *"...but if the results speak for themselves and the health authorities recommend something, people tend to*
334 *do that. And I believe, and I know I'm not alone in believing that, if we were to make mandatory vaccination, it*

335 *would actually spark this hesitancy, it would spark distrust. And I think it would be detrimental for our*
336 *program to do that.” (Denmark expert)*

337 4. Discussion

338 In this work we first reviewed the literature to define the extent of variation of vaccination
339 policies across EU countries. We then selected 5 countries with contrasted policies to conduct an
340 investigation of vaccination policy determinants. In the semi-structured interview, experts from
341 Denmark, France, Poland, Sweden and the UK were asked about their perception of the
342 determinants for changes in the type of *pertussis* vaccine (wP / aP1 / aP2,3,5) and schedule being used
343 in the national childhood immunization program, and the reasons for such changes, if any. Experts
344 were also asked why cocooning strategy or maternal vaccination might be important to the country,
345 if there was such recommendation in place.


346 All participating countries except Poland experienced the switch of wP to aP in national
347 immunization against *pertussis*. Although it is widely believed that aP is better tolerated than wP [3],
348 it was not the main reason for the switch in France, Sweden and the UK. Moreover, the wP in Poland
349 did not trigger concern about AEFI. An explanation for these observations is that wP, of which the
350 production process is not standardized, showed different efficacies and safety profiles in different
351 countries, leading to heterogeneity in the discontinuation or continuation of wP in national
352 immunizations program.

353 One of the recurrent messages brought up by experts was the inappropriate comparison
354 between wP and aP in literature and in nowadays’ debates. Experts reminded researchers and policy
355 makers that wP and aP comparison would not be meaningful and can be misleading when the strain
356 of wP was not specified or characterized. The efficacy and safety profile of wP depended on the
357 specific strain and the production of the vaccine. Some countries used locally produced wP;
358 therefore the quality, efficacy and safety profile of the vaccines across countries would vary. Even
359 within the same country, wP still varied from year to year, and from batch to batch. This also
360 explained why the decision of using wP or aP and the reasons for the switch differed from country to
361 country. If the country had a wP with good effectiveness and desirable safety profile, wP tended to
362 remain in use for longer periods. As different wP have different safety profiles, it is therefore
363 important to be precise about the wP when the concern of AEFI is addressed.

364 Often mentioned was the “side effects” or “safety profile” of wP but the more important
365 concept is the distinction between the actual AEFI that occurred and the concern about the AEFI. The
366 former is a factual concept – frequency and severity of the AEFI that occurred; the latter is a concept
367 about perceived risk and a measure of attitude.

368 Looking closer at the driving factors for the change from wP to aP in the selected countries,
369 there appeared to be an interdependent relationships among scientific factors, sociological factors
370 and pragmatic factors. This study leads us to propose a mechanism of influences among cases of
371 AEFI, the concern about AEFI and the behavioral adaptation (Figure 3). Hidden influence or
372 relationship, such as the influence from manufacturer on HCP and policy makers, or the influence
373 from media and social media on HCP and policy makers, can be present. The existing literature on
374 vaccination policy also highlighted that transparency of the decision process needs improving [63].
375 Therefore, while deciphering the driving factors in vaccination policy, one must bear in mind the
376 potential hidden driving factors or the concealed relationship between factors.

377



378

379

Figure 3. Relationship between AEFI and the concern about AEFI among public and HCP.

380

381

382

383

384

The determination of the childhood immunization schedule against pertussis appeared to result from a balance of three essential factors: i) immunogenicity; ii) earliest immunization possible; and iii) highest uptake possible. These three independent but important factors justify the flexibility included in the WHO recommendations [62] and offer a basis for vaccine policy makers to weigh the above-mentioned factors according to the country-specific context.

385

386

387

388

389

390

391

392

393

394

Closely related to the determination of the childhood immunization schedule are the recommendations for parents. Most experts agreed that maternal vaccination became a topic of discussion when an epidemic or an increase in pertussis-related infant deaths was observed in the country. Such finding is coherent with the policy evolution in the UK, as the UK government introduced a temporary immunization program for pregnant women from October 2012 as a response to the national outbreak declared in April 2012 [64]. Later in June 2014, the Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) advised the program to continue for another five years before further evaluation [64]. Such evaluation shall offer an abundance of evidence that may answer many questions about the longer term safety, efficacy and cost-effectiveness of the national maternal immunization program.

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

A similar case was observed in an overseas Department of France: the increase in pertussis cases among infants in Mayotte in 2017 has sparked the discussion that led to the implementation of local maternal immunization as a response to the epidemic [65]. The outbreak in Mayotte was partly due to insufficient coverage of childhood immunization program caused by the breakdown of health care infrastructure [65]. Further, the Technical Commission of Vaccinations (Commission Technique des Vaccinations, Haute Autorité de Santé) has affirmed that maternal vaccination is more efficient and beneficial than the cocooning strategy in protecting infants too young to be vaccinated in the context of major epidemics [66]. Hence, the situation in Mayotte might influence an evolution of maternal vaccination recommendations even in mainland France.

404

405

406

407

408

409

410

411

As primary research, this study offered abundant data and will allow further analyses. Its sampling frame aimed to obtain representation from all five selected countries. In each country, at least two different professional backgrounds were included in order to maximize data variation and to serve the purpose of triangulation. The median duration of experts' experience was 18 years, indicating that the study sample has long duration of exposure in the field of interest and can be considered as a credible source of information. The data collection relied on audio-recording, together with the transcript endorsement process, which ensured the accuracy of data and thus increased the internal validity of the study. Qualitative research is often attacked for being subjective

412 and biased [67], especially when there is ambiguity in the data or when certain codes belong to more
413 than one coding categories [68]. To increase rigorousness and external validity, this study
414 endeavored to establish a reliable codebook with an assessment of the inter-coder agreement of three
415 coders who had worked on the same set of transcripts [59,60]. Although the sample size was small
416 (n=15), no new code arose towards the last few interviews and a large amount of recurrent codes
417 were observed, suggesting saturation of knowledge, which was the purpose of this qualitative
418 research using the method of interview [69].

419 There were a few limitations in this study. Firstly, the study sample included more scientists
420 from the natural and health disciplines than social and political ones, which caused the data to be
421 more science-centric. The reason for such sample composition was driven by the reality that more
422 experts from the field of natural science and health science responded to the study invitation than
423 experts from the field of social and political science. This could be due to no or very few sociologists
424 and political scientists working on pertussis vaccination specifically, and some may not feel
425 comfortable participating in a study on pertussis vaccination policy. Secondly, the set duration of 30
426 minutes was a limiting time frame for an interview, so some participants did not cover all topics on
427 the interview topic guide. Thirdly, as discussed above, hidden external influence such as that from
428 the pharmaceutical industry cannot be assessed. This may or may not have affected the neutrality of
429 experts' opinions [70]. Since participants did not declare conflict of interests, it was not possible to
430 estimate the impact of such influence on this study. As with many studies using the method of
431 qualitative interview, unitization of transcripts was a limitation in this study [59,60]. In the content
432 analysis, coding units were "units of meaning" instead of demarcated parts of text. Such unitization,
433 despite being more appropriate in this exploratory research study using complex interview data
434 [59], tends to result in lower inter-coder agreement [59,60]. Lastly, the five countries had different
435 surveillance systems and strategies in place, which may influence the experts' perception of
436 determining factors for pertussis vaccination policy.

437 5. Conclusions

438 By disputing the oversimplified version of safety- and efficacy-driven vaccine policy, the
439 findings of this study contribute to a better understanding of the determining factors that drive
440 pertussis vaccination policy. The choice of the immunization agent was influenced by prescriber's
441 preference, concern of adverse events following immunization (AEFI), effectiveness, and
442 consideration of other vaccine components in combined vaccines. The schedule of childhood
443 immunization was determined by immunity response and the potential to improve coverage and
444 timeliness. The recommendations on maternal immunization hinges on infant mortality contributed
445 by pertussis in the country as well as acceptability of such strategy by HCP and the general public.

446 To better guide pertussis vaccination policy, future researchers should pay attention to should
447 pay attention to the impact of changes in vaccine policies on pertussis epidemiology within a
448 country and dynamics of transmission in Europe and worldwide. More efforts and attention should
449 be given to sociological research on pertussis vaccination strategies, especially on the attitude and
450 behavior of HCP and the public. Including sociological expertise in the decision making and
451 increasing the transparency of decision process may also help build public's trust in the vaccine
452 policy decision process.

453 Author Contributions:

454 Conceptualization, Anabelle Wong, Annick Opinel, Julie Toubiana and Sylvain Brisse; methodology, Anabelle
455 Wong and Annick Opinel; software, Anabelle Wong and Simon Jean-Baptiste Combes; validation, Anabelle
456 Wong, Annick Opinel and Simon Jean-Baptiste Combes; formal analysis, Anabelle Wong; investigation,
457 Anabelle Wong; resources, Annick Opinel, Julie Toubiana and Sylvain Brisse; data curation, Anabelle Wong;
458 writing—original draft preparation, Anabelle Wong; writing—review and editing, Annick Opinel, Simon
459 Jean-Baptiste Combes, Julie Toubiana and Sylvain Brisse; visualization, Anabelle Wong; supervision, Annick
460 Opinel and Simon Jean-Baptiste Combes; project administration, Anabelle Wong and Annick Opinel; funding
461 acquisition, Sylvain Brisse.

462 **Funding:** This project was funded by the INCEPTION interdisciplinary project at Institut Pasteur,
463 “Understanding whooping cough resurgence in Europe by combing genomic, epidemiological and sociological
464 approaches” (French Government Investissements d’Avenir grant ANR-16-CONV-0005).

465 **Acknowledgments:** The research team would like to thank Yoriko Masunaga, Institute of Tropical Medicine in
466 Antwerp; Richard Cooper, University of Sheffield; Didier Guillemot, Tamara Giles-Vernick and Matthieu
467 Domenech de Cellès, Institut Pasteur, for their valuable advice and resourcefulness. We would also like to
468 express our heart-felt gratitude to Daniel Levy-Bruhl, Daniel Floret, Nicole Guiso, Tine Dalby, Michał
469 Zabdyr-Jamróz, Sven-Arne Silfverdal and other experts who have offered their support to this project.

470 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

471

472 Appendix A: Pertussis Vaccination Policy in 14 EU Countries since Introduction. [3,4,6,16-50]

Country	Year	Vaccine	Prime schedule	Booster (childhood)	Booster (teenage)
Belgium	1950s	wP	3 / 4 / 5 / 13mo		
	1999	DTaP; wP in FR			
	2001	DTaP-IPV			
	2003		2 / 3 / 4 / 15mo		
	2004	DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB		4-6yr DTaP-IPV	
	2009				14-16yr dTap
Czech	1958	wP	0 / 6wk / 6 / 18-20mo	3 / 6 yr wP	
	1991	DTwP	9 / 13 / 17wk / 18-20mo	5yr DTwP	
	2007	DTaP	9 / 13 / 17wk / 18-20mo	5-6yr DTaP	
	2009				10-11yr DTaP-IPV
	2016	DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB	3 / 5 / 11-13mo		
	Denmark	1961	DTwP	5 / 6 / 7 / 15mo	
1969		wP	5wk / 9wk / 10mo		
1997		DTaP-IPV	3 / 5 / 12mo		
2002		DTaP-IPV/Hib			
2003				5yr dTaP	
2004				5yr dTaP-IPV	
Finland	1952	DwP	3 / 4 / 5mo	3-4 / 6-7 yr DTwP	
	1957	DTwP			
	1977		3 / 4 / 5 / 24mo		
	2003			6yr dtaP	
	2005	DTaP-IPV-Hib	3 / 5 / 12mo		
	2008			4yr DTaP-IPV	
	2009				11-13yr dtaP
2011				14-15yr dtaP	
France	1959	wP	3 / 4 / 5 / 18-24mo		
	1966	DTwP-IPV	3 / 4 / 5 / 18-24mo		
	1995	DTwP-IPV-Hib	2 / 3 / 4 / 16-18mo		
	1998				11-13yr DTaP-IPV
	2004	DTaP-IPV-Hib			
	2008	DTaP-IPV-Hib (HB)			11-13yr dTaP-IPV
	2013		2 / 4 / 11mo	6yr DTaP-IPV	

Germany	1964 1969 1974 1991 1995 2000 2006	wP in GDR wP in FWG Nil in FWG DTwP in all 3/4/5/24mo 3/4/5/13mo 2/3/4/11-14mo		5-6yr dTaP	9-17yr dTaP
Ireland	1952 1995 2001 2008 2010 2012 2016	DTwP DTwP DTaP-IPV-Hib DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB	2 / 4 / 6mo	4-5yr DTaP	12-13yr dTaP
Italy	1961 1995 1999 2012	wP DTaP	3 / 5 / 11-12mo 3 / 5 / 11mo	5-6yr DTaP	11-18yr dTaP
The Netherlands	1957 1962 1993 1999 2002 2003 2005 2006 2008 2010 2011 2017	DTwP DTwP-IPV DTwP-IPV, Hib DTwP-IPV-Hib DTaP-IPV-Hib DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB	3 / 4 / 5mo 3 / 4 / 5 / 11mo 2 / 3 / 4 / 11mo 2 / 3 / 4 / 11mo	4yr aP 4yr DTaP-IPV	4yr dTaP
Norway	1952 1984 1998 2006 2012	DTwP DTaP-IPV/Hib	3 / 4 / 5 / 15-18mo 3 / 5 / 10mo 3 / 5 / 12mo	7yr DTaP-IPV	15yr DTaP-IPV
Poland	1960 2004 2016	DTwP	2 / 3-4 / 5 / 16-18mo	6yr DTaP	14yr dTaP

474

475

Spain	1965	wP			
	1967				
	1975		3 / 5 / 7mo 2-3 / 4-5 / 6-7 /		
	1995	DTwP	18mo		
	2000		2 / 4 / 6 / 18mo	4-6yr DTaP	
	2005	DTaP		4-6yr DTaP/dTaP	11-14yr dTaP 11-12yr dTaP
	2012				
	2014				
2015			6yr DTaP/dTaP		
2016	DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB	2 / 4 / 12mo	6yr dTaP-IPV		
Sweden	1953	DTwP	3 / 5 / 12mo		
	1979	Nil			
	1996	DTaP	3 / 5 / 12mo		
	1998	DTaP-IPV/Hib	3 / 5 / 12mo		
	2005				10yr DTaP till 2011
	2007			5-6yr DTaP-IPV	
2016				14-16yr dTap	
UK	1957	DTwP			
	1968		3 / 5 / 11mo		
	1990		2 / 3 / 4mo		
	2000	(DTaP3-Hib)		3yr4mo DTaP-IPV	
	2001	(DTaP3-Hib)			
	2004	DTaP-IPV-Hib	2 / 3 / 4mo		
2017	DTaP-IPV-Hib/HB			14yr dT-IPV	

476

477

478

479 **References**

- 480 1. National Health Service. Whooping cough. Available online:
481 <https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/whooping-cough/> (accessed on 12 Feb 2019).
- 482 2. Amirthalingam, G.; Gupta, S. and Campbell H. Pertussis immunisation and control in England and Wales,
483 1957 to 2012: A historical review. *Euro Surveill* **2013**, *18*(38), pii20587.
- 484 3. Caro, V.; Njamkepo, E.; Van Amersfoort, S.C.M.; Mooi, F.R.; Advani, A.; Hallander, H.O. et al.
485 Pulsed-field gel electrophoresis analysis of *Bordetella pertussis* populations in various European countries
486 with different vaccine policies. *Microbes Infect* **2005**, *7*, 976-982.
- 487 4. Advani, A.; Hallander, H.O.; Dalby, T.; Krogfelt, K.A.; Guiso, N.; Njamkepo, E. et al. Pulsed-field gel
488 electrophoresis analysis of *Bordetella pertussis* isolates circulating in Europe from 1998 to 2009. *J Clin*
489 *Microbiol* **2013**, *51*(2), 422-428.
- 490 5. Barkoff, A.; Mertsola, J.; Pierard, D.; Dalby, T.; Hoegh, S.V.; Guillot, S. et al. Surveillance of circulating
491 *Bordetella pertussis* strains in Europe during 1998 to 2015. *J Clin Microbiol* **2018**, *56*(5), e01998-17.
- 492 6. World Health Organization. SAGE pertussis working group background paper. **2014**.
- 493 7. Preston, A. The role of *B. pertussis* vaccine antigen gene variants in pertussis resurgence and possible
494 consequences for vaccine development. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **2016**, *12*(5), 1274-1276.
- 495 8. Domenech de Celles, M.; Magpantay, F.M.G.; King, A.A. and Rohani, P. The pertussis enigma: Reconciling
496 epidemiology, immunology and evolution. *Proc Royal Soc B* **2016**, *283*(1822), 20152309.
497 doi: 10.1098/rspb.2015.2309
- 498 9. Bart, M.J.; Harris, S.R.; Advani, A.; Arakawa, Y.; Bottero, D.; Bouchez, V. et al. Global population structure
499 and evolution of *Bordetella pertussis* and their relationship with vaccination. *mBio* **2014**, *5*(2), e01074-14.
500 doi:10.1128/mBio.01074-14.
- 501 10. Hallander, H.; Advani, A.; Riffelmann, M.; von König, C.H.W.; Caro, V.; Guiso, N. et al. *Bordetella*
502 *pertussis* strains circulating in Europe in 1994 to 2004 as determined by pulsed-field gel electrophoresis. *J*
503 *Clin Microbiol* **2007**, *45*(10), 3257-3262.
- 504 11. Bouchez, V.; Hegerle, N.; Strati, F.; Njamkepo, E. and Guiso, N. New data on vaccine antigen deficient
505 *Bordetella pertussis* isolates. *Vaccines (Basel)* **2015**, *3*(3), 751-770.
- 506 12. Martin, S.W.; Pawloski, L.; Williams, M.; Weening, K.; DeBolt, C.; Qin, X. et al.
507 Pertactin-Negative *Bordetella pertussis* Strains: Evidence for a possible selective advantage. *Clin Infect Dis*
508 **2015**, *60*(2), 223-227
- 509 13. Mooi, F.R.; Van der Maas, N.A.T. and De Melker, H.E. Pertussis resurgence: waning immunity and
510 pathogen adaptation – two sides of the same coin. *Epidemiol Infect* **2014**, *142*, 685-694
- 511 14. Bodilis, H. and Guiso, N. Virulence of pertactin-negative *Bordetella pertussis* isolates from infants, France.
512 *Emerg Infect Dis* **2013**, *19*(3), 471-474. doi: 10.3201/1903.121475. .
- 513 15. Clarke, M.; McIntyre, P.B.; Blyth, C.C.; Wood, N.; Octavia, S.; Sintchenko, V. et al. The relationship
514 between *Bordetella pertussis* genotype and clinical severity in Australian children with pertussis. *J Infect*
515 **2016**, *72*(2), 171-178.
- 516 16. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Vaccine schedules in all countries of the European
517 Union. Available online: <https://vaccine-schedule.ecdc.europa.eu/> (accessed on 14 Feb 2019).
- 518 17. Therre, H. and Baron, S. Pertussis immunization in Europe – the situation in late 1999. *Euro Surveill* **2000**,
519 *5*(1), 6-10.
- 520 18. Van Kerschaver, E. The Belgian expanded Programme on immunization (EPI) and hepatitis B vaccination.
521 *S Afr J Epidemiol Infect* **2008**, *23*(1), 40-44.
- 522 19. Maertens, K.; Cabore, R.N.; Huygen, K.; Hens, N.; Van Damme, P. and Leuridan, E. Pertussis vaccination
523 during pregnancy in Belgium: Results of a prospective controlled cohort study. *Vaccine* **2016**, *34* (1),
524 142-150.
- 525 20. Maertens, K.; Braeckman, T.; Top, G.; Van Damme, P. and Leuridan, E. Maternal pertussis and influenza
526 immunization coverage and attitude of health care workers towards these recommendations in Flanders,
527 Belgium. *Vaccine* **2016**, *34* (1), 5785-5791.
- 528 21. Vaccination Info. [Diseases and vaccines: whooping cough] Available online:
529 <https://www.vaccination-info.be/maladie/coqueluche/> (accessed on 19 Feb 2019). (French)
- 530 22. The Citizens Information Portal of the German-speaking Community of Belgium. [The optimal
531 vaccination schedule]. Available online:

- 532 <https://translate.google.fr/?hl=en&tab=rT&authuser=0#view=home&op=translate&sl=de&tl=en&text=Das>
533 %20optimale%20Impfschema (accessed on 19 Feb 2019). (German)
- 534 23. Flanders Care and Health. [Basic vaccination schedule]. Available online:
535 <https://www.zorg-en-gezondheid.be/basisvaccinatieschema> (accessed on 19 Feb 2019). (Dutch)
- 536 24. Heininger, U.; Andre, P.; Chlibek, R.; Kristufkova, Z.; Kutsar, K.; Manarov, A. et al. Comparative
537 epidemiologic characteristics of pertussis in 10 Central and Eastern European countries, 2000-2013. *PLoS*
538 *ONE* **2016**, *11*(6), e0155949. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0155949
- 539 25. Chlibek, R.; Smetana, J.; Sosovickova, R.; Fabianova, K.; Zavadilova, J.; Dite, P. et al. Seroepidemiology of
540 whooping cough in the Czech Republic: estimates of incidence of infection in adults. *Public Health* **2017**,
541 *150*, 77-83.
- 542 26. National Immunisation Committee of Czech Republic. Recommendation for pertussis vaccination in
543 pregnancy for the Czech Republic. 2015 Dec 8. Available online:
544 http://www.szu.cz/uploads/Epidemiologie/Pertuse/CR_Pertussis_Recommendation_for_pregnant_wome
545 [n.pdf](#) (accessed on 14 Feb 2019).
- 546 27. Dalby, T.; Andersen, P.A. and Hoffmann, S. Epidemiology of pertussis in Denmark, 1995 to 2013. *Euro*
547 *Surveill* **2016**, *21*(36), pii=30334. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2016.21.36.30334>
- 548 28. Zoeldi, V.; Sane, J.; Nohynek, H.; Virkki, M.; Hannila-Handelberg, T. and Mertsola, J. Decreased incidence
549 of pertussis in young adults after the introduction of booster vaccine in military conscripts:
550 Epidemiological analyzes of pertussis in Finland, 1995-2015. *Vaccine* **2017**, *35*, 5249-5255.
- 551 29. Guiso, N. [The reality of pertussis vaccination]. Proceedings of [14th National Day of Infectious Diseases],
552 2013 Jun 12-14, Clermont-Ferrand. (French)
- 553 30. National Institute of Prevention and Health Education (INPES). [The vaccination against whooping
554 cough]. 1999. (French)
- 555 31. National Institute of Prevention and Health Education (INPES). [The vaccination Guide]. 2012. (French)
- 556 32. High Council of Public Health (HCSP). [Vaccine schedule and vaccination recommendations]. 2015.
557 (French)
- 558 33. National Institute of Prevention and Health Education (INPES). [The vaccination against whooping
559 cough], 2016. Available online:
560 <https://www.santepubliquefrance.fr/determinants-de-sante/vaccination/documents/depliant-flyer/la-vacc>
561 [ination-contre-la-coqueluche-rpv-p-mars-2016](#)(accessed on 14 Feb 2019). (French)
- 562 34. Hellenbrand, W.; Beier, D.; Jensen, E.; Littmann, M.; Meyer, C.; Oppermann, H. et al. The epidemiology of
563 pertussis in Germany: past and present. *BMC Infect Dis* **2009**, *9*, 22-33.
- 564 35. Robert Koch Institute. [Epidemiology Bulletin]. 2000 Jan 14. (German)
- 565 36. Robert Koch Institute. [Epidemiology Bulletin]. 2001 Jan 13. (German)
- 566 37. Robert Koch Institute. [Epidemiology Bulletin]. 2006 Jul 28. (German)
- 567 38. Cocoran, B. National Immunisation Study Day. The national immunisation schedule update and current
568 issues. Dublin: 2014 Sep 12. Available online:
569 <http://www.hse.ie/eng/health/immunisation/hcpinfo/conference/conference120914.html> (accessed on 19
570 Feb 2019).
- 571 39. Health Service Executive National Immunisation Office. Immunisation schedule. Available online:
572 <https://www.hse.ie/eng/health/immunisation/pubinfo/pcischedule/immschedule/> (access on 10 Feb
573 2019).
- 574 40. Gonfiantini, M.V.; Carloni, E.; Gesualdo, F.; Pandolfi, E.; Agricola, E.; Rizzuto, E. et al. Epidemiology of
575 pertussis in Italy: Disease trends over the last century. *Euro Surveill* **2014**, *19*(40), pii=20921.
- 576 41. The Italian Vaccine Coverage Survey Working Group. Childhood vaccination coverage in Italy: Results of
577 a seven-region survey. *Bull of the World Health Organ* **1994**, *72*(6), 885-895.
- 578 42. Bonanni P., Ferro A., Guerra R. Iannazzo S., Odone A., Pompa M.G. et al. Vaccine coverage in Italy and
579 assessment of the 2012-2014 National Immunization Prevention Plan. *Epidemiologia & Prevenzione* **2015**,
580 *39*(4) Suppl 1, 145-158.
- 581 43. The National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM). Adverse events in the Netherlands
582 vaccination programme. 2011.
- 583 44. Lavine, J.; Bjørnstad, O.N.; de Blasio, B. F. and Storsaeter, J. Short-lived immunity against pertussis,
584 age-specific routes of transmission, and the utility of a teenage booster vaccine. *Vaccine* **2011**, *30*(3),
585 544-551. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.11.065

- 586 45. Bednarek, A.; Bodajko-Grochowska, A.; Hasiiec, B.; Klepacz, R.; Szczekala, K.; Zarzycka, D. et al. In search
587 of factors negatively affecting vaccine immunity to pertussis in preschool children before the
588 administration of the first booster. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* **2018**, *15*, 1432-1446.
- 589 46. National Institute of Public Health- National Institute of Hygiene (NIPH-NIH). Immunization schedule.
590 Available online: <http://szczepienia.pzh.gov.pl/en/immunization-schedule/> (accessed on 14 Feb 2019).
- 591 47. Latasa, P.; Garcia-Comas, L.; Gil de Miguel, A.; Barranco, M.D.; Rodero, I.; Sanz, J.C. et al. Effectiveness of
592 acellular pertussis vaccine and evolution of pertussis incidence in the community of Madrid from 1998 to
593 2015. *Vaccine* **2018**, *36*, 1643-1649.
- 594 48. Working Group of Whooping Cough, Ministry of Health, Social Service and Equality. [Review of the
595 program of vaccination against whooping cough in Spain]. 2012. (Spanish)
- 596 49. Hallander, H. and Gustafsson, L. Efficacy and effectiveness of acellular pertussis vaccines: A 20-year
597 Swedish experience. *Expert Rev of Vaccines* **2009**, *8*(10), 1303-1307.
- 598 50. Aronsson, B.; Källberg, H.; Byström, E. and Drakes-Jämtberg, K. Pertussis surveillance in Sweden:
599 Progress report October 1997-December 2018 with an executive summary. The Public Health Agency of
600 Sweden; 2017. Available online: <https://www.folkhalsomyndigheten.se> (accessed on 14 Feb 2019).
- 601 51. Thierry-Carstensen, B.; Dalby, T.; Stevner, M.A.; Robbins, J.B.; Schneerson, R. and Trollfors, B. Experience
602 with monocomponent acellular pertussis combination vaccines for infants, children, adolescents and
603 adults – a review of safety, immunogenicity, efficacy and effectiveness studies and 15 years of field
604 experience. *Vaccine* **2013**, *31*, 5178-5191.
- 605 52. Mueller, J.; Koutangni, T.; Diallo, C. and Yaro, S. Comparative efficacy / effectiveness of schedules in infant
606 immunization against pertussis, diphtheria and tetanus: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Part 2:
607 Whole-cell pertussis vaccine. World Health Organization (Report Draft) 2014 Aug 13.
- 608 53. Olin, P.; Hallander, H.O.; Gustafsson, L.; Barreto, L. and Podda, A. Measuring protection; a case study of
609 pertussis vaccines – Swedish Trial II: secondary non-randomized comparisons between two schedules of
610 infant vaccination. *Dev Biol Stand* **1998**, *95*, 211-20.
- 611 54. Miller, E.; Ashworth, M.A.E.; Redhead, K.; Thornton, C.; Waight, P.A.; Coleman, T. Effect of schedule on
612 reactogenicity and antibody persistence of acellular and whole-cell pertussis vaccines: value of laboratory
613 tests as predictors of clinical performance. *Vaccine* **1997**, *15*, 51-60.
- 614 55. DiCicco-Bloom, B. and Crabtree, B.F. The qualitative research interview. *Med Educ* **2006**, *40*, 314-321.
- 615 56. Given, L.M. *The SAGE encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*; SAGE: Los Angeles, US, 2008; pp. 810-811.
- 616 57. Boyce, C. and Neale, P. *Conducting in-depth interview: A guide for designing and conducting in-depth interviews
617 for evaluation input*. Pathfinder International: Watertown, US, 2006; pp. 11-12.
- 618 58. Holton, J.A. The coding process and its challenges. *Grounded Theory Review* **2010**, *9* (1), 21-40.
- 619 59. Campbell, J.L.; Quincy, C.; Osserman, J. and Pedersen, O.K. Coding in-depth semistructured interviews :
620 problems of unitization and intercoder reliability and agreement. *Sociol Methods Res* **2013**, *42*(3), 294-320.
- 621 60. Krippendorff, K. *Content Analysis: An introduction to its methodology*, 2nd ed.; SAGE: London, UK, 2004; pp.
622 221-251.
- 623 61. Landis, J.R. and Kock, G.G. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* **1977**;
624 *33*, 159-174.
- 625 62. World Health Organization. Immunization, vaccines and biologicals: pertussis. Available online:
626 <https://www.who.int/immunization/diseases/pertussis/en/> (accessed on 27 May 2019).
- 627 63. Silva, M.L.; Perrier, L.; Paget, J.W.; Mosnier, A.; Buthion, V.; Cohen, J.M. et al. Influenza vaccination
628 policy-making process in France and the Netherlands: framework and determinants. *Health Policy* **2016**,
629 *120*, 293-305.
- 630 64. Public Health England. Laboratory confirmed cases of pertussis (England): January to March 2019.
631 Available online:
632 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/81329
633 2/hpr2219_prtsss.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/81329/2/hpr2219_prtsss.pdf) (accessed on 07 Jul 2019).
- 634 65. High Authority of Health (HAS). [The vaccination against whooping cough for pregnant women in the
635 context of epidemic in Mayotte]. 2018. (French)
- 636 66. High Authority of Health (HAS). [The vaccination against whooping cough for pregnant women]. 2019.
637 Available online:
638 [https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2019-07/recommandation_vaccinale_contre_la_coq
639 ueluche_chez_la_femme_enceinte_feuille_de_route.pdf](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/2019-07/recommandation_vaccinale_contre_la_coq
639 ueluche_chez_la_femme_enceinte_feuille_de_route.pdf) (accessed on 15 Aug 2019). (French)

It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) .

- 640 67. Kvale S. Ten standard objections to qualitative research interviews. *J Phenomenol Psychol* **1994**, 25(2),
641 147-173.
642 68. Seale C. and Silverman D. Ensuring rigour in qualitative research. *Eur J Public Health* **1997**, 7, 379-384.
643 69. Bonde D. *Qualitative interview: when enough is enough*. Research by Design: Australia, 2013.
644 70. Geyer R. and Rihani S. *Complexity and public policy: a new approach to 21st century politics, policy, and society*,
645 1st ed.; Routledge: New York, 2010.



© 2019 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

646