Title

Global impact and cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose human papillomavirus vaccination schedules: a comparative modelling analysis

Kiesha Prem[*], Yoon Hong Choi[†], Élodie Bénard[†], Emily A Burger[†], Liza Hadley, Jean-François Laprise, Mary Caroline Regan, Mélanie Drolet, Stephen Sy, Kaja Abbas, Allison Portnoy, Jane J Kim, Marc Brisson, Mark Jit[*]

[*]Joint Corresponding Author
[†]Joint Second Author; contributed equally

Authors and Affiliations

Kiesha Prem
Joint Corresponding Author
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom; Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, National University of Singapore and National University Health System, Singapore
Email: kiesha.prem@lshtm.ac.uk

Yoon Hong Choi
Joint Second Author
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Modelling and Economics Unit, Data, Analytics and Surveillance, UK Health Security Agency, London, United Kingdom
Email: yoon.choi@ukhsa.gov.uk

Élodie Bénard
Joint Second Author
Degree: MSc
Affiliations: Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec - Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
Email: elodie.benard.1@ulaval.ca

Emily A Burger
Joint Second Author
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA; Department of Health Management and Health Economics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
Email: eburger@hsph.harvard.edu

Liza Hadley
Degree: MMath

Affiliations: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom; Disease Dynamics Unit, Department of Veterinary Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
Email: lh667@cam.ac.uk

Jean-François Laprise
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec - Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
Email: jean-francois.laprise@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca

Mary Caroline Regan
Degree: BA
Affiliations: Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
Email: mregan@hsph.harvard.edu

Mélanie Drolet
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec - Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada
Email: melanie.drolet@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca

Stephen Sy
Degree: MS
Affiliations: Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
Email: ssy@hsph.harvard.edu

Kaja Abbas
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom
Email: kaja.abbas@lshtm.ac.uk

Allison Portnoy
Degree: ScD
Affiliations: Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
Email: aportnoy@mail.harvard.edu

Prof Jane J Kim
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA
Email: jkim@hsph.harvard.edu

Prof Marc Brisson
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Centre de recherche du CHU de Québec - Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada; Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Université Laval, Québec, QC, Canada; MRC Centre for Global Infectious Disease Analysis, Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Imperial College London, London, UK

Email: marc.brisson@crchudequebec.ulaval.ca

Prof Mark Jit
Joint Corresponding Author
Degree: PhD
Affiliations: Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology, Faculty of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom; Modelling and Economics Unit, National Infection Service, Public Health England, London, United Kingdom; School of Public Health, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China
Email: mark.jit@lshtm.ac.uk

Abstract

Background

To eliminate cervical cancer as a public health problem, the World Health Organization currently recommends routine vaccination of adolescent girls with two doses of the human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine before sexual initiation. However, many countries have yet to implement HPV vaccination because of financial or logistical barriers to delivering two doses outside the infant immunisation programme.

Methods

Using three independent HPV transmission models, we estimated the long-term health benefits and cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose HPV vaccination, in 188 countries, assuming that one dose of the vaccine gives either a shorter duration of full protection (20 or 30 years) or lifelong protection but lower vaccine efficacy (e.g., 80%) compared to two doses. We simulated routine vaccination with the 9-valent HPV vaccine in 10-year-old girls at 80% coverage for the years 2021–2120, with a one-year catch-up campaign of 11–14-year-old girls at 80% coverage in the first year of the programme.

Results

Over the years 2021–2120, one-dose vaccination at 80% coverage was projected to avert 112.9 million (range of medians: 75.8–176.2) and 148.0 million (111.6–187.6) cervical cancer cases assuming one dose of the vaccine confers 20 and 30 years of protection, respectively. Should one dose of the vaccine provide lifelong protection at 80% vaccine efficacy, 155.2 million (143.7–170.3) cervical cancer cases could be prevented. Around 65 to 889 additional girls would need to be vaccinated with the second dose to prevent one cervical cancer case, depending on the epidemiological profiles of the country. Across all income groups, the threshold cost for the second dose was low: from 0.85 (0.07–3.82) USD in low-income countries to 18.08 (-3.62–85.64) USD in high-income countries, assuming one-dose confers 30-year protection.

131 **Conclusions**

132 Results were consistent across the three independent models and suggest that one-dose
133 vaccination has similar health benefits to a two-dose programme while simplifying vaccine
134 delivery, reducing costs, and alleviating vaccine supply constraints. The second dose may be
135 cost-effective if there is a shorter duration of protection from one dose, cheaper vaccine
136 and vaccination delivery strategies, and high burden of cervical cancer.
137

138 **Background**

139

140 Cervical cancer is the fourth leading cause of cancer mortality among women globally with
141 an estimated 570 000 new cases and 311 000 deaths in 2018, with the majority of deaths
142 occurring in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) (1). Persistent infection with high-
143 risk genotypes of human papillomavirus (HPV) is a necessary precursor of cervical cancer.

144

145 Primary prevention of cervical cancer is available with four highly efficacious prophylactic
146 vaccines—two 2-valent, one 4-valent, one 9-valent—that are currently licensed for
147 protection against HPV infection (2–5). All protect against the two most carcinogenic HPV
148 types, 16 and 18, which are responsible for 70% of cervical cancer cases globally (6–8). Some
149 additionally protect against HPV types 6 and 11, which do not cause cancer but are
150 responsible for most cases of anogenital warts, and against other high-risk types such as
151 HPV 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58 (either directly or through cross-protection), which have been
152 linked to a further 20% of cervical cancer cases (6–8).

153

154 Multiple analyses including the global Papillomavirus Rapid Interface for Modelling and
155 Economics (PRIME) model developed in collaboration with the World Health Organization
156 (WHO) (9,10) have found HPV vaccination to be cost-effective in almost all countries. The
157 HPV vaccines were initially administered as a three-dose regimen over six months. In 2014,
158 the WHO Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization reviewed the evidence for
159 dose reduction and recommended a two-dose regimen for individuals below 15 years of age
160 (11). With the availability of vaccines and screening tests that allow detection of both high-
161 risk HPV types and neoplasias that are precursors to cervical cancer, the Secretary-General

162 of WHO has called for global elimination of cervical cancer as a public health problem, i.e.,
163 achieving the measurable global targets set by WHO (12). Current WHO guidelines
164 recommend that all countries vaccinate females aged 9–14 years against HPV (13).
165
166 Although some of these vaccines have been licensed for more than a decade, LMICs with
167 the highest incidence of cervical cancer are disproportionately less likely to introduce the
168 HPV vaccine into their routine immunisation programmes (9,14–16). High vaccine
169 procurement and delivery costs coupled with logistical constraints surrounding the delivery
170 of a two-dose regimen outside the infant vaccination schedule has hampered vaccine
171 introduction and uptake (17). Despite the financial support of Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance,
172 many LMICs have yet to introduce HPV vaccines into their routine programmes (18,19).
173 Since 2017, constrained supply of the 4-valent and 9-valent HPV vaccines has further
174 delayed vaccine introductions in many countries (20,21). Moreover, physical distancing
175 measures such as school closures and national lockdowns in response to the current COVID-
176 19 pandemic (22) have caused eligible populations to miss doses of HPV vaccine (21).
177
178 These financial, logistical, and supply constraints have motivated research into one-dose
179 vaccination schedules. If proven effective, one-dose HPV vaccination would simplify vaccine
180 delivery and lower costs of national vaccination programmes (18,23). It could also expedite
181 the introduction of HPV vaccines into national immunisation schedules for LMICs,
182 potentially protecting many more females against cervical cancer (19).
183

184 Evidence is emerging from immunogenicity trials, post-hoc analyses of efficacy trials, and
185 post-licensure observational studies to suggest that one dose of the HPV vaccine may
186 provide a high level of protection against incident and persistent HPV infections.
187 A systematic review of participants in six clinical trials who received only one dose of HPV
188 vaccination, because they did not complete their allocated schedules, suggests that this
189 schedule may be as effective as two doses in preventing HPV infection in up to seven years
190 of follow-up (24). However, evidence on the non-inferior efficacy of a single-dose schedule
191 from participants randomised to receive one dose has yet to emerge (expected in 2025).
192 Furthermore, antibody titres in immunogenicity trials were lower than in those receiving
193 two or three doses. While inferior antibody titres may not necessarily translate to inferior
194 protection, at this point, there is still uncertainty about the efficacy and durability of one-
195 dose vaccination.
196
197 Additionally, in the event that one-dose vaccination protection is slightly worse than two or
198 three doses, populations may still be almost as well protected through indirect (herd)
199 protection. Such effects can be examined using HPV transmission dynamic models. To date,
200 model-based analyses set in the United Kingdom (UK) (25), the United States (US), and
201 Uganda (26,27) suggest that one-dose schedules would be cost-effective and would prevent
202 almost as many cancers as two-dose or three-dose schedules if one dose confers at least 20
203 years of protection or has at least 80% efficacy against HPV 16/18 infection.
204
205 In this paper, we compare the impact and cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose
206 vaccination in 188 countries, assuming that one dose of the vaccine gives either shorter
207 duration of protection or lower vaccine efficacy compared to two doses. We use a hybrid

208 approach: firstly, we consider the age-specific impact that HPV vaccines may have using the
209 results of multiple independent HPV transmission dynamic models, and secondly,
210 extrapolate these effects to the remaining countries in the world using data on population
211 demographics and cervical cancer burden synthesised in a single model (PRIME).
212

213 # Methods

214

215 To assess the extent to which one-dose HPV vaccination schedules will provide similar
216 protection and be cost-effective compared to two doses, we compared the impact of three
217 different strategies: (1) no HPV vaccination; (2) a one-dose HPV vaccination schedule in
218 which we assume that one dose of the HPV vaccine confers either 20 or 30 years of full
219 protection or 80% vaccine efficacy (VE) over the lifetime; and (3) a two-dose HPV
220 vaccination schedule in which two doses of the vaccine would provide lifetime protection at
221 100% VE. The minimum duration of protection in the waning scenarios for one-dose reflects
222 the availability of over 10 years of data from various studies—ESCUDDO trial (28,29), IARC
223 India post-randomisation analysis (30)—that do not show any evidence of waning of either
224 clinical or immunological protection (31).
225

226 **Fig 1** provides an overview of the data sources and key steps of the modelling framework
227 described in the following sections. We synthesised the long-term population-wide impact
228 of HPV vaccination on cervical cancer incidence by age and time predicted by three
229 published transmission dynamic models: (i) the Public Health England (PHE) model, a
230 compartmental dynamic model set in the UK (32); (ii) the HPV-ADVISE model, an individual-

231 based dynamic model set in Uganda, Nigeria, India, Vietnam (27,33), and Canada (34,35);
232 and (iii) the Harvard model, a hybrid model that links two individual-based models, set in
233 the US, Uganda, El Salvador, and Nicaragua (14,36). In total, we combined results from 10
234 model-country scenarios. The models have been extensively reviewed and used to inform
235 vaccine policy (including by the UK's Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (37),
236 the World Health Organization's Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization
237 (11,38,39) and the US Advisory Committee on Immunization Practice (40–43). The models
238 stratify population by age, gender, and sexual activity-based risk group, as well as screening
239 behaviour-based risk group in the HPV-ADVISE and Harvard models. They capture HPV
240 natural history and disease, as well as HPV transmission as informed by country-specific
241 sexual behaviour surveys. More details about the models can be found in the
242 **Supplementary Materials**. For the scenarios where one dose confers a shorter duration of
243 protection (i.e., 20 or 30 years), we assume 100% VE, as suggested by clinical trial
244 populations (24,28,30,31). We modelled routine annual vaccination with the 9-valent
245 vaccine in 10-year-old girls to begin in 2021 and run uninterrupted until 2120. We also
246 included catch-up vaccination of girls aged 11–14 years in the first year of the programme.
247 Throughout, vaccine coverage was assumed to be 80%. In sensitivity analyses, we
248 investigated the impact of a one-dose vaccination schedule with a bivalent vaccine
249 (**Supplementary Materials**).
250

251 **Fig 1. Overview of the data sources and the key steps of the modelling.** To compare the impact and
252 cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose vaccination in 188 countries, we adopted a hybrid
253 approach. First, we synthesised the age-specific impact of HPV vaccines of three published
254 transmission dynamic models—PHE, HPV-ADVISE, Harvard—from 11 model-country settings.
255 Second, we derived the primary impact of vaccination using a static model (PRIME). Third, we
256 extrapolated the primary and secondary effects to the remaining countries in the world. Fourth, we
257 measured and compared population-level impact (e.g., cervical cancers averted, number of females
258 needed to be vaccinated, threshold costs of the first and second dose of the vaccine) for three

259 vaccine strategies: no HPV vaccination (the counterfactual); a one-dose HPV vaccination schedule in
260 which we assume that one dose of the vaccine provides either a shorter duration of protection (20
261 or 30 years) or lower vaccine efficacy (i.e., 80%) compared to two doses; and a two-dose HPV
262 vaccination schedule in which two doses of the vaccine provides lifetime protection.
263

264 Using PRIME, we then estimated the primary impact of a two-dose vaccination schedule,
265 without herd effects and waning immunity, in 188 countries. Full details of PRIME, including
266 model equations and updates, are available at (9,10). As PRIME is a static model, it cannot
267 estimate herd effects, nor can it capture the effect of waning vaccine immunity. Here, we
268 introduced a novel method which compares results from PRIME and the three dynamic
269 models—PHE, HPV-ADVISE, Harvard—set in nine countries—UK, US, Canada, Nigeria,
270 Uganda, India, Vietnam, El Salvador, and Nicaragua. We calculated the difference between
271 cervical cancer incidence predicted by PRIME and each of the dynamic models to derive the
272 secondary effects of vaccination, which is a combination of waning immunity (20/30-year
273 duration vs lifetime protection and lower vaccine efficacy) and herd effects at every age and
274 time-point. We then calculated the ratio of secondary to primary vaccine impact. By
275 assuming that the primary impact of a vaccine (i.e., vaccine with lifetime protection and no
276 herd effects) is different in every country as estimated by PRIME, we extrapolated the ratio
277 (secondary to primary) to other countries to project the secondary effects of vaccination,
278 using a similar approach as two comparative modelling analyses conducted by the WHO's
279 Cervical Cancer Elimination Modelling Consortium (14,44). A meta-analysis by Drolet and
280 colleagues showed a significant decrease in the prevalence of HPV 16 and 18 among women
281 aged 20–24 years (risk ratio [RR] 0.34, 95% CI 0.23–0.49) and 25–29 years (RR 0.63, 95% CI
282 0.41–0.97) (45). As most of the women in these age groups were unvaccinated, the meta-
283 analysis found evidence of similar herd effects more than four years after the introduction
284 of HPV vaccination.

285

286 Uncertainty in predictions was captured by generating multiple simulations from the three
287 dynamic models representing different plausible parameter sets. For the PHE model, 100
288 runs were simulated from the best-fitting parameter sets to capture uncertainty in the
289 duration of infection, duration of natural immunity, screening accuracy, the progression of
290 cervical cancer, age-specific prevalence, and the number of sexual partners. For HPV-
291 ADVISE, 1000 runs were simulated from 50 parameter sets that simultaneously fit country-
292 specific behavioural and epidemiological data. These 50 parameter sets illustrate the
293 uncertainty in sexual behaviour, HPV transmission, the natural history of HPV-related
294 diseases, and screening. For the Harvard model that reflect two sexual behaviour settings
295 (low- and high-HPV prevalence), 50 best-fitting dynamic transmission model parameter sets,
296 capturing variations in genotype- and sex-specific transmission probability, and genotype-
297 and sex-specific natural immunity, were propagated through four cervical carcinogenesis
298 models that have been previously calibrated (i.e., fit) to the US, Uganda, El Salvador, or
299 Nicaragua (14,36).

300 **Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness measures**

301 For each country, we estimated the number of cervical cancer cases, deaths, and disability-
302 adjusted life years (DALYs)—caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58—occurring under
303 each scenario by age and time since vaccination in females born in the years 2011–2110
304 (Section 1.8 **Supplementary materials**). We then compared the impact of a one-dose
305 schedule (giving 20/30 years protection or lifelong protection but at 80% initial VE) with no
306 vaccination, and a two-dose schedule (giving lifetime protection at 100% VE) with a one-
307 dose schedule. We calculated the number of females needed to vaccinate with one dose,

308 and the number of females needed to give an additional (i.e., second) dose, to avert one
309 cervical cancer case, death, or DALY. We also projected the threshold cost to pay for the
310 first and second dose of vaccine, which is the maximum that could be paid for the first dose
311 (compared to no vaccination) and second dose (compared to one dose only) for the
312 incremental cost-effectiveness ratio to remain below country-specific gross domestic
313 product (GDP) per capita (in 2017 USD). We used the GDP per capita estimates by the World
314 Bank (46), but also considered a lower threshold , i.e., 30–40% and 60–65% of GDP per
315 capita in low-income and middle- to high-income countries (47,48). The time horizon of the
316 analysis was from 2021 to 2120; we accrued all health benefits of vaccination up to the end
317 of the routine vaccination programme (i.e., the year 2120) or age 100 of all vaccinated
318 cohorts, whichever came first. Using modelled results from the 10 model-country pairs, we
319 projected the outcome measures in 188 countries and aggregated the results by World Bank
320 income groups. After projecting the various measures of effectiveness and cost-
321 effectiveness under the several vaccination scenarios, we compared the outcomes
322 generated with results from the 10 model-country pairs. After projecting the various
323 measures of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness under the vaccination scenarios, we
324 compared the outcomes generated with results from the 10 model-country scenarios. We
325 presented the results, aggregated by World Bank income groups (details in the
326 **Supplementary Materials**), as the median (and 80% uncertainty intervals (UI)) from each of
327 the model-country predictions. Both health outcomes and costs were discounted at 0% and
328 3% per year (49).
329

330 # Results

331

332 In 188 countries over the years 2021–2120, the models projected that routine annual
333 vaccination of 10-year-old girls (plus a one-year catch-up campaign of girls aged 11–14
334 years) with one-dose of the 9-valent HPV vaccine at 80% coverage would avert 112.9 million
335 (range of medians: 75.8–176.2) and 148.0 million (111.6–187.6) cervical cancer cases should
336 one dose of the vaccine confer 20 and 30 years of protection, respectively (**Fig 2**; with the
337 equivalent cumulative and discounted benefits figures in the **Supplementary Materials**).
338 Under a scenario of one dose of the vaccine providing lifelong protection at 80% initial VE,
339 the models predicted that 155.2 million (143.7–170.3) cervical cancer cases would be
340 prevented (**Fig 2**). A one-dose schedule conferring 20 years of protection would avert 65.0%
341 (range of medians: 45.8–91.8%) of the cases averted by the vaccination schedule providing
342 lifelong protection at 100% VE (**Fig 3**). However, if the duration of protection increases to 30
343 years, a one-dose schedule would avert more cases at 87.9% (range of medians: 59.6–100%)
344 of the cases averted by the vaccination schedule providing lifelong protection at 100% VE
345 (**Fig 3**). Similarly, for the scenario where one dose of the vaccine provides lifelong protection
346 but at lower VE (of 80%), most of the cases (88.3% (range of medians: 86.2–96.7%)) can still
347 be averted (**Fig 3**).

348

349 **Fig 2. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination by country income groups.**
350 The lines represent the median projections of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in
351 black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The
352 grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of
353 routine vaccination. Cancers averted were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16,
354 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.
355

356 **Fig 3. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination as a proportion of cervical**
357 **cancers averted by routine HPV vaccination programmes conferring lifelong protection at 100%**
358 **vaccine efficacy.** The median percentage (intervals: 10–90th percentile) of cancers averted by a
359 one-dose schedule compared to a two-dose programme of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE
360 model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in
361 blue. Health outcomes were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45,
362 52, and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.

363

364 Due to large disparities in age-standardised cervical cancer incidence across country income
365 groups in 2021, the number of cases averted by routine vaccination programmes is higher in
366 low-income countries (31.9 million (range of medians: 21.2–48.6), if one-dose confers 20
367 years of protection) than in high-income countries (4.8 million (range of medians: 3.5–6.9)).
368 More cervical cancers could be averted if one dose of the vaccine confers a longer duration
369 of protection, i.e., at 30 years or lifelong but lowered VE. Assuming waning of protection at
370 20 years (on average) after vaccination, the PHE model parameterised with data from the
371 UK projected that a one-dose schedule could avert 91.8% (80%UI 76.2–99.8%) of the cases
372 averted by a two-schedule vaccination schedule. However, the HPV-ADVISE and Harvard
373 models, mostly parameterised with data from LMICs, projected that 61.0% (range of
374 medians: 45.8–87.6%) could be averted (**Fig 3**).

375

376 The models consistently projected that fewer girls need to be vaccinated with the first dose
377 to prevent one cervical cancer case in low-income countries (32 (range of medians: 23–51))
378 than middle-income (43 (range of medians: 31–69)) and high-income countries (83 (range of
379 medians: 67–122)) if one-dose confers 20 years of protection (**Fig 4A–C**). However,
380 variations across models were observed for the projections of the number of girls needed to
381 be vaccinated with the second dose to prevent one cervical cancer case. Compared to the

382 HPV-ADVISE and Harvard models, the PHE model projected that more girls need to be
383 vaccinated with the second dose to avert one cervical cancer case when the protection from
384 one dose of the vaccine wanes 20 years after vaccination (**Fig 4A–D**; 889 (80%UI 93–27 700)
385 girls if one dose confers 20 years of protection). However, if one-dose confers lifelong
386 protection but at lowered VE, the differences between the PHE, HPV-ADVISE and Harvard
387 models decrease. When we discounted health outcomes, the model predicted that more
388 girls need to be vaccinated to avert one cervical cancer case (**Fig 4E–H**).
389
390 **Fig 4. Number of girls needed to be vaccinated with the first and second dose to avert one**
391 **additional cervical cancer case by income group.** The lines represent the median projections of the
392 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the
393 Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in
394 the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of routine vaccination. Health outcomes were discounted
395 at 3% (panels A–D) and 0% (panels E–H).
396

397 Across all income groups, the threshold (i.e., maximum) cost for the second dose to remain
398 cost-effective was low—from 0.85 (range of medians: 0.07–3.82) USD in low-income
399 countries to 18.08 (range of medians: -3.62–85.64) USD in high-income countries if one-
400 dose confers 30 year protection to—as few additional cancers would be averted with a
401 longer duration of protection (≥30 years) or higher VE (>80%). With a higher GDP per capita,
402 middle- and high-income countries have a higher threshold cost (**Fig 5**). However, if one-
403 dose confers ≤20 years of protection, the threshold cost for the second dose to remain cost-
404 effective is borderline at 3.24 (range of medians: 0.34–5.35) USD in low-income countries
405 and 62.93 (range of medians: 12.63–117.45) USD in high-income countries, suggesting that
406 duration of protection remains the main driver of uncertainty.
407
408 **Fig 5. Threshold cost to pay for the first and second dose of vaccine by country income groups.** The
409 threshold cost is the maximum that could be paid for the first dose (compared to no vaccination)

410 and second dose (compared to one dose only) for the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio to remain
411 below the cost-effectiveness threshold. Two cost-effectiveness thresholds are presented: a lower
412 threshold as suggested by Jit (2020) in panels A–D and country gross domestic product (GDP) per
413 capita (in 2017 USD) in panels E–H. The lower cost-effectiveness threshold presented in panels A–D
414 is 30–40% and 60–65% of GDP per capita in low-income and middle- to high-income countries,
415 respectively. Cost and health outcomes were discounted at 3% and 0%, respectively.

416

417 Discussion

418 In this study, three independent transmission dynamic models projected consistent results
419 suggesting that routine one-dose HPV vaccine programmes at 80% coverage worldwide
420 could provide a high level of population protection and be cost-effective. We considered
421 three assumptions of the one-dose schedule: one dose of the HPV vaccine confers either 20
422 or 30 years of protection at full VE, or lifelong protection but at 80% VE. Across all
423 assumptions, one-dose schedules provide large population impacts on cervical cancer, while
424 the difference in population impact of the one-dose versus two-dose vaccination schedule is
425 small if one dose confers ≥30 years of protection or lifelong protection but at 80% VE. This
426 underscores the significant potential public health impact of the one-dose vaccination
427 schedule if vaccine uptake is high across all countries (21).

428

429 Although trials (28–30) and post-randomisation analyses (30) suggest that the duration of
430 protection of one dose of the vaccine is more than ten years, it is uncertain how long
431 vaccinated individuals will remain protected and how the vaccine would wane beyond the
432 first decade. The threshold duration of protection for a one-dose schedule to avert the
433 majority of vaccine-preventable cancers is associated with the ages at which individuals are
434 vaccinated and reach peak sexual activity, which varies between countries. If one dose of
435 the vaccine confers ≤20 years of protection, giving the second dose may have a larger health

436 impact, especially in settings where HPV transmission persists decades after vaccination.
437 However, if one dose provides a longer duration of protection (≥30 years), administering the
438 second dose will bring about few health gains at potentially high costs. Hence, decisions on
439 offering the second dose should account for the duration of protection provided by the first
440 dose, whether it covers the peak years of sexual activity and HPV transmission, and the
441 costs of delivering the additional dose. The second dose becomes more cost-effective if the
442 protection from one dose is less than 20 years, the costs of the vaccine and delivering it are
443 lower than current reported costs, and/or the local burden of cervical cancer is high.
444
445 Our comparison of one- and two-dose vaccination schedules is motivated by several
446 advantages of a one-dose schedule. Firstly, many LMICs have yet to implement national HPV
447 vaccination programmes because of the challenges of delivering two vaccine doses to
448 adolescent females (17). Compared to two-dose HPV vaccination, a one-dose HPV
449 vaccination schedule would be cheaper and easier to implement (e.g., no follow-up of
450 vaccinated individuals would be required), potentially enabling more LMICs to introduce
451 HPV vaccine into national immunisation schedules (21,23). More recently, HPV vaccine
452 implementation in LMICs has been delayed due to constraints in HPV vaccine supply (20,21).
453 Our model-based analysis predicts that routinely vaccinating 10-year-old girls at 80%
454 coverage in LICs could result in four times (population-adjusted) more cervical cases averted
455 than in high-income countries. Under our one-dose assumptions, routine one-dose HPV
456 vaccination programmes could protect up to 155 million females against cervical cancer
457 globally over the years 2021–2120.
458

459 Secondly, the COVID-19 pandemic has disrupted several routine immunisation programmes
460 (50–52), including HPV vaccination (21,53). Abbas and colleagues predicted that the benefits
461 of resuming routine childhood immunisation services outweigh the risk of being infected
462 with COVID-19 during the vaccination visits (52), reinforcing WHO's call for all countries to
463 continue routine immunisation services safely (54). With physical distancing measures such
464 as school closures and national lockdowns being implemented in many countries to cope
465 with the COVID-19 pandemic (22), health officials grapple with reconfiguring school-based
466 HPV vaccine delivery (53–55). Compared to the two-dose vaccination schedule, a one-dose
467 schedule would further minimise interactions between vaccinees and health workers,
468 simplifying vaccine delivery while also decreasing SARS-CoV-2 exposure.
469
470 The lack of country-specific behavioural, virological, and clinical data in many countries
471 limits fitting transmission dynamic models individually to most countries (56). However, in
472 this comparative modelling study, we synthesised results from three published dynamic
473 models based in nine countries, covering high-, middle- and low-income settings across
474 three continents and a wide variety of epidemiological characteristics for HPV transmission
475 and cervical cancer (14,56). Our approach provides a common framework using PRIME for
476 population demographics, cervical cancer burden, and impact/cost-effectiveness
477 calculations, while varying representation of HPV transmission and cervical cancer natural
478 history across the three dynamic models. We then extrapolated the age- and time-
479 dependent ratio of the secondary to primary impacts of vaccine strategies to other
480 countries. While there may be considerable uncertainty around extrapolating this ratio to
481 another country, the use of 10 model-country pairs lends confidence that we are likely to
482 have captured the range of possible outcomes for most countries. More precise estimates

483 would require fitting these models to additional specific countries, for which calibration
484 data are not available (56,57).
485
486 Our model projections of vaccine impact also involve other sources of uncertainty that we
487 did not explicitly quantify. The PRIME model uses country-specific cervical cancer burden
488 from the Global Cancer Incidence, Mortality and Prevalence (GLOBOCAN) database (58),
489 which may underestimate the full burden of HPV-related disease, and thus vaccine impact,
490 in LMICs (14). In this study, we only assessed the effect of HPV vaccination on cervical
491 cancers. If we also accounted for the vaccine impact on other HPV-related cancers, we
492 would anticipate a greater value of HPV vaccination programmes (26,59). However, the
493 paucity of data on the efficacy of one dose on non-cervical cancers complicates the analysis
494 evaluating their vaccine impact. Because the health gains from the second dose are small,
495 any minor variations in gains will amplify the variability in the number needed to vaccinate
496 with the additional dose. Finally, we project the impact of HPV vaccination on cervical
497 cancers over the next century. Over the past decades, we have witnessed substantial
498 demographic (60) and behavioural changes (61,62) with extraordinary improvements in
499 public health (63). In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused substantial disruptions to
500 population demography (64) and sexual behaviour (65), with uncertainty around the longer-
501 term consequences of such disruption. Moreover, over the next century, we expect to see
502 continued advancements in pre-cancer screening and treatment services, which will further
503 decrease cervical cancer incidence. Such uncertainties in life expectancy, population, and
504 economic forecasts have significant implications for our predictions.
505

506 ## Conclusion

507 Under the scenarios where a single HPV vaccine dose confers more than 30 years of
508 protection or 80% efficacy with lifelong protection, routine one-dose HPV vaccination
509 provides the majority of health benefits to the two-dose programme while simplifying
510 vaccine delivery, reducing costs, and circumventing vaccine supply constraints. The second
511 dose may be cost-effective if there is a shorter duration of protection from one dose,
512 cheaper vaccine and vaccination delivery strategies, and high burden of cervical cancer.
513 These results are fairly consistent when projected from three independent transmission
514 dynamic models used in nine countries. The outcomes of our comparative modelling
515 analysis contribute to the extensive evidence base, including emerging evidence from the
516 single-dose HPV vaccine trials and observational studies, which would be beneficial to
517 policymakers when they consider HPV vaccination in their populations.

518 **References**

519 1. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics
520 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in
521 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 2018;
522 2. Garland SM, Hernandez-Avila M, Wheeler CM, Perez G, Harper DM, Leodolter S, et al.
523 Quadrivalent Vaccine against Human Papillomavirus to Prevent Anogenital Diseases.
524 N Engl J Med [Internet]. 2007 May 10 [cited 2020 Oct 30];356(19):1928–43. Available
525 from: www.nejm.org
526 3. Paavonen J, Naud P, Salmerón J, Wheeler CM, Chow SN, Apter D, et al. Efficacy of
527 human papillomavirus (HPV)-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine against cervical
528 infection and precancer caused by oncogenic HPV types (PATRICIA): final analysis of a
529 double-blind, randomised study in young women. Lancet. 2009 Jul 25;374(9686):301–
530 14.
531 4. Joura EA, Giuliano AR, Iversen O-E, Bouchard C, Mao C, Mehlsen J, et al. A 9-Valent
532 HPV Vaccine against Infection and Intraepithelial Neoplasia in Women. N Engl J Med
533 [Internet]. 2015 Feb 19 [cited 2020 Oct 30];372(8):711–23. Available from:
534 https://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1405044
535 5. Qiao YL, Wu T, Li RC, Hu YM, Wei LH, Li CG, et al. Efficacy, Safety, and Immunogenicity
536 of an Escherichia coli-Produced Bivalent Human Papillomavirus Vaccine: An Interim
537 Analysis of a Randomized Clinical Trial. J Natl Cancer Inst [Internet]. 2020 Feb 1 [cited
538 2020 Nov 4];112(2):145–53. Available from:
539 https://academic.oup.com/jnci/article/112/2/145/5488952
540 6. de Sanjose S, Quint WGV, Alemany L, Geraets DT, Klaustermeier JE, Lloveras B, et al.
541 Human papillomavirus genotype attribution in invasive cervical cancer: a
542 retrospective cross-sectional worldwide study. Lancet Oncol. 2010;
543 7. Serrano B, Alemany L, Tous S, Bruni L, Clifford GM, Weiss T, et al. Potential impact of
544 a nine-valent vaccine in human papillomavirus related cervical disease. Infect Agent
545 Cancer [Internet]. 2012 Dec 29 [cited 2020 Oct 30];7(1):1–13. Available from:
546 https://link.springer.com/articles/10.1186/1750-9378-7-38
547 8. de Martel C, Georges D, Bray F, Ferlay J, Clifford GM. Global burden of cancer
548 attributable to infections in 2018: a worldwide incidence analysis. Lancet Glob Heal
549 [Internet]. 2020 Feb 1 [cited 2020 Oct 30];8(2):e180–90. Available from:
550 www.thelancet.com/lancetgh
551 9. Jit M, Brisson M, Portnoy A, Hutubessy R. Cost-effectiveness of female human
552 papillomavirus vaccination in 179 countries: A PRIME modelling study. Lancet Glob
553 Heal [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Oct 30];2(7):e406–14. Available from:
554 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25103394/
555 10. Abbas KM, van Zandvoort K, Brisson M, Jit M. Effects of updated demography,
556 disability weights, and cervical cancer burden on estimates of human papillomavirus
557 vaccination impact at the global, regional, and national levels: a PRIME modelling
558 study. Lancet Glob Heal [Internet]. 2020 Apr 1 [cited 2020 Oct 30];8(4):e536–44.
559 Available from: http://gco.iarc.fr
560 11. World Health Organization. Human papillomavirus vaccines: WHO position paper,
561 October 2014. Wkly Epidemiol Rec Relev épidémiologique Hebd. 2014;89(43):465–91.
562 12. World Health Organization. WHO | WHO leads the way towards the elimination of
563 cervical cancer as a public health concern. World Health Organization; 2018.

13. Simms KT, Steinberg J, Caruana M, Smith MA, Lew J Bin, Soerjomataram I, et al. Impact of scaled up human papillomavirus vaccination and cervical screening and the potential for global elimination of cervical cancer in 181 countries, 2020–99: a modelling study. Lancet Oncol. 2019;
14. Brisson M, Kim JJ, Canfell K, Drolet M, Gingras G, Burger EA, et al. Impact of HPV vaccination and cervical screening on cervical cancer elimination: a comparative modelling analysis in 78 low-income and lower-middle-income countries. Lancet [Internet]. 2020 Feb 22 [cited 2020 Oct 30];395(10224):575–90. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/
15. PATH. Global HPV Vaccine Introduction Overview: projected and current national introductions, demonstration/pilot projects, gender-neutral vaccination programs, and global HPV vaccine introduction maps (2006–2022). [Internet]. 2020 May [cited 2020 Oct 30]. Available from: https://www.path.org/resources/global-hpv-vaccine-introduction-overview/
16. WHO. Immunization, vaccines and biologicals: data, statistics and graphics. WHO [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Oct 30]; Available from: http://www.who.int/immunization/monitoring_surveillance/data/en/
17. Gallagher KE, LaMontagne DS, Watson-Jones D. Status of HPV vaccine introduction and barriers to country uptake. Vaccine. 2018 Aug 6;36(32):4761–7.
18. LaMontagne DS, Bloem PJN, Brotherton JML, Gallagher KE, Badiane O, Ndiaye C. Progress in HPV vaccination in low- and lower-middle-income countries. Int J Gynecol Obstet [Internet]. 2017 Jul 1 [cited 2020 Oct 30];138:7–14. Available from: http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ijgo.12186
19. Kreimer AR, Cernuschi T, Rees H, Saslow D, Porras C, Schiller J. Prioritisation of the human papillomavirus vaccine in a time of constrained supply. Vol. 4, The Lancet Child and Adolescent Health. Elsevier B.V.; 2020. p. 349–51.
20. World Health Organization. Global market study: HPV vaccines. World Health Organization; 2019.
21. World Health Organization. Meeting of the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization, April 2022: conclusions and recommendations – Réunion du Groupe stratégique consultatif d'experts sur la vaccination, avril 2022: conclusions et recommandations. Wkly Epidemiol Rec [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2022 Jun 20];97(24):261–76. Available from: https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/356580
22. Viner RM, Russell SJ, Croker H, Packer J, Ward J, Stansfield C, et al. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Apr 22];0(0). Available from: https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S235246422030095X
23. Barnabas R V., Brown ER, Onono MA, Bukusi EA, Njoroge B, Winer RL, et al. Efficacy of Single-Dose Human Papillomavirus Vaccination among Young African Women. NEJM Evid [Internet]. 2022 Apr 11 [cited 2022 Jun 20];1(5). Available from: https://evidence.nejm.org/doi/abs/10.1056/EVIDoa2100056
24. Whitworth HS, Gallagher KE, Howard N, Mounier-Jack S, Mbwanji G, Kreimer AR, et al. Efficacy and immunogenicity of a single dose of human papillomavirus vaccine compared to no vaccination or standard three and two-dose vaccination regimens: A systematic review of evidence from clinical trials. Vol. 38, Vaccine. Elsevier Ltd; 2020. p. 1302–14.

611 25. Jit M, Brisson M, Laprise JF, Choi YH. Comparison of two dose and three dose human
612 papillomavirus vaccine schedules: Cost effectiveness analysis based on transmission
613 model. BMJ. 2015 Jan 7;350. Available from:
614 http://www.bmj.com/content/350/bmj.g7584?tab=related#datasupp
615 26. Burger EA, Campos NG, Sy S, Regan C, Kim JJ. Health and economic benefits of single-
616 dose HPV vaccination in a Gavi-eligible country. Vaccine. 2018 Aug 6;36(32):4823–9.
617 27. Drolet M, Laprise JF, Martin D, Jit M, Bénard É, Gingras G, et al. Optimal human
618 papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination strategies to prevent cervical cancer in low- and
619 middle-income countries in the context of limited resources: A mathematical
620 modeling analysis. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021;
621 28. Porras C, Sampson JN, Herrero R, Gail MH, Cortés B, Hildesheim A, et al. Rationale
622 and design of a double-blind randomized non-inferiority clinical trial to evaluate one
623 or two doses of vaccine against human papillomavirus including an epidemiologic
624 survey to estimate vaccine efficacy: The Costa Rica ESCUDDO trial. Vaccine. 2022 Jan
625 3;40(1):76–88.
626 29. ClinicalTrials.gov. Comparing One or Two Doses of the Human Papillomavirus Vaccine
627 for the Prevention of Human Papillomavirus Infection, ESCUDDO Study:
628 NCT03180034 [Internet]. [cited 2022 Feb 3]. Available from:
629 https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03180034
630 30. Basu P, Malvi SG, Joshi S, Bhatla N, Muwonge R, Lucas E, et al. Vaccine efficacy
631 against persistent human papillomavirus (HPV) 16/18 infection at 10 years after one,
632 two, and three doses of quadrivalent HPV vaccine in girls in India: a multicentre,
633 prospective, cohort study. Lancet Oncol. 2021 Nov 1;22(11):1518–29.
634 31. Single-dose-HPV-Vaccine-Evaluation-Consortium. Review of the current published
635 evidence on single-dose HPV vaccination 3rd edition 2020. 2020.
636 32. Choi YH, Jit M, Gay N, Cox A, Garnett GP, Edmunds WJ. Transmission dynamic
637 modelling of the impact of human papillomavirus vaccination in the United Kingdom.
638 Vaccine [Internet]. 2010 May 28 [cited 2020 Oct 30];28(24):4091–102. Available from:
639 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19909831/
640 33. Brisson M, Laprise JF, Martin D, Drolet M, Van De Velde N, Boily MC. Technical
641 Appendix HPV-ADVISE LMIC. 2017.
642 34. Van De Velde N, Boily MC, Drolet M, Franco EL, Mayrand MH, Kliewer E V., et al.
643 Population-level impact of the bivalent, quadrivalent, and nonavalent human
644 papillomavirus vaccines: A model-based analysis. J Natl Cancer Inst [Internet]. 2012
645 Nov 21 [cited 2020 Oct 30];104(22):1712–23. Available from: http://www.marc-
646 brisson.net/HPVadvise.pdf
647 35. Brisson M, Van De Velde N, Drolet M, Laprise JF, Boily MC. Technical Appendix HPV-
648 ADVISE Canada [Internet]. 2012. Available from: http://www.marc-
649 brisson.net/HPVadvise.pdf
650 36. Burger EA, Smith MA, Killen J, Sy S, Simms KT, Canfell K, et al. Projected time to
651 elimination of cervical cancer in the USA: a comparative modelling study. Lancet
652 Public Heal [Internet]. 2020 Apr 1 [cited 2021 Jan 12];5(4):e213–22. Available from:
653 www.thelancet.com/
654 37. Hall AJ. The United Kingdom Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation.
655 Vaccine. 2010 Apr 19;28(SUPPL. 1):A54–7.
656 38. World Health Organization. Human papillomavirus vaccines: WHO position paper,
657 May 2017. Weekly Epidemiological Record= Relevé épidémiologique hebdomadaire

[Internet]. 2017; Available from: https://www.who.int/immunization/policy/position_papers/hpv/en/

39. World Health Organization. Meeting of the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on immunization, October 2019 – conclusions and recommendations. Wkly Epidemiol Rec Relev épidémiologique Hebd [Internet]. 2019 [cited 2020 Nov 3];49(47):541–560. Available from: http://www.who.int/wer/2019/wer9447/en/

40. Laprise JF, Chesson HW, Markowitz LE, Drolet M, Martin D, Bénard É, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of human papillomavirus vaccination through age 45 years in the United States. Ann Intern Med. 2020 Jan 7;172(1):22–9.

41. Brisson M, Laprise JF, Chesson HW, Drolet M, Malagón T, Boily MC, et al. Health and Economic Impact of Switching from a 4-Valent to a 9-Valent HPV Vaccination Program in the United States. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2016 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Jan 12];108(1). Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26438574/

42. Chesson HW, Laprise JF, Brisson M, Markowitz LE. Impact and Cost-effectiveness of 3 Doses of 9-Valent Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine among US females previously vaccinated with 4-valent hpv vaccine. J Infect Dis. 2016 Jun 1;213(11):1694–700. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4857476/?report=abstract

43. Laprise JF, Markowitz LE, Chesson HW, Drolet M, Brisson M. Comparison of 2-dose and 3-dose 9-valent human papillomavirus vaccine schedules in the United States: A cost-effectiveness analysis. J Infect Dis. 2016 Sep 1;214(5):685–8.

44. Canfell K, Kim JJ, Brisson M, Keane A, Simms KT, Caruana M, et al. Mortality impact of achieving WHO cervical cancer elimination targets: a comparative modelling analysis in 78 low-income and lower-middle-income countries. Lancet. 2020 Feb 22;395(10224):591–603. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com/article/S0140673620301574/fulltext

45. Drolet M, Bénard É, Pérez N, Brisson M, Ali H, Boily MC, et al. Population-level impact and herd effects following the introduction of human papillomavirus vaccination programmes: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2019 Aug 10;394(10197):497–509. Available from: http://www.thelancet.com.libproxy1.nus.edu.sg/article/S0140673619302983/fulltext

46. World Bank. GDP per capita (current US$) | Data. Available from: https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD

47. Jit M. Informing Global Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds Using Country Investment Decisions: Human Papillomavirus Vaccine Introductions in 2006-2018. Value Heal. 2020 Oct 16;

48. Ochalek J, Abbas K, Claxton K, Jit M, Lomas J. Assessing the value of human papillomavirus vaccination in Gavi-eligible low-income and middle-income countries. BMJ Glob Heal. 2020 Oct 20;5(10):e003006. Available from: https://gh.bmj.com/lookup/doi/10.1136/bmjgh-2020-003006

49. World Health Organization. WHO Guide on Standardization of Economic Evaluations of Immunization Programmes. WHO. 2019 Oct; Available from: http://www.who.int/immunization/documents/who_ivb_19.10/en/

50. World Health Organization. Pulse survey on continuity of essential health services during the COVID-19 pandemic: interim report, 27 August 2020. Available from: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-EHS_continuity-survey-2020.1

51. Nelson R. COVID-19 disrupts vaccine delivery. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020 May

1;20(5):546. Available from: www.thelancet.com/infection

52. Abbas K, Procter SR, van Zandvoort K, Clark A, Funk S, Mengistu T, et al. Routine childhood immunisation during the COVID-19 pandemic in Africa: a benefit–risk analysis of health benefits versus excess risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Lancet Glob Heal. 2020 Oct 1;8(10):e1264–72. Available from: www.thelancet.com/lancetgh
53. UNICEF Supply Division. Human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine: supply and demand update | UNICEF Supply Division. Available from: https://www.unicef.org/supply/reports/human-papillomavirus-hpv-vaccine-supply-and-demand-update
54. World Health Organization. WHO and UNICEF warn of a decline in vaccinations during COVID-19. Available from: https://www.who.int/news/item/15-07-2020-who-and-unicef-warn-of-a-decline-in-vaccinations-during-covid-19
55. Suwantika AA, Boersma C, Postma MJ. The potential impact of COVID-19 pandemic on the immunization performance in Indonesia. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2020 Aug 2;19(8):687–90. Available from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14760584.2020.1800461
56. Jit M, Levin C, Brisson M, Levin A, Resch S, Berkhof J, et al. Economic analyses to support decisions about HPV vaccination in low- and middle-income countries: A consensus report and guide for analysts. Vol. 11, BMC Medicine. BioMed Central; 2013. p. 23. Available from: http://bmcmedicine.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1741-7015-11-23
57. Kim JJ, Brisson M, Edmunds WJ, Goldie SJ. Modeling Cervical Cancer Prevention in Developed Countries. Vaccine. 2008 Aug 19;26(SUPPL. 10):K76. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC2769256/?report=abstract
58. International Agency for Research on Cancer. Global Cancer Observatory. Available from: https://gco.iarc.fr/
59. Gillison ML, Chaturvedi AK, Lowy DR. HPV prophylactic vaccines and the potential prevention of noncervical cancers in both men and women. Vol. 113, Cancer. NIH Public Access; 2008. p. 3036–46. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC6264789/?report=abstract
60. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division. World Population Prospects. 2019. Available from: https://population.un.org/wpp/
61. Baussano I, Lazzarato F, Brisson M, Franceschi S. Human papillomavirus vaccination at a time of changing sexual behavior. Emerg Infect Dis. 2016 Jan 1;22(1):18–23. Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC4696692/?report=abstract
62. Wellings K, Collumbien M, Slaymaker E, Singh S, Hodges Z, Patel D, et al. Sexual behaviour in context: a global perspective. Vol. 368, Lancet. Elsevier Limited; 2006. p. 1706–28. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17098090/
63. Cutler D, Miller G. The role of public health improvements in health advances: The twentieth-century United States. Demography. 2005;42(1):1–22. Available from: https://link-springer-com.ez.lshtm.ac.uk/article/10.1353/dem.2005.0002
64. Goldstein JR, Lee RD. Demographic perspectives on the mortality of COVID-19 and other epidemics. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2020 Sep 8;117(36):22035–41. Available from: www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.2006392117
65. Ibarra FP, Mehrad M, Di Mauro M, Peraza Godoy MF, Cruz EG, Nilforoushzadeh MA, et al. Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the sexual behavior of the population. The vision of the east and the west. Vol. 46, International Braz J Urol. Brazilian Society of

752 Urology; 2020. p. 104–12. Available from: http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4687-7353
753
754
755

Abbreviations

DALY	Disability-adjusted life year
GDP	Gross domestic product
HPV	Human papillomavirus
LMICs	Low- and middle-income countries
PHE	Public Health England
PRIME	Papillomavirus Rapid Interface for Modelling and Economics
RR	Risk ratios
UI	Uncertainty intervals
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States
USD	United States Dollar
VE	Vaccine efficacy
WHO	World Health Organization

Funding

Financial support for this project was provided by PATH on behalf of the Single-Dose HPV Vaccine Evaluation Consortium which includes Harvard University (Harvard), London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine (LSHTM), PATH, US National Cancer Institute (NCI), University of British Columbia, Canada (UBC), CHU de Québec-Université Laval, Quebec (CHU), University of Witwatersrand Reproductive Health and HIV Institute (Wits RHI), US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the World Health Organization (WHO). The work was also part funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (OPP1157270) and the Fonds de recherche du Québec - Santé (FRQS) Research Scholars award (to MB), and a Foundation scheme grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR; grant number FDN-143283). This research was also enabled in part by support provided by Compute Canada (www.computecanada.ca).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' Contributions

KP and MJ conceptualised the study, curated and analysed the data, interpreted the findings, and drafted manuscript. YHC, EB, EAB, LH, and JFL curated and analysed the data, interpreted the findings, and were major contributors in writing the manuscript. JJK and MB interpreted the findings and were major contributors in writing the manuscript. MCR, MD, SS, KA, and AP analysed the data, interpreted the findings, and reviewed the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

We declare no competing interests.

Data availability

All analysis codes are available at https://github.com/kieshaprem/hpv-1-dose.

Acknowledgement

We thank members of the Single-Dose HPV Vaccine Evaluation Consortium for comments and helpful discussion on this work.

Figure captions

Fig 1. Overview of the data sources and the key steps of the modelling. To compare the impact and cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose vaccination in 188 countries, we adopted a hybrid approach. First, we synthesised the age-specific impact of HPV vaccines of three published transmission dynamic models—PHE, HPV-ADVISE, Harvard—from 10 model-country settings. Second, we derived the primary impact of vaccination using a static model (PRIME). Third, we extrapolated the primary and secondary effects to the remaining countries in the world. Fourth, we measured and compared population-level impact (e.g., cervical cancers averted, number of females needed to be vaccinated, threshold costs of the first and second dose of the vaccine) for three vaccine strategies: no HPV vaccination (the counterfactual); a one-dose HPV vaccination schedule in which we assume that one dose of the vaccine provides either a shorter duration of protection (20 or 30 years) or lower vaccine efficacy (i.e., 80%) compared to two doses; and a two-dose HPV vaccination schedule in which two doses of the vaccine provides lifetime protection.

Fig 2. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination by country income groups. The lines represent the median projections of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of routine vaccination. Cancers averted were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.

Fig 3. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination as a proportion of cervical cancers averted by routine HPV vaccination programmes conferring lifelong protection at 100% vaccine efficacy. The median percentage (intervals: 10–90th percentile) of cancers averted by a one-dose schedule compared to a two-dose programme of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. Health outcomes were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.

Fig 4. Number of girls needed to be vaccinated with the first and second dose to avert one additional cervical cancer case by income group. The lines represent the median projections of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of routine vaccination. Health outcomes were discounted at 3% (panels A–D) and 0% (panels E–H).

Fig 5. Threshold cost to pay for the first and second dose of vaccine by country income groups. The threshold cost is the maximum that could be paid for the first dose (compared to no vaccination) and second dose (compared to one dose only) for the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio to remain below the cost-effectiveness threshold. Two cost-effectiveness thresholds are presented: a lower threshold as suggested by Jit (2020) in panels A–D and country gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (in 2017 USD) in panels E–H. The lower cost-effectiveness threshold presented in panels A–D is 30–40% and 60–65% of GDP per capita in low-income and middle- to high-income countries, respectively. Cost and health outcomes were discounted at 3% and 0%, respectively.

838 **Figures**



Figure 1. Overview of the data sources and the key steps of the modelling. To compare the impact and cost-effectiveness of one-dose versus two-dose vaccination in 188 countries, we adopted a hybrid approach. First, we synthesised the age-specific impact of HPV vaccines of three published transmission dynamic models—PHE, HPV-ADVISE, Harvard—from 10 model-country settings. Second, we derived the primary impact of vaccination using a static model (PRIME). Third, we extrapolated the primary and secondary effects to the remaining countries in the world. Fourth, we measured and compared population-level impact (e.g., cervical cancers averted, number of females needed to be vaccinated, threshold costs of the first and second dose of the vaccine) for three vaccine strategies: no HPV vaccination (the counterfactual); a one-dose HPV vaccination schedule in which we assume that one dose of the vaccine provides either a shorter duration of protection (20 or 30 years) or lower vaccine efficacy (i.e., 80%) compared to two doses; and a two-dose HPV vaccination schedule in which two doses of the vaccine provides lifetime protection.

839



Figure 2. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination by country income groups. The lines represent the median projections of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of routine vaccination. Cancers averted (health outcomes) were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52 and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.

840
841



Figure 3. Cervical cancers averted by routine one-dose HPV vaccination as a proportion of cervical cancers averted by routine HPV vaccination programmes conferring lifelong protection at 100% vaccine efficacy. The median percentage (intervals: 10–90th percentile) of cancers averted by a one-dose schedule compared to a two-dose programme of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. Health outcomes were discounted at 0%. Only cervical cancer caused by HPV 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52 and 58, which could be averted by the 9-valent HPV vaccine, were considered.

842
843
844

845



Figure 4. Number of girls needed to be vaccinated with the first and second dose to avert one additional cervical cancer case by income group. The lines represent the median projections of the 10 model-country settings: the PHE model in black, HPV-ADVISE model-country pairs in red, and the Harvard model-country pairs in blue. The grey area corresponds to the additional cases averted in the vaccinated cohort after the 100 years of routine vaccination. Health outcomes were discounted at 3% (panels A–D) and 0% (panels E–H).

846
847



Figure 5. Threshold cost to pay for the first and second dose of vaccine by country income groups. The threshold cost is the maximum that could be paid for the first dose (compared to no vaccination) and second dose (compared to one dose only) for the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio to remain below the cost-effectiveness threshold. Two cost-effectiveness thresholds are presented: a lower threshold as suggested by Jit (2020) in panels A–D and country gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (in 2017 USD) in panels E–H. The lower cost-effectiveness threshold presented in panels A–D is 30–40% and 60–65% of GDP per capita in low-income and middle- to high-income countries, respectively. Cost and health outcomes were discounted at 3% and 0%, respectively.


HPV DYNAMIC MODELS
Demographics, sexual activity, HPV natural history and disease, HPV transmission
PHE UK
HPV-ADVISE India
HPV-ADVISE Nigeria
HPV-ADVISE Uganda
HPV-ADVISE Vietnam
HPV-ADVISE Canada
Harvard Uganda
Harvard Nicaragua
Harvard El Salvador
Harvard US
Synthesized results from HPV-ADVISE, PHE, Harvard
Total vaccine impact
Primary impact of vaccination w/o waning (10 model-country)
Secondary impact of vaccination (10 model-country)
Ratio (10 model-country)
Compare • Estimate
Assumptions
• 80% vaccine coverage against all high-risk HPV types in the 9-valent vaccine (16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, 58)
• Routine vaccination at 10y girls + catch-up 11-14y girls (for first year)
• Routine annual vaccination in 2021–2120
HPV STATIC MODEL
Demographics, cervical cancer incidence, HPV type distribution
Assumptions
• 80% vaccine coverage against all high-risk HPV types in the 9-valent vaccine (16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, 58)
• Routine annual vaccination in 2021–2120
PRIME
Primary impact of vaccination w/o waning (in 188 countries)
C Estimating and extrapolating vaccine impact outside PRIME
1. waning immunity: 20/30y vs. lifetime protection
2. herd effects
•Extrapolate•
Secondary impact of vaccination (in 188 countries)
VACCINATION STRATEGIES
1. no HPV vaccination
2. one-dose HPV vaccination (20y/30y/lifetime at VE 80%)
3. two-dose HPV vaccination (lifetime protection)
Number of cervical cancer-related cases, deaths and DALYs (in 188 countries)
NNV with one-dose, and second dose, to avert one cervical cancer case/death/DALY (in 188 countries)
Threshold cost to pay for the first and second dose of vaccine (in 188 countries)
Primary impact of vaccination* (in 188 countries)
&
Secondary impact of vaccination* (in 188 countries)
* For any protection length: 20y/30y/lifetime
Legend
DALYs: disability-adjusted life years
NNV: number (of females) needed to vaccinate
Input
Model
Estimates


Protection from 1 dose
20 years at 100% VE
30 years at 100% VE
Lifelong years at 80% VE
Low-income countries
Middle-income countries
High-income countries
World
Cervical cancers averted
× 10^3
PHE: UK
HPV-ADVISE: India
HPV-ADVISE: Nigeria
HPV-ADVISE: Uganda
HPV-ADVISE: Vietnam
HPV-ADVISE: Canada
Harvard: Uganda
Harvard: El Salvador
Harvard: Nicaragua
Harvard: United States
2050
2100
2150
2200


Protection from 1 dose
20 years at 100% VE
30 years at 100% VE
Lifelong years at 80% VE
Low-income countries
Middle-income countries
High-income countries
World
Cervical cancers averted by 1-dose as a % 2-dose
0
25
50
75
100
GBR
IND
NGA
UGA
VNM
CAN
UGA
SLV
NIC
USA
PHE
HPV-ADVISE
HARVARD


Benefits discounted at 0%
Benefits discounted at 3%
Low-income countries
Middle-income countries
High-income countries
World
Number needed to give +1 dose to avert 1 cervical cancer case (log10 scale)
A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
PHE: UK
HPV-ADVISE: India
HPV-ADVISE: Nigeria
HPV-ADVISE: Uganda
HPV-ADVISE: Vietnam
HPV-ADVISE: Canada
Harvard: Uganda
Harvard: El Salvador
Harvard: Nicaragua
Harvard: US
10M
1M
100k
10k
1k
100
10
0 → 1 20y
0 → 1 30y
0 → 1 VE:80%
1 20y → 2 life
1 30y → 2 life
1 VE:80% → 2 life
0 → 1 20y / 30y / VE:80%
1 20 / 30y / VE:80% → 2 life
Change in number of vaccine doses (duration/extent of protection)


Threshold of < 1 GDP per capita
Threshold of 1 GDP per capita
Low-income countries
Middle-income countries
High-income countries
World
Threshold costs for +1 dose (2017 US dollar)
A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
PHE: UK
HPV-ADVISE: India
HPV-ADVISE: Nigeria
HPV-ADVISE: Uganda
HPV-ADVISE: Vietnam
HPV-ADVISE: Canada
Harvard: Uganda
Harvard: El Salvador
Harvard: Nicaragua
Harvard: US
0
200
400
600
0 → 1 20y
0 → 1 30y
0 → 1 VE:80%
1 20y → 2 life
1 30y → 2 life
1 VE:80% → 2 life
0 → 1 20y / 30y / VE:80%
1 20 / 30y / VE:80% → 2 life
Change in number of vaccine doses (duration/extent of protection)