Assessing the impact of limit of detection on HAI titer increase estimation in vaccine studies

Yang Ge[1*]
[1]School of Health Professions, University of Southern Mississippi

*Corresponding author: Yang Ge, yang.ge@usm.edu

This study is part of a thesis for the degree of biostatistics, which can be found at University of Georgia's library.

Abstract. In vaccine development studies, scientists usually compare the immunogenicity of candidate vaccines using lab assays. However, assays have limit of detection (LOD) issues that challenge the comparison of immunogenicity. Inappropriate accounting for the LOD often leads to biased coefficient estimates. We found a linear model without adjustment for the LOD produced biased parameters estimations. To better account for the LODs, a bi-censoring (ice) method was proposed. This adjustment yielded less biased estimates.

Keywords: Influenza, Vaccine, HAI, limit of detection.

Introduction

The United States Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices recommends that US residents older than six months receive annual influenza vaccination.[1] Around 50% of the population has received influenza vaccines in the past several seasons,[2,3] leading to the prevention of millions of illnesses and medical visits, hundreds of thousands of hospitalizations, and thousands of death annually.[2,3]

In the development of vaccines, scientists usually compare the immunogenicity of multiple vaccine candidates,[4] then select the most promising ones. The level of protective antibodies is a critical immunogenicity measurement. Antibodies that specifically bind to a certain area of the viral surface can neutralize the virus and help prevent infection. Thus, vaccines are designed to induce these neutralizing antibodies.[5]

Hemagglutination-inhibition (HAI) antibody concentration can be measured with the Hemagglutination inhibition (HI) assay. Many studies have used HI assay to compare the effectiveness of

vaccine candidates.[6–11] However, it is not uncommon for the measurement of immunogenicity to have limit of detection (LOD) issues[12] that bias the comparison results. Adjustments for LOD are needed to obtain unbiased results from models.

In this study, with a motivating data,[13] we explored the bias due to the LOD issues and proposed a adjustment method.

Method

The motivating data

The motivating data are from an ongoing vaccination study in which volunteers who had not yet received an influenza vaccine for the season were recruited each year before the start of the influenza season. The study belongs to the *Collaborative Influenza Vaccine Innovation Centers (CIVICs)* program[13] that is funded by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health. In the *the Collaborative Influenza Vaccine Innovation Centers (CIVICs)* program, individuals 65+ years of age were offered a choice between the high-dose (HD) and standard-dose (SD) influenza vaccine.

The influenza vaccine used during this study contained either three or four strains. Biological samples were taken prior to vaccinations and 21-28 days after vaccinations.[8–10] These serum samples were tested with multiple strains for HAI titer results. If the influenza strain that used for the HAI titer testing is the same as the strain contained in the vaccine, the HAI titer results are said to be homologous. Otherwise, the titer is called heterologous. The main quantity of interest for our analysis is the hemagglutination-inhibition antibody titer (HAI) change between pre- and post-vaccination sera. HAI titers were measured with the standard dilution assay. The limit of detection (LOD) in this study was $1:10$. Values below the LOD were coded as $1:5$.

The main outcome is titer increase, defined as the difference between post-vaccination and pre-vaccination titer. In this motivating data, when HAI titers are below the LOD level, a fixed numeric value of five was used to impute the missing values due to LOD. Such imputation approaches using either $\frac{x}{2}$, or x, or $\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}}$, etc., will likely reduce the variance in our outcome from its true underlying distribution and introduce bias.

The simulated data

We simulated pre-vaccination HAI titers and then calculated post-vaccination HAI titers with assumptions of the titer increase of the intervention. Following previous studies, the data sets of HAI titers were simulated and analyzed on the log scale.[14–18]

The pre-vaccination titers were simulated with log-normal distributions with mean μ and a standard deviation of 1. To simulate pre-vaccination titers with different proportions of HAI titer below LODs (i.e., ¡ 1:10 according to the CIVIC data), the mean of the distribution, μ, was determined by setting it to a value ($\mu_{LOD[i]}$) that the cumulative probability $F(x \leq 10)$ equal to the value of i, which could be 10%, 30%, 50%, 70%, 90%, respectively. We determined the μ by

$$x_\alpha = e^{\mu + Z_\alpha \sigma_y},$$

where x_α is the pre-set proportion for the LOD value (1:10); Z_α is the Z value in the normal distribution for the cut-off of α quantile; σ_y is set to 1. By this equation, the value of μ can be identified.

According to the CIVIC study design, for the comparison of HD and SD vaccines, the post-vaccination HAI titers were simulated by

$$\begin{aligned} log(HAI_{Post-VAC}) = log(HAI_{Pre-VAC}) \\ +\beta_{HD} \cdot I(Dose = HD) \\ +\beta_{SD} \cdot I(Dose = SD) \\ +\beta_{age} \cdot x_{age} \\ +\epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where β_{HD} is the impact of high-dose vaccine (HD), which was assumed to be log(12); and β_{SD} is the impact of standard-dose vaccine (SD), which was assumed to be log(6). Other assumptions of the impact of vaccines were provided in the sensitivity analyses. β_{age} is the coefficient for the variable of age, which was assumed to be -0.03; and ϵ, is the error term, which was assumed to follow the standard normal distribution.

The simulated raw data were continuous values generated by the log normal distribution (raw). Those values were transformed into a discrete format by grouping the raw data to the closest discrete value (raw + bin). Lastly, the discrete data was imputed with a LOD design where discrete values with all values below $1:10$ were set to $1:5$ (raw + bin + lod5). Therefore, three kinds of data were fitted into a model for estimation comparisons. We repeated the data simulation to have 500 data sets for confidence interval estimations.

The Bi-censoring method

The proposed bi-censoring method accounts for LOD issues in both pre-vaccination and post-vaccination HAI titer values with a technique similar to an interval censoring method.[19] Thus, we called it as bi-censoring or ice method. We treated these LOD issues as interval censors rather than left censors.

The titer increase is defined as the difference between pre-vaccination and post-vaccination HAI titers on the log scale.

$$log(HAI_{titer-increase}) = log(HAI_{Post-VAC}) - log(HAI_{Pre-VAC})$$

We consider the titer increase an interval-censored value when either pre-vaccination or post-

vaccination was censored, so the likelihood of the model would be

$$
\begin{aligned}
L &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-n_c} \log[f(x_i, y_i)] + \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \log[\int_{low}^{high} f(x_j, y) dy] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N-n_c} \log[f(y_i)|\mu = \hat{y}, \sigma = 1] \\
&+ \sum_{j=1}^{n_c} \log[F(y_j \leq high|\mu = \hat{y}, \sigma = 1) - F(y_j \leq low|\mu = \hat{y}, \sigma = 1)],
\end{aligned} \tag{2}
$$

If the titer increase is a positive number, the intervention induces a better immune response than the control group. Otherwise, the intervention is not better than the control.

To maximize the log-likelihood, we used the Newton-Raphson method[20] with the statistical software R and the maxLik package.[21,22] The estimate of β and its confidence interval are based on $\hat{\beta}^{ML}$ and $\hat{\beta}^{ML} \pm z_\alpha$se (se: standard errors based on the Hessian matrix).

Results

Simulation Study

The impact of high-dose vaccine (HD), β_{HD}, was equal to log(12). The impact of standard-dose vaccine (SD), β_{SD}, was equal to log(6). Therefore, the benefit of the high-dose vaccine compared to the standard-dose vaccine (SD) was $\log(2) \approx 0.7$. The parameter for the variable of age, β_{age}, was assumed to be -0.03, which means as the age increases the vaccine's impact on titer increase decreases.

Figure 1 shows that the same linear regression model with data of raw or raw + bin provided unbiased results that the mean and 95$\%$ confidence intervals covered the true value of the impact of the vaccine ($\log(2) \approx 0.7$). However, the model with data of raw + bin + lod5 (the naive imputation method) provided biased coefficient estimations. With 10$\%$ HAI titer data below the LOD ($< 1:10$), the simple linear regression model returned a significantly lower estimation of the impact of HD compared to the SD vaccine. The magnitude of bias with the naive imputation method increased as the proportion of data below the LOD became higher.



Fig 1 The bias of the estimation of the titer increase difference between HD and SD vaccines increased with the increase of LOD proportion (N=1000). Confidence interval came from 500 iterations. Three kinds of data were used. raw: continuous titer; raw + bin: discrete titer; raw + bin + lod5: discrete titer with LOD. Points and bars were the means and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficient estimations, respectively.

In Figure 2, again, that same model with the raw or raw + bin data provided unbiased results that the mean and 95% confidence intervals covered the true value of the coefficient of age ($\beta_{age} = -0.03$). However, the model with raw + bin + lod5 data provided biased coefficient estimations. With 10% HAI titer data below the LOD ($< 1:10$), the model underestimated the variable of age. The magnitude of bias increased as the proportion of data below the LOD became higher. The biased estimation became significantly higher when the proportion of data below the LOD was 50%.



Fig 2 The bias of the estimation of the impact of age increased with the increase of LOD proportion (N=1000). Confidence interval came from 500 iterations. Three kinds of data were used. raw: continuous titer; raw + bin: discrete titer; raw + bin + lod5: discrete titer with LOD. Points and bars were the means and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficient estimations, respectively.

Bi-censoring

The bi-censoring (ice) method, described in the Chapter 3, was implemented on LOD data sets (raw + bin + lod5) to compare to the naive imputation method.

The ice method (raw+bin+lod5+ice) provided estimations closer to the true value compared to the naive imputation method (raw+bin+lod5) (Figure 3). As the LOD proportion of HAI titer data increased from 10% to 90%, the mean estimations and 95% confidence intervals from the ice method continued to include the true value.



Fig 3 The comparison of the estimations of titer increase difference between HD and SD vaccine with the method of bi-censoring (N=1000). Confidence interval came from 500 iterations. The high-dose vaccine has a titer increase equal to $\log(12)$, and the standard-dose vaccine has a titer increase equal to $\log(6)$. Three kinds of data were used. raw: continuous titer; raw + bin: discrete titer; raw + bin + lod5: discrete titer with LOD. The method of bi-censoring (ice) was used for the LOD data. Points and bars were the mean and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficients estimations.

The bi-censoring method provided estimations of the impact of age closer to the true value than the naive imputation method (Figure 4). The mean estimations and 95% confidence intervals of the ice method covered the true value for all tested LOD proportions.



Fig 4 The impact of age on HAI titer increase with the method of bi-censoring (N=1000). The simulated log normal distributions with total sample size equal to 1000 was used. Confidence interval came from 500 iterations. Three kinds of data were used. raw: continuous titer; raw + bin: discrete titer; raw + bin + lod5: discrete titer with LOD. The method of bi-censoring (ice) was used for the LOD data. Points and bars were the mean and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficient estimations.

Although the ice method's bias was much smaller than the simple linear regression model, the variance of the estimation was more considerable and increased as the increase of LOD proportion.

Apply the bi-censoring method to the CIVIC data

We applied the bi-censoring method (ice) and the naive imputation with linear regression model (lm) to the CIVIC data to make comparisons. The homologous results are presented in Figure 5. The heterologous results are presented in Figure 6.



Fig 5 Apply bi-censoring method for homologous responses estimations. Points and bars were the mean and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficient estimations. ice + lm: apply bi-censoring method to the CIVIC data with a linear regression model. lm: the simple linear regression model.



Fig 6 Apply bi-censoring method for H1N1-California-2009 heterologous responses estimations. Points and bars were the mean and 95% confidence intervals of model coefficient estimations. ice + lm: apply bi-censoring method to the CIVIC data with a linear regression model. lm: the simple linear regression model.

For homologous comparisons, the ice and lm method provided different results for several strains (Table 1). For example, H1N1-California-2009 and H1N1-Michigan-2015, the estimation of coefficients changed from significant in the naive imputation linear regression model to non-significant with the ice method.

For heterologous comparisons, generally, these two methods provided similar results, but the ice method had wider confidence intervals (Table 2). For example, in the heterologous pair of H1N1-Brisbane-2018 and H1N1-Brisbane-2007, the proportion of pre-vaccination titer below the LOD was 100%. Therefore, the ice method provided a wide interval. In the heterologous pair of H3N2-Kansas-2017 and H3N2-Hong Kong-2014, the result was significant with the ice method, but was non-significant with the naive imputation linear regression model.

Table 1 Comparison of model estimations on selected homologous responses

Vaccine strain	Sample size	LOD	ice method	lm method
H1N1-California-2009	301	26.25%	0.23 (95%CI, -0.02 to 0.48)	0.31 (95%CI, 0.11 to 0.51)
H1N1-Michigan-2015	57	7.02%	0.44 (95%CI, -0.13 to 1.01)	0.45 (95%CI, 0.01 to 0.89)

Table 2 Comparison of model estimations on heterologous responses

Vaccine strain	Tested strain	Sample size	LOD	ice method	lm method
H1N1-Brisbane-2018	H1N1-Brisbane-2007	90	100%	-0.96 (95%CI, -192.36 to 190.45)	-0.22 (95%CI, -0.55 to 0.1)
H3N2-Kansas-2017	H3N2-Hong Kong-2014	90	44.44%	-0.69 (95%CI, -1.26 to -0.12)	-0.56 (95%CI, -1.31 to 0.19)
H3N2-Texas-2012	H3N2-Hong Kong-1968	92	41.30%	-0.42 (95%CI, -1 to 0.17)	-0.17 (95%CI, -0.33 to -0.01)

Discussion

In this thesis, antibody data sets were simulated to study the bias in coefficient estimations due to the data's limit of detection (LOD) issues. Subsequently, the Bi-censoring method (ice) was proposed to adjust the bias. Compared to linear regression models with the naive imputation method on LOD data, the ice method yielded less biased estimations with relatively wider confidence intervals.

The HAI assay provides discrete titer values (e.g., $1:10$, $1:20$ etc.).[14–18] However, continuous values (e.g., $1:2$, $1:3.5$ etc.) might be possible if the assay is revised. By comparing coefficients estimations, models with continuous or discrete dilution values produced similar and unbiased results.

Limit of detection (LOD) issues are common in antibody assays.[12,23] Several studies have explored the LOD of post-intervention outcomes in vaccine studies. In most circumstances, only the post-vaccination HAI titer is studied, considering the LOD as censored data. One study derived a formula for the bias as a function of the geometric standard deviation.[24] In addition to the maximum likelihood estimate (MLE) accounting for censoring, Schmoyeri et al. explored a non-parametric method to account for the censored data.[25] Most recently, Thao et al. have studied two aspects: 1) estimating the association between two variables under the presence of censoring; and 2) estimating the coefficients of a linear regression model in the presence of censoring using the maximum likelihood estimation approach.[26]

However, titer increase is an important measurement of vaccine efficacy, but may have LOD issues on pre- and post- vaccination titers. Adjustments for titer increase were not fully explored. A naive imputation method that replaced data points below the LOD with a fixed value introduced

bias in the coefficients' estimations. Imputation is challenging because those data points may not be missing at random, an assumption often required by most missing data imputation procedures. We proposed the Bi-censoring (ice) method. In the ice method, the HAI titer below the LOD was assumed to be within a set range. So, the bi-censoring method was introduced into the model's maximum likelihood estimation. Finally, we implemented both approaches in the real data analysis of the CIVIC data for results comparisons. Two approaches provided different conclusions on several strains.

These findings may benefit future clinical trials in which candidate vaccines are compared based on immunogenicity outcomes. We found that the common discrete dilution values of antibodies are robust surrogate outcomes. When the proportion of LOD is high, the investigators should refer to the Bi-censoring method instead of the naive imputation method.

References

1 L. A. Grohskopf, L. Z. Sokolow, S. J. Olsen, *et al.*, "Prevention and control of influenza with vaccines: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices, United States, 2015–16 influenza season," *MMWR. Morbidity and mortality weekly report* **64**(30), 818 (2015).

2 J. R. Chung, M. A. Rolfes, B. Flannery, *et al.*, "Effects of influenza vaccination in the United States during the 2018 - 2019 influenza season," *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **71**(8), e368–e376 (2020).

3 M. A. Rolfes, B. Flannery, J. R. Chung, *et al.*, "Effects of influenza vaccination in the United States during the 2017–2018 influenza season," *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **69**(11), 1845–1853 (2019).

4 A. Iwasaki and S. B. Omer, "Why and how vaccines work," *Cell* **183**(2), 290–295 (2020).

5 J. A. Owen, J. Punt, and S. A. Stranford, *Kuby Immunology*, WH Freeman New York, NY, USA: (2013).

6 L. Coudeville, F. Bailleux, B. Riche, *et al.*, "Relationship between haemagglutination-inhibiting antibody titres and clinical protection against influenza: Development and application of a bayesian random-effects model.," *BMC medical research methodology* **10**(1), 18 (2010).

7 T. M. Ross, C. J. Lin, M. P. Nowalk, *et al.*, "Influence of pre-existing hemagglutination inhibition titers against historical influenza strains on antibody response to inactivated trivalent influenza vaccine in adults 50–80 years of age," *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* **10**, 1195–1203 (2014).

8 I. A. Nuñez, M. A. Carlock, J. D. Allen, *et al.*, "Impact of age and pre-existing influenza immune responses in humans receiving split inactivated influenza vaccine on the induction of the breadth of antibodies to influenza A strains," *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0185666 (2017).

9 R. B. Abreu, E. F. Clutter, S. Attari, *et al.*, "IgA Responses Following Recurrent Influenza Virus Vaccination," *Frontiers in Immunology* **11**, 902 (2020).

10 M. A. Carlock, J. G. Ingram, E. F. Clutter, *et al.*, "Impact of age and pre-existing immunity on the induction of human antibody responses against influenza B viruses," *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics* **15**, 2030–2043 (2019).

11 R. B. Abreu, G. A. Kirchenbaum, E. F. Clutter, *et al.*, "Preexisting subtype immunodominance shapes memory B cell recall response to influenza vaccination," *JCI insight* **5** (2020).

12 EMEA, "Guidelines for the validation of analytical methods used in residue depletion studies," *Vet. Med. Insp. Eur. Med. Agency* (2009).

13 CIVICs, "The Collaborative Influenza Vaccine Innovation Centers." https://www.niaidcivics.org/.

14 R. B. Couch, P. Winokur, R. Brady, *et al.*, "Safety and immunogenicity of a high dosage trivalent influenza vaccine among elderly subjects," *Vaccine* **25**, 7656–7663 (2007).

15 A. R. Falsey, J. J. Treanor, N. Tornieporth, *et al.*, "Randomized, Double-Blind Controlled Phase 3 Trial Comparing the Immunogenicity of High-Dose and Standard-Dose Influenza Vaccine in Adults 65 Years of Age and Older," *The Journal of Infectious Diseases* **200**, 172–180 (2009).

16 C. A. DiazGranados, A. J. Dunning, E. Jordanov, *et al.*, "High-dose trivalent influenza vac-

cine compared to standard dose vaccine in elderly adults: Safety, immunogenicity and relative efficacy during the 2009–2010 season," *Vaccine* **31**, 861–866 (2013).

17 C. A. DiazGranados, A. J. Dunning, M. Kimmel, *et al.*, "Efficacy of High-Dose versus Standard-Dose Influenza Vaccine in Older Adults," *New England Journal of Medicine* **371**, 635–645 (2014).

18 J. K. H. Lee, G. K. L. Lam, T. Shin, *et al.*, "Efficacy and effectiveness of high-dose influenza vaccine in older adults by circulating strain and antigenic match: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis," *Vaccine* **39**, A24–A35 (2021).

19 R. J. Little and D. B. Rubin, *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*, vol. 793, John Wiley & Sons (2019).

20 T. J. Ypma, "Historical development of the Newton–Raphson method," *SIAM review* **37**(4), 531–551 (1995).

21 "R: The R Project for Statistical Computing." https://www.r-project.org/.

22 A. Henningsen and O. Toomet, "maxLik: A package for maximum likelihood estimation in R," *Computational Statistics* **26**(3), 443–458 (2011).

23 A. Zeghnoun, M. Pascal, N. Fréry, *et al.*, "Dealing with the non-detected and non-quantified data. The example of the serum dioxin data in the French dioxin and incinerators study," *Organohalogen Compounds* **69**, 2288–2291 (2007).

24 A. H. El-Shaarawi and S. R. Esterby, "Replacement of censored observations by a constant: An evaluation," *Water Research* **26**(6), 835–844 (1992).

25 R. L. Schmoyeri, J. J. Beauchamp, C. C. Brandt, *et al.*, "Difficulties with the lognormal model in mean estimation and testing," *Environmental and Ecological Statistics* **3**(1), 81–97 (1996).

26 T. M. P. Tran, S. Abrams, M. Aerts, *et al.*, "Measuring association among censored antibody titer data," *Statistics in Medicine* **40**, 3740–3761 (2021).