

1 **MVA-BN Vaccine Effectiveness: A Systematic Review of** 2 **Real-World Evidence in Outbreak Settings**

3 **Authors:**

4 Lauren M.K. Mason Ph.D.^a, Estefania Betancur MSc^a, Margarita Riera-Montes MD MSc^a, Florian
5 Lienert Ph.D.^b, Suzanne Scheele MS^c

6 **Affiliations:**

7 ^a P95 Epidemiology and Pharmacovigilance, Leuven, Belgium.

8 ^b Bavarian Nordic Switzerland AG, Zug, Switzerland

9 ^c Bavarian Nordic, Inc., Morrisville, North Carolina, United States of America.

10 **Corresponding author:** Florian Lienert; Bavarian Nordic Switzerland AG, Zug, Switzerland;
11 fli@bavarian-nordic.com

12 **Abstract**

13 **Background:** Mpox is a disease endemic to Central and West Africa. It caused outbreaks in non-
14 endemic countries, mainly in 2022. The endemic Democratic Republic of Congo is currently
15 experiencing its largest outbreak yet. The vaccine Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavarian Nordic (MVA-
16 BN) is approved for active immunization against mpox and smallpox. Since the outbreak in 2022, real-
17 world studies have assessed MVA-BN's vaccine effectiveness (VE) against mpox, and this systematic
18 literature review aims to summarize the most current evidence.

19 **Methods:** Medline (via PubMed), Embase, and LILACS were searched, as well as grey literature
20 sources and publications' bibliographies to identify observational studies published between
21 1/Jan/2022 and 28/Feb/2024 that estimate the VE of MVA-BN against symptomatic mpox or provide
22 risk measures that allow calculation of these VE estimates. Data were presented descriptively in
23 tables and text; the methodological quality of included records was assessed using an informal
24 qualitative approach.

25 **Results:** The literature search identified a total of 16 records that fit the inclusion criteria. The studies
26 took place in high-income countries and were heterogenous in design, setting, and definition of at-risk
27 populations. MVA-BN VE estimates against symptomatic mpox infection ≥ 14 days post-vaccination
28 were assessed. Where the study population was exclusively or primarily those receiving pre-exposure
29 prophylactic vaccination, the adjusted VE estimates ranged from 35% to 86% (n=8 studies) for one
30 dose and from 66% to 90% (n=5) for two doses. Where only post-exposure prophylactic vaccination
31 was assessed, adjusted VE estimates were reported for one dose only at 78% and 89% (n=2).
32 Additionally, MVA-BN reduced the risk of mpox-related hospitalization in one study and the severity of
33 mpox clinical manifestations in two studies.

34 **Conclusions:** Despite heterogeneity in study design, setting, and at-risk populations, the reported VE
35 estimates against symptomatic mpox infection for one or two doses of MVA-BN support deployment of
36 MVA-BN for mpox outbreak control.

37 **Keywords**

38 mpox; post-exposure prophylactic vaccination; pre-exposure prophylactic vaccination; real-world
39 evidence; systematic literature review; vaccine effectiveness

40 **Abbreviations**

41 CDC: US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CDESS: The Communicable Disease
42 Electronic Surveillance System; CHS: Clalit Health Services; CI: confidence interval; DE: data
43 extraction; DRC: Democratic Republic of Congo; FT: full-text review; GBMSM: gay, bisexual, and
44 other men who have sex with men; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; HRR: hazard rate ratio; IC,
45 immunocompromised; IRR: incidence rate ratio; MeSH: medical subject headings; MPVX: monkeypox
46 virus; MSM: men who have sex with men; MVA-BN: Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavarian Nordic; NR:
47 not reported; NYC: New York City; OCM: other clinical manifestations; OR: odds ratio; PDE5:
48 phosphodiesterase 5; PEP: post-exposure prophylactic vaccination; PrEP: pre-exposure prophylactic
49 vaccination; PICOS: patient, intervention, comparison, outcome, setting; PRISMA: Preferred
50 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; RR: risk ratio; RWE: real-world
51 evidence; SHC: sexual health clinic; SLR: systematic literature review; STI: sexually transmittable
52 infection; SVI: social vulnerability index; VE: vaccine effectiveness.

53 Introduction

54 Mpox, formerly called monkeypox and first described in humans in the Democratic Republic of Congo
55 (DRC) in 1970 [1], is an illness that was initially zoonotic and is caused by the monkeypox virus
56 (MPXV). This DNA virus belongs to the *Orthopoxvirus* genus, which also includes the smallpox-
57 causing variola virus [2]. The clinical presentation of mpox includes a distinctive, extensive rash, fever,
58 headache, cough, asthenia, and lymphadenopathy. Additionally, complications such as coalescence
59 of skin ulcers, bacterial skin infections, bronchopneumonia, and sepsis may occur [3]. MPXV is
60 transmitted from animals to humans and between humans through contact with bodily fluids, lesions
61 on the skin or mucosae, respiratory droplets, and contaminated objects [4]. A definitive animal
62 reservoir host has not been identified [1].

63 Before the unprecedented global spread of the disease outside previously endemic countries in 2022,
64 reports of mpox were almost exclusively limited to Central and West African countries [4]. An
65 observed increase in cases in these countries before 2018 was hypothesized to be due to the
66 cessation of routine smallpox vaccination leading to waning *Orthopoxvirus* immunity [1].

67 Starting in May 2022, a significant surge in mpox cases occurred in numerous non-endemic countries
68 [5]. As of February 2024, over 94,000 confirmed mpox cases have been documented in 117 countries
69 [6]. While previous occurrences of mpox in non-endemic regions were associated with international
70 travel and importation of infected animals from West Africa [7], the 2022 outbreak was primarily
71 characterized by human-to-human transmission of MPXV [8]. This outbreak mainly occurred among,
72 but was not limited to, men who have sex with men (MSM) and in several high-income countries [9],
73 which had not been reported previously. Other differences included a different clade type, lower
74 mortality, and suggested novel epidemiological and clinical characteristics [9]. The outbreak response
75 strategy consisted mainly of behavior change and vaccination of high-risk populations [2].

76 The DRC is currently experiencing its largest ever recorded mpox outbreak, with more than 12,000
77 suspected cases and 500 deaths reported since the start of 2023 [10]. The outbreak is spreading to
78 almost all provinces, with different transmission patterns and affected populations. Some areas are
79 seeing large-scale transmission involving a larger proportion of children, potentially due to contact
80 with rodents. The province of Equateur, with a population of almost 6 million, is experiencing large,
81 concomitant mpox and measles outbreaks, with a potential increase in the risk of complications and a

82 larger reported mortality rate, as well as the risk of misdiagnosis of either disease. There is also a
83 large outbreak of primarily sexually transmitted mpox infections among sex workers and adults in the
84 mining city of Kamituga in South Kivu. The city's highly mobile population creates the risk for a multi-
85 country outbreak as the area borders Rwanda, Burundi, and Tanzania [11]. Global outbreak response
86 teams from multiple countries are active in the DRC, and mpox vaccination may soon become a tool
87 in controlling the current crisis.

88 Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavarian Nordic (MVA-BN; trade names Jynneos/Imvanex/Imvamune) is
89 the smallpox and mpox vaccine that has most broadly been used in response to the global mpox
90 outbreak. MVA-BN cannot replicate in human cells and, unlike replicating smallpox vaccines, has a
91 favorable safety profile for individuals with atopic dermatitis and immunodeficiency [12].

92 The MVA-BN vaccine can be administered prophylactically either before or after exposure to
93 confirmed mpox cases. Pre-exposure prophylactic vaccination (PrEP) aims at protecting those at risk
94 of mpox infections prior to having had contact with a confirmed case. Currently, the US Centers for
95 Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends PrEP for the at-risk groups: those at risk of
96 occupational exposure, gay, bisexual, and other MSM (GBMSM) who have been diagnosed with
97 certain sexually transmitted diseases and have multiple sexual partners, individuals engaging in
98 sexual activities in areas with a high prevalence of mpox, and those with sexual partners meeting
99 these criteria, as well as people with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection or other causes of
100 immunosuppression who have had recent or anticipate potential mpox exposure [13]. Post-exposure
101 prophylactic vaccination (PEP) aims to prevent mpox or reduce its severity in individuals who have
102 had contact with confirmed cases and can be administered up to 14 days post-exposure [13].

103 The regulatory authorities in the US, Canada, UK, and the EU approved MVA-BN in a two-dose
104 schedule ≥ 28 days apart for active immunization against smallpox and mpox based on pre-clinical
105 efficacy data from animal studies and clinical immunogenicity and safety studies [14-17]. The efficacy
106 of MVA-BN against mpox has not been demonstrated in randomized controlled clinical trials; however,
107 since the 2022 outbreak started, several real-world effectiveness studies have been conducted. This
108 systematic literature review (SLR) aims to identify and summarize the most current real-world
109 evidence (RWE) on the MVA-BN vaccine effectiveness (VE) against symptomatic mpox infection,
110 mpox-related hospitalization, and severity of clinical mpox manifestations.

111 **Methods**

112 **Registration and protocol**

113 This SLR was registered prospectively in PROSPERO (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/>; number
114 CRD42023441204), where key features from the protocol can be retrieved. The literature search was
115 initially performed in 2023 and updated on February 28, 2024, to include the latest relevant literature.

116 The focus of this manuscript is on the summary of RWE of the VE of MVA-BN against mpox.

117 The protocol and manuscript for this SLR were developed in line with recommendations from the
118 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement and
119 PRISMA extension for protocols (PRISMA-P) [18, 19].

120 **Search strategies and eligibility criteria**

121 The databases Medline (via PubMed), Embase, and LILACS were searched using database-specific
122 keywords and medical subject headings (MeSH terms) related to mpox and vaccine
123 effectiveness/vaccination. The detailed search strategies are available in **Supplementary Methods**.

124 We included peer-reviewed publications reporting on observational studies in humans on the VE of
125 MVA-BN, published between January 1, 2022, and February 28, 2024 (date of last search) in English,
126 Spanish, or French. We excluded publications that did not meet the inclusion criteria or where
127 methods and sources for data collection and/or analysis were not clearly defined. Records reporting
128 on *in vitro* studies, modeling studies, case reports/series, and (non-)randomized clinical trials were
129 excluded. SLRs and meta-analyses (MAs) were retained through the search and first selection stage
130 to allow screening through the bibliographies for identification of additional relevant publications, but
131 SLRs and MAs were not retained for data extraction. The full list of eligibility criteria is available in
132 **Supplementary Methods**.

133 To identify additional relevant publications, grey literature sources and pre-print databases were
134 searched on March 5, 2024 (date of last search) using source-specific search terms and limits as
135 detailed in **Supplementary Methods**.

136 **Record selection**

137 After deduplicating identified records, two independent researchers (EB, LM) screened the titles and
138 abstracts of all records in duplicate. Results were compared and discrepancies were discussed; in

139 case of doubt, the record was included for full-text review. Records for which insufficient information
140 was available in the title and abstract were also included for full-text review. All full texts were
141 reviewed by one researcher (EB), and full texts for 10% of the records were screened in duplicate
142 (EB, LM). The results were compared and discrepancies were discussed; any doubts outside the 10%
143 were also discussed. When multiple articles reported on the same dataset and the same outcome,
144 only the most recent and complete available version was included. To identify additional relevant
145 publications, bibliographies of selected papers (e.g., key studies, SLRs, and MAs) were manually
146 searched.

147 **Data collection and synthesis**

148 One reviewer (EB) extracted all relevant data for each retained record in a pre-defined template in
149 Microsoft Excel. The main outcomes of interest were crude and/or adjusted VE estimates against
150 symptomatic mpox infection, mpox-related hospitalization, and severity of mpox clinical
151 manifestations with crude/adjusted confidence intervals (CIs). Data related to these VE estimates,
152 such as VE calculation methods, subpopulations, stratification groups, incidence rates, cumulative
153 hazard rates, risk association measures (odds ratios [ORs], risk ratios [RRs], hazard ratios [HRs],
154 incidence rate ratios [IRR], hazard rate ratios [HRRs]), and confounders were also extracted. In case
155 no crude or adjusted VE estimates were reported in the publication, we calculated the VE and 95%
156 CIs from extracted risk association measures using the following formula:

$$VE = 1 - \frac{\text{Risk among vaccinated group}}{\text{Risk among unvaccinated group}} \times 100$$

157 No other calculations or assumptions were made in case of other missing data. Variables related to
158 study characteristics (e.g., study design, vaccination strategy), population characteristics (e.g.,
159 sample definitions, comorbidities), study methods (e.g., case and control definitions), additional
160 information on statistical analyses (e.g., results of the sensitivity analysis), and data for assessment of
161 the study's methodological quality (e.g., strengths and limitations as mentioned by the authors) were
162 also extracted.

163 Study characteristics and the collected VE estimates were presented descriptively in tables and text.
164 VE estimates were reported stratified by type of vaccination strategy: PrEP or PEP. For the former, we
165 reported studies including exclusively PrEP recipients together with studies designed primarily to

166 evaluate PrEP, but that may have inadvertently included some PEP subjects (designated 'PrEP ±
167 PEP'). Due to the heterogeneity of the data, no statistical synthesis of the extracted data was
168 performed.

169 **Risk of bias assessment**

170 The methodological quality of all records included in the final review was assessed by three
171 researchers (EB, LM, MRM) using an informal qualitative approach based on the expertise of
172 reviewers and published commentaries, as well as the limitations described by the authors
173 themselves. Potential biases of the studies were identified and how these might impact the results
174 and conclusions of the studies was considered and discussed.

175 **Results**

176 **Study selection and characteristics**

177 The literature search identified 904 unique records from databases, of which 106 were retained for
178 full-text review and eight were included in the final review. Nine additional records were identified from
179 other sources, of which eight were included in the final review. Hence, a total of 16 records on 16
180 unique studies were identified that reported on the VE of MVA-BN against symptomatic mpox infection
181 or provided risk measures that allow calculation of VE estimates (**Figure 1**).

182 The main characteristics of the included studies are summarized in **Table 1**. The studies took place in
183 six countries, with the majority conducted in the United States (n=7) [20-26], followed by Canada
184 (n=3) [27-29], Spain (n=2) [30, 31], the United Kingdom (n=2) [32, 33], and one each in Israel [34] and
185 the Netherlands [35]. The studies used various designs to assess effectiveness of MVA-BN, with a
186 retrospective cohort design being used most frequently (n=6) [23, 24, 26, 27, 30, 34], followed by a
187 case-coverage design (n=4) [22, 32, 33, 35], a case-control design (n=4; incl. one test-negative case-
188 control design [28]) [20, 21, 25, 28], and a prospective cohort design (n=2) [29, 31]. The studies used
189 linked data from public health surveillance systems [20, 22-30, 32, 33], from public health institutions
190 [23, 31, 35], and/or from healthcare systems [21, 34]. The number of mpox cases included for
191 calculation of the VE against symptomatic mpox infection ranged from 137 to 11,320. Control groups
192 were defined in various ways across study designs and included MSM, incident HIV cases, males
193 with sexually transmitted infections (STIs), symptomatic individuals who tested negative for mpox, and
194 individuals in contact with mpox cases. The study period covered (part of) 2022 in 11 studies [21-25,

195 28, 30-32, 34, 35], (part of) 2022 and part of 2023 in four studies [20, 26, 27, 29], and the whole of
196 2023 in one study [33]. Fourteen studies focused on the use of MVA-BN as PrEP, of which six
197 included PrEP recipients only [21, 28-30, 32, 33] and eight may have included a proportion of PEP
198 recipients due to the available data not allowing exclusion of all PEP recipients (PrEP \pm PEP) [20, 22,
199 23, 25-27, 34, 35]; the remaining two studies focused on the use of MVA-BN as PEP [24, 31]. The
200 effectiveness of MVA-BN against mpox was evaluated using ORs (n=10) [20, 21, 24-28, 32, 33, 35],
201 HRs (n=4) [23, 29, 31, 34], RRs (n=1) [30], or IRRs (n=1) [22] (**Table 1**).

202 **Risk of bias**

203 The risk of bias assessment found sources of (residual) confounding in several studies, with the most
204 important ones resulting from the overall population setting and/or the selection of
205 controls/comparator groups [21, 23-28, 31-34]. Sources of bias inherent to study design were also
206 identified, including misclassification bias for studies using data from registries and databases [24, 25,
207 33], recall bias and non-response bias for studies using surveys and self-reported data [20, 24, 27,
208 28, 32], and an inability to control for confounders in case-coverage studies [22, 32, 33, 35].
209 Additionally, one study was found to be at risk of immortal time bias [31].

210 **Study results**

211 ***Vaccine effectiveness estimates against symptomatic mpox infection for PrEP with MVA-BN***

212 Twelve studies reported that PrEP with MVA-BN reduced the risk of symptomatic mpox infection at
213 ≥ 14 days after vaccination. Half of the studies reported data for PrEP recipients only, while the other
214 half may have included a proportion of PEP recipients (PrEP \pm PEP). Five studies reported data for
215 one dose of MVA-BN only, one study reported data for two doses only, and six studies reported data
216 for both one and two doses (**Table 2**).

217 For one dose of MVA-BN administered as PrEP, adjusted VE estimates between 35% and 86% were
218 reported across eight studies. Seven studies reported crude VE estimates, which fell within the same
219 range (33%–84%). The studies conducted by Brousseau et al. [28] and Deputy et al. [21] reported
220 adjusted VE estimates for one dose of MVA-BN of 35% and 36%, respectively, which were notably
221 lower than the adjusted VE estimates reported in the other studies ($\geq 59\%$) (**Table 2**).

222 For two doses of MVA-BN administered as PrEP, five studies reported adjusted VE estimates ranging
223 from 66% to 90%. The reported crude VE estimates ranged from 57% to 87% in five studies (**Table**

224 2). The study by Charles et al. [33] was the only study to use data collected in the year 2023 (Jan
225 2023 until Dec 2023) only, and found crude VE estimates of 84% for one dose and 80% for two doses
226 of MVA-BN (adjusted VE estimates were not reported) (**Table 2**).

227 ***Vaccine effectiveness estimates against symptomatic mpox infection for PEP with MVA-BN***

228 Two studies reported on the effectiveness of one dose of PEP with MVA-BN against symptomatic
229 mpox infection at ≥ 14 days after vaccination; no data were reported for two doses of PEP (**Table 3**).

230 The two studies found adjusted VE estimates of 78% and 89% when ‘classic statistical methods’
231 (multivariate logistic regression and survival analysis, respectively) were used. Rosen et al. [24] also
232 calculated VE estimates using target trial emulation to account for immortal time bias, which were -7%
233 for PEP administered ≤ 14 days after first exposure and 19% for PEP administered ≤ 14 days after last
234 exposure; these VE estimates were associated with wide CIs due to small sample sizes (**Table 3**).

235 ***Vaccine effectiveness estimates of MVA-BN against mpox-related hospitalization and severity*** 236 ***of mpox clinical manifestations***

237 The study by Schildhauer et al. [26] reported a lower risk of mpox-related hospitalization among those
238 who had been vaccinated with MVA-BN compared to those who had not been vaccinated. Based on
239 ORs provided by Schildhauer et al., we calculated crude VE estimates against hospitalization of 73%
240 and 80% for a vaccination schedule consisting of one or two MVA-BN doses, respectively, and 58%
241 for one dose of MVA-BN administered as PEP < 14 days before the episode date (**Table 4**).

242 Two papers reported a decreased severity of mpox clinical manifestations in cases who had received
243 one dose of MVA-BN. Allard et al. [27] found adjusted VE estimates at day 1 of infection of 60%
244 against the number of skin lesions, 76% against the number of body sites affected by skin lesions,
245 and 59% against other clinical manifestations (incl. fever, muscle pain, and headache). Montero
246 Morales et al. [31] reported adjusted VE estimates of one dose of MVA-BN administered as PEP of
247 72% against general symptoms (fever, asthenia, odynophagia, muscle pain, headache, or other
248 symptoms) and 86% against polysymptomatic disease (i.e., occurrence of four or more general
249 symptoms) (**Table 4**).

250 ***Vaccine effectiveness estimates of MVA-BN against symptomatic mpox infection by route of***
251 ***administration***

252 Two studies reported data stratified by route of administration; one reported VE estimates while the
253 other study only reported the number of mpox cases in vaccinated and unvaccinated groups
254 (**Supplementary Table 1**). When adjusted VE estimates against symptomatic mpox infection were
255 reported, these were in similar ranges for two doses of MVA-BN regardless of the route of
256 administration: 80% (95% CI 23–95) for intradermal administration, 89% (95% CI 56–97) for
257 subcutaneous administration, and 87% (95% CI 69–95) when administered via a combination of both
258 routes (**Supplementary Table 1**).

259 ***Vaccine effectiveness estimates of MVA-BN against symptomatic mpox infection <14 days***
260 ***after vaccination***

261 Four studies reported VE estimates stratified by time after vaccination, and as such demonstrated the
262 risk of breakthrough infections before the onset of vaccine-induced immunity (**Supplementary Table**
263 **2**). Within the first 13 days post-vaccination, reported VE estimates for MVA-BN PrEP or ‘PrEP ± PEP’
264 did not exceed -4% (95% CI -50–29) (**Supplementary Table 2**).

265 **Discussion**

266 This SLR identified 16 records on real-world studies assessing the VE of one or two doses of MVA-BN
267 against symptomatic mpox infection, mpox-related hospitalization, and severity of mpox clinical
268 manifestations. When MVA-BN was administered as PrEP, the adjusted VE estimates against
269 symptomatic mpox infection ≥ 14 days post-vaccination were $\geq 35\%$ ($n=8$ studies) for one dose and
270 $\geq 66\%$ ($n=5$) for two doses. The lower limit of the VE range for one dose of MVA-BN administered as
271 PrEP was lower than that of other ranges because two studies reported VE estimates that were
272 notably lower than other estimates [21, 28]. Outside of these data points, the adjusted VE estimates
273 for PrEP with one dose of MVA-BN were $\geq 59\%$. Adjusted VE estimates against symptomatic mpox
274 infection for MVA-BN administered as PEP were only reported for one dose and were $\geq 78\%$ ($n=2$
275 studies). The VE estimates for two doses of MVA-BN fell in a similar range as VE estimates
276 historically reported for replicating vaccinia-based smallpox vaccines [36]. Furthermore, MVA-BN
277 vaccination reduced the risk of mpox-related hospitalization and the severity of mpox clinical
278 manifestations.

279 In most studies, controls or unvaccinated comparator groups were selected based on characteristics
280 such as MSM or transgender status, recent diagnosis of HIV or other STIs, and/or use of HIV pre-
281 exposure prophylaxis. However, there was notable heterogeneity across studies in the definition of
282 the at-risk population, which might have influenced the VE estimates. In the case-control study by
283 Deputy et al. [21] for example, which found an adjusted VE estimate against symptomatic mpox
284 infection of 36% for one dose of MVA-BN administered as PrEP and was one of the notably low VE
285 estimates, controls were identified from a large secondary database that may not have had as
286 granular information on risk proxies as studies using individual patient-level data. The control
287 population was not restricted to MSM, resulting in a broader at-risk population than in other studies,
288 which may have led to the inclusion of a higher proportion of subjects who were not vaccine-eligible in
289 the control group and to the underestimation of the VE. This concern was also highlighted in a letter to
290 the editor related to this article [37, 38]. The authors of this letter to the editor highlighted that the
291 vaccine uptake of one dose of MVA-BN among controls reported by Deputy et al. (14.5%) was lower
292 than vaccine uptake data reported by e.g., the CDC. When they recalculated VE estimates against
293 symptomatic mpox infection using a vaccine uptake of 45.5% (i.e., uptake reported by CDC for the
294 period until October 1, 2022 [22]), the crude VE estimate increased to fall within a similar range as VE
295 estimates reported by other studies [22, 32, 34]. A very different approach regarding the included at-
296 risk population was taken in the case-control study by Rosenberg et al. [25], where controls were
297 restricted to MSM who had rectal gonorrhea or primary syphilis diagnosed within the same time frame
298 as the mpox cases. This approach was assumed to lead to a control population that exhibited risk
299 behavior similar to the cases within the same time period. A sensitivity analysis within that study
300 included secondary syphilis cases in the control group and found a VE estimate for one or two MVA-
301 BN doses against symptomatic mpox infection that trended lower than the main VE estimate, albeit
302 with overlapping CIs (64.8% [95% CI 26.7–83.1] and 75.7% [95% CI 48.5–88.5], respectively). This
303 difference may reflect the inclusion of control patients with more remote risk behaviors or different
304 clinical presentations [25]. As a last example, the test-negative case-control study by Brousseau et al.
305 [28] found a VE estimate against symptomatic mpox infection for one MVA-BN dose of 35% based on
306 data in administrative databases only, with adjustment for surrogate indicators of exposure risk
307 available in these databases. However, when the authors adjusted for self-reported risk factors, which
308 were higher in number and more detailed than those available in the administrative databases, the VE

309 estimate increased to 65% (with a wide CI) [28]. Though the sample size in this study was small,
310 particularly for the sub-analysis (n=199 cases), the study design highlights the potential impact of
311 confounding based on differential risk exposure by vaccination status.

312 Licensure of MVA-BN for protection against mpox was based on the efficacy of two MVA-BN doses
313 against mpox observed in animal studies [39] and clinical safety and immunogenicity data. The latter
314 includes the demonstration of non-inferior immunogenicity compared to the replicating-vaccinia
315 vaccine ACAM2000 together with a more favorable safety profile for MVA-BN compared to
316 ACAM2000 as demonstrated in a pivotal phase 3 randomized clinical trial [40]. While one dose of
317 MVA-BN was previously shown to induce low titers of vaccinia-specific and MPVX-specific
318 neutralizing antibody titers [41-43], our SLR found VE estimates against symptomatic infections for
319 one dose of MVA-BN suggestive of high effectiveness. This challenges the view that neutralizing
320 antibody levels correlate with protection against *Orthopoxvirus* infection. Indeed, previous
321 experiments showed that MVA vaccination fully protected B cell-deficient mice in *Orthopoxvirus*
322 challenge models, indicating that antibodies are not the sole correlate of protection [44]. Furthermore,
323 a study including a small number of MVA-BN vaccinated individuals revealed that the protective
324 immunogenicity of MVA-BN might be mostly mediated by T cells [45]. While a correlate of immunity for
325 MVA-BN has not been established yet, these findings suggest that cellular immunity could be
326 relevant. However, a pre-clinical animal study for an mRNA mpox vaccine candidate found that
327 protection was primarily conferred by inducing a focused humoral immune response [46], which
328 suggests that the correlate of immunity might depend on the vaccine platform.

329 This SLR employed a thorough process searching three literature databases combined with grey
330 literature sources including preprints and a search through bibliographies of selected papers.
331 Nevertheless, the presented data need to be interpreted in light of the high heterogeneity across
332 included studies in terms of study design, characteristics of study populations, and study settings,
333 among others, which limits comparisons. Because we considered that this heterogeneity across
334 studies would hamper the interpretation of VE point estimates originating from MAs, we chose not to
335 perform such analysis. This SLR also highlighted gaps in data. Most participants included in the
336 identified studies were adult MSM, and data on females and children are lacking. The use of very
337 specific at-risk groups reduced the generalizability of some studies. All identified studies took place in
338 high-income countries, while no data from mpox-endemic countries were identified. Furthermore,

339 several research groups initiated prospective studies in high-income countries in the early phases of
340 the mpox outbreak, but these have not (yet) been finalized and/or published, primarily because of a
341 waning number of cases. Most of these studies have now been suspended due to a lack of cases.
342 Lastly, while we identified studies that demonstrated the risk of breakthrough infections within 14 days
343 of vaccination, data on VE durability in real-world settings was limited. Only the study by Charles et al.
344 from the UK provided some insight by reporting crude VE estimates against symptomatic infections of
345 84% and 80% for one and two doses of MVA-BN, respectively, based on confirmed and highly
346 probable mpox diagnoses reported until December 2023, while most vaccines had been administered
347 by March 2023 [33]. It should, however, be noted that follow-up time might impact VE estimates as a
348 large proportion of those vaccinated will receive the vaccine during the early stages of its availability
349 during an outbreak. Also, a larger proportion of those at greatest risk of infection are also likely to be
350 infected earlier in the outbreak when awareness and vaccination coverage are lower. Therefore, a
351 longer duration of follow-up may bias toward vaccine effect as overall case rates decline over time.

352 The included studies themselves also had limitations. A common limitation was that, due to the timing
353 of the vaccination program within the mpox outbreak, limited numbers of cases were available for
354 inclusion, especially after deployment of the second MVA-BN dose. This limited the studies in terms of
355 power and the types of analyses that they could perform. However, all of the included studies were
356 adequately powered for primary VE analyses. Furthermore, the studies were inconsistent in how they
357 defined the use of MVA-BN as PEP and whether studies that focused on PrEP included or excluded
358 PEP use in their analyses. The inclusion of a proportion of PEP recipients was unavoidable in some
359 studies because of the data used for the analyses. In Germany, only 7% of all MVA-BN
360 administrations from June 2022 to January 2024 were PEP [47]. Because the studies included in our
361 SLR used mpox vaccination recommendations similar to those in place in Germany, it is likely that the
362 majority of vaccine recipients included in 'PrEP ± PEP' studies received MVA-BN as PrEP. Lastly, all
363 studies were found to be at risk of some (residual) confounding and other sources of bias. Many
364 studies relied on data from databases, and exposure risk was defined based on proxies such as MSM
365 or transgender status, recent diagnosis of HIV or other STIs, and/or use of HIV pre-exposure
366 prophylaxis because individual-level behavior data were not available; however, this limited the
367 researchers' ability to account for confounding. Health-seeking behavior, HIV status, geographic
368 location, socioeconomic status, race and gender identity are examples of other confounders which

369 were not considered or accounted for by some studies. Studies that actively recruited participants
370 could obtain more detailed data on exposure risk but were also subject to bias based on factors
371 related to willingness to participate as well as recall bias. A test-negative case-control design, which
372 might help reduce selection bias and avoid confounding associated with health-seeking behavior
373 because cases and controls arise from the same source population, was employed in only one study
374 [28]. Concern was raised in a letter to the editor that immortal time bias and confounding might have
375 overestimated the adjusted VE of one dose of MVA-BN administered as PEP estimated by Montero
376 Morales et al. (89% [95% CI 76–95]) [31, 48]. In their response letter, Montero Morales et al.
377 performed an intent-to-treat analysis and found a VE of 75% (95% CI 55–86). Additionally, they
378 performed a landmark approach analysis to try and account for immortal time bias by including
379 vaccination as a time-varying exposure, which resulted in an estimated VE of 83% (95% CI 61–92)
380 [49]. The importance of being mindful of immortal time bias was also demonstrated by the target trial
381 emulation conducted by Rosen et al. [24], which lowered their adjusted VE estimates against
382 symptomatic infections for PEP administered ≤ 14 days after last exposure from 78% (95% CI 50–91)
383 to 19% (95% CI -54–57). Regardless of these limitations and the heterogeneity in study design and
384 methods across the included studies, the VE estimates of MVA-BN against symptomatic mpox
385 infection were generally high and in similar ranges. Taken together, the available real-world VE data
386 support the use of MVA-BN in managing active outbreaks.

387 Future VE studies may be conducted if new outbreaks continue to expand. Ideally, investigators would
388 prioritize maximizing comparability in risk of exposure/infection over time in the vaccinated and
389 unvaccinated and in cases and controls in order to generate a more precise estimate of the true
390 effectiveness of MVA-BN against mpox.

391 **Conclusions**

392 Despite heterogeneity in study design, study settings, and at-risk populations across the 16 included
393 studies, this SLR demonstrated the effectiveness of one or two doses of MVA-BN against
394 symptomatic mpox infection in outbreak settings. As such, the presented data support the deployment
395 of MVA-BN for mpox outbreak control. The identified methodological limitations and biases
396 underscore the need for improved study designs to allow more accurate evaluation and more precise
397 estimation of the true effectiveness of MVA-BN against mpox.

398 **Additional information**

399 **Acknowledgments**

400 The authors thank Lotte Mathé (P95) for medical writing support.

401 **Author contributions**

402 FL: Conceptualization; Writing – review and editing

403 SS: Conceptualization; Writing – review and editing

404 EB: Investigation; Writing – original draft; Writing – review and editing

405 LM: Investigation; Writing – original draft; Writing – review and editing

406 MRM: Conceptualization; Supervision; Writing – review and editing

407 **Availability of data**

408 Other: All data used in this study originated from published sources.

409 **Conflicts of interest**

410 FL and SS are employees of Bavarian Nordic. The study-related activities of P95 employees EB, LM,
411 and MRM were funded by Bavarian Nordic. All authors attest that they meet the ICMJE criteria for
412 authorship.

413 **Funding source**

414 The research presented in this manuscript and manuscript development were funded by Bavarian
415 Nordic Inc.

416 References

- 417 1. Petersen, B.W., et al., *Vaccinating against monkeypox in the Democratic Republic of the*
418 *Congo*. *Antiviral Res*, 2019. **162**: p. 171-177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.antiviral.2018.11.004>
- 419 2. Huang, Y., Mu, L., and Wang, W., *Monkeypox: epidemiology, pathogenesis, treatment and*
420 *prevention*. *Signal Transduct Target Ther*, 2022. **7**(1): p. 373. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-022-01215-4)
421 [022-01215-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-022-01215-4)
- 422 3. Sharma, A., et al., *Monkeypox epidemiology, clinical presentation, and transmission: a*
423 *systematic review*. *Int J Emerg Med*, 2023. **16**(1): p. 20. [https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-023-](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-023-00491-3)
424 [00491-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12245-023-00491-3)
- 425 4. Durski, K.N., et al., *Emergence of Monkeypox - West and Central Africa, 1970-2017*. *MMWR*
426 *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2018. **67**(10): p. 306-310. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6710a5>
- 427 5. Thornhill, J.P., et al., *Monkeypox Virus Infection in Humans across 16 Countries - April-June*
428 *2022*. *N Engl J Med*, 2022. **387**(8): p. 679-691. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2207323>
- 429 6. World Health Organization. *2022-23 Mpox Outbreak: Global Trends*. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar
430 22]; Available from: https://worldhealthorg.shinyapps.io/mpox_global/.
- 431 7. Reed, K.D., et al., *The detection of monkeypox in humans in the Western Hemisphere*. *N*
432 *Engl J Med*, 2004. **350**(4): p. 342-50. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa032299>
- 433 8. Perez Duque, M., et al., *Ongoing monkeypox virus outbreak, Portugal, 29 April to 23 May*
434 *2022*. *Euro Surveill*, 2022. **27**(22). <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.22.2200424>
- 435 9. Mitja, O., et al., *Monkeypox*. *Lancet*, 2023. **401**(10370): p. 60-74.
436 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(22\)02075-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(22)02075-X)
- 437 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *2023 Outbreak in Democratic Republic of*
438 *Congo*. 2024 [cited 2024 Mar 25]; Available from:
439 <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/outbreak/2023-drc.html>.
- 440 11. World Health Organization. *Disease Outbreak News; Mpox (monkeypox) in the Democratic*
441 *Republic of the Congo*. 2023 [cited 2024 Apr 4]; Available from:
442 <https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2023-DON493>.
- 443 12. Volkmann, A., et al., *The Brighton Collaboration standardized template for collection of key*
444 *information for risk/benefit assessment of a Modified Vaccinia Ankara (MVA) vaccine platform*.
445 *Vaccine*, 2021. **39**(22): p. 3067-3080. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.08.050>

- 446 13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Mpox - Vaccination*. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 22];
447 Available from: <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/interim-considerations/overview.html>.
- 448 14. European Medicines Agency. *Imvanex*. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 22]; Available from:
449 <https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/imvanex>.
- 450 15. Government of Canada. *Smallpox and mpox (monkeypox) vaccines: Canadian Immunization*
451 *Guide*. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 22]; Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/healthy-living/canadian-immunization-guide-part-4-active-vaccines/page-21-smallpox-vaccine.html)
452 [health/services/publications/healthy-living/canadian-immunization-guide-part-4-active-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/healthy-living/canadian-immunization-guide-part-4-active-vaccines/page-21-smallpox-vaccine.html)
453 [vaccines/page-21-smallpox-vaccine.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/healthy-living/canadian-immunization-guide-part-4-active-vaccines/page-21-smallpox-vaccine.html).
- 454 16. UK Health Security Agency. *Guidance - Protecting you from mpox (monkeypox): information*
455 *on the smallpox vaccination*. 2022 [cited 2024 Mar 22]; Available from:
456 [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monkeypox-vaccination-resources/protecting-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monkeypox-vaccination-resources/protecting-you-from-monkeypox-information-on-the-smallpox-vaccination)
457 [you-from-monkeypox-information-on-the-smallpox-vaccination](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/monkeypox-vaccination-resources/protecting-you-from-monkeypox-information-on-the-smallpox-vaccination).
- 458 17. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. *Jynneos*. 2023 [cited 2024 Mar 22]; Available from:
459 <https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/jynneos>.
- 460 18. Page, M.J., et al., *The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting*
461 *systematic reviews*. *BMJ*, 2021. **372**: p. n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- 462 19. Moher, D., et al., *Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols*
463 *(PRISMA-P) 2015 statement*. *Syst Rev*, 2015. **4**(1): p. 1. [https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-](https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1)
464 [1](https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1)
- 465 20. Dalton, A.F., et al., *Estimated Effectiveness of JYNNEOS Vaccine in Preventing Mpox: A*
466 *Multijurisdictional Case-Control Study - United States, August 19, 2022-March 31, 2023*.
467 *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2023. **72**(20): p. 553-558.
468 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7220a3>
- 469 21. Deputy, N.P., et al., *Vaccine Effectiveness of JYNNEOS against Mpox Disease in the United*
470 *States*. *N Engl J Med*, 2023. **388**(26): p. 2434-2443. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2215201>
- 471 22. Payne, A.B., et al., *Reduced Risk for Mpox After Receipt of 1 or 2 Doses of JYNNEOS*
472 *Vaccine Compared with Risk Among Unvaccinated Persons - 43 U.S. Jurisdictions, July 31-*
473 *October 1, 2022*. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*, 2022. **71**(49): p. 1560-1564.
474 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7149a5>

- 475 23. Ramchandani, M.S., et al., *Effectiveness of the Modified Vaccinia Ankara Vaccine Against*
476 *Mpox in Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Retrospective Cohort Analysis, Seattle,*
477 *Washington.* Open Forum Infect Dis, 2023. **10**(11): p. ofad528.
478 <https://doi.org/10.1093/ofid/ofad528>
- 479 24. Rosen, J.B., et al., *JYNNEOS effectiveness as post-exposure prophylaxis against mpox:*
480 *Challenges using real-world outbreak data.* Vaccine, 2024. **42**(3): p. 548-555.
481 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2023.12.066>
- 482 25. Rosenberg, E.S., et al., *Effectiveness of JYNNEOS Vaccine Against Diagnosed Mpox*
483 *Infection - New York, 2022.* MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep, 2023. **72**(20): p. 559-563.
484 <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7220a4>
- 485 26. Schildhauer, S., et al., *Reduced Odds of Mpox-Associated Hospitalization Among Persons*
486 *Who Received JYNNEOS Vaccine - California, May 2022-May 2023.* MMWR Morb Mortal
487 Wkly Rep, 2023. **72**(36): p. 992-996. <https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7236a4>
- 488 27. Allard, R., et al., *Breakthrough cases of mpox: One-dose vaccination is associated with milder*
489 *clinical manifestations.* J Infect Public Health, 2024. **17**(4): p. 676-680.
490 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jiph.2024.02.015>
- 491 28. Brousseau, N., et al., *Single-dose Effectiveness of Mpox Vaccine in Quebec, Canada: Test-*
492 *negative Design With and Without Adjustment for Self-reported Exposure Risk.* Clin Infect Dis,
493 2024. **78**(2): p. 461-469. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad584>
- 494 29. Navarro, C., et al., *Effectiveness of one dose of MVA-BN vaccine against mpox infection in*
495 *males in Ontario, Canada: A target trial emulation.* 2023.
496 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1101/2023.10.04.23296566>
- 497 30. Fontan-Vela, M., et al., *Effectiveness of Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavaria Nordic Vaccination*
498 *in a Population at High Risk of Mpox: A Spanish Cohort Study.* Clin Infect Dis, 2024. **78**(2): p.
499 476-483. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad645>
- 500 31. Montero Morales, L., et al., *Post-exposure vaccine effectiveness and contact management in*
501 *the mpox outbreak, Madrid, Spain, May to August 2022.* Euro Surveill, 2023. **28**(24).
502 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2023.28.24.2200883>

- 503 32. Bertran, M., et al., *Effectiveness of one dose of MVA-BN smallpox vaccine against mpox in*
504 *England using the case-coverage method: an observational study.* Lancet Infect Dis, 2023.
505 **23**(7): p. 828-835. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(23\)00057-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00057-9)
- 506 33. Charles, H., et al., *Post-peak mpox in England: epidemiology, reinfection, and vaccine*
507 *effectiveness – data from 2023.* medRxiv, 2024: p. 2024.02.26.24303362.
508 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.26.24303362>
- 509 34. Wolff Sagy, Y., et al., *Real-world effectiveness of a single dose of mpox vaccine in males.* Nat
510 Med, 2023. **29**(3): p. 748-752. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-023-02229-3>
- 511 35. Haverkate, M.R., et al., *Factors that influenced the course of the mpox outbreak in the*
512 *Netherlands, 2022-2023.* medRxiv, 2023: p. 2023.10.09.23296426.
513 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.10.09.23296426>
- 514 36. Fine, P.E., et al., *The transmission potential of monkeypox virus in human populations.* Int J
515 Epidemiol, 1988. **17**(3): p. 643-50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/17.3.643>
- 516 37. Arbel, R., Zucker, R., and Wolff-Sagy, Y., *Vaccine Effectiveness against Mpox in the United*
517 *States - Letter to the Editor.* N Engl J Med, 2023. **389**(15): p. 1440.
518 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2309583>
- 519 38. Deputy, N.P.G., J.L., *Vaccine Effectiveness against Mpox in the United States - Author's reply.*
520 New England Journal of Medicine, 2023. **389**(15): p. 1440-1441. [https://doi.org/DOI:](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1056/NEJMc2309583)
521 [10.1056/NEJMc2309583](https://doi.org/DOI:10.1056/NEJMc2309583)
- 522 39. Hatch, G.J., et al., *Assessment of the protective effect of Imvamune and Acam2000 vaccines*
523 *against aerosolized monkeypox virus in cynomolgus macaques.* J Virol, 2013. **87**(14): p.
524 7805-15. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JVI.03481-12>
- 525 40. Pittman, P.R., et al., *Phase 3 Efficacy Trial of Modified Vaccinia Ankara as a Vaccine against*
526 *Smallpox.* N Engl J Med, 2019. **381**(20): p. 1897-1908.
527 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1817307>
- 528 41. Ilchmann, H., et al., *One- and Two-Dose Vaccinations With Modified Vaccinia Ankara-*
529 *Bavarian Nordic Induce Durable B-Cell Memory Responses Comparable to Replicating*
530 *Smallpox Vaccines.* J Infect Dis, 2023. **227**(10): p. 1203-1213.
531 <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiac455>

- 532 42. Hubert, M., et al., *Complement-dependent mpox-virus-neutralizing antibodies in infected and*
533 *vaccinated individuals*. Cell Host Microbe, 2023. **31**(6): p. 937-948 e4.
534 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2023.05.001>
- 535 43. Mazzotta, V., et al., *Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of modified vaccinia Ankara pre-*
536 *exposure vaccination against mpox according to previous smallpox vaccine exposure and*
537 *HIV infection: prospective cohort study*. EClinicalMedicine, 2024. **68**: p. 102420.
538 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2023.102420>
- 539 44. Wyatt, L.S., et al., *Highly attenuated smallpox vaccine protects mice with and without immune*
540 *deficiencies against pathogenic vaccinia virus challenge*. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2004.
541 **101**(13): p. 4590-5. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0401165101>
- 542 45. Cohn, H., et al., *Mpox vaccine and infection-driven human immune signatures: an*
543 *immunological analysis of an observational study*. Lancet Infect Dis, 2023. **23**(11): p. 1302-
544 1312. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(23\)00352-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(23)00352-3)
- 545 46. Freyn, A.W., et al., *An mpox virus mRNA-lipid nanoparticle vaccine confers protection against*
546 *lethal orthopoxviral challenge*. Sci Transl Med, 2023. **15**(716): p. eadg3540.
547 <https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.adg3540>
- 548 47. Robert Koch-Institut. *Mpox Impfmonitoring Juni 2022 – Januar 2024*. 2024 [cited 2024 18
549 Apr]; Available from:
550 [https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Infekt/Impfen/ImpfungenAZ/Affenpocken/Affenpocken-](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Infekt/Impfen/ImpfungenAZ/Affenpocken/Affenpocken-Impfmonitoring.pdf?__blob=publicationFile)
551 [Impfmonitoring.pdf?__blob=publicationFile](https://www.rki.de/DE/Content/Infekt/Impfen/ImpfungenAZ/Affenpocken/Affenpocken-Impfmonitoring.pdf?__blob=publicationFile).
- 552 48. van Ewijk, C.E. and Hahne, S.J., *Letter to the editor: Bias in the vaccine effectiveness*
553 *estimates of one-dose post-exposure prophylaxis against mpox*. Euro Surveill, 2023. **28**(34).
554 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2023.28.34.2300358>
- 555 49. Montero Morales, L., et al., *Authors' response: Bias in the vaccine effectiveness estimates of*
556 *one-dose post-exposure prophylaxis against mpox*. Euro Surveill, 2023. **28**(34).
557 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2023.28.34.2300442>

558

559 **Tables**

560 **Table 1. Characteristics of the studies included**

Author, date Country	Study design Period	Study population Setting	Sample size, n ^a	Vaccination strategy ^b	VE analyses
Allard, 2024 [27] Canada	Retrospective cohort study 19 May 2022 to 2023 ^c	Individuals with mpox Public health surveillance from Montreal Public Health; supplemented with self-reported sociodemographic and clinical data from questionnaires; vaccination data from provincial immunization registry	403	PrEP ± PEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of clinical outcomes among persons with mpox who were vaccinated compared with those who were unvaccinated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time after vaccination • By clinical manifestations^d
Bertran, 2023 [32] United Kingdom	Case- coverage 04 Jul 2022 to 21 Dec 2022	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage estimated in at-risk GBMSM population Cases: public health surveillance data from across England, with self- reported vaccination data from questionnaires; coverage population in England estimated by public health agency (no individual patient-level data)	Cases: 363 Population used for coverage estimate: 89,240	PrEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination in cases/odds of vaccination in the population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time after vaccination; all ages • By time after vaccination; cases younger than 50 years
Brousseau, 2023 [28] Canada	Test-negative case-control 19 Jun 2022 to 24 Sep 2022	Individuals with a specimen submitted for mpox testing Public health surveillance data from the province of Quebec, linked to administrative data and supplemented with self-reported sociodemographic and exposure data from questionnaires	Cases: 231 Controls: 301 Subset with questionnaire data: 199	PrEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination in cases/odds of vaccination in the population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For entire sample • For subset with questionnaire data • For subset with questionnaire data, adjusting for questionnaire variables

Charles, 2024 [33]	Case-coverage	Confirmed positive or highly probable mpox case; vaccine coverage estimated in at-risk GBMSM population in England	Cases: 137 Population used for coverage estimate: 89,240	PrEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination in cases/odds of vaccination in the population <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one or two)
United Kingdom	01 Jan 2023 to 31 Dec 2023	Cases: public health surveillance data from across England; aggregate mpox vaccination data obtained from the NHS England			
Dalton, 2023 [20]	Case-control	Mpox cases; controls were MSM/transgender adults visiting sexual health/HIV care/HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis clinics	Cases: 309 Controls: 608	PrEP ± PEP ^e	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination among cases/odds of vaccination among controls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one or two) • By route of administration • By IC status
United States	19 Aug 2022 to 31 Mar 2023	Cases: Public health surveillance data from 12 US jurisdictions; controls identified from public health clinics; self-reported vaccination data from surveys verified by state registries where available			
Deputy, 2023 [21]	Case-control	Mpox cases; Controls with incident HIV infection or taking HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	Cases: 2,193 Controls: 8,319	PrEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination among cases/odds of vaccination among controls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one or two) • By route of administration • Non-IC only • Male only • Without previous smallpox vaccination
United States	15 Aug 2022 to 19 Nov 2022	Inpatient and outpatient electronic health data aggregated from healthcare systems across the US; Cosmos Epic database			
Fontán-Vela, 2023 [30]	Retrospective cohort study	Men receiving HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	11,320	PrEP	VE calculated as: 1 - risk of infection among vaccinated group/risk of infection among unvaccinated group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time since vaccination; all ages • By time since vaccination; among individuals under 50 years
Spain	12 Jul 2022 to 12 Dec 2022	Public health surveillance data from autonomous regions across Spain			

Haverkate, 2023 [35] The Netherlands	Case-coverage 08 Aug 2022 to 04 Dec 2022	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage calculated in population invited for vaccination (GBMSM/transgender persons using/on the waiting list for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis or at high risk for mpox) Public health institutions across the Netherlands	Cases: 162 Population for coverage calculation: 39,657	PrEP ± PEP ^e	VE calculated as 1 - odds of vaccination in cases/odds of vaccination in the population
Montero Morales, 2023 [31] Spain	Prospective cohort 17 May 2022 to 15 Aug 2022	Close contacts of laboratory-confirmed mpox cases Public health institutions serving the Madrid region; confirmed by vaccination registries	484	PEP	VE calculated as 1 - hazard rate among vaccinated group/hazard rate among unvaccinated group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time from exposure to vaccination • By clinical symptoms (general symptoms^f or polysymptomatic disease^g) • By age • By sex • By contact type • By HIV-related information
Navarro, 2023 [29] Canada	Prospective cohort 12 Jun 2022 to 26 Nov 2023	Individuals with at least one syphilis test in the previous year, a new diagnosis of one or more bacterial STIs in the previous year or who filled a prescription for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in the previous year Public health surveillance data from Ontario	6,408 (3,204 vaccinated individuals matched with 3,204 unvaccinated individuals)	PrEP	VE calculated as 1 - hazard rate among vaccinated group/hazard rate among unvaccinated group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time after vaccination

Payne, 2022 [22]	Case-coverage	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage estimated in MSM with HIV or eligible for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	Cases: 9,544 Population used for coverage estimate: NR	PrEP ± PEP	Incidence rate ratio was calculated comparing that of unvaccinated individuals to vaccinated individuals with one or two doses
United States	31 Jul 2022 to 01 Oct 2022	Cases: Public health surveillance data from 43 jurisdictions across the US; coverage population of MSM/HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis recipients estimated (no individual patient-level data)			
Ramchandani, 2023 [23]	Retrospective cohort	MSM attending sexual health clinics	204 mpox cases 4,230 MSM attended the clinic	PrEP ± PEP	VE calculated as 1 - hazard rate among vaccinated group/hazard rate among unvaccinated group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one or two)
United States	01 May 2022 to 31 Dec 2022	Public health institutions, vaccination registries and surveillance data from Seattle and King Country, Washington			
Rosen, 2024 [24]	Retrospective cohort study	Individuals exposed to persons with confirmed mpox	PEP _L ⁿ : 594 PEP _F ⁿ : 471	PEP	VE calculated as 1 - adjusted odds among vaccinated group/odds among unvaccinated group <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By time from first and last exposure to vaccination • By method; target trial emulation or conventional
United States	22 May 2022 to 24 Aug 2022	Public health surveillance data from the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene			
Rosenberg, 2023 [25]	Case-control	Mpox cases; controls were males with rectal gonorrhoea or primary syphilis diagnosed within the same time frame as the mpox cases, and with presumptive sexual contact with a male or transgender person	Cases:252 Controls: 255	PrEP ± PEP	VE calculated as: 1 - odds of vaccination among cases/odds of vaccination among controls <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one, two or both) • By time intervals after receipt of one or two doses
United States	02 Jun 2022 to 31 Dec 2022	Public health surveillance data covering New York State (excluding NYC); CDESS			

Schildhauer, 2023 [26] United States	Retrospective cohort 12 May 2022 to 18 May 2023	California residents diagnosed with mpox Public health surveillance data covering California	250 mpox-associated hospitalizations 4,611 persons with mpox	PrEP ± PEP	Odds of hospitalization among persons with mpox who were vaccinated compared with those who were unvaccinated were calculated <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By dose (one or two) • By strategy (PEP or PrEP) • By HIV status • By dose and HIV status • By strategy and HIV status
Wolff Sagy, 2023 [34] Israel	Retrospective cohort 31 Jul 2022 to 25 Dec 2022	Males aged 18–42 years who were (a) dispensed HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis at least for 1 month since 1 January 2022, or (b) diagnosed with HIV and also were diagnosed with one or more STIs since 1 January 2022 HER database from a large healthcare system operating across Israel (52% of population covered); CHS	2,054	PrEP ± PEP	VE calculated as 1 - hazard rate among vaccinated group/hazard rate among unvaccinated group

CDESS: The Communicable Disease Electronic Surveillance System; CHS: Clalit Health Services; GBMSM: gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; IC: immunocompromised; MSM: men who have sex with men; NHS: National Health Service; NYC: New York City; PEP: post-exposure prophylactic vaccination; PrEP: pre-exposure prophylactic vaccination; STI: sexually transmitted infection; US: United States; VE: vaccine effectiveness.

^a Sample size as used in the main VE analysis; ^b The studies focused either on PrEP or on PEP. In the former case, studies may have inadvertently included some PEP recipients and these studies are designated as 'PrEP ± PEP'; ^c The mpox outbreak in Montreal, Canada, during 2022; ^d The number of lesions, sites affected by lesions, and other clinical manifestations (OCM); ^e Number of participants receiving MVA-BN as PEP limited by exclusion of those receiving the vaccine ≤13 days before their index date. VE for PEP was not estimated due to small sample sizes; ^f General symptoms: exanthema, lymphadenopathy, proctitis, mouth ulcers, ocular involvement, bacterial superinfection of lesions, bronchopneumonia, and general symptoms such as fever, asthenia, odynophagia, muscle pain, headache, other); ^g Polysymptomatic disease: Four or more symptoms described in 'general symptoms'. ^h Analyses of VE were conducted separately for MVA-BN vaccine administered as PEP ≤14 days after the last exposure (PEP_L) and for PEP administered ≤14 days after the first exposure (PEP_F).

562 **Table 2. Vaccine effectiveness estimates against symptomatic mpox disease ≥ 14 days after vaccination for MVA-BN administered**
 563 **exclusively or primarily as pre-exposure prophylactic vaccination**

Author, date Study design	Study population	Sample size, n	Crude VE (95% CI)		Adjusted VE (95% CI)		Statistical methods
			One dose	Two doses	One dose	Two doses	
PrEP							
Bertran, 2023 [32] Case-coverage	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage estimated in at-risk GBMSM population	Cases: 330 Population used for coverage estimate: 89,240	78% (54–89)	NR	NR	NR	Basic rate comparison without adjustment
Brousseau, 2023 [28] Test-negative case-control	Individuals with a specimen submitted for mpox testing	Cases: 231 Controls: 301	33% (2–54)	NR	35% (-2–59)	NR	Logistic regression Adjustment for age, calendar time, STI tests and diagnosis, HIV status
	Subset with questionnaire data	Cases: 91 Controls: 108	38% (-9–65)	NR	30% (-38–64)	NR	Logistic regression Adjustment for age, calendar time, STI tests and diagnosis, HIV status
			NR	NR	65% (1–87)	NR	As above, additionally adjusted for ethnocultural background, immunosuppression, HIV status/pre-exposure prophylaxis use, contact with a person who has mpox symptoms, number of sexual partners, drug use before or during sexual activity, sex involving >2 people, attending sex-on-premise venues, skin-to-skin contacts during a festive event
Charles, 2024 [33]	Confirmed positive or highly probable mpox case; vaccine	Cases: 126 Population used for coverage	84% (74–91)	80% (69–83) ^a	NR	NR	Basic rate comparison without adjustment

Case-coverage	coverage estimated in at-risk GBMSM population in England	estimate: 89,240					
Deputy, 2023 [21]	Mpox cases; Controls with incident HIV infection or taking HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	<u>One dose</u> Cases: 2,168 Controls: 7,984	52% (42–60)	77% (65–85)	36% (22–47)	66% (47–78)	Conditional logistic regression Adjustment for age, race or ethnic group, SVI score, and the presence or absence of IC conditions
Case-control		<u>Two doses</u> Cases: 2,047 Controls: 7,319					
Fontán-Vela, 2023 [30]	Men receiving HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	Exposed: 5,560 Unexposed: 5,560	79% (33–100)	NR	NR	NR	Basic rate comparison without adjustment
Retrospective cohort							
Navarro, 2023 [29]	Individuals with at least one syphilis test in the previous year, a new diagnosis of one or more bacterial STIs in the previous year or who filled a prescription for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis in the previous year	Exposed: 3,204 Unexposed: 3,204	NR	NR	59% (31–76)	NR	Cox proportional hazards model Adjustment for age, geographic region, proxies for sexual exposures (number of bacterial STIs in the previous three years, HIV status), and history of receipt of any non-MVA-BN vaccine in the previous year
Prospective cohort							
PrEP ± PEP^b							
Dalton, 2023 [20]	Mpox cases; controls were MSM/transgender adults visiting sexual health/HIV care/HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis clinics	<u>One dose:</u> Cases: 281 Controls: 430 <u>Two doses:</u> Cases: 251 Controls: 371	76% (65–83)	87% (79–93)	75% (61–84)	86% (74–92)	Conditional logistic regression Adjustment for age, race, and ethnicity; immunocompromising conditions; and close contact with a person with known mpox
Case-control							
Haverkate, 2023	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage calculated	Cases: 162 Population for	NR	68% (4–90)	NR	NR	A logistic regression model + with the logit of the proportion of the

[35] Case-coverage	in population invited for vaccination (GBMSM/transgender persons using/on the waiting list for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis or at high risk for mpox)	coverage calculation: 39,657					population vaccinated as an offset
Payne, 2022 [22] Case-coverage	Mpox cases; vaccine coverage estimated in MSM with HIV or eligible for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis	<u>One dose:</u> Cases: 8,712 Population used for coverage estimate: NR <u>Two doses:</u> Cases: 48 Population used for coverage estimate: NR	NR	NR	86% (83–89) ^c	90% (86–92) ^c	IRR: negative binomial regression, controlling for week
Ramchandani, 2023 [23] Retrospective cohort	MSM attending sexual health clinics	Exposed: 1837 Nonexposed: 2,393	60% (24–79)	57% (-84–90)	81% (64–90)	83% (28–96)	Cox proportional hazards model Adjustment for age, race/ethnicity, HIV status, year of last SHC visit, methamphetamine use in the last year, gonorrhea or syphilis diagnosis in the last year, and self-report of >10 sex partners in the last year
Rosenberg, 2023 [25] Case-control	Mpox cases; controls were males with rectal gonorrhea or primary syphilis diagnosed within the same time frame as the mpox cases, and with presumptive sexual contact with a male or transgender person	<u>One dose:</u> Cases: 240 Controls: 227 <u>Two doses:</u> Cases: 232 Controls: 223	NR	NR	68% (25–87)	89% (44–98) ^d	Conditional logistic regression Adjustment for age, race, and ethnicity; and region within New York outside NYC

Wolff Sagy, 2023 [34]	Individuals considered at high risk for infection and eligible for the vaccine	Exposed: 1,037 Unexposed: 1,017	NR	NR	86% (59–95) ^e	NR	Multivariate cox proportional hazards regression Adjustment for age, sex, sector, sociodemographic status, MVA-BN vaccine uptake, Tel Aviv District, HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis use, purchase of PDE5 inhibitors, HIV history, STI (chlamydia or gonorrhea, recent chlamydia or gonorrhea)
-----------------------	--	------------------------------------	----	----	--------------------------	----	---

CI: confidence interval; GBMSM: gay, bisexual, and other men who have sex with men; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; IC: immunocompromised;

MSM: men who have sex with men; NR: not reported; NYC: New York City; PDE5: phosphodiesterase 5; SHC: sexual health clinic; STI: sexually transmitted infection; SVI: social vulnerability index; VE: vaccine effectiveness.

^a Includes one individual who reported having received three doses; ^b Studies that focused on PrEP but may have inadvertently included some PEP recipients; ^c Calculated by the authors of this systematic literature review; ^d ≥0 days after the second dose; ^e Also includes cases <14 days after vaccination.

565 **Table 3. Vaccine effectiveness estimates against symptomatic mpox disease ≥ 14 days after second dose for MVA-BN administered as**
 566 **post-exposure prophylactic vaccination**

Author, date Study design	Study population	Sample size, n	Crude VE % (95% CI)		Adjusted VE (95% CI)		Statistical methods
			One dose	Two doses	One dose	Two doses	
Montero Morales, 2023 [31] Prospective cohort study	Close contacts of laboratory- confirmed mpox cases	Exposed: 230 Unexposed: 254	84% (66–92)	NR	89% (76–95) ^a	NR	Survival analysis Adjustment for age, sex, type of close contact, HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis user, HIV infection, and symptoms
Rosen, 2024 [24] Retrospective cohort study – with target trial design	Individuals having contact with persons with confirmed mpox	PEP _L ^b Exposed: 333 Unexposed: 261 PEP _F ^b Exposed: 183 Unexposed: 288	NR	NR	Conventional: PEP _L : 78% (50–91) PEP _F : 73% (31–91) Target trial PEP _L : 19% (-54–57) PEP _F : -7% (-144–53)	NR	Conventional: multivariate logistic regression, controlling for exposure risk and race/ethnicity Target trial emulation: sequence of nested trials starting each day after exposure to account for immortal time bias. Logistic regression controlling for exposure risk and race/ethnicity

CI: confidence interval; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; NR: not reported; PEP: post-exposure prophylaxis; VE: vaccine effectiveness.

^a Also includes cases <14 days after vaccination; ^b Analyses of VE were conducted separately for MVA-BN vaccine administered as PEP ≤ 14 days after the last exposure (PEP_L) and for PEP administered ≤ 14 days after the first exposure (PEP_F).

567

568 **Table 4. Vaccine effectiveness estimates against hospitalizations and mpox clinical manifestations**

Author, date Study design	Study population	Sample size, n	Crude VE (95% CI)	Adjusted VE (95% CI)	Statistical methods
Hospitalizations					
Schildhauer, 2023 [26] Retrospective cohort	One dose of MVA-BN, ≥14 days after vaccination				Binomial logistic regression
	California residents diagnosed with mpox	Exposed: 230 Unexposed: 3,845	73% (35–92) ^a	NR	
	Two doses of MVA-BN, ≥14 days after 2nd dose				
	California residents diagnosed with mpox	Exposed: 79 Unexposed: 3,845	80% (10–99) ^a	NR	
	One dose of MVA-BN after a known or suspected exposure, <14 days after vaccination				
	California residents diagnosed with mpox	Exposed: 457 Unexposed: 3,845	58% (28–78) ^a	NR	
Clinical manifestations					
Allard, 2024 [27] Retrospective cohort	Numbers of skin lesions at day 1 (one dose)^b				Multivariate logistic regression Adjustment for each other clinical manifestation and age
	Individuals with mpox	Exposed: 59 Unexposed: 344	NR	60% (21–80)	
	Body sites affected at day 1 (one dose)^b				
	Individuals with mpox	Exposed: 59 Unexposed: 344	NR	76% (54–87)	
	OCM^c (one dose)^b				
	Individuals with mpox	Exposed: 59 Unexposed: 344	NR	59% (26–77)	
Montero Morales, 2023 [31] Prospective cohort	General symptoms^d (one dose PEP)				Survival analysis Adjustment for age, sex, type of close contact, HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis user and HIV infection
	Close contacts of laboratory- confirmed mpox cases	Exposed: 230 Unexposed: 254	68.8% (-1.5–90.4)	71.6% (18.1–90.2)	
	Polysymptomatic disease^e (one dose PEP)				
	Close contacts of laboratory- confirmed mpox cases	Exposed: 230 Unexposed: 254	87.5% (6.2–98.3)	85.5% (26.7–91.1)	

CI: confidence interval; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus; NR: not reported; PEP: post-exposure prophylactic vaccination; VE: vaccine effectiveness.

^a Calculated by the authors of this systematic literature review; ^b Vaccine administered ≥ 14 days before the onset of symptoms; ^c Other clinical manifestations (OCM): fever, adenopathy, fatigue, muscle pains, headaches, backaches, sweating, rectal pain, nausea and vomiting, sore throat etc. ^d General symptoms: fever, asthenia, odynophagia, muscle pain, headache, other; ^e Polysymptomatic disease: four or more symptoms described in 'general symptoms'.

570 **Figure captions**

571 **Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart**

572 DE: data extraction; FT: full-text review

Identification of studies via databases and registers

Identification of studies via other methods

Identification

Records identified from (n=1,173)

- PubMed (n=546)
- Embase (n=614)
- LILACS (n=13)

Records removed *before screening*:

- Duplicate records removed (n=269)

Records identified from (n=9)

- Grey literature search (n=5)
- Other sources (n=4)
Citation searching (n=1)
Provided by experts (n=3)

Screening

Records screened (n=904)

Records excluded (n=798)

Reports sought for retrieval (n=106)

Reports not retrieved (n=0)

Reports sought for retrieval (n=9)

- Grey literature search (n=5)
- Other sources (n=4)

Reports not retrieved (n=0)

Included

Reports assessed for eligibility (n=106)

Reports excluded during FT (n=97)

- Study design/publication type not of interest (n=47)
- No data on the outcome of interest (n=31)
- Duplicate (n=12)
- Language out of scope (n=3)
- Topic out of scope (n=3)
- Withdrawn (n=1)

Reports assessed for eligibility (n=9)

Reports excluded during DE (n=1)

- Overlap with more recent publication (n=1)

Studies included in review (n=16)

- From peer-reviewed sources (n=8)
- From other sources (n=8)

Reports excluded during DE (n=1)

- Overlap with more recent publication (n=1)

