

1 **Reactogenicity and immunogenicity against MPXV of the intradermal administration of**
2 **Modified Vaccinia Ankara compared to the standard subcutaneous route.**

3

4 Valentina Mazzotta¹, Pierluca Piselli^{2*}, Alessandro Cozzi Lepri³, Giulia Matusali⁴, Eleonora Cimini⁵,
5 Rozenn Esvan¹, Francesca Colavita⁴, Roberta Gagliardini¹, Stefania Notari⁵, Alessandra Oliva¹,
6 Silvia Meschi⁴, Rita Casetti⁵, Giulia Micheli¹, Licia Bordi⁴, Alessandro Giacinta¹, Germana Grassi⁵,
7 Saba Gebremeskel Tekle¹, Claudia Cimaglia², Jessica Paulicelli¹, Alessandro Caioli², Paola Galli⁶,
8 Giulia Del Duca¹, Miriam Lichtner⁷, Loredana Sarmati⁸, Enrica Tamburrini^{9,10}, Claudio
9 Mastroianni¹¹, Alessandra Latini¹², Paolo Faccendini¹³, Carla Fontana¹⁴, Emauele Nicastrì¹, Andrea
10 Siddu¹⁵, Alessandra Barca¹⁶, Francesco Vaia¹⁵, Enrico Girardi¹⁷, Fabrizio Maggi⁴, Andrea Antinori¹,
11 for the MPOX Vaccine Lazio Study Group.

12

- 13 ¹ Clinical Infectious Diseases Department, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro
14 Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy;
15 ² Clinical Epidemiology Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani
16 IRCCS, Rome, Italy;
17 ³ Centre for Clinical Research, Epidemiology, Modelling and Evaluation (CREME), Institute for
18 Global Health, UCL, London, UK;
19 ⁴ Laboratory of Virology, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS,
20 Rome, Italy;
21 ⁵ Cellular Immunology and Pharmacology Laboratory, National Institute for Infectious Diseases,
22 Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy;
23 ⁶ Health Direction, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome,
24 Italy;
25 ⁷ Infectious Diseases Unit, Santa Maria Goretti Hospital of Latina, NESMOS Department,
26 Sapienza University of Rome, Italy;
27 ⁸ Infectious Diseases Unit, Tor Vergata University Hospital, Rome, Italy;
28 ⁹ Department of Safety and Bioethics, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy;
29 ¹⁰ Infectious Diseases Unit, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario A. Gemelli IRCCS, Rome, Italy;
30 ¹¹ Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy;
31 ¹² STI/HIV Unit, San Gallicano Dermatological Institute IRCCS, Rome, Italy.
32 ¹³ Pharmacy Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome,
33 Italy;
34 ¹⁴ Laboratory of Microbiology and Biological Bank Unit, National Institute for Infectious Diseases
35 Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS, Rome, Italy;
36 ¹⁵ General Directorate of Prevention, Ministry of Health, Rome, Italy;
37 ¹⁶ Unit of Health Promotion and Prevention, Directorate of Health and Integration, Lazio Region,
38 Rome, Italy;
39 ¹⁷ Scientific Directorate, National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS,
40 Rome, Italy.

41

42 ***Corresponding author**

43 Pierluca Piselli, MSc MPH

44 e-mail: pierluca.piselli@inmi.it

45 Clinical Epidemiology Unit

46 National Institute for Infectious Diseases Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS

47 Via Portuense 292, 00149 Rome, Italy

48 **Abstract**

49 The recent resurgence of Mpox in central Africa has been declared again a Public Health Emergency
50 of International Concern (PHEIC) requiring coordinated international responses. Vaccination is a
51 priority to expand protection and enhance control strategies, but the vaccine's need exceeds the
52 currently available doses. Intradermal administration of one-fifth of the standard Modified-Vaccinia-
53 Ankara (MVA-BN) dose was temporarily authorized during the 2022 PHEIC. Studies conducted
54 before 2022 provided evidence about the humoral response against the Vaccinia virus (VACV) after
55 vaccination but not against the Mpox virus (MPXV). Moreover, no data are available on the T-cell
56 response elicited by MVA-BN administered subcutaneously or intradermally. Here, we compare the
57 two vaccine administration routes according to reactogenicity and immunogenicity based on data
58 from 943 vaccine recipients during the 2022 vaccination campaign in Rome, Italy. We found that the
59 intradermal route elicited slightly higher titers of MPXV-specific IgG and nAbs than the
60 subcutaneous one. At the same time, no differences in cellular response were detected. MVA-BN was
61 globally well tolerated despite higher reactogenicity for the intradermal than the subcutaneous route,
62 especially for the reactions at the local injection site. The intradermal dose-sparing strategy was
63 proven safe and immunogenic and would make vaccination available to more people.

64

65

66 **Introduction**

67 As of May 2022, an unexpected mpox epidemic caused by the clade IIb spread in 122 countries with
68 a global case count higher than 99,000¹. The rapid increase in confirmed cases led to the subsequent
69 declaration of mpox as a public health emergency of international concern (PHEIC) by the World
70 Health Organization (WHO)². Therefore, the WHO recommended vaccination for high-risk people
71 and other mitigation strategies to control the epidemic³.

72 Licensed vaccines against mpox consist of two doses of the third-generation replication-deficient
73 modified vaccinia Ankara produced by Bavarian Nordic (MVA-BN)^{4,5}. The standard route of
74 administration of MVA-BN is subcutaneous (SC), with two doses delivered at least 28 days apart.

75 However, a randomized clinical trial (RCT) compared the safety and immunogenicity of the standard
76 SC formulation (dose and route) of MVA-BN with the intradermal (ID) administration of one-fifth
77 of the standard SC dose⁶. Although the proportion of local reactions was significantly higher after ID
78 inoculation than SC, the ID route was considered non-inferior to the SC route regarding neutralization
79 against vaccinia virus, and it was purposed as a valid alternative in the event of an emergency
80 requiring more doses available⁷.

81 In the summer of 2022, it became necessary to rapidly vaccinate as many high-risk people as possible
82 to contain the epidemic⁸. Therefore, due to the limited availability of MVA-BN worldwide, the
83 European Medicine Agency and Food and Drugs Administration authorized using the intradermal
84 route of administration with a reduced dose to extend vaccination^{9,10}.

85 Data from large-scale administration of MVA-BN published by Bavarian Nordic confirmed the
86 overall safety of the vaccine with an increased frequency of syncopal events after ID administration¹¹.

87 Recently, Frey et al. reported data from a phase-2 open-label trial comparing two 2-dose ID regimens
88 of MVA-BN (one-tenth and one-fifth) with the standard dose SC regimen. MVA-BN administered
89 ID at fractional doses was safe, and the vaccination with one-fifth (but not one-tenth) dose
90 demonstrated non-inferior immunogenicity by vaccinia virus (Western Reserve strain) plaque
91 reduction neutralization test (PRNT) after 43 days¹². However, even though similar clinical

92 effectiveness of the two different vaccination schedules against mpox was reported from 2022 real-
93 world data¹³, comparative data on the immunogenicity of ID route compared to SC are lacking and,
94 those available are not informative on the humoral response specifically against mpox, nor on the T-
95 cell response.

96 Although the massive vaccination campaigns during the MPXV Clade I Ib outbreak must have helped
97 to control the epidemic in high-income countries¹⁴, many outbreaks were constantly observed in
98 endemic areas during the last year, especially in South Africa, where Clade I Ib of mpox virus
99 (MPXV) was still detected¹⁵ and in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where the Clade I had
100 acquired the capability of human-to-human transmission through the sexual route¹⁶, and it has spread
101 in some neighboring countries where mpox cases have never been reported before (e.g Burundi,
102 Rwanda, and Uganda)¹⁷. Furthermore, this “new sexually transmitted clade”, named Clade Ib, is
103 particularly worrisome because of its lethality (nearly 3%)¹⁸, leading WHO to renew the declaration
104 of mpox as a PHEIC on the 14th of August 2024¹⁷.

105 Vaccination is recommended as one of the main tools to control this new increase in mpox cases.
106 WHO and the African Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) are producing efforts to
107 step up the vaccination campaign in low-income countries with limited access. In front of the 10
108 million doses African CDC estimates are needed to contain the current outbreak, the negotiations
109 with Bavarian Nordic aim to obtain around 200.000 doses of MVA-BN¹⁹. In this setting, enhancing
110 knowledge about the reactogenicity and immunogenicity against MPXV of the intradermal dose-
111 sparing strategy compared to the standard subcutaneous one in mpox high-risk people in the real-
112 world setting is crucial to address an efficient and cost-effective implementation of the arising mpox
113 vaccination campaign.

114 Here, we report observational data from a data set on the non-randomized comparison on safety and
115 reactogenicity, and immunogenicity (neutralization and T-cell response) specifically directed against
116 the MPXV target between the two vaccination schedules of MVA-BN (Jynneos) delivered in the
117 vaccination campaign during the 2022-2023 mpox outbreak in Italy.

118 **Methods**

119 *Patients' enrolment*

120 In the Lazio Region of Italy mpox vaccination campaign started on August 8th, 2022, and took place
121 in a hospital setting at the Lazzaro Spallanzani National Institute for Infectious Diseases in Rome,
122 which was identified as the only vaccination center in the entire region.

123 According to the recommendations of the Ministry of Health²⁰, MVA-BN was administered as pre-
124 exposure prophylaxis to a target population, including laboratory personnel with possible direct
125 exposure to orthopoxviruses (OPXV) and high-risk gay-bisexual-men who have sex with men
126 (GBMSM), defined as individuals reporting a recent history of sexually transmitted infections (STIs),
127 multiple sexual partners or participation in group sex events, sexual encounters in
128 clubs/cruising/saunas or sexual acts associated with the use of Chemical drugs (Chemsex). For
129 individuals who had never received the smallpox vaccine (vaccine-naïve or non-primed), the
130 vaccination schedule consisted of a two-dose cycle with a 28-day interval between each dose, while
131 individuals who had received the smallpox vaccine in the past (vaccine-experienced or primed) were
132 administered a single-dose cycle. Of note, in Italy, the smallpox vaccination campaign was stopped
133 in 1977 and officially abrogated in 1981²¹.

134 The MVA-BN first dose was administered subcutaneously during the first two weeks of the
135 vaccination campaign, after which the intradermal route was adopted, following the ministerial
136 indications²².

137 For the same reason, the vaccine was administered exclusively intradermally in those receiving a
138 second dose. A prospective observational cohort was integrated into the framework of this vaccination
139 campaign.

140

141 *Study protocol*

142 The protocol for the study named Mpox-Vac ("Studio prospettico osservazionale per monitorare
143 aspetti relativi alla sicurezza, all'efficacia, all'immunogenicità e all'accettabilità della vaccinazione

144 anti Monkeypox con vaccino MVA-BN (JYNNEOS) in persone ad alto rischio”) was approved by
145 the INMI Lazzaro Spallanzani Ethical Committee (approval number 41z, Register of Non-Covid
146 Trials 2022). The study protocol was previously described in detail ²³.

147

148 Briefly, all subjects eligible for mpox vaccination according to the ministerial guidelines and who
149 signed a written informed consent were enrolled in the study. Laboratory personnel were excluded
150 from the analysis. At baseline (when receiving the first MVA-BN dose, T1), subjects were evaluated
151 for demographic and behavioural characteristics linked to mpox exposure. Information regarding HIV
152 status, CD4 count, HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) uptake and any history of previous STIs
153 was collected. Other time points were scheduled at the administration of the second dose (T2) and
154 one month after the completion of the cycle (T3). For the vaccine-experienced individuals (primed)
155 who received a single-dose schedule as a complete vaccination cycle, T2 was the time point
156 corresponding to one month after vaccination completion.

157

158 *Assessment of adverse reactions*

159 As part of the protocol, participants were delivered a paper symptoms diary after each vaccine dose
160 (T1 and T2) to collect self-reported adverse effects following immunization (AEFIs) for 28
161 consecutive days. Participants returned the completed diaries at the next time point.

162 Participants were able to report the presence of systemic symptoms (S-AEFIs) classified as fatigue,
163 muscle pain, headache, gastrointestinal effects, and chills, and local injection site symptoms (LIS-
164 AEFIs), such as redness, induration, and pain. AEFIs were graded by the vaccinees as absent (grade
165 0), mild (1), moderate (2), or severe (3). Here, we report the results regarding erythema and induration
166 as recalculated with the use of the current FDA Toxicity Grading Scale for Healthy Adult and
167 Adolescent Volunteers Enrolled in Preventive Vaccine Clinical Trials. According to that scale, a
168 diameter of 25 to 50 mm indicates a mild reaction, 51 to 100 mm is a moderate reaction, and more
169 than 100 mm is a severe reaction²⁴.

170

171 *Assessment of immunogenicity*

172 In a specific subgroup of participants for whom blood samples collected at each time point were
173 available, the assessment of the early humoral and cellular immune response was performed.

174 *MPXV-specific IgG and neutralization assays*

175 Specific anti-MPXV immune response was evaluated by measuring MPXV-specific IgGs and
176 neutralizing antibodies in the serum as previously described²⁵. The presence of anti-MPXV IgGs was
177 assessed on immunofluorescence slides in-house prepared with Vero E6 cells (ATCC) infected with
178 an MPXV isolated from the skin lesion of a patient infected with MPXV during the 2022 outbreak
179 (GenBank: ON745215.1, referred to the clinical sample). Serum samples were tested with a starting
180 dilution of 1:20, and serial two-fold dilutions were performed to determine anti-MPXV IgG titer.
181 MPXV-specific neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) were measured by 50% plaque-reduction-
182 neutralization test (PRNT₅₀) with a starting dilution of 1:10. Specifically, serum samples were heat-
183 inactivated at 56 °C for 30 min and titrated in duplicate in 4 four-fold serial dilutions. Each serum
184 dilution was added to the same volume (1:1) of a solution containing 100 TCID₅₀ MPXV isolate
185 (GenBank: ON745215.1, referred to the clinical sample) and incubated at 37 °C for 2 h. Subconfluent
186 Vero E6 cells were infected with virus/serum mixtures and incubated at 37 °C and 5% CO₂. After 5
187 days, the supernatant was carefully discarded, and a crystal violet solution (Diapath S.P.A.) containing
188 10% formaldehyde (Sigma-Aldrich) was added for 30 min, then cells were washed with phosphate-
189 buffered saline (PBS, 1X; Sigma-Aldrich). Using the Cytation 5 reader (Biotek), the number of
190 plaques was counted. The neutralizing titers were estimated by measuring the plaques number
191 reduction as compared to the control virus wells. The highest serum dilution showing at least 50% of
192 the plaque number reduction was indicated as the 50% neutralization titer (PRNT₅₀). Each test
193 included serum control (1:10 dilution of each sample tested without virus), cell control (Vero E6 cells
194 alone), and virus control (100 TCID₅₀ MPXV in octuplicate).

195

196 *PBMC isolation*

197 Using Ficoll density gradient centrifugation (Pancoll human, PAN Biotech) method peripheral blood
198 mononuclear cells (PBMC) were isolated, frozen in FBS (Fetal Bovine Serum, Gibco, USA) added
199 of 10% of DMSO (Merck Life sciences, Milan, Italy) at vapors of liquid nitrogen for further
200 experiments.

201

202 *Elispot assay*

203 The frequency of T-cell-specific responses to the MVA-BN vaccine was assessed by Interferon- γ
204 ELISpot assay. Briefly, PBMC were thawed and suspended in a complete medium [RPMI-1640 added
205 of 10% FBS, 1% L-glutamine, and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (Euroclone S.p.A, Italy)]. Live PBMC
206 were counted by Trypan blue exclusion, plated at 3×10^5 cells per well in ELISpot plates (Human IFN-
207 γ ELISpot plus kit; Mabtech, Nacka Strand, Sweden), and stimulated for 20 h with MOI 1 of the
208 MVA-BN vaccine suspension [JYNNEOS (Smallpox and Monkeypox Vaccine, Live, non-
209 replicating)] and α CD28/ α CD49d (1 μ g/ml, BD Biosciences) at 37 °C (5% CO₂), using T cell
210 superantigen (SEB 200 nM, Sigma) as positive control. At the end of the of incubation, the ELISpot
211 assay was developed following manufacturer's instructions. Results are expressed as spot-forming
212 cells per 10^6 PBMCs (SFC/ 10^6 PBMCs) in stimulating cultures after subtracting the background
213 (unstimulated culture).

214

215 *Statistical analysis*

216 Demographic and epidemiological characteristics of the patients are presented both for the overall
217 sample population and for each route of administration. Continuous variables were described using
218 median and Interquartile Range (IQR), while categorical variables were summarized using absolute
219 and relative (percentage) frequencies.

220 The main characteristics of participants according to the route of administration were compared using
221 the Chi-square test or Fisher exact test when appropriate for qualitative variables and the Mann-

222 Whitney test for numerical variables. We then used collected diaries to calculate the prevalence of
223 reported AEFIs according to the route of administration, as well as the duration and maximum level
224 of severity ever experienced over the 28 days following the first dose of vaccination for each S-AEFI
225 and LIS-AEFI, according to the above-mentioned grading (none to severe).

226 The raw proportions of participants whose maximum reported AEFIs was none, mild, moderate or
227 severe by route of administration groups are also shown. We also computed the Odds ratio (OR) of
228 the maximum severity level of AEFIs experienced by the administration route using multinomial
229 logistic regression models, both univariable and after adjusting for age and HIV status. In these
230 models, the never-reported AEFIs category was chosen as the reference group, and the estimated ORs
231 show the risk of reporting mild, moderate or severe AEFIs as the maximum level ever experienced
232 according to the administration route. For a proportion of participants, the diary data were censored
233 at day six, so we have also performed a sensitivity analysis restricting to only the level of AEFI
234 severity ever experienced over the six days following the first vaccination dose for everybody.

235 As a second continuous outcome, we calculated the average number of days in which participants
236 experienced each of the 4 levels of symptoms over the 28 days past the first dose of the MVA-BN
237 vaccine. We then compared the average duration in days of any systemic or local reactions by route
238 of administration by means of an unpaired t-test. Also, in this analysis, the comparison was performed
239 by analyzing the reporting of any grade of reaction (from mild to severe, grade 1 to 3) or moderate to
240 severe (2 or 3).

241 Similarly to what was done for the categorical outcome, we controlled for the potential confounding
242 effect of age and HIV status using a counterfactual linear regression model and provided an estimate
243 of the average treatment effect (ATE) associated with the administration route. Of note, the aim of
244 this analysis was to evaluate what would have been the duration of any adverse response to the MVA-
245 BN vaccine had everybody in the sample received the ID vs. had everybody received the SC route of
246 administration instead. We used a doubly robust method (using augmented inverse probability
247 weighting-AIPW) to obtain estimates which are robust against misspecification of either the

248 propensity model or the outcome model. Both the propensity and outcome models included HIV and
249 age as confounding variables. For the outcome model, we also used the saturated model, including
250 the interaction parameter between exposure and HIV status (results were similar, not shown).
251 Finally, the same approach to analysis (a marginal model and the calculation of the ATE after
252 controlling for HIV and age) was conducted in a subset of 171 (18%) vaccinated subjects for whom
253 stored samples were available and analyzed to compare the overall increase in the average levels (on
254 a log₂ scale) of IgG and nAb as well as ELISPOT response 1 month after vaccination according to
255 route of administration.

256

257 **Results**

258

259 *Characteristics of the study population*

260 Between August 8th and December 31st, 2022, 3,296 individuals received at least one dose of MVA-
261 BN. Of those, 943 (28.6%) agreed to be enrolled in the study and completed the symptom-reporting
262 daily diary covering their experience within 28 days from the first dose administration. Among the
263 943 individuals included in the analysis, 225 (23.9%) received the first dose via the SC route, of
264 whom 50 as a single dose because they were vaccine-experienced (22.2% of this group), and 718
265 (76.1%) via the ID route; of this latter group 523 (73%) received only the first of the two doses
266 scheduled for the previously unvaccinated.

267 All were male, and the majority (90.9%) self-identified as MSM. Overall, the median age was 44
268 years (IQR 36-51), 43 (36-48) years in the SC group, and 45 (38-52) years in the ID, respectively
269 (p=0.15). Regarding other characteristics, 167 participants (17.7%) were on PrEP, 227 (24.1%)
270 reported at least one STI diagnosed within the previous year, and 261 subjects (27.7%) were people
271 living with HIV (PLWH), all on highly active antiretroviral therapy. HIV infection was more
272 prevalent in the SC (35%) vs. the ID group (25%, p=0.0004). In those with HIV, CD4- cell count was
273 lower than 200 cells/μL only in 10 participants (3.8%), while it was higher than 500 cells/μL in 211

274 (80.8%), with no evidence for a difference between the two groups ($p=0.232$). The two groups
275 differed significantly also according to the use of PrEP (25.8% vs. 15.2%, for SC and ID groups
276 respectively, $p<0.001$) and in the proportion of participants who reported one or more comorbidities
277 (0% vs. 8.2%, for SC and ID group, respectively, $p<0.001$), while there was no evidence for a
278 difference in other examined factors (i.e. sexual orientation, history of STI other than HIV, CD4
279 counts for those with HIV, and history of smallpox vaccination. The main characteristics of the study
280 population according to the administration route are reported in more detail in Table 1. The crude
281 proportions of participants reporting various grades of the evaluated adverse effect are reported in
282 Figure 1 and Table 2. The grade and duration of S-AEFIs and LIS-AEFIs within 28 days from
283 vaccination according to the route of vaccination are summarized in Supplementary Figure 1.

284

285 *Systemic reactions*

286 No serious adverse events were observed over the 28-day follow-up. Overall systemic reactions
287 occurred in 526 (55.9%) participants, with a higher proportion observed in the ID group compared to
288 the SC group (59.1% vs 45.8%, $p<0.001$). The most common S-AEFIs were fatigue and headache,
289 occurring in 46.7% and 33.8% of participants, which tended to be slightly higher in the ID group
290 ($p=0.08$ and $p=0.09$, respectively); however, when considering only moderate or severe grades, there
291 was no evidence for a difference between the two groups.

292 After adjusting for age and HIV status in a multinomial regression model, we found evidence that
293 participants in the ID group had an increased risk of developing mild-grade headaches (2.91; 95%
294 Confidence Interval, 95% CI: 1.23,6.89; $p=0.045$) compared to the SC group (Table 3). Results were
295 similar when we restricted the analysis only to the first 6 days of the diary (OR=2.66, 95% CI:1.13-
296 6.27, $p=0.07$), suggesting that most of the difference is likely to occur early after vaccination
297 (Supplementary Table 1).

298 Systemic reactions were of short duration, 3.7 days on average for any grade and any type of S-AEFI,
299 with no evidence for a difference in symptom duration between the ID and SC groups in the
300 unadjusted analysis and after controlling for HIV and age (Table 4).

301 *Local reactions*

302 LIS-AEFIs were reported by a total of 852 (90.9%) participants, with a higher proportion in those
303 receiving the ID route (94.4% vs 80.0%, $p < 0.001$).

304 Among LIS-AEFIs, redness and induration at the injection site were the most frequently reported
305 adverse effects (80.9% and 81.0%, respectively), with a significantly higher proportion (about twice
306 as high) in the ID group than in the SC group ($p < 0.001$); a similar difference was also observed
307 considering only moderate or severe grade adverse events.

308 In contrast, 74.7% of participants in the SC group reported any-grade pain at the injection site vs.
309 69.2% in the ID group, although there was no evidence for a difference ($p = 0.14$); the same applied
310 when considering moderate or severe grade pain (34.2% vs. 30.1%, $p = 0.13$).

311 After controlling for HIV and age, we found a higher risk of occurrence for any grade of redness and
312 induration at the local site in the ID than in the SC group ($p < 0.001$). Conversely, a higher degree of
313 pain was reported by participants who received the vaccine through the SC modality ($p < 0.002$). ORs
314 with 95% CI from fitting the multinomial regression models are reported in Table 3. Results were
315 similar after restricting the analysis to the 0-6 days diary data (Supplementary Table 1).

316 Local redness and induration (regardless of grade) were the most long-lasting symptoms, especially
317 in the ID group (on average, 18.7 and 16.6 days in ID vs. 5.9 and 5.5 in the SC group, respectively).

318 After controlling for HIV status and age, we estimated that the duration of redness (regardless of
319 grade) in participants who received the vaccine in ID modality was 12.8 days (95% CI: 9.96, 15.55;
320 $p < 0.0001$) longer than that of subjects receiving the SC strategy. Similar results were observed for
321 induration, which lasted on average 11.1 days (95% CI: 8.45, 13.7; $p < 0.0001$) longer in the ID vs.
322 SC strategy. After restricting the analysis to only moderate or severe grades, we observed a shorter
323 duration of these AEFIs, although still significantly longer in the ID vs. SC group (7.14 vs. 4.24 days

324 for redness, $p=0.023$ and 5.55 vs. 3.23 days for induration, $p=0.004$). Overall, local pain (regardless
325 of grade) had a shorter duration, not exceeding 7 days on average, but still with a longer duration in
326 the ID vs. SC group (mean difference 1.8 days (95% CI: 0.2, 3.4; $p=0.025$) in the unadjusted analysis,
327 which was however largely attenuated after considering only moderate and severe grade and
328 controlling for age and HIV-status ($p=0.312$, Table 4).

329

330 *Immunogenicity*

331 Finally, in a subset of 171 (18%) vaccine recipients for whom samples have been stored and analyzed
332 we compared the average change in immunogenicity one month after the completion of the
333 vaccination cycle according to the route of administration (ID vs SC). Our counterfactual analysis
334 controlling for HIV and age showed some evidence for a larger increase of MPXV-specific IgG (mean
335 $\text{diff}=0.26 \log_2$, $p=0.05$) and nAb ($0.34 \log_2$, $p=0.08$) titers in favour of the ID vs. SC administration.
336 Weaker evidence for a difference by administration route was found in the variation of MVA-BN
337 specific T-cell response measured by Elispot assay (0.41 , $p=0.18$) (Table 5).

338

339 **Discussion**

340 This work showed that the intradermal route of administration of the MVA-BN vaccine was safe and
341 well tolerated despite higher reactogenicity than the subcutaneous route. We did not observe serious
342 adverse effects or syncope, as recently reported by the manufacturer¹¹. However, among the
343 participants receiving the vaccine ID, we observed a slightly higher prevalence of headache and
344 fatigue than in the SC group. This difference, already mild in the unadjusted analysis, was even more
345 mitigated after a multinomial analysis adjusted for age and HIV status. Local redness and induration
346 were confirmed to be more prevalent (94%) and long-lasting (around 18 days) among participants
347 receiving the intradermal route than those receiving the subcutaneous one. On the contrary, pain was
348 more common after subcutaneous administration. These findings are quite expected considering the
349 mode of inoculation and are consistent with other reports. Recently, Frey et al. reported proportions

350 of adverse effects in people receiving the intradermal dose of 97% for the local and 79% for the
351 systemic symptoms, without evidence of severe grade events. Moreover, local symptoms lasted over
352 a month after the intradermal administration¹².

353 Although expected and not severe, redness and induration in the forearm were not well accepted by
354 vaccinated people because they were considered a mark of vaccination and, consequently, of sexual
355 behaviour associated with a high risk of contracting mpox.

356 Stigma could represent a barrier to vaccination, especially in countries where discrimination and
357 racism are deep-rooted, and the LGBT community is criminalized²⁶. Anyway, MVA-BN could also
358 be inoculated intradermally into the upper back just below the shoulder blade or into the skin of the
359 shoulder above the deltoid muscle²⁷, where the spot is less visible than in the forearm.

360 Knowledge of these aspects might help clinicians provide more appropriate counselling, make people
361 aware of the course of side effects, and, therefore, make vaccination more acceptable and widespread
362 enough to protect the “core group” that sustains the virus transmission and contributes to its possible
363 spread to the general population²⁸.

364 Regarding immunogenicity, our data collected one month after completing the vaccination cycle
365 found a substantially equivalent immune response between the participants receiving the first dose
366 intradermally and those receiving it subcutaneously. Differently from previously published data,
367 analyzing humoral immune response against vaccinia virus VACV, not MPXV, we measured both
368 titers of specific IgG and nAbs against MPXV, and we found that slightly higher titers of MPXV IgG
369 and nAbs were elicited after the homologous (ID+ID) course of vaccination than after the
370 heterologous (SC+ID) one.

371 These findings represent the immunological counterpart of a report from May 2022 to May 2024 in
372 the USA, showing a higher incidence of breakthrough infections among people fully vaccinated with
373 the heterologous than the homologous intradermal vaccination cycle. Of note, in our cohort, we did
374 not observe breakthrough infections²⁹.

375 Finally, this is the first analysis providing data regarding the cellular immune response according to
376 the administration route of MVA-BN. There was no evidence for a difference in the cellular immune
377 response between participants receiving the first dose intradermally or subcutaneously.

378 T-cell response has been known to be crucial for the control and resolution of poxvirus infections^{30,31},
379 and T-cell reactivity to VACV and MPXV was detected decades post-vaccination with first-generation
380 vaccine, suggesting a role of long-lasting cross-reactive T-cell memory responses in vaccine
381 efficacy³². A good T-cell response was also demonstrated after third-generation MVA-BN³³. T-cells
382 elicited from VACV-based vaccines were found to recognize MPXV-derived epitopes, suggesting that
383 it is crucial for the cross-reactivity between different Orthopox strains³⁴. Consequently, T-cells could
384 contribute to the recognition of the different MPXV clades and to a broader vaccine efficacy.

385 Recently, the Afro-Mpox bulletin showed a spreading outbreak involving several African countries,
386 and clade Ib and clade IIb have been sequenced³⁵. In the wake of these reactogenicity and
387 immunological data, we support the use of vaccination by MVA-BN administered by an intradermal
388 route in low-income countries, as WHO suggested, even still in the absence of specific data against
389 the clade Ib. Thus, the sparing-dose protocol of ID-based vaccination may provide a cost-effective
390 approach to the current global vaccination campaign.

391 Some limitations need to be stated. First, the study's observational design could account for
392 unmeasured bias, although the analysis was controlled for the main confounders. Furthermore, we
393 cannot compare the two homologous cycles (SC+SC vs ID+ID) because the second doses were only
394 administered intradermally due to the regulatory recommendations. For this reason, we have limited
395 the comparison to the first dose. As mentioned, although we extensively assessed the immune
396 response against MPXV clade IIb, we cannot provide information on the humoral and cellular
397 response against Clade I.

398

399 In conclusion, our study demonstrated that the intradermal route of administration of MVA-BN
400 elicited slightly higher titers of MPXV-specific IgG and nAbs than the subcutaneous route. At the

401 same time, no differences in cellular response were detected. MVA-BN was globally well tolerated
402 despite higher reactogenicity with the intradermal than the subcutaneous route. Based on these results,
403 we believe that intradermal administration of MVA-BN is feasible, safe, and immunogenic, and we
404 support the use of this dose-sparing strategy to increase the feasibility of a broad vaccination
405 campaign to control the current multiclade mpox outbreak in Africa.

406

407

408 **Acknowledgements**

409 We thank the participants who gave their time to the project, the nurse, the laboratory staff, and the
410 bio-banking personnel. Thanks to all the members of the *Mpox Vaccine Lazio Study Group*: C
411 Aguglia, A Antinori, E Anzalone, A Barca, M Camici, F Cannone, P Caputi, R Casetti, L Caterini, C
412 Cimaglia, E Cimini, F Colavita, L Coppola, R Corso, F Cristofanelli, S Cruciani, N De Marco, G Del
413 Duca, G D’Ettorre, S Di Bari, S Di Giambenedetto, P Faccendini, F Faraglia, D Farinacci, A Faticoni,
414 C Fontana, M Fusto, R Gagliardini, P Galli, S Gebremeskel, G Giannico, S Gili, E Girardi, G Grassi,
415 MR Iannella, A Junea, D Kontogiannis, A Lamonaca, S Lanini, A Latini, D Lapa, M Lichtner, MG
416 Loira, F Maggi, A Marani, M Marchili, R Marocco, A Masone, C Mastroianni, I Mastrorosa, G
417 Matusali, V Mazzotta, S Meschi, S Minicucci, A Mondì, V Mondillo, A Nappo, G Natalini, E Nicastrì,
418 S Notari, A Oliva, A Parisi, J Paulicelli, C Pinnetti, P Piselli, MM Plazzi, A Possi, G Preziosi, R
419 Preziosi, G Prota, M Ridolfi, S Rosati, A Russo, L Sarmati, P Scanzano, L Scorzolìni, C Stingone, E
420 Tamburrini, E Tartaglia, V Tomassi, F Vaia, A Vergori, M Vescovo, S Vita, J Volpi, P Zuccalà.

421

422 **Authors contribution**

423 VM, AA, and ACL conceived the study; VM, GMa, EC, and FC wrote the protocol. PP and VM wrote
424 the first draft of the manuscript. AA, FM, ACL, EC, GMa, FC, EG, EN, CF and CA revised the
425 manuscript. GMa, FC, SM, LB, SN, RC, and GG performed the laboratory analyses. PP, JP, AC and
426 CC was responsible for data management. PP and ACL performed statistical analysis. VM, RE, AG,
427 GMi, AO, SG, and RG enrolled and followed the patients during the study time points. ML, LS, ET,
428 CM, and AL contributed to the enrollment. PG, AS, FV, and AB contributed to the realization of the
429 study. VM and AA provided the grant for funding the study. All authors gave their final approval of
430 the submitted version.

431

432

433 **Competitive of interests**

434 AA received a grant from Bavarian Nordic for participation in conferences. The other authors
435 declared no conflicts of interest.

436

437 **Data sharing statement**

438 Data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

439

440 **Funding**

441 The study was supported by the National Institute for Infectious Disease Lazzaro Spallanzani IRCCS
442 “Advanced grant 5x1000, 2021” and by the Italian Ministry of Health “*Ricerca Corrente Linea 2*”
443 INMI Spallanzani IRCCS

444 **References**

- 445 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *2022 -2023 Monkeypox Outbreak Global Map.*
446 *2023.* <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/response/2022/world-map.html> (2024).
- 447 2. World Health Organization. WHO director general declares the ongoing monkeypox outbreak
448 a public health event of international concern. [https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/23-07-](https://www.who.int/europe/news/item/23-07-2022-who-director-general-declares-the-ongoing-monkeypox-outbreak-a-public-health-event-of-international-concern)
449 *2022-who-director-general-declares-the-ongoing-monkeypox-outbreak-a-public-health-event-*
450 *of-international-concern* (2022).
- 451 3. Hubach, R. D. & Owens, C. Findings on the Monkeypox Exposure Mitigation Strategies
452 Employed by Men Who Have Sex with Men and Transgender Women in the United States.
453 *Arch. Sex. Behav.* **51**, 3653–3658 (2022).
- 454 4. European Medicines Agency. EMA recommends approval Imvanex prevention monkeypox
455 disease. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-recommends-approval-imvanex-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-recommends-approval-imvanex-prevention-monkeypox-disease)
456 *prevention-monkeypox-disease* (2022).
- 457 5. Food and Drug Administration. BLA approval.
458 <https://www.fda.gov/media/131079/download?attachment> (2019).
- 459 6. Frey, S. E. *et al.* Comparison of lyophilized versus liquid modified vaccinia Ankara (MVA)
460 formulations and subcutaneous versus intradermal routes of administration in healthy
461 vaccinia-naïve subjects. *Vaccine* **33**, 5225–5234 (2015).
- 462 7. Frey, S. E., Goll, J. B. & Beigel, J. H. Erythema and Induration after Mpox (JYNNEOS)
463 Vaccination Revisited. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **388**, 1432–1435 (2023).
- 464 8. Brooks, J. T., Marks, P., Goldstein, R. H. & Walensky, R. P. Intradermal Vaccination for
465 Monkeypox — Benefits for Individual and Public Health. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **387**, 1151–1153
466 (2022).
- 467 9. European Medicines Agency. EMA’s Emergency Task Force advises on intradermal use of
468 Imvanex / Jynneos against monkeypox. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/emas-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/emas-emergency-task-force-advises-intradermal-use-imvanex-jynneos-against-monkeypox)
469 *emergency-task-force-advises-intradermal-use-imvanex-jynneos-against-monkeypox.*

- 470 10. Food and Drug Administration. Review Memorandum for the emergency use authorization
471 (EUA) of JYNNEOS. <https://www.fda.gov/media/160785/download>.
- 472 11. Weidenthaler, H., Vidojkovic, S., Martin, B. K. & Moerlooze, L. D. Real-world safety data for
473 MVA-BN: Increased frequency of syncope following intradermal administration for
474 immunization against mpox disease. *Vaccine* (2024) doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2024.05.072.
- 475 12. Frey, S. E., Lerner, A. & Tomashek, K. Safety and immunogenicity of fractional doses of
476 Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavarian Nordic. in (ESCMID Global, 2024).
- 477 13. Dalton, A. F. *et al.* Estimated Effectiveness of JYNNEOS Vaccine in Preventing Mpox: A
478 Multijurisdictional Case-Control Study — United States, August 19, 2022–March 31, 2023.
479 *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **72**, 553–558 (2023).
- 480 14. Vairo, F. *et al.* The possible effect of sociobehavioral factors and public health actions on the
481 mpox epidemic slowdown. *Int. J. Infect. Dis.* **130**, 83–85 (2023).
- 482 15. World Health Organization. *Weekly Bulletin on Outbreak and Other Emergencies: Week 28: 8*
483 *- 14 July 2024*. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/378355>.
- 484 16. Vakaniaki, E. H. *et al.* Sustained human outbreak of a new MPXV clade I lineage in eastern
485 Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Nat. Med.* (2024) doi:10.1038/s41591-024-03130-3.
- 486 17. World Health Organization. WHO Director-General declares mpox outbreak a public health
487 emergency of international concern. [https://www.who.int/news/item/14-08-2024-who-](https://www.who.int/news/item/14-08-2024-who-director-general-declares-mpox-outbreak-a-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern)
488 [director-general-declares-mpox-outbreak-a-public-health-emergency-of-international-](https://www.who.int/news/item/14-08-2024-who-director-general-declares-mpox-outbreak-a-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern)
489 [concern](https://www.who.int/news/item/14-08-2024-who-director-general-declares-mpox-outbreak-a-public-health-emergency-of-international-concern).
- 490 18. Kibungu, E. M. *et al.* Clade I–Associated Mpox Cases Associated with Sexual Contact, the
491 Democratic Republic of the Congo. *Emerg. Infect. Dis.* **30**, (2024).
- 492 19. Kozlov, M. Growing mpox outbreak prompts WHO to declare global health emergency.
493 *Nature* (2024) doi:10.1038/d41586-024-02607-y.
- 494 20. Ministero della Salute. Circolare del Ministero della Salute n. 35365 - Indicazioni ad interim
495 sulla strategia vaccinale contro il vaiolo delle scimmie (MPX). (2022).

- 496 21. Istituto Superiore Di Sanita'. EpiCentro sul vaiolo. <https://www.epicentro.iss.it/vaiolo/>.
497 (2022).
- 498 22. Ministero della Salute. Aggiornamento sulla modalità di somministrazione del vaccino
499 JYNNEOS (MVA-BN).
- 500 23. Mazzotta, V. *et al.* Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of modified vaccinia Ankara pre-
501 exposure vaccination against mpox according to previous smallpox vaccine exposure and
502 HIV infection: prospective cohort study. *eClinicalMedicine* **68**, 102420 (2024).
- 503 24. Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for industry - Toxicity Grading Scale for Healthy
504 Adult and Adolescent Volunteers Enrolled in Preventive Vaccine Clinical Trials.
505 <https://www.fda.gov/media/73679/download> (2007).
- 506 25. Colavita, F. *et al.* Kinetics of viral DNA in body fluids and antibody response in patients with
507 acute Monkeypox virus infection. *iScience* **26**, 106102 (2023).
- 508 26. World Health Organization. WHO publishes public health advice on preventing and
509 addressing stigma and discrimination related to mpox. [https://www.who.int/news/item/11-12-](https://www.who.int/news/item/11-12-2022-who-publishes-public-health-advice-on-preventing-and-addressing-stigma-and-discrimination-related-to-mpox)
510 [2022-who-publishes-public-health-advice-on-preventing-and-addressing-stigma-and-](https://www.who.int/news/item/11-12-2022-who-publishes-public-health-advice-on-preventing-and-addressing-stigma-and-discrimination-related-to-mpox)
511 [discrimination-related-to-mpox](https://www.who.int/news/item/11-12-2022-who-publishes-public-health-advice-on-preventing-and-addressing-stigma-and-discrimination-related-to-mpox) (2022).
- 512 27. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Mpox Vaccine Recommendations.
513 <https://www.cdc.gov/poxvirus/mpox/vaccines/vaccine-recommendations.html> (2024).
- 514 28. Allan-Blitz, L.-T. & Klausner, J. D. Prevalence of mpox immunity among the core group and
515 its potential to prevent future large-scale outbreaks. *Lancet Microbe* 100957 (2024)
516 doi:10.1016/j.lanmic.2024.100957.
- 517 29. Guagliardo, S. A. J. *et al.* Monkeypox Virus Infections After 2 Preexposure Doses of
518 JYNNEOS Vaccine — United States, May 2022–May 2024. *MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly.*
519 *Rep.* **73**, 460–466 (2024).
- 520 30. Pauli, Georg *et al.* Orthopox Viruses: Infections in Humans. *Transfus. Med. Hemotherapy* **37**,
521 351–364 (2010).

- 522 31. Jing, L. *et al.* Diversity in the Acute CD8 T Cell Response to Vaccinia Virus in Humans^{1,2}.
523 (2007).
- 524 32. Matusali, G. *et al.* Evaluation of Cross-Immunity to the Mpox Virus Due to Historic Smallpox
525 Vaccination. *Vaccines* **11**, 1541 (2023).
- 526 33. Cohn, H. *et al.* Mpox vaccine and infection-driven human immune signatures: an
527 immunological analysis of an observational study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **23**, 1302–1312 (2023).
- 528 34. Crandell, J. *et al.* The impact of antigenic distance on Orthopoxvirus Vaccination and Mpox
529 Infection for cross-protective immunity. doi:10.1101/2024.01.31.24302065.
- 530 35. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Africa. *Regional Mpox Bulletin: 11 August*
531 *2024*. <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/378456> (2024).
- 532

Table 1. Main characteristics by route of administration of the first MVA-BN dose.

Characteristics	Total N= 943	Route of administration of the first vaccination dose			
		ID N= 718	SC N= 225	p-value*	
Sexual orientation, n (%)	Bisexual	65 (6.9)	52 (7.2)	13 (5.8)	0.479
	Transgender	12 (1.3)	9 (1.3)	3 (1.3)	
	MSM	857 (90.9)	648 (90.3)	209 (92.9)	
Age, years	Median (IQR)	44 (36, 51)	45 (38, 52)	43 (36, 48)	0.153
PrEP use, n (%)	No	759 (80.5)	604 (84.1)	155 (68.9)	<0.001
	Yes	167 (17.7)	109 (15.2)	58 (25.8)	
	Not reported	15 (1.6)	4 (0.6)	11 (4.9)	
≥1 STI over previous year, n (%)	Yes	227 (24.1)	161 (22.5)	66 (29.3)	0.286
	Syphilis	108 (57.4)	72 (55.0)	36 (63.2)	0.222
	Gonorrhoea	73 (39.9)	44 (34.9)	29 (50.9)	0.329
	Chlamydia	43 (24.6)	22 (18.6)	21 (36.8)	0.324
	HPV	28 (16.4)	14 (12.3)	14 (24.6)	0.298
	PLWH	261 (27.7)	182 (25.3)	79 (35.1)	0.004
	PLWH on effective ART	261 (100.0)	182 (100.0)	79 (100.0)	
CD4 cell count ^{&} , cells/mm ³ , n (%)	0-200	10 (3.8)	5 (2.7)	5 (6.3)	0.232
	201-500	39 (14.9)	28 (15.4)	11 (13.9)	
	501+	211 (80.8)	149 (81.9)	62 (78.5)	
	Unknown	1 (0.4)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.3)	
Comorbidities, n (%)	None	884 (93.7)	659 (91.8)	225 (100.0)	<0.001
	≥1	37 (3.9)	37 (5.2)	0 (0.0)	
	Unknown	22 (2.3)	22 (3.1)	0 (0.0)	
Previous smallpox vaccination, n (%)	Yes	245 (26.0)	195 (27.2)	50 (22.2)	0.638

[&]In PLWH; *Chi-square or Mann-Whitney test as appropriate

ID: intradermal; SC: subcutaneous; MSM: men who have sex with men; IQR: interquartile range; PrEP: pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV infection; STI: sexually transmitted infection; HPV: human papillomavirus; PLWH: people living with HIV; ART: antiretroviral therapy.

Table 2. Table of prevalence of Systemic and Local Adverse Effects Following Immunisation (S-AEFIs and L-AEFIs) with MVA-BN Vaccine.

Adverse effect	Grade	Tot n (%)	Prevalence of symptoms (ID vs. SC)		
			ID n (%)	SC n (%)	p-value*
<i>Any S-AEFI</i>	No	415 (44.1)	293 (40.9)	122 (54.2)	<0.001
	Yes, any grade	526 (55.9)	423 (59.1)	103 (45.8)	
<i>Fatigue</i>	No	502 (53.3)	370 (51.7)	132 (58.7)	0.079
	Yes, any grade	439 (46.7)	346 (48.3)	93 (41.3)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	221 (23.5)	163 (22.8)	58 (25.8)	
<i>Headache</i>	No	623 (66.2)	463 (64.7)	160 (71.1)	0.089
	Yes, any grade	318 (33.8)	253 (35.3)	65 (28.9)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	128 (13.6)	92 (12.8)	36 (16)	
<i>Myalgia</i>	No	708 (75.2)	541 (75.6)	167 (74.2)	0.752
	Yes, any grade	233 (24.8)	175 (24.4)	58 (25.8)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	97 (10.3)	71 (9.9)	26 (11.6)	
<i>Nausea</i>	No	823 (87.5)	626 (87.4)	197 (87.6)	0.948
	Yes, any grade	118 (12.5)	90 (12.6)	28 (12.4)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	42 (4.5)	30 (4.2)	12 (5.3)	
<i>Chills</i>	No	835 (88.7)	639 (89.2)	196 (87.1)	0.446
	Yes, any grade	106 (11.3)	77 (10.8)	29 (12.9)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	47 (5)	34 (4.7)	13 (5.8)	
<i>Vomit</i>	No	915 (97.2)	697 (97.3)	218 (96.9)	0.895
	Yes, any grade	26 (2.8)	19 (2.7)	7 (3.1)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	11 (1.2)	8 (1.1)	3 (1.3)	
<i>Any LIS-AEFI</i>	No	85 (9.1)	40 (5.6)	45 (20.0)	<0.001
	Yes, any grade	852 (90.9)	672 (94.4)	180 (80.0)	
<i>Redness</i>	No	179 (19.1)	42 (5.9)	137 (60.9)	<0.001
	Yes, any grade	758 (80.9)	670 (94.1)	88 (39.1)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	556 (59.3)	511 (71.8)	45 (20.0)	
<i>Induration</i>	No	178 (19.0)	59 (8.3)	119 (52.9)	<0.001
	Yes, any grade	759 (81.0)	653 (91.7)	106 (47.1)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	450 (48.0)	396 (55.6)	54 (24.0)	
<i>Pain</i>	No	276 (29.5)	219 (30.8)	57 (25.3)	0.141
	Yes, any grade	661 (70.5)	493 (69.2)	168 (74.7)	
	Yes, moderate or severe	291 (31.1)	214 (30.1)	77 (34.2)	

*Chi-square or Fisher's exact test as appropriate, comparing No vs Yes, any grade or No vs Yes, moderate or severe.

Table 3. Prevalence and risk of developing different grades of Systemic and Local Adverse Effects Following Immunisation (S-AEFIs and L-AEFIs) with MVA-BN Vaccine from fitting a multinomial logistic regression according to administration route - intradermal (ID) vs subcutaneous (SC).

		Prevalence of S-AEFIs and OR (ID vs. SC)					
Systemic symptoms	max severity	ID n (%)	SC n (%)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI) ID vs. SC	p-value	Adjusted* OR (95% CI) ID vs. SC	p-value
<i>Fatigue</i>	None	370 (51.7)	132 (58.7)	1	<0.001	1	0.673
	Mild	183 (25.6)	35 (15.6)	1.87 (1.23, 2.82)		0.95 (0.40, 2.24)	
	Moderate	120 (16.8)	30 (13.3)	1.43 (0.91, 2.23)		1.67 (0.66, 4.26)	
	Severe	43 (6.0)	28 (12.4)	0.55 (0.33, 0.92)		1.54 (0.49, 4.81)	
<i>Headache</i>	None	463 (64.7)	160 (71.1)	1	0.011	1	0.045
	Mild	161 (22.5)	29 (12.9)	1.92 (1.24, 2.96)		2.91 (1.23, 6.89)	
	Moderate	68 (9.5)	25 (11.1)	0.94 (0.57, 1.54)		1.37 (0.44, 4.27)	
	Severe	24 (3.4)	11 (4.9)	0.75 (0.36, 1.57)		7.17 (0.74, 69.81)	
<i>Myalgia</i>	None	541 (75.6)	167 (74.2)	1	0.915	1	0.675
	Mild	104 (14.5)	32 (14.2)	1.00 (0.65, 1.55)		1.04 (0.39, 2.78)	
	Moderate	45 (6.3)	17 (7.6)	0.82 (0.46, 1.47)		1.27 (0.37, 4.32)	
	Severe	26 (3.6)	9 (4.0)	0.89 (0.41, 1.94)		2.47 (0.57, 10.68)	
<i>Nausea</i>	None	626 (87.4)	197 (87.6)	1	0.294	1	0.723
	Mild	60 (8.4)	16 (7.1)	1.18 (0.66, 2.10)		1.79 (0.50, 6.46)	
	Moderate	17 (2.4)	10 (4.4)	0.53 (0.24, 1.19)		0.55 (0.10, 3.13)	
	Severe	13 (1.8)	2 (0.9)	Nd		Nd	
<i>Chills</i>	None	639 (89.2)	196 (87.1)	1	0.089	1	0.698
	Mild	43 (6.0)	16 (7.1)	0.82 (0.45, 1.50)		1.13 (0.37, 3.50)	
	Moderate	20 (2.8)	12 (5.3)	0.51 (0.25, 1.06)		0.27 (0.03, 2.48)	
	Severe	14 (2.0)	1 (0.4)	Nd		Nd	
<i>Vomit</i>	None	697 (97.3)	218 (96.9)	1	0.195	1	0.748
	Mild	11 (1.5)	4 (1.8)	0.86 (0.27, 2.73)		2.68 (0.21, 33.94)	
	Moderate	3 (0.4)	3 (1.3)	Nd		Nd	
	Severe	5 (0.7)	0 (0.0)	Nd		Nd	
		Prevalence of L-AEFIs and OR (ID vs. SC)					
Local symptoms	max severity	ID n (%)	SC n (%)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI) ID vs. SC	p-value	Adjusted* OR (95% CI) ID vs. SC	p-value
<i>Redness</i>	None	42 (5.9)	137 (60.9)	1	0.089	1	<0.001
	Mild	159 (22.3)	43 (19.1)	12.06 (7.44, 19.54)		26.87 (6.87, 105.1)	

	Moderate	328 (46.1)	25 (11.1)	42.80 (25.10, 72.98)		65.91 (16.39, 265.1)	
	Severe	183 (25.7)	20 (8.9)	29.85 (16.77, 53.13)		48.44 (11.71, 200.4)	
Induration	None	59 (8.3)	119 (52.9)	1	<0.001	1	<0.001
	Mild	257 (36.1)	52 (23.1)	9.97 (6.47, 15.35)		12.08 (4.44, 32.89)	
	Moderate	292 (41.0)	37 (16.4)	15.92 (10.02, 25.29)		14.92 (5.03, 44.22)	
	Severe	104 (14.6)	17 (7.6)	12.34 (6.77, 22.49)		16.28 (4.73, 55.98)	
Pain	None	219 (30.8)	57 (25.3)	1	0.425	1	0.002
	Mild	279 (39.2)	91 (40.4)	0.80 (0.55, 1.16)		0.36 (0.16, 0.81)	
	Moderate	165 (23.2)	60 (26.7)	0.72 (0.47, 1.08)		0.14 (0.05, 0.39)	
	Severe	49 (6.9)	17 (7.6)	0.75 (0.40, 1.40)		0.57 (0.15, 2.18)	

* Adjusted for age and HIV status.

95% CI: 95% Confidence Interval

Nd: not determined

Table 4. Contrasts of the duration of Systemic and Local Adverse Effects Following Immunisation (S-AEFIs and L-AEFIs) with MVA-BN Vaccine (days 1-28 after 1st dose) and ATE[&] from fitting a linear regression model.

	Potential average duration of systemic symptoms (days) over 1-28 days after the 1 st vaccine dose			
	Mean in ID (95% CI)	Mean in SC (95% CI)	ATE* (95% CI) ID vs. SC	p-value
<i>S-AEFIs</i>				
<i>Fatigue - any</i>	3.70 (2.63, 4.77)	3.46 (2.21, 4.72)	0.24 (-1.36, 1.84)	0.7720
<i>Fatigue - moderate or severe</i>	2.95 (1.26, 4.63)	3.03 (1.07, 4.98)	-0.08 (-2.52, 2.36)	0.9488
<i>Headache - any</i>	2.20 (1.53, 2.87)	2.51 (1.81, 3.20)	-0.30 (-1.24, 0.63)	0.5269
<i>Headache - moderate or severe</i>	2.53 (0.99, 4.07)	2.20 (1.23, 3.16)	0.34 (-1.37, 2.04)	0.7005
<i>Myalgia - any</i>	3.65 (2.11, 5.19)	3.12 (2.14, 4.10)	0.52 (-1.21, 2.25)	0.5527
<i>Myalgia - moderate or severe</i>	3.20 (0.51, 5.90)	2.17 (0.71, 3.63)	1.03 (-1.64, 3.70)	0.4479
<i>Nausea - any</i>	3.31 (1.61, 5.00)	1.74 (1.17, 2.30)	1.57 (-0.09, 3.22)	0.0632
<i>Chills - any</i>	2.10 (1.32, 2.88)	1.92 (1.07, 2.77)	0.18 (-0.85, 1.21)	0.7289
<i>L-AEFIs</i>				
<i>Redness - any</i>	18.66 (16.76, 20.55)	5.90 (3.72, 8.09)	12.76 (9.96, 15.55)	<0.0001
<i>Redness - moderate or severe</i>	7.14 (5.61, 8.66)	4.24 (2.06, 6.42)	2.90 (0.41, 5.39)	0.0226
<i>Induration - any</i>	16.62 (14.51, 18.73)	5.54 (3.66, 7.41)	11.09 (8.45, 13.72)	<0.0001
<i>Induration - moderate or severe</i>	5.55 (4.08, 7.02)	3.23 (2.66, 3.81)	2.32 (0.75, 3.89)	0.0037
<i>Pain - any</i>	6.18 (4.66, 7.70)	4.37 (3.86, 4.88)	1.81 (0.22, 3.39)	0.0254
<i>Pain - moderate or severe</i>	4.77 (1.69, 7.85)	3.13 (2.54, 3.72)	1.64 (-1.54, 4.82)	0.3124

[&]Average Treatment Effect *weighted for age and HIV status

Table 5. Potential average change one month after the completion of vaccination cycle according to the route of administration of the first dose and ATE[&] from fitting a linear regression model (log₂ scale)

	Mean (log₂) in ID (95% CI)	Mean (log₂) in SC (95% CI)	ATE* (95% CI)	p-value
Elispot	1.74 (1.31, 2.17)	1.33 (0.94, 1.73)	0.41 (-0.19, 1.01)	0.183
IgG	1.22 (1.00, 1.43)	0.96 (0.80, 1.13)	0.26 (-0.00, 0.51)	0.053
nAbs	0.84 (0.53, 1.16)	0.50 (0.28, 0.72)	0.34 (-0.04, 0.72)	0.076

[&]Average Treatment Effect; ^{*}weighted for age and HIV-status

Figure 1. Distribution of reactivity and referred severity of Systemic and Local Injection Site Adverse Effect Following Immunisation (S-AEFIs and LIS-AEFIs) with the first dose of MVA-BN Vaccine within 28-days from vaccination according to route of administration [All: N=943; Sub-cutaneous (SC): N=225; Intra-dermal (ID): N=718]. p<0.10 are shown; p values refer to the difference in the proportion of any grade symptom between the SC and ID groups.

