medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The potential global impact and cost-effectiveness of next-generation influenza vaccines: a modelling analysis

Short title: Global impact of next-generation influenza vaccines

Lucy Goodfellow[1*], Simon R Procter[1*], Mihaly Koltai[1], Naomi R Waterlow[1], Johnny A N Filipe[1], Carlos K H Wong[1,2], Edwin van Leeuwen[1,3], WHO Technical Advisory Group for the Full Value of Influenza Vaccines Assessment[±], Rosalind M Eggo[1^], Mark Jit[1^]

* equal contribution
^ equal contribution
± Members: Jon Abramson, Salah Al Awaidy, Eduardo Azziz-Baumgartner, Edwine Barasa, Paula Barbosa, Silvia Bino, Joseph Bresee, Rebecca Cox, Carlo Federici, Lu-Zhao Feng, Shawn Gilchrist, Rosalind Hollingsworth, Kathryn Lafond, Philipp Lambach, Dafrossa Lyimo, Stefano Malvolti, Carsten Mantel, Jodie McVernon, Harish Nair, Anthony T Newall, Punnee Pitisuttithum, Diane Post, Sara Sá Silva, Adam Soble, Rajinder Suri, Cécile Viboud, Joseph T Wu

Correspondence: lucy.goodfellow@lshtm.ac.uk

1. Department of Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Dynamics, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London WC14 7HT, United Kingdom
2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health ($D^2$4H), Hong Kong SAR, China
3. Modelling and Economics Unit and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit, UK Health Security Agency, London NW9 5EQ, United Kingdom

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background

Next-generation influenza vaccines (NGIVs) are in development and have the potential to achieve greater reductions in influenza burden, with resulting widespread health and economic benefits. Understanding the prices at which their market can be sustained and which vaccination strategies may maximise impact and cost-effectiveness, particularly in low- and middle-income countries, can provide a valuable tool for vaccine development and investment decision-making at a national and global level. To address this evidence gap, we projected the health and economic impact of NGIVs in 186 countries and territories.

Methods and Findings

We inferred current influenza transmission parameters from World Health Organization (WHO) FluNet data in regions defined by their transmission dynamics, and projected thirty years of influenza epidemics, accounting for demographic changes. Vaccines considered included current seasonal vaccines, vaccines with increased efficacy, duration, and breadth of protection, and universal vaccines, defined in line with the WHO Preferred Product Characteristics. We estimated cost-effectiveness of different vaccination scenarios using novel estimates of key health outcomes and costs.

NGIVs have the potential to substantially reduce influenza burden: compared to no vaccination, vaccinating 50% of children aged under 18 annually prevented 1.3 (95% uncertainty range (UR): 1.2-1.5) billion infections using current vaccines, 2.6 (95% UR: 2.4-2.9) billion infections using vaccines with improved efficacy or breadth, and 3.0 (95% UR: 2.7-3.3) billion infections using universal vaccines. In many countries, NGIVs were cost-effective at higher prices than typically paid for existing seasonal vaccines. However, cross-subsidy may be necessary for improved vaccines to be cost-effective in lower income countries.

This study is limited by the availability of accurate data on influenza incidence and influenza-associated health outcomes and costs. Furthermore, the model involves simplifying assumptions around vaccination coverage and administration, and does not account for societal costs or budget impact of NGIVs. How NGIVs will compare to the vaccine types considered in this model when developed is unknown. We conducted sensitivity analyses to investigate key model parameters.

Conclusions

This study highlights the considerable potential health and economic benefits of NGIVs, but also the variation in cost-effectiveness between high-income and low- and middle-income countries. This work provides a framework for long-term global cost-effectiveness evaluations, and contributes to a full value of influenza vaccines assessment to inform recommendations by WHO, providing a pathway to developing NGIVs and rolling them out globally.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abbreviations

DALY - Disability-Adjusted Life Years
GDP - Gross Domestic Product
HIC - High-Income Country
IFR - Infection-Fatality Ratio
IHR - Infection-Hospitalisation Ratio
ITZ - Influenza Transmission Zone
LIC - Low-Income Country
LMIC - Lower-Middle-Income Country
MCMC - Markov Chain Monte Carlo
NGIV - Next-Generation Influenza Vaccine
NNV - Number Needed to Vaccinate
PPC - Preferred Product Characteristic
UMIC - Upper-Middle-Income Country
UR - Uncertainty Range
VE - Vaccine Effectiveness
WHO - World Health Organization
WTP - Willingness-To-Pay
YLL - Year of life lost

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Globally, seasonal influenza is a substantial cause of respiratory illness, morbidity, and mortality, causing 291 ,000-646, 000 deaths annually and significant economic impact through healthcare costs, costs to the individual, and productivity losses [1–3]. The burden varies between countries and wider geographical regions, due to variation in circulating influenza strains and subtypes, population age structure, and current vaccination programmes and coverage. Furthermore, the timing and regularity of influenza epidemics ranges widely around the world, as does the quality and reliability of influenza surveillance data [4].

Seasonal influenza vaccines have been available since the 1940s, and have been subject to extensive improvements and developments since their introduction [5]. However, while influenza vaccines are widely used in the Americas and some high-income countries (HICs), seasonal vaccination coverage remains low globally, and as of 2024 only 34% of low- and lower-middle income countries have a national policy for seasonal influenza vaccination [6].

Current seasonal influenza vaccines face several barriers that can limit their impact and cost-effectiveness. Their duration of protection is less than a year [7], which does not provide immunity through long or multi-peak seasons in temperate and tropical climates, and also requires annual revaccination. Current vaccines must also be reformulated annually based on early estimates of circulating influenza strains and subtypes due to the long timeframe needed for vaccine production. This can lead to very low vaccine effectiveness (VE) in some seasons, particularly in older people for whom vaccines are typically less effective [8]. Next-generation influenza vaccines (NGIVs) are in development which aim to address these limitations, with 40 vaccine candidates currently in clinical trials and over 170 preclinical candidates [9]. The World Health Organization (WHO) defines several types of NGIVs using Preferred Product Characteristics (PPCs); they are categorised as *'improved'* vaccines, which have increased efficacy or breadth of protection and length of immunity, and *'universal'* vaccines, which have an increased efficacy and breadth of protection, and immunity lasting up to 5 years [10].

Previous cost-effectiveness analyses conducted in Kenya, UK, and USA have found NGIVs to be cost-effective over a range of willingness-to-pay (WTP) thresholds [11,12]. However, understanding the potential cost-effectiveness of NGIVs globally, and the vaccine prices at which their market can be sustained, is key to informing the planning of possible future investments and decisions made by manufacturers, governments, and potential donors. Here, we expand on models previously used to estimate the national-level cost-effectiveness of NGIVs to generate global estimates.

Methods

We used a modelling framework consisting of four steps (Figure 1a) to assess the future impact and cost-effectiveness of NGIVs in 186 countries and territories (hereafter referred to as just countries). The steps were: (1) epidemiological inference model (infer current influenza transmission parameters in regions with similar transmission dynamics), (2) vaccination model (project age- and vaccination status-specific populations in each country), (3) epidemic model (simulate future influenza epidemics), and (4) economic model (estimate cost-effectiveness).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Populations were stratified into four age categories: 0-4, 5-19, 20-64, and 65+ years of age. The age-stratified transmission model used was an extension of the *FluEvidenceSynthesis* model (Figure 1b) [13], and consisted of 13 compartments: Susceptible (S), Exposed (E1, E2), Infectious (I1, I2), and Recovered (R), their ineffectively vaccinated counterparts (Sv-Rv), and Rev (individuals who were vaccinated effectively) (Figure 1b). The E and I populations were split into two sequential compartments to produce gamma-distributed latent and infectious periods. Susceptibles who were infected progressed through the E and I compartments and entered the R compartment after ceasing to be infectious, whereupon they could not be re-infected during the same epidemic. This transmission model was used for both the epidemic inference (Step 1) and epidemic model (Step 3).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(a)



(b)



Figure 1. a) Overview of modelling steps. Orange indicates inputs, brown indicates outputs and blue shows the modelling elements. **b)** Vaccination and transmission models. Compartments outlined in orange and transitions in solid orange are included in both the vaccination and the transmission models. Transitions in black are only included in the transmission model. *v* denotes the age-specific rates of vaccination, *a* the vaccine effectiveness, which varied by age and strain and depended annually on whether the vaccine matches circulating strains in each hemisphere, and *ω* vaccine-derived immunity waning. Each compartment was stratified by age (i) and strain (k). Ageing, births, and age-specific mortality are not included in this diagram.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Epidemiological inference model

WHO provides national-level weekly data on laboratory-confirmed influenza through FluNet, an online tool, but the availability and consistency of this data varies widely and could not be used to inform influenza epidemiology in every country [14]. We therefore used a global categorisation of countries with similar influenza epidemiology to project characteristics of influenza transmission inferred for a limited number of countries onto the rest of the world.

We expanded the seven Influenza Transmission Zones (ITZs) produced by Chen et al. [4], which classified 109 countries with data available in FluNet using influenza season timing, laboratory-confirmed influenza positivity, and location parameters. The 77 countries not classified in Chen et al. due to insufficient influenza surveillance data were assigned to an existing ITZ based on location parameters (Supplementary Section 2b). The exemplar countries for each ITZ were chosen to maximise the number of years with available data in FluNet and number of laboratory tests performed: Argentina (Southern America), Australia (Oceania-Melanesia-Polynesia), Canada (Northern America), China (Eastern & Southern-Asia), Ghana (Africa), Turkey (Asia-Europe), United Kingdom (Europe). In each exemplar country, we identified distinct influenza A and influenza B epidemics using weekly laboratory-confirmed influenza incidence in the inference period of 1st January 2010 to 31st December 2019 (Supplementary Section 2d).

In each exemplar country, age-specific seasonal vaccination coverage was assumed to be constant over the 2010-2019 inference period based on estimates from the same time period, with the exception of the UK, where seasonal vaccination policy changed in 2013 (Supplementary Section 3d). We determined whether vaccine strains ‘matched’ or ‘mismatched’ dominant circulating strains of influenza A and B in the Northern and Southern Hemisphere in each year using peer-reviewed literature (Supplementary Section 3e). In line with existing literature, we assumed that in years in which the vaccine strains matched the circulating influenza viruses, VE against infection was 70% in under 65 year olds, and 46% in the age group 65+, compared to 42% and 28%, respectively, in mismatched years [12,15].

We fitted our model to incidence data independently for each identified epidemic using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm in the *BayesianTools* R package [16], and obtained joint posterior samples of the reporting rate, population susceptibility, transmissibility, and initial number of infections (Supplementary Section 3f).

Vaccination model

To ascertain the future impact of NGIVs, we used a 30 year simulation period between 1st January 2025 to 31st December 2054. The vaccination model tracked the vaccination status-specific size of each age group over time. Demographic changes (births, mortality, ageing) occurred annually on April 1st (Northern Hemisphere) or October 1st (Southern Hemisphere) using projected 2025 demographic parameters (Supplementary Section 5a). Vaccinations were given over a twelve-week period, beginning on October 1st (Northern Hemisphere) or April 1st (Southern Hemisphere). A proportion of those vaccinated, defined by VE, became immune to infection and entered the Rev compartment; the complement of this proportion did not develop immunity and entered the Sv compartment (Figure 1b).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Individuals in Rev moved to S upon the waning of immunity. At the same rate, ineffectively vaccinated individuals returned to their unvaccinated counterpart compartment (i.e. Sv to S, Rv to R).

We considered vaccination scenarios defined by combinations of 5 vaccine types as described by WHO PPCs [10] (Table 1) and 5 age-targeting strategies: ages 0-4, 0-10, 0-17, 65+, and 0-17 combined with 65+. The three *improved* vaccines have increased duration of protection, and efficacy or breadth of protection against strains; *universal* vaccines are enhanced in all aspects. Vaccine doses were distributed at a rate determined by the mean immunity duration of the vaccine type used (i.e. fewer vaccine doses were given annually for vaccine types with longer immunity duration). Vaccine doses were distributed independently of previous vaccination and infection status, but we did not assume any increased protection upon multiple doses (Supplementary Section 6b).

We assumed that vaccination coverage reached 50% in each age group targeted by vaccination programmes, and conducted sensitivity analyses considering 20% or 70% coverage in each targeted age group. We also ran analyses where only duration of immunity or VE improved in NGIVs, to disentangle the combined effects of NGIVs.

Vaccine type	Current seasonal vaccines	Improved (minimal)	Improved (efficacy)	Improved (breadth)	Universal vaccines
Mean duration of protection	6 months	1 year	2 years	3 years	5 years
Vaccine effectiveness (Matched 0-64, 65+/ Mismatched 0-64, 65+)	0.70, 0.46/ 0.42, 0.28	0.70, 0.46/ 0.42, 0.28	0.90, 0.70/ 0.70, 0.46	0.70, 0.46/ 0.70, 0.46	0.90, 0.70/ 0.90, 0.70
Mismatched seasons?	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No

Table 1. Vaccine types, based on WHO Preferred Product Characteristics [10]. Some vaccine types (including current) may have 'mismatched' seasons where their formulation does not match circulating strains.

Epidemic model

In each year of the simulation period, we randomly sampled a year from the inference period, and sampled the susceptibility and transmissibility of all epidemics starting in that year from their joint posterior distributions, to produce a thirty-year period of epidemics occurring with the same frequency and intensity as the inference period in each ITZ. We simulated epidemics in each of the 186 countries using the transmission model (Figure 1b), the sampled ITZ-specific epidemiological parameters, and the national age- and vaccination status-specific population sizes calculated in the vaccination model. This was repeated 100 times for each vaccine scenario to determine uncertainty in our estimates.

Infected individuals could experience asymptomatic infection, symptomatic but non-fever infection, fever, hospitalisation, and death. Data on seasonal influenza infection-fatality ratios (IFRs), which are highly age- and context-dependent, are sparse. We calculated national age-specific IFR estimates using data on seasonal influenza-associated respiratory deaths [1], and global age-specific infection-hospitalisation ratios (IHRs) using data from Paget et al. [17] (Supplementary Section 7a), and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

used these estimates to calculate the predicted number of hospitalisations and deaths. We conducted a systematised review to compare our IFR estimates against the limited literature (Supplementary Section 10). There is evidence to support the hypothesis that vaccinated individuals who develop breakthrough infections experience less severe influenza;[18,19] we conducted a sensitivity analysis in which breakthrough infections experienced a 50% reduction in both IHR and IFR, and another in which the infectiousness of individuals experiencing breakthrough infections was assumed to be 50% lower.

Economic model

To estimate the cost-effectiveness of each vaccination scenario, we used a decision tree model (Supplementary Figure S26) and a no-vaccination scenario as the comparator, as national-level data on current seasonal vaccination coverage is sparse and vaccination coverage is low in most of the global population. We calculated the disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted by estimating age-specific Years of Life Lost (YLLs) per influenza death using national life tables and combining this with Years Lived with Disability (YLDs) for symptomatic cases, fevers, and hospitalisations (Supplementary Section 7a). Future DALYs were discounted at a rate of 3%, and in a sensitivity analysis reduced to 0%, as recommended by WHO [20].

We estimated costs from a healthcare-payer perspective (Supplementary Section 7b). We estimated national costs of hospitalised cases using data from existing systematic reviews in a regression model predicted by national gross domestic product (GDP) per capita, and included the cost of outpatient visits in a sensitivity analysis. Country-level costs of vaccine dose delivery were estimated using data from a meta-regression for low- and middle-income countries [21], and extrapolated to HICs using a regression against healthcare expenditure per capita. Future costs were discounted at a rate of 3%, and all costs were expressed in 2022 USD.

To inform the potential return on investment to NGIVs developers, we calculated threshold prices per dose for each country below which vaccination would be cost-effective. We used WTP thresholds estimated in Pichon-Riviere et al. [22], which are based on national per-capita health expenditures and life expectancy, and conducted a sensitivity analysis using WTP thresholds of 50% of GDP per capita.

Results

The expanded ITZs and selected exemplar countries are shown in Figure 2a. In most exemplar countries, observed epidemics followed regular seasonality, but the timing of outbreaks was less regular in Ghana and China (the African and Eastern and Southern Asian ITZs, respectively; Figure 2b). Posterior estimates of susceptibility and transmissibility inferred for each epidemic were in similar ranges (Supplementary Section 4).

Globally, the number of influenza infections averted depended on the vaccine characteristics and age-targeting strategies. *Current* vaccines would prevent 1.33 (95% uncertainty range (UR): 1.20-1.48) billion, or 37% of, infections annually when vaccinating 50% of 0-17 year olds worldwide compared to no vaccinations, but only 117 (95% UR: 105-129) million, or 3% of, infections when targeting the 65+ age group. The number of infections averted increased for NGIVs, with *improved (minimal)* preventing 1.93 (95% UR: 1.72-2.11) billion and *improved (efficacy)* and *improved (breadth)* both preventing 2.65 (95%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

UR: 2.29-2.93) billion annual infections when targeting 0-17 year olds, while *universal* vaccines prevented 2.96 (95% UR: 2.70-3.27) billion, or 83% of, infections annually. See Table S8 for annual influenza infections averted under each vaccination scenario.



Figure 2. a) Map of influenza transmission zones. White dots show exemplar countries for each influenza transmission zone. **b)** FluNet data in each exemplar country over the inference period, stratified by influenza strain, showing total number of positive tests. Shaded time periods indicate identified epidemics.

Some age-targeting strategies were clearly more effective than others: while vaccinating children aged 0-10 required approximately the same number of vaccine doses as vaccinating adults aged over 65, the former strategy prevented up to 9.5x as many infections and 2.5x as many deaths. This is likely because young children have higher contact rates, and so preventing infections in children can lead to highly effective indirect protection for unvaccinated individuals. The global number needed to vaccinate (NNV) to avert one DALY was consistently lowest in the 0-10 age-targeting strategy, and highest in the 65+ age-targeting strategy (Figure 3a), similarly for NNV against infections, hospitalisations, and deaths

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

(Figure S31). While most infections were prevented in the 20-64 age group, averted hospitalisations were concentrated in children under age 5 and adults aged 65+, and fatalities in the 65+ age group (Figure 3b).

Under no vaccinations, we estimated the average annual number of hospitalisations and deaths between 2025-2054 to be 4.83 (95% UR: 2.82-7.34) million and 1.06 (95% UR: 0.80-1.42) million, respectively. This figure is higher than current estimates [1], due to the assumption of no vaccinations and since populations are predicted to grow and age in the next 30 years. Vaccinating all children under age 18 with *current* vaccines prevented 1.85 (95% UR: 1.06-2.82) million annual hospitalisations and 357,000 (95% UR: 279,000, 454,000) annual deaths compared to no vaccinations; these figures increased to 2.63 (95% UR: 1.53-3.95) million and 519,000 (95% UR: 401,000-653,000) under *improved (minimal)* vaccines, and 4.04 (95% UR: 2.33-6.12) million and 826,000 (95% UR: 641,000-1,050,000) under *universal* vaccines.



Figure 3: a) Global number needed to vaccinate to avert one DALY, for each vaccine type and age-targeting strategy, on a log scale. **b)** Global averted annual age-specific health outcomes under each age-targeting strategy and vaccine type, with 95% uncertainty ranges.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Threshold prices below which vaccines are cost-effective tended to increase with national-level income, but varied between countries with similar GDP per capita, even within the same ITZ, indicating that willingness to pay for NGIVs also depends on epidemiology and demography (Figure 4a). NGIVs were associated with higher threshold prices than current seasonal influenza vaccines under all age-targeting strategies in all World Bank income groups (Figure 4b). The 0-10 age-targeting strategy was associated with the highest threshold price across vaccine types in the majority of countries (Figure S40).

We found that *current* seasonal vaccines were not cost-effective in any low-income countries (LICs) under any age-targeting strategy or price, and only had positive threshold prices in 31% of lower-middle-income countries (LMICs) when vaccinating all children aged 0-10 (Table S12). In comparison, vaccinating the same age group with *current* seasonal vaccines had positive threshold prices in 98% of HICs, and reached up to $430 (95% UR: $200-$810). *Improved (minimal, efficacy, breadth)* vaccines had feasible threshold prices in very few LICs, but were associated with median threshold prices of up to $12, $32, and $41, respectively, in LMICs when vaccinating children aged 0-10. These vaccines could therefore be cost-effective in many countries, but are unlikely to be cost-effective in LICs without substantial subsidy, as the unit price of newly introduced NGIVs may be higher than the estimated threshold prices.

Universal vaccines had positive threshold prices in the majority of countries (184/186) under the 0-10 age-targeting strategy. Median threshold prices ranged up to $5.50 in LICs and $78 in LMICs, ranged between $7.90 and $960 in upper-middle-income countries (UMICs), and between $65 and $4800 in HICs. It is therefore likely that *universal* vaccines will be highly cost-effective in HICs, many UMICs and LMICs, but few LICs without substantial subsidy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. a) Median national threshold prices per vaccine dose and 95% uncertainty ranges for each vaccine type when vaccinating 50% of those aged 0-10, on a log-log scale. **b)** Median national threshold vaccine price in each World Bank income group, for each vaccine type and age-targeting strategy.

We conducted a range of sensitivity analyses (Supplementary Section 9). More infections, hospitalisations, and deaths were prevented when 70% coverage was achieved in targeted age groups, instead of 50%, similarly less for 20%, but increasing vaccination coverage from 50% to 70% had a diminishing marginal impact of each vaccine dose in terms of reduction of infection (Table S13). Reduced relative infectiousness or disease modifying in breakthrough infections was associated with a small further reduction in the number of infections over the thirty-year period, although the impact on threshold prices for each vaccine type was small. When comparing the effects of increasing VE or the length of immunity provided, more benefits were found to be due to increased length of immunity.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

We found that using NGIVs could have a dramatic impact on global influenza burden and be cost-effective in most parts of the world even if prices are high. Vaccinating children aged under 18 years old with currently licensed vaccines could prevent 37% of influenza infections (1.33 billion infections) when compared to no influenza vaccinations; this increased to 53% using *minimally improved* vaccines and 83% using *universal* vaccines. However, for all vaccine types, we found less impact per dose in extending coverage above age ten.

The unit price at which NGIVs could be cost-effective varied widely. In many countries, NGIVs are likely to be cost-effective if they were to become available at prices similar to or higher than other recently introduced vaccines [23]. *Universal* influenza vaccines could become one of the highest value vaccines available in some HICs, with threshold prices reaching thousands of dollars. Conversely, in some LICs, only slightly *improved* vaccines might not be cost-effective from a health-service perspective even if donated for free, and *universal* vaccines would not be cost-effective in any LICs if they were priced at over $6. Our findings highlight the likely need for financial subsidies for procurement and delivery (e.g. through aggressively tiered prices or support from Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance) for such vaccines to be accessible globally. These results are consistent with previous country-level analyses' findings that *universal* vaccines would likely be cost-effective in the UK, and in Kenya if priced less than $4.94 per dose using a WTP threshold of 45% of GDP per capita [11,12].

We developed novel approaches to simulating future influenza epidemics globally, which allowed us to account for the impact of future demographic changes. A limitation of our data sources was that the model could only be fitted using ten years of influenza data, was subject to simplifying assumptions such as age-consistent reporting rates, and assumed broadly consistent epidemiology across wide regions of the world. We also did not capture within-country variation in vaccine policy and epidemiology, which may be important in geographically large countries such as Canada and China.

The vaccine types considered in this study were guided by WHO PPCs, which are based on expert opinion from 2017 but may not reflect the current state of vaccine development. Using no vaccinations as a comparator scenario underestimates influenza burden in settings where current seasonal vaccination coverage is high, but these countries make up the minority of the global population as coverage is globally low. Epidemic inference in exemplar countries where coverage is high may have overlooked epidemics that would have occurred without any vaccinations; this effect is likely small, as we observed relatively consistent seasonality in these countries over the inference period.

Many of our simplifying assumptions cause the cost-effectiveness of NGIVs to be underestimated. The assumption that vaccine doses were delivered independently of vaccination and infection history could lead to underestimation of the benefits of NGIVs, since doses could be targeted at individuals with the longest interval since their last dose. Administering vaccines with longer duration of protection is likely to differ from current seasonal vaccination programmes, as populations could receive vaccinations all year round, as opposed to in a pre-epidemic period, or as part of a routine immunisation program, which could lead to further cost-saving. Vaccine wastage in the delivery process may also be lower for NGIVs, which we did not consider in this analysis. We did not consider potential future changes in the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

prevalence of chronic diseases which may be exacerbated by, or exacerbate, flu burden. Our estimated threshold prices were influenced by assumptions about the willingness to pay for improvements in health, for which we have used empirical estimates of the opportunity cost of alternative uses of the healthcare budget [22]. The analysis was performed using a healthcare-payer perspective, which does not account for wider economic costs such as out-of-pocket healthcare payments, time spent on informal care-giving, and lost income and improved productivity. Conversely, depending on the market price, there could be a substantial budget impact of NGIVs, particularly if they were to lead to a large expansion in existing influenza vaccine coverage, potentially decreasing cost-effectiveness.

In conclusion, NGIVs have the potential to significantly improve global health if made widely available, and could command higher prices than current seasonal vaccines in many countries, due to their higher VE and reduced need for re-vaccination. Given the high prices achievable in HICs, there may be potential for cross-subsidy in the vaccine market to enhance affordability in LICs and LMICs, for example via aggressively tiered pricing and pooled procurement schemes. While these NGIVs are not yet available, our findings have also shown the health and economic benefits of currently licensed seasonal influenza vaccines in many countries when targeted at children and adolescents.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Data Availability Statement

All analysis code is available at https://github.com/lucy-gf/flu_model_LG. All analyses were conducted using R (version 4.3.1) and RStudio (version 2024.04.1+748) software.

Competing Interests

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Acknowledgements

LG, SRP, NRW, RME and MJ were funded through the Task Force for Global Health in collaboration with Partnership for Influenza Vaccine Introduction (PIVI), Ready2Respond, Wellcome Trust, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and by the World Health Organization. JF and CW were funded by AIR@InnoHK administered by Innovation and Technology Commission, Government of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China, as part of the Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health ($D^2$4H).

EvL, RME, and MJ were also supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Health Protection Research Unit (HPRU) in Modelling and Health Economics, a partnership between UK HSA, Imperial College London, and LSHTM (grant number NIHR200908). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the UK Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC), NIHR, or UKHSA. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Author Contributions

SRP, NRW, MK, RME, and MJ conceived the study. LG, SRP, MK, NRW, EvL, RME, and MJ designed the methodology. LG, SRP, and MK analysed the data. LG and SRP built the model. LG made the figures. CW and JF conducted the systematised review. LG and SRP wrote the original draft. All authors interpreted the results, contributed to reviewing and editing of the manuscript and have approved the final version.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Iuliano AD, Roguski KM, Chang HH, Muscatello DJ, Palekar R, Tempia S, et al. Estimates of global seasonal influenza-associated respiratory mortality: a modelling study. Lancet Lond Engl. 2018;391: 1285–1300. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)33293-2
2. Van Wormer JJ, King JP, Gajewski A, McLean HQ, Belongia EA. Influenza and Workplace Productivity Loss in Working Adults. J Occup Environ Med. 2017;59: 1135–1139. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000001120
3. Federici C, Cavazza M, Costa F, Jommi C. Health care costs of influenza-related episodes in high income countries: A systematic review. De Boer PT, editor. PLOS ONE. 2018;13: e0202787. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0202787
4. Chen C, Jiang D, Yan D, Pi L, Zhang X, Du Y, et al. The global region-specific epidemiologic characteristics of influenza: World Health Organization FluNet data from 1996 to 2021. Int J Infect Dis. 2023;129: 118–124. doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2023.02.002
5. Kim Y, Hong K, Kim H, Nam J. Influenza vaccines: Past, present, and future. Rev Med Virol. 2022;32: e2243. doi:10.1002/rmv.2243
6. World Health Organization. Global Market Study, Seasonal Influenza Vaccine. 2024. Available: https://cdn.who.int/media/docs/default-source/immunization/mi4a/who_mi4a_global_market_study_seasonal_influenza_vaccine.pdf?sfvrsn=9f24acbf_3&download=true#:~:text=Seasonal%20influenza%20demand%20is%20stable,policy%20for%20seasonal%20influenza%20vaccination.
7. Young B, Sadarangani S, Jiang L, Wilder-Smith A, Chen MI-C. Duration of Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness: A Systematic Review, Meta-analysis, and Meta-regression of Test-Negative Design Case-Control Studies. J Infect Dis. 2018;217: 731–741. doi:10.1093/infdis/jix632
8. Belongia EA, McLean HQ. Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness: Defining the H3N2 Problem. Clin Infect Dis. 2019;69: 1817–1823. doi:10.1093/cid/ciz411
9. Universal Influenza Vaccine Technology Landscape | CIDRAP. 21 Feb 2017 [cited 14 Mar 2024]. Available: https://ivr.cidrap.umn.edu/universal-influenza-vaccine-technology-landscape
10. WHO Preferred Product Characteristics for Next-Generation Influenza Vaccines. 1 May 2017 [cited 14 Mar 2024]. Available: https://www.who.int/publications-detail-redirect/9789241512466
11. Waterlow NR, Radhakrishnan S, Dawa J, van Leeuwen E, Procter SR, Lambach P, et al. Potential health and economic impact of paediatric vaccination using next-generation influenza vaccines in Kenya: a modelling study. BMC Med. 2023;21: 106. doi:10.1186/s12916-023-02830-w
12. Waterlow NR, Procter SR, van Leeuwen E, Radhakrishnan S, Jit M, Eggo RM. The potential cost-effectiveness of next generation influenza vaccines in England and Wales: A modelling analysis. Vaccine. 2023;41: 6017–6024. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2023.08.031
13. Van Leeuwen E, Klepac P, Thorrington D, Pebody R, Baguelin M. fluEvidenceSynthesis: An R package for evidence synthesis based analysis of epidemiological outbreaks. Schneidman D, editor. PLOS Comput Biol. 2017;13: e1005838. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005838
14. World Health Organization. FluNet. In: Global Influenza Programme [Internet]. [cited 22 Aug 2024]. Available: https://www.who.int/tools/flunet
15. Baguelin M, Flasche S, Camacho A, Demiris N, Miller E, Edmunds WJ. Assessing Optimal Target Populations for Influenza Vaccination Programmes: An Evidence Synthesis and Modelling Study. Leung GM, editor. PLoS Med. 2013;10: e1001527. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001527
16. Hartig F, Minunno F, Paul S, Cameron D, Ott T, Pichler M. BayesianTools: General-Purpose MCMC and SMC Samplers and Tools for Bayesian Statistics. 2023. Available: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/BayesianTools/index.html
17. Paget J, Staadegaard L, Wang X, Li Y, van Pomeren T, van Summeren J, et al. Global and national influenza-associated hospitalisation rates: Estimates for 40 countries and administrative regions. J Glob Health. 2023;13: 04003. doi:10.7189/jogh.13.04003
18. Arriola C, Garg S, Anderson EJ, Ryan PA, George A, Zansky SM, et al. Influenza Vaccination Modifies Disease Severity Among Community-dwelling Adults Hospitalized With Influenza. Clin

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.09.19.24313950; this version posted September 22, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2017;65: 1289–1297. doi:10.1093/cid/cix468

19. Regan AK, Arriola CS, Couto P, Duca L, Loayza S, Nogareda F, et al. Severity of influenza illness by seasonal influenza vaccination status among hospitalised patients in four South American countries, 2013–19: a surveillance-based cohort study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2023;23: 222–232. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00493-5
20. World Health Organization. WHO guide for standardization of economic evaluations of immunization programmes, 2nd ed. 17 Oct 2019 [cited 25 Jun 2024]. Available: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-guide-for-standardization-of-economic-evaluations-of-immunization-programmes-2nd-ed
21. Portnoy A, Vaughan K, Clarke-Deelder E, Suharlim C, Resch SC, Brenzel L, et al. Producing Standardized Country-Level Immunization Delivery Unit Cost Estimates. PharmacoEconomics. 2020;38: 995–1005. doi:10.1007/s40273-020-00930-6
22. Pichon-Riviere A, Drummond M, Palacios A, Garcia-Marti S, Augustovski F. Determining the efficiency path to universal health coverage: cost-effectiveness thresholds for 174 countries based on growth in life expectancy and health expenditures. Lancet Glob Health. 2023;11: e833–e842. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00162-6
23. Hussain R, Bukhari NI, Ur Rehman A, Hassali MA, Babar Z-U-D. Vaccine Prices: A Systematic Review of Literature. Vaccines. 2020;8: 629. doi:10.3390/vaccines8040629