Inequalities in childhood pneumococcal conjugate vaccine uptake in England before and after the change from a 2+1 to 1+1 schedule: a longitudinal study

Praise Ilechukwu MSc[1], Daniel Hungerford, PhD[2,3], Neil French, Phd FRCP[2], Edward M. Hill, PhD[4,5,*]

[1]Department of Health Data Science, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

[2] The Centre for Global Vaccine Research, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

[3]Civic Health Innovation Labs, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

[4]Department of Public Health Policy and Systems, Institute of Population Health, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

[5]NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, United Kingdom.

*Corresponding author: Edward M Hill (Edward.Hill@liverpool.ac.uk)

Research in context

Evidence before this study

Pneumococcal conjugate vaccines (PCVs) have been part of the routine childhood immunisation schedule in England since September 2006, firstly using PCV7 (targeting seven serotypes) and then from 2010 PCV13 (targeting thirteen serotypes). This has resulted in reduced invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD) burden, although IPD continues to cause marked morbidity and mortality across the population, including young children. Originally administered as a "2+1" schedule (two primary doses at 8 and 16 weeks, with a booster dose at 12 months), England transitioned In January 2020 to a "1+1" PCV schedule (single primary dose at 12 weeks and a booster dose at 12 months). While immunogenicity studies suggested comparable protection, reducing primary vaccine doses places greater emphasis on timely booster uptake.

We searched PubMed, Google Scholar, and medRxiv for articles published in English from inception to 30 Nov 2025 with the following search terms: ("PCV-13" OR "13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine" OR "pneumococcal conjugate vaccine") AND (booster OR "third dose" OR "2+1 schedule" OR "additional dose") AND (children OR infants OR toddlers OR paediatric OR paediatric) AND ("vaccine effectiveness" OR "vaccine efficacy") AND "England". To our knowledge, an observational analysis investigating potential inequalities in Childhood Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine Uptake and resultant susceptibility to IPD in England Before and After the change from a 2+1 to 1+1 schedule in January 2020 has not been conducted.

Added value of this study

We analysed temporal and spatial trends and inequalities in PCV13 uptake across England at an Upper Tier Local Authority level for 2013-2025. This period included the January 2020 transition from a 2+1 to 1+1 dose schedule. The analysis revealed three critical findings: booster retention deteriorated under the 1+1 schedule; socioeconomic inequalities in vaccine uptake persisted and widened (particularly affecting the most deprived communities); using a susceptibility model that combined PCV uptake data with current knowledge on vaccine effectiveness estimates for PCV13 against vaccine type IPD, we highlight a growing inequitable susceptibility to vaccine type IPD in child cohorts.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our study shows that PCV booster retention has notably declined in England since the change from a '2+1' to a '1+1' schedule change. This means the full protective potential of the 1+1 schedule is not being realised. A trend of lower booster retention amongst children in more deprived areas risks avoidable disease burden being concentrated in the most disadvantaged communities and widening health inequalities. Other European and high-income countries considering a '1+1' schedule change should consider underlying inequality in vaccine uptake and booster retention before implementation. Systems strengthening and targeted, equity-focused interventions are needed to address the identified coverage gaps.

Abstract

Background: Introducing the pneumococcal conjugate vaccines (PCV) into the routine childhood immunisation schedule in England has reduced pneumococcal disease burden. Nonetheless, pneumococcal disease continues to afflict marked morbidity and mortality in the population, including young children. In January 2020, England transitioned from a "2+1" PCV schedule (two primary doses at 8 and 16 weeks, with a booster dose at 12 months) to a "1+1" PCV schedule (single primary dose at 12 weeks and a booster dose at 12 months). While immunogenicity studies suggested comparable protection, reducing primary vaccine doses places greater emphasis on timely booster uptake.

Methods: We examine national trends in PCV uptake before and after the schedule change and quantify inequalities by deprivation. We analysed quarterly vaccine uptake data for 2013-2025 from the Cover of Vaccination Evaluated Rapidly (COVER) programme for upper-tier local authorities in England linked to 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation quintiles. We examined booster gaps - the difference between primary coverage at 12 months and booster coverage at 24 months. We estimated susceptibility to pneumococcal disease (by birth cohort stratified by quarter) by combining observed PCV uptake with published vaccine effectiveness estimates.

Findings: Booster retention deteriorated following the schedule change; mean booster gaps increased from 2.32% (2+1 period) to 4.79% (1+1 period). The largest booster gaps arose in London boroughs. The gap between least and most deprived quintiles widened from 2-3% (2+1 period) to 4-6% (1+1 period). Susceptibility modelling estimated notable geographical variation in estimated vaccine type invasive pneumococcal disease susceptibility in England, with disproportionate burden in deprived areas.

Interpretations: The success of the 1+1 schedule depends on maintaining equitable, high booster uptake. Declining booster retention and widening inequalities threaten programme effectiveness. Strengthened follow-up systems and targeted interventions in deprived communities are essential to prevent widening protection gaps.

Funding: No specific funding for this project.

1. Introduction

Pneumococcal disease, caused by *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, remains a leading cause of vaccine-preventable illness and death globally, particularly in children under five years old. In 2019, globally an estimated 740,180 deaths (14% of all deaths) in children under five were attributable to S. pneumoniae (1). In England, the introduction of pneumococcal conjugate vaccines (PCVs) into the routine childhood immunisation schedule has led to declines in invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD) through direct and indirect (herd) immunity. PCV7 (targeting seven serotypes) was first introduced in September 2006, followed by PCV13 (targeting thirteen serotypes) in 2010 (2).

Within four years of both programmes, the maximum benefit of reducing IPD vaccine type (VT) serotypes - was reached, with a plateauing of VT IPD cases across all age groups. Prior to 2020, England's infant vaccination programme followed a 2+1 PCV13 schedule: two primary doses at 8 and 16 weeks, followed by a booster at 12 months. In January 2020 the UK became the first and to date, only European nation to have a reduced 1+1 schedule, a primary dose at 12 weeks and a booster at 12-months (3). The rationale for was supported by clinical trials and dynamic transmission modelling, which suggested similar levels of population protection could be maintained, provided that the booster uptake remained high (4).

Following the change in schedule, overall IPD incidence in 2022-23 remained 14% lower than pre-pandemic levels in 2019-20 (IRR 0.86, 95% CI 0.81-0.91; p<0.001), though incidence was 34% higher in children aged <15 years (378 cases vs 292 cases; IRR 1.34, 95% CI 1.08-1.68; p=0.009). Importantly, breakthrough infections and vaccine failure rates were not significantly different between children who received the 1+1 compared with the 2+1 PCV13 immunisation schedule (1.08 vs 0.76 per 100,000 person-years; IRR 1.42, 95% CI 0.78-2.49; p=0.20) (2).

Despite these assurances, concerns remain regarding the adequacy of individual-level protection under the reduced schedule. Recent data show that national booster coverage at 24 months has declined steadily since its peak of 92.5% in 2012–13, falling to 88.2% in 2023–24, whilst 12-month PCV coverage of 93.2% in 2023–24 was a 0.5 percentage point drop from the previous year (5). These trends raise questions about the sustainability of high coverage under the simplified 1+1 schedule, particularly in the context of existing health inequalities.

In England, vaccine uptake is lower in socioeconomic disadvantaged populations and there is a clear social gradient linked to deprivation for IPD burden (6). National surveillance data from the Northeast of England from April 2006 to March 2011 show that the incidence of IPD increased linearly from 7.0 cases per 100,000 population in the least socioeconomically deprived quintile to 13.6 cases per 100,000 in the most deprived—an increase of 114% (95% CI 80–156%) (7).

This paper explores two key areas of public health interest in the context of this schedule change. First, we investigated the temporal and spatial trends and inequalities in paediatric PCV13 uptake across cohorts receiving the 2+1 versus the 1+1 schedule in England. Second, we estimated and compared pneumococcal disease susceptibility among different cohorts; susceptibility in this context refers to the proportion of children in the population at risk to VT IPD – IPD caused by serotypes covered by PCV13 - due to either non-vaccination, partial vaccination (i.e. not completing the full schedule of doses) plus the residual risk of disease after full vaccination. By inferring susceptibility at different time points using vaccine effectiveness estimates against IPD available from the literature, we draw conclusions on how variations in booster uptake might influence susceptibility to VT IPD in early childhood.

2. Methods

Herein we overview our methodology to process the PCV uptake date from COVER (Section 2.1.1) and its linkage to a validated measure of socioeconomic deprivation for small areas in England, the Index of Multiple Deprivation (Section 2.1.2); analyse the PCV uptake data (Section 2.2); model pneumococcal disease susceptibility (Section 2.3).

We performed all data manipulation, statistical analysis and visualisation using R version 4.4.1 (8). All analysis code and cleaned datasets are publicly available: https://github.com/aaliswalker/DASC500-Dissertation---Inequalities-in-Childhood-Pneumococcal-Vaccine-Uptake-in-England

2.1 Datasets

2.1.1. PCV uptake data from COVER

We extracted quarterly PCV uptake data for England from the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) Cover of Vaccination Evaluated Rapidly (COVER) programme (9), spanning Q2 2013-2014 to Q4 2024–2025 (where quarters represent financial year periods: Q1 April-June, Q2 July-September, Q3 October-December, Q4 January-March). The data reported for upper-tier local authorities (UTLAs) vaccine uptake at 12 months (primary course) and 24 months (booster course), along with denominator eligible population counts for each cohort. The start and end of the COVID-19 period (11 March 2020 - 5 May 2023) were informed by available NHS data (10). See the S1 Text for additional information on COVER dataset processing.

2.1.2. Linkage of vaccine uptake data to Index of Multiple Deprivation

We linked the COVER vaccine uptake data to the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) for England via the Office for National Statistics (ONS) UTLA codes (11). We excluded The City of London and Isles of Scilly from all analyses due to their very small populations and unique administrative arrangements (12). We cross-checked each cleaned quarterly COVER dataset against this validated list of 149 UTLAs. All COVER observations contained valid ONS local authority codes. However, not all 149 UTLAs appeared in every quarterly file due to administrative boundary changes during the study period. We identified and resolved several additional UTLA code inconsistencies (see S2 Text for further details). The final analytical dataset comprised 6,816 observations across 149 distinct upper-tier local authorities.

We used the average IMD score for each local authority, following an approach used in recent studies examining local government inequalities (e.g. Murrell et al. (2024) (13)). We applied quintile-based stratification to reflect the population-weighted distribution of deprivation ('quintile 1' corresponded to the least deprived areas; 'quintile 5' corresponded to the most deprived areas). See S3 Text for a listing of UTLAs in each IMD quintile.

2.2. Analysis of PCV Uptake Data

2.2.1. Temporal trends in PCV uptake

We analysed national PCV uptake trends using weighted means (weighted by population denominators to account for varying local authority sizes). We inspected time series trends in 12-month primary coverage and 24-month booster coverage across the study period by IMD. We also examined spatial patterns through choropleth mapping linking UTLA boundaries to uptake data via ONS codes (14).

2.2.2. Booster retention analysis

We next examined changes in booster retention patterns following the schedule transition. For each quarter and each of the retained UTLAs, we computed the percentage point difference between the mean 12-month primary coverage one year prior and the mean 24-month booster coverage at the reference quarter. As an example, to examine booster retention for Q1 2023 we used the mean 12-month primary coverage from Q1 2022 and the mean 24-month booster coverage from Q1 2023.

We stratified our analysis by schedule period: the pre-schedule change period (2013/2014 to 2019/2020 - the 2+1 schedule era) and the post-schedule change period (2020/2021 to 2024/2025 - the 1+1 schedule era). For each schedule period we identified statistical outliers using the interquartile range (IQR) method (i.e. outlier thresholds calculated as the 75th percentile plus 1.5 times the IQR).

2.3. Pneumococcal disease susceptibility modelling

To estimate the vulnerability of specific birth cohorts to VT IPD at defined timepoints based on observed vaccine uptake patterns, we developed a simple protection model that combined the PCV coverage data with published vaccine effectiveness estimates for PCV13 against IPD. These estimates address susceptibility to VT IPD (i.e. IPD caused by serotypes covered by PCV13), but do not account for changes in risk form non-vaccine serotypes, which may vary over time.

2.3.1. The susceptibility model

We classified as susceptible those at risk from contracting VT IPD due to either non-vaccination, partial vaccination (i.e. not completing the full schedule of doses) or the residual risk of disease after full vaccination (6,15).

Consequently, for each birth cohort (stratified by quarter) we calculated susceptibility as:

$$Susceptibility = p_0 + p_1(1 - VE_1) + p_2(1 - VE_2)$$

where p_0 corresponds to the proportion of children unvaccinated, p_1 the proportion who received only the primary doses (referred to as the 'booster gap' – the difference between the booster vaccine uptake at 24 months in the reference quarter and the primary vaccine uptake at 12 months one year prior) and p_2 the proportion who received the booster dose - for instances where booster vaccine uptake at 24 months in the reference quarter was greater than primary vaccine uptake at 12 months one year prior, we assumed none of the population had received primary doses only (i.e. $p_1 = 0$). VE_1 and VE_2 denote the estimated vaccine effectiveness against VT IPD after receiving the primary doses and booster dose, respectively.

We assumed that vaccine protection remained constant at the specified effectiveness levels throughout the observation period (up to 24 months post-booster). We acknowledge that our susceptibility model does not account for partial catch-up, waning immunity or indirect (herd) protection effects. Nonetheless, it does provide a first-order approximation of the proportion of each cohort that remains vulnerable to IPD based on coverage gaps and estimates of vaccine effectiveness against IPD, thereby allowing comparisons across deprivation quintiles and time periods.

Table 1. Vaccine effectiveness estimates against invasive pneumococcal disease. *We list the used lower, central and upper estimates. We sourced the estimates from European based studies reported by Savulescu et al. (16).*

Dose	Schedule	Lower estimate	Central estimate	Upper estimate
Primary	2+1	60	76.1	86
	1+1 (baseline assumption)	29	60.6	78
	1+1 (alternate assumption)	60	76.1	86
Booster	All	56	78.2	89

2.3.2. Vaccine effectiveness assumptions

We selected vaccine effectiveness parameters for susceptibility modelling from the European multi-country study by Savulescu et al. (16). We expand below on our assumptions, with the vaccine effectiveness values used in the analysis summarised in Table 1.

For the 2+1 schedule, vaccine effectiveness estimates corresponded directly to the published effectiveness data (16). Due to limited post-implementation effectiveness data for the 1+1 schedule, vaccine effectiveness estimates required assumptions. For our main analysis, we assumed a vaccine effectiveness of 60.6% after the primary dose; this matched the vaccine effectiveness estimate after one dose in the 2+1 schedule. We refer to that assumption setup as the '1+1 (baseline assumption)' schedule.

To assess the robustness of our findings given this assumption, we considered a '1+1 (alternate assumption)' where the single primary dose administered at 12 weeks in the 1+1 schedule had an effectiveness value matching the vaccine effectiveness post the secondary dose in the 2+1 schedule (76.1%). This assignment reflects a best-case scenario where vaccine administration at 12 weeks, compared to 8 weeks in the 2+1 schedule, generates a more mature immune response functionally equivalent to a second priming dose. We assumed both schedules had an equivalent booster dose effectiveness (78.2%).

To account for uncertainty in VE estimates, we repeated the susceptibility estimation using lower and upper bounds for vaccine effectiveness against IPD reported in the literature. This enabled an exploration of best- and worst-case protection scenarios.

2.3.3. Measured outcomes

For the different dose schedule and vaccine effectiveness scenarios we report: (i) the estimated proportion of susceptible children within a designated strata); (ii) the estimated susceptibility by local authority. In S5 Text we additionally report the estimated cumulative number of susceptible children by quarterly birth cohort.

3. Results

3.1. Retained dataset characteristics

Our analysis encompassed 149 upper-tier local authorities across England, spanning an 11-year period from 2013/2014 to 2024/2025 and covering 46 quarterly reporting periods. The study population included over 7 million eligible children across both 12-month cohorts (7,036,482 children) and 24-month cohorts (7,235,389 children). The dataset contained 7,003 total observations.

3.2. Trends and inequalities in PCV uptake

3.2.1. Temporal trends in PCV uptake

National coverage patterns

During the pre-schedule change period (2+1 schedule, 2013-2020), coverage averaged 93.2% at 12-months and 91.2% at 24-months, yielding a booster gap of 2.0%. Following the transition to the 1+1 schedule (2020-2024), while 12-month coverage remained stable at 93.3%, 24-month booster coverage declined to 89.0%. The larger booster gap of 4.4% more than doubled the pre-schedule retention deficit.

Local authority patterns

Achievement of the World Health Organization's 95% coverage target varied substantially between primary and booster doses. For 12-month coverage, 42.1% of quarterly local authority observations (2,846 out of 6,768) met the 95% threshold, with minimal change between schedule periods (43% under the 2+1 schedule versus 40.9% under the 1+1 schedule). However, booster coverage performance was considerably weaker, with only 17.8% of observations (1,203 out of 6,768) achieving 95% coverage at 24 months. This is a deterioration from 23.3% of observations meeting the 95% target under the 2+1 schedule, falling to just 10.7% under the 1+1 schedule [S4 Text].

Deprivation-related inequalities

There were distinct patterns in PCV uptake across deprivation quintiles over the study period. Primary dose coverage at 12 months remained relatively stable across all deprivation quintiles before 2020, with most groups maintaining coverage between 90-95%. PCV booster coverage at 24-months was consistently lower than primary dose coverage across all quintiles, with a more pronounced deprivation gradient. Prior to 2020, booster coverage ranged from approximately 90-94% in the least deprived areas to 87-91% in the most deprived quintiles, representing a persistent gap of 2-4 percentage points [Figure 1].

Following the January 2020 schedule change, the COVID-19 pandemic period (2020-2022) caused sharp declines in coverage across all quintiles. The impact was more severe for booster doses, with all quintiles experiencing drops of 3-6 percentage points. The most deprived quintiles (4 and 5) showed larger declines and slower recovery, widening the pre-existing deprivation gap.

By 2023-2024, while 12-month coverage had largely recovered to pre-pandemic levels across most quintiles, 24-month booster coverage remained depressed, particularly in more deprived areas. The deprivation gradient persisted, with quintiles 4 and 5 showing booster coverage 2-3

percentage points below the least deprived quintile - a gap that appears to have widened compared to the pre-2020 period.

Excluding London UTLAs from our analysis substantially improved quintile 3 coverage, demonstrating that this quintile's poor performance is driven by London-specific challenges rather than deprivation per se. London boroughs comprise 31% of Quintile 3 areas but only 7-21% of other quintiles, creating a disproportionate impact on middle-deprivation coverage statistics. The impact of London exclusion is more pronounced for booster coverage than primary doses [Figure S4, S4 Text].



Figure 1. Trends in Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine (PCV) uptake at 12 and 24 months by deprivation quintile, 2013–2024. We display for children in England, *grouped by deprivation quintile (IMD 1 = least deprived, IMD 5 = most deprived)*, the: **(a)** *average primary dose PCV uptake at 12 months*; **(b)** average *booster dose uptake at 24 months*. *The dotted* horizontal *line marks the WHO-recommended 95% target coverage. The dashed vertical line marks the January 2020 schedule change from a "2+1" to a "1+1" dosing regimen. The shaded grey area highlights the* COVID-19 pandemic period. We see a persistent and widening in vaccine uptake over time between the most and least deprived IMD quintiles.

3.2.2. Booster retention comparison: Deterioration in the retention of booster doses post the schedule change

In the pre-schedule change period (2+1, 7-year average), Kensington and Chelsea, in London recorded the lowest overall coverage at 70.6% for the minimum of 12-month and 24-month uptake. The local authority with the largest booster gap was Hounslow, London (9.9%). We note that Lancashire recorded a 3.3% higher mean booster uptake by 24-months than mean primary dose coverage at 12-months in the pre-schedule change period. These data indicate potential reporting variations or catch-up vaccination patterns [Figure 2a]. The booster 'drop-off' distribution was heavily concentrated in the 1-2% range, with very few areas experiencing gaps exceeding 8 percentage points [Figure 2c].

In the post-schedule change period (1+1, 5-year average) the most concerning booster gaps were observed in Lewisham (11.3%), Greenwich (11.8%), and Brent (12.5%) - all London boroughs showing substantial deterioration in booster retention. Hackney recorded the lowest overall booster coverage at 65.5%, representing further decline in this already disadvantaged area [Figure 2b]. The post-schedule booster 'drop-off' distribution saw the modal bin move to approximately 2.5-3%, whilst becoming more dispersed and extending further into higher drop-off ranges. The maximum observed gap increased from approximately 9-10% to over 12% [Figure 2d].

These observations confirmed that the aggregate increase in mean booster gaps from 2.32% to 4.79% represented a systematic shift affecting many local authorities rather than being driven by a few extreme outliers. Deprivation-related patterns were also evident in both periods. Higher deprivation quintile areas (quintiles 4 and 5) more frequently appeared among the outliers with large booster gaps.



Figure 2. PCV booster retention: Comparison before and after schedule change. ***(a,b)*** *Each dot represents a local authority. Points are coloured by deprivation quintile. We show average coverage during the:* ***(a)*** *2+1 schedule period (pre-2020, seven-year average);* ***(b)*** *1+1 schedule period (post-2020, five-year average). The dashed grey line shows perfect retention (equal uptake at 12 and 24 months). Dots below the line indicate booster drop-off. The post-schedule change period has many local authorities falling further below the diagonal, indicating a widespread deterioration in booster completion rates in England. Red labels signify the local authority with the largest booster gap before and after the schedule change (Pre-schedule change: Hounslow, 9.9%; Post-schedule change: Brent, 12.5%). Green labels correspond to the local authorities with the lowest overall coverage.* ***Blue*** *labels are local authorities with higher 24-month than 12-month coverage.* ***(c,d)*** *Distribution of booster drop-off during the:* ***(c)*** *2+1 schedule period (pre-2020, seven-year average);* ***(d)*** *1+1 schedule period (post-2020, five-year average). The colour gradient transitions from yellow (lower drop-off) to red (higher drop-off rates). The dashed vertical line at zero indicates perfect retention (equal 12-month and 24-month coverage). There is an evident rightward shift in the distribution toward higher drop-off rates in the post-schedule period.*

3.3. Vaccine Type Invasive Pneumococcal Disease susceptibility

By combining observed vaccination uptake data with published vaccine effectiveness estimates, we modelled the proportion of children who remain susceptible to VT IPD across different time periods, deprivation levels, and geographic areas.

3.3.1. Most deprived populations have an increasing proportion of children susceptible to VT IPD

Susceptibility patterns to VT IPD varied considerably across deprivation quintiles and time periods. Quintile 3 demonstrated the most volatile patterns, with the highest susceptibility peaks exceeding 31% during 2017-2018 and again during 2020-2021. Throughout most of the study period, quintiles 3 and 5 (most deprived) showed the highest susceptibility levels, while quintile 1 (least deprived) generally maintained the lowest susceptibility [Figure 3a].

The overall pattern shows more stable susceptibility levels under the 2+1 schedule compared to the increased variability observed during the 1+1 implementation period. Under the 2+1 schedule, susceptibility levels showed gradual increases from 2013 onwards, rising from approximately 30% to 31% by late 2019. The transition period marked by the dashed line (January 2020) coincided with a sharp spike in susceptibility, reaching 49% during 2020-2021 Q1 [Figure 3b]. The 1+1 schedule period demonstrated greater volatility compared to the 2+1 era, with marked fluctuations particularly evident during 2020-2022 (coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic). The post-2020 period showed increased divergence between quintiles, with the gap between the best and worst performing quintiles widening from approximately 2-3% pre-2020 to 4-5% in later quarters.

3.3.2. Notable geographical variation in estimated VT IPD susceptibility in England

Susceptibility estimates demonstrated marked geographic heterogeneity across England, with local authority-level susceptibility ranging from 22.4% to 47.8% [Figure 4].

During the 2+1 schedule period (2013-2020), most local authorities displayed susceptibility levels between 20-30%, indicating moderate protection levels. There was consistent clustering of well-protected and more vulnerable areas [Figure 4, left panel]. Spatial patterns under the 1+1 schedule (2020-2025) were broadly similar; most local authorities continued to show susceptibility levels in the 20-30% range. Subtle variations in protection levels were evident across regions, but we did not see dramatic geographic polarisation [Figure 4, right panel].

3.3.3. Findings robust to alternate vaccine effectiveness assumption for the 1+1 schedule

Under the alternate assumption (1+1 primary dose VE = 76.1%, equivalent to completed 2+1 primary course), the mean population susceptibility within each schedule period and for all local authorities was 27.1% for both the 2+1 schedule period and 1+1 schedule period. That compared to a 0.7 percentage point increase in the mean population susceptibility between schedule periods under the baseline assumption (27.1% for the 2+1 schedule period; 27.8% for the 1+1 schedule period). The differing VE assumptions also resulted in a similar range in minimum and maximum mean susceptibility values across the local authorities during the 1+1 schedule period (Baseline assumption: 23.2-45.2%; Alternate assumption: 22.9-44.5%). Geographic patterns remained consistent across both VE assumptions, with similar spatial distributions of susceptibility levels and no dramatic changes in regional vulnerability patterns [S5 Text].



Figure 3. Estimated Susceptibility to Invasive Pneumococcal Disease by Deprivation Quintile: Baseline vs Alternate VE Assumption. *We display the upper panel: alternate assumption (1+1 primary dose VE = 76.1%); lower panel: baseline assumption (1+1 primary dose VE = 60.6%). Lines represent IMD quintiles (1 = least deprived, 5 = most deprived). The vertical dashed line marks the January 2020 schedule change. Both scenarios show similar susceptibility patterns over time, with persistent deprivation gradients and elevated vulnerability in quintiles 3 and 5 throughout the study period.*



Figure 4. Geographic variation in estimated susceptibility to invasive pneumococcal disease across upper-tier local authorities in England. *We show average susceptibility by upper-tier local authority for 2019/2020 (2+1 schedule), 2020/2021 (transition), and 2021/2022 (1+1 schedule). Colour scale: purple (20% susceptibility) to yellow (35% susceptibility). Estimates based on observed coverage and baseline vaccine effectiveness assumptions (1+1 primary VE = 60.6%). Geographic patterns remain relatively consistent across periods, with most areas showing 20-30% susceptibility. Pockets of higher vulnerability are visible in urban centres, reflecting local variation in vaccination coverage and population characteristics. For the period 2021/2022 panel, we have filled the 'Northamptonshire' UTLA based on a weighted average from the 'West Northamptonshire' & 'North Northamptonshire' data.*

4. Discussion

This study examined trends and inequalities in PCV13 uptake across England following the January 2020 transition from a 2+1 to 1+1 dose regimen. The analysis revealed three critical findings: booster retention deteriorated under the 1+1 schedule; socioeconomic inequalities in vaccine uptake persisted and widened (particularly affecting the most deprived communities); a growing population-level and inequitable susceptibility to VT IPD.

The most striking finding was the systematic national deterioration in booster retention following the schedule transition (2.32% for 2+1; 4.79% for 1+1). The scientific literature supporting the schedule change, including work by Ladhani et al. (4) and Goldblatt et al. (17), demonstrated non-inferiority in controlled trial conditions but could not have adequately anticipated the operational challenges of maintaining booster completion in routine healthcare delivery post COVID-19. Furthermore, there is emerging evidence of "booster hesitancy", even among those who accepted initial vaccination. The terminology itself may be problematic - the gap between "fully vaccinated" status (after primary doses) and the need for a "booster" creates cognitive dissonance. Lin et al. (18) found that vaccinated-but-not-boosted individuals expressed confusion about the need for additional doses and discontentment that this requirement was not communicated from the start. Additionally, because the PCV booster is administered alongside the first dose of the Measles, Mumps, and Rubella (MMR) vaccine, its receipt may be indirectly influenced by vaccine hesitancy stemming from the post-Andrew Wakefield MMR scandal (19,20).

Second, although the deprivation gradient was consistently present across both schedule periods, the gap between the least and most deprived quintiles expanded from approximately 2-3% pre-2020 to 4-6% in later quarters. These data corroborate previous research demonstrating widening socioeconomic disparities across multiple paediatric vaccines during the post COVID-19 pandemic period (6). Our observation that quintile 3 areas often performed worse than the most deprived (quintile 5) requires careful interpretation. This is partially an effect of London local authorities (many in quintile 3 [S3 Text]) having the widest internal heterogeneity in deprivation levels, including some of the most deprived neighbourhoods in England.

Third, modelled susceptibility estimates suggest that the burden of children vulnerable to VT IPD by 2024/25 disproportionately concentrated in disadvantaged areas. The pneumococcal vaccination programme provides population-level protection through both direct immunity in vaccinated individuals and indirect (herd) immunity that particularly benefits vulnerable populations including the elderly. This dual protection mechanism means that declining vaccine uptake in children can have cascading effects on community-wide disease prevention. Higher valency PCVs with reduced potential for carriage control as a consequence of lower immunogenicity may compound this (21). Areas with higher levels of socioeconomic deprivation may experience more rapid erosion of herd immunity due to lower vaccination coverage, potentially widening health inequalities that extend beyond the directly affected paediatric population to encompass older vulnerable groups who rely on community protection.

These findings must, however, be interpreted in the context of study assumptions and limitations. The first limitation relates to the use of UTLA-level deprivation measures and vaccination uptake statistics. UTLAs encompass diverse neighbourhoods ranging from affluent to severely deprived. Area-based deprivation indices can therefore fail to capture significant

proportions of deprived individuals (22), exemplified in the London Boroughs. This spatial aggregation may obscure important local patterns of vaccination uptake in pockets of deprivation within otherwise affluent areas, or conversely areas of relative advantage within deprived authorities. Ideally, we would conduct the analysis at GP practice level, which would better capture local deprivation patterns and their relationship with vaccination uptake. However, GP-level vaccination data were not available before 2018 for the 2+1 regimen period.

Second, the susceptibility modelling relied on vaccine effectiveness estimates derived from European studies of the 2+1 schedule. Additionally, the assumptions about 1+1 effectiveness have not yet been fully validated in post-implementation surveillance. Given that uncertainty, our sensitivity analysis can offer insight on a plausible range of estimates for susceptibility. More complex susceptibility models may be devised that consider both direct protection from receiving the vaccine and indirect protection via herd immunity. Further processes could be added to the susceptibility model to account for possible waning immunity; we assumed constant protection from vaccination through time, whereas relaxing that assumption would result in a rise in susceptibility amongst the population.

The third limitation is the model assumes children remain in their assigned vaccination status without accounting for potential catch-up vaccination. While this limitation affects the precision of our booster retention calculations, the observed patterns remain valid for assessing population-level trends in vaccination completion.

Finally, the observed deprivation-uptake associations could be influenced by confounding factors at the area level, including ethnicity, sex, gender, long-term health conditions and religion. Though the ecological study design provides implementation advantages due to its simplicity, it does preclude causal inference about individual-level relationships.

5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that PCV booster retention has deteriorated substantially in England since the schedule change. This deterioration disproportionately affects children in more deprived areas, risking avoidable disease burden concentrated in the most disadvantaged communities and widening health inequalities. Immunisation system strengthening, targeted, equity-focused interventions and enhanced call-recall systems for post-infant vaccine delivery are needed address the identified coverage gaps (see Box 1 for our policy and practice recommendations). Before altering vaccine schedules in other European countries, inequalities in vaccine uptake and booster retention, must be factored into predictions of population impact, alongside measures of immunogenicity, VE estimates and cost-effectiveness. Otherwise, the full protective potential of the 1+1 schedule may not be realised.

Box 1: Policy and practice recommendations

The deterioration in booster retention is evident across multiple measures and geographic areas. The deprivation gradient is consistent with established patterns in childhood vaccination and the susceptibility estimates provide a reasonable first-order approximation of population protection gaps based on available evidence.

Several evidence-based recommendations emerge based on these findings.

Enhanced follow-up systems: Call-recall systems that were sufficient when children had higher protection from two priming doses may be inadequate when a single primary dose provides more limited early protection. We suggest investment in robust booster dose call-recall systems, particularly in areas with demonstrated large booster gaps. This should include automated reminders, integration across GP and health visitor services and targeted outreach in high-risk areas.

Equity-focused interventions: Implement targeted interventions in deprived areas, including mobile vaccination units, community-based clinics, and culturally appropriate reminder systems. Standard approaches appear insufficient to address the persistent deprivation gradient.

Geographically targeted interventions: Focus resources on areas with consistently poor performance, particularly London boroughs and other urban areas with large booster gaps.

Implementation research: Conduct rigorous evaluation of the 1+1 schedule's real-world effectiveness, including linkage of coverage data with disease outcomes. Existing inequalities in vaccine uptake and booster retention should be assessed prior to any schedule changes. This should inform evidence-based decisions about potential programme modifications.

Real-time monitoring: Establish routine monitoring of booster gaps as a key performance indicator for the vaccination programme. This should include regular reporting by deprivation quintile and geographic area to enable early identification of emerging problems.

Author contributions

Praise Ilechukwu: Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualisation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing.

Daniel Hungerford: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Visualisation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing.

Neil French: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Writing - Review & Editing.

Edward M. Hill: Conceptualisation, Methodology, Supervision, Validation, Visualisation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing.

Funding statement

EMH is affiliated to the NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections (NIHR207393). EMH is funded by The Pandemic Institute, formed of seven founding partners: The University of Liverpool, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool City Council, Liverpool City Region Combined Authority, Liverpool University Hospital Foundation Trust, and Knowledge Quarter Liverpool (EMH is based at The University of Liverpool). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or The Pandemic Institute.

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

Data and code availability statement

All data utilised in this study are publicly available. We state relevant references and data repositories stated within the main manuscript.

Data and code associated with the study are available in the following repository: https://github.com/aaliswalker/DASC500-Dissertation---Inequalities-in-Childhood-Pneumococcal-Vaccine-Uptake-in-England

Declaration of interests

DH and NF are currently in receipt of grant support from Seqirus UK for the evaluation of influenza vaccines in the UK; NF is in receipt of funding from GSK in relation to malaria vaccines; DH has also received grants from Sanofi Pasteur, and Merck and Co (Kenilworth, NJ) for rotavirus strain surveillance, received honorariums for presentation at a Merck Sharp and Dohme (UK) symposium on vaccines and has consulted on rotavirus strain surveillance; PI and EMH have nothing to disclose.

References

1. O'Brien KL, Wolfson LJ, Watt JP, Henkle E, Deloria-Knoll M, McCall N, et al. Burden of disease caused by Streptococcus pneumoniae in children younger than 5 years: global estimates. The Lancet. 2009 Sept;374(9693):893–902.

2. Bertran M, D'Aeth JC, Abdullahi F, Eletu S, Andrews NJ, Ramsay ME, et al. Invasive pneumococcal disease 3 years after introduction of a reduced 1 + 1 infant 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine immunisation schedule in England: a prospective national observational surveillance study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2024 May;24(5):546–56.

3. UK Health Security Agency. GOV.UK. 2020 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Changes to the infant pneumococcal conjugate vaccine schedule: information for healthcare practitioners. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/pneumococcal-vaccination-guidance-for-health-professionals/changes-to-the-infant-pneumococcal-conjugate-vaccine-schedule-information-for-healthcare-practitioners

4. Ladhani SN, Andrews N, Ramsay ME. Summary of evidence to reduce the two-dose infant priming schedule to a single dose of the 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine in the national immunisation programme in the UK. Lancet Infect Dis. 2021 Apr;21(4):e93–102.

5. NHS Digital. Childhood Vaccination Coverage Statistics, England, 2023-24 [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Available from: https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/nhs-immunisation-statistics/england-2023-24

6. Flatt A, Vivancos R, French N, Quinn S, Ashton M, Decraene V, et al. Inequalities in uptake of childhood vaccination in England, 2019-23: longitudinal study. BMJ. 2024 Dec 11;e079550.

7. Chapman KE, Wilson D, Gorton R. Invasive pneumococcal disease and socioeconomic deprivation: a population study from the North East of England. J Public Health. 2013 Dec 1;35(4):558–69.

8. R Core Team. R: The R Project for Statistical Computing [Internet]. 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Available from: https://www.r-project.org/

9. UK Health Security Agency. GOV.UK. 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Cover of vaccination evaluated rapidly (COVER) programme: annual data. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/cover-of-vaccination-evaluated-rapidly-cover-programme-annual-data

10. UK Health Security Agency. GOV.UK. 2025 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Epidemiology of COVID-19 in England: January 2020 to December 2024. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/epidemiology-of-covid-19-in-england/epidemiology-of-covid-19-in-england-january-2020-to-december-2024

11. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. GOV.UK. 2019 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. English indices of deprivation 2019. Available from: https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019

12. Murrell L, Fahy K, Clough HE, Gibb R, Zhang X, Chattaway MA, et al. Inequalities in local government expenditure on environmental and regulatory services in England from 2009 to 2020: a longitudinal ecological study. BMJ Public Health. 2024 Dec;2(2):e001144.

13. Murrell L, Clough H, Gibb R, Zhang X, Green M, Chattaway M, et al. Understanding the impact funding cuts on Environmental and regulatory services and gastrointestinal infections: a longitudinal ecological study. NIHR Open Res. 2024 Jan 5;3:41.

14. Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. Local Authority (Upper Tier) IMD 2019 (WGS84) [Internet]. 2024 [cited 2025 Nov 28]. Available from: https://communitiesopendata-communities.hub.arcgis.com/datasets/953303c8019a47549faf079b8a5e9600_0/about

15. Keenan A, Ghebrehewet S, Vivancos R, Seddon D, MacPherson P, Hungerford D. Measles outbreaks in the UK, is it when and where, rather than if? A database cohort study of childhood population susceptibility in Liverpool, UK. BMJ Open. 2017 Mar;7(3):e014106.

16. Savulescu C, Krizova P, Valentiner-Branth P, Ladhani S, Rinta-Kokko H, Levy C, et al. Effectiveness of 10 and 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccines against invasive pneumococcal disease in European children: SpIDnet observational multicentre study. Vaccine. 2022 June;40(29):3963–74.

17. Goldblatt D, Southern J, Andrews NJ, Burbidge P, Partington J, Roalfe L, et al. Pneumococcal conjugate vaccine 13 delivered as one primary and one booster dose (1 + 1) compared with two primary doses and a booster (2 + 1) in UK infants: a multicentre, parallel group randomised controlled trial. Lancet Infect Dis. 2018 Feb;18(2):171–9.

18. Lin C, Bier B, Tu R, Paat JJ, Tu P. Vaccinated Yet Booster-Hesitant: Perspectives from Boosted, Non-Boosted, and Unvaccinated Individuals. Vaccines. 2023 Feb 25;11(3):550.

19. Dyer C. Lancet retracts Wakefield's MMR paper. BMJ. 2010 Feb 2;340(feb02 4):c696–c696.

20. Hungerford D, Macpherson P, Farmer S, Ghebrehewet S, Seddon D, Vivancos R, et al. Effect of socioeconomic deprivation on uptake of measles, mumps and rubella vaccination in Liverpool, UK over 16 years: a longitudinal ecological study. Epidemiol Infect. 2016 Apr;144(6):1201–11.

21. De Wals P. PCV13, PCV15 or PCV20: Which vaccine is best for children in terms of immunogenicity? Can Commun Dis Rep. 2024 Feb 29;50(1/2):35–9.

22. Clelland D, Hill C. Deprivation, policy and rurality: The limitations and applications of area-based deprivation indices in Scotland. Local Econ J Local Econ Policy Unit. 2019 Feb;34(1):33–50.

Supplementary Material

S1 Text. COVER data preparation

We downloaded all pneumococcal vaccine uptake data from the COVER programme for the years 2013 to 2024, spanning a total of 52 quarterly files. These files varied in structure, format (.xlsx, .ods), and naming conventions. To ensure consistency, we renamed all files using a uniform format: 20XX_QX for pre-2020 files and 20XX QX for post-2020 files.

We imported all quarterly PCV uptake files into R and combined them into a single dataset for analysis. Due to inconsistencies across years—including changes in sheet names, column headers, and data formatting—we wrote custom cleaning scripts to extract only the relevant PCV tables (i.e., 12-month and 24-month PCV coverage and population denominators). We filtered out unrelated tables (e.g. MMR, Hib/MenC), and harmonised all extracted columns using a consistent naming convention (e.g., PCV_12m, PCV_24m, ONS_Code). [Table S1]

To prevent data type mismatches, we initially read all columns as character vectors, before converting them to appropriate types for analysis (e.g., numeric for coverage percentages and denominators, factor for categorical variables). To ensure that we handled missing values consistently, we recoded any value starting with 'N' (e.g., "N.A.") or containing extraneous symbols (such as those beginning with '[' e.g [z]) as NA.

Table S1. Variables used for data preparation.

Variables	Meaning
ONS_Code	ONS Upper Tier Local Authority code (geographic unit of analysis)
PCV_12m	Percentage uptake of the pneumococcal vaccine at 12 months
PCV_24m	Percentage uptake of the booster dose (at 24 months)
Population_12m	Eligible population denominator for 12-month coverage
Population_24m	Eligible population denominator for 24-month coverage
Year	Year the data relates to (e.g. "2019/2020")
Quarter	Quarter of the data year (e.g. Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)
Timepoint	0 = Q1 2013, 1 = Q2 2013, etc.
Vaccine_Schedule	Binary indicator: 0 = 2+1 schedule (pre-2020), 1 = 1+1 schedule (2020+)

NB: As documented on the COVER data, there are a variety of reasons why some entries in the original data files are censored, including but not limited to:

a. Small denominators, with data censored to protect the identities of patients
b. Data quality issues
c. Data missing or unavailable

d. Unrecognisable code from EMIS: These data are collected through routine reporting by Child Health Information Systems (local NHS digital systems that track childhood immunizations and health records, including EMIS - Egton Medical Information Systems, which is one of the main GP IT systems used across England; for more details, visit https://digital.nhs.uk/services/gp-it-futures-systems/im1-pairing-integration/emis-pfs-suppliers).

S2 Text. COVER data cleaning

Cross-referencing quarterly COVER files against the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation UTLA list identified two authorities that did not appear in all years: Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (E06000058) and Northamptonshire (E10000021).

- **Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole (E06000058):** This authority code first appeared in the COVER dataset from 2019/2020 onwards. It was absent from COVER data for 2013/2014 through 2018/2019, where instead there were two separate authorities: Bournemouth (E06000028) and Poole (E06000029).
- **Northamptonshire (E10000021):** This authority code appeared in COVER data from 2013/2014 through 2020/2021. It was absent from the dataset from 2021/2022 onwards. During this same period, two new authority codes appeared: West Northamptonshire (E06000061) and North Northamptonshire (E06000062).

We also identified two authorities whose ONS code changed during the study period: Buckinghamshire and Dorset.

- **Buckinghamshire:** We verified ONS code consistency across all years and standardised records to the current code (E06000060).
- **Dorset:** Early COVER files used code E10000009, while later files (2020 onwards) used code E06000059 for the same geographic area. We standardised all records to use E06000059 to ensure temporal consistency.

These temporal variations resulted in 149 distinct UTLA codes appearing across the study period, though not all 149 appeared in every quarterly file. The final analytical dataset comprised 6,816 observations with no records excluded due to missing or invalid geographic identifiers.

S3 Text. UTLA stratification by IMD quintile

We merged our cleaned vaccine uptake dataset with the IMD dataset using the ONS code as a key. We retained only matched records. We then split IMD scores into quintiles using the ntile() function, with quintile 1 corresponding to the least deprived and quintile 5 to the most deprived local authorities.

We list below the UTLA's that were classified under each IMD quintile. These classifications used UTLA-level Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) summary data from the English Indices of Deprivation 2019 (11). For each IMD quintile we list the UTLA's alphabetically.

IMD quintile 1 (Least Deprived): Bath and North East Somerset, Bracknell Forest, Bromley, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Central Bedfordshire, Cheshire East, Dorset, East Riding of Yorkshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Harrow, Hertfordshire, Kingston upon Thames, Leicestershire, Merton, North Yorkshire, Oxfordshire, Richmond upon Thames, Rutland, South Gloucestershire, Surrey, Sutton, Warwickshire, West Berkshire, West Sussex, Wiltshire, Windsor and Maidenhead, Wokingham, York.

IMD quintile 2: Barnet, Bedford, Bexley, (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole*), Camden, Cheshire West and Chester, Derbyshire, Devon, Dorset, East Sussex, Essex, Havering, County of Herefordshire, Hillingdon, Kent, Milton Keynes, North Somerset, Northamptonshire^, Nottinghamshire, Reading, Redbridge, Shropshire, Solihull, Somerset, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Swindon, Trafford, Wandsworth, Warrington, Worcestershire.

IMD quintile 3: Brent, Brighton and Hove, Bury, Cornwall, Coventry, Croydon, Cumbria, Dudley, Ealing, Greenwich, Hammersmith and Fulham, Hounslow, Isle of Wight, Kensington and Chelsea, Kirklees, Lambeth, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Medway, Norfolk, North Lincolnshire, North Tyneside, Northumberland, Slough, Southend-on-Sea, Stockport, Telford and Wrekin, Thurrock, Waltham Forest, Westminster.

IMD quintile 4: Barnsley, City of Bristol, Calderdale, County Durham, Darlington, Derby, Enfield, Gateshead, Haringey, Islington, Leeds, Lewisham, Luton, Newcastle upon Tyne, Newham, Peterborough, Plymouth, Portsmouth, Redcar and Cleveland, Rotherham, Sefton, Sheffield, Southampton, Southwark, Stockton-on-Tees, Torbay, Tower Hamlets, Wakefield, Wigan, Wirral.

IMD quintile 5 (Most Deprived): Barking and Dagenham, Birmingham, Blackburn with Darwen, Blackpool, Bolton, Bradford, Doncaster, Hackney, Halton, Hartlepool, City of Kingston upon Hull, Knowsley, Leicester, Liverpool, Manchester, Middlesbrough, North East Lincolnshire, Nottingham, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Sandwell, South Tyneside, St. Helens, Stoke-on-Trent, Sunderland, Tameside, Walsall, Wolverhampton.

* For analysis of data from 2013 to 2019, we applied the IMD quintile assignment for 'Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole' to 'Bournemouth' and 'Poole' (i.e. IMD quintile 2)

^ For analysis of data from 2021 to 2025, we applied the IMD quintile assignment for 'Northamptonshire to 'North Northamptonshire' and 'West Northamptonshire' (i.e. IMD quintile 2).



Figure S1. Assignment of UTLAs in England to IMD quintiles. *These classifications used UTLA-level Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) summary data from the English Indices of Deprivation 2019 (11). We assigned each UTLA to an IMD quintile based on the average IMD score for each UTLA. Shading denotes the IMD quintile associated with that UTLA, with the lightest shading representing the least deprived UTLAs (quintile 1) and the darkest shading representing the most deprived UTLAs (quintile 5). We assigned as NA the UTLAs not retained for our study (Isle of Scilly, The City of London).*

S4 Text. Additional PCV uptake figures



Figure S2. Geographic variation in PCV primary coverage (12 months) across local authorities in England, 2013/2014 to 2024/2025. *The colour scale ranges from dark blue/purple (70% coverage) to bright green/yellow (100% coverage), so brighter areas indicate higher vaccination rates while darker areas show lower uptake. The maps are arranged chronologically from left to right, top to bottom, spanning both the 2+1 schedule period (2013-2020), and the 1+1 schedule period (2021-2025).*



Figure S3. Geographic variation in PCV booster coverage (24 months) across local authorities in England, 2013/2014 to 2024/2025. *The colour scale ranges from dark blue/purple (60% coverage) to bright yellow (100% coverage), where brighter green/yellow areas indicate higher booster uptake and darker blue areas show lower coverage. The maps are arranged chronologically from left to right, top to bottom, spanning both the 2+1 schedule period (2013-2020), and the 1+1 schedule period (2021-2025).*

(a)



(b)



Figure S4. Impact of London on PCV Coverage by Deprivation Quintile. *Comparison of booster uptake trends at:* ***(a)*** *12 months;* ***(b)*** *24 months. In each panel, the upper plot includes London's 76 boroughs, whereas the lower panel does not include London's 32 boroughs. Lines represent IMD quintiles (1 = least deprived, 5 = most deprived). Dashed vertical line: schedule change (January 2020); shaded area: COVID-19 period. The impact of London exclusion is more pronounced for booster coverage than primary doses.*

S5 Text. Cumulative VT IPD susceptibility estimates indicate widening socioeconomic inequalities

To better understand the growing burden of disease risk over time, we calculated the cumulative number of susceptible children by birth cohort (quarterly). This analysis demonstrates how even small reductions in uptake can lead to a steady accumulation of susceptible individuals, which may have implications for herd protection and future disease resurgence if left unaddressed [Figure S5a]. Susceptibility patterns revealed persistent and widening inequalities by deprivation level. Although overall susceptibility levels appeared similar before and after the schedule change, the more deprived areas (quintiles 3 and 5) experienced disproportionately higher vulnerability throughout the study period [Figure S5b]. Geographic patterns remained consistent across both VE assumptions, with similar spatial distributions of susceptibility levels and no dramatic changes in regional vulnerability patterns [Figure S6].



Figure S5. Cumulative number of susceptible children by quarter. *Susceptibility is modelled based on observed uptake and literature-based vaccine effectiveness.* ***(a)*** *Each point represents the total number of children estimated to remain susceptible to invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD) after vaccination, cumulatively summed from 2013/2014 Q2 to 2024/2025 Q3.* ***(b)*** *Stratification by deprivation quintiles. (1 = least deprived, 5 = most deprived). The x-axis tracks cohort entry by year and quarter.*



Figure S6. Geographic Variation in IPD Susceptibility: Alternate Assumption. *We show average susceptibility by upper-tier local authority for 2019/2020 (2+1 schedule), 2020/2021 (transition), and 2021/2022 (1+1 schedule). Colour scale: purple (20% susceptibility) to yellow (35% susceptibility). Estimates based on alternate vaccine effectiveness assumption (1+1 primary VE = 76.1%, matching completed 2+1 primary course with booster 78.2%). Most areas show 20-30% susceptibility, with persistent pockets of higher vulnerability in urban centres.*