

1 **Antibody responses induced by trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine**
2 **among pregnant and non-pregnant women in Thailand: a matched cohort**
3 **study**

4

5 Sutthichai Nakphook^{1,2}, Jayanton Patumanond³, Manash Shrestha^{4*}, Kriengkrai Prasert⁵,
6 Malinee Chittaganpitch⁶, Joshua A. Mott^{7,8}, Prabda Prapasiri⁷

7

8 1. Institute of Preventive Medicine, Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public
9 Health, Thailand

10 2. Thammasat University, Pathum Thani, Thailand

11 3. Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

12 4. Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

13 5. Nakhon Phanom Provincial Hospital, Nakhon Phanom, Thailand

14 6. National Institute of Health, Ministry of Public Health, Nonthaburi, Thailand

15 7. Influenza Program, Thailand MOPH- US CDC Collaboration, Nonthaburi, Thailand

16 8. Influenza Division, US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA, USA

17

18 Corresponding Author*:

19 Email: dr.manashshrestha@gmail.com

20

21 **Running title:** Antibodies induced by influenza vaccine in pregnancy

22

23

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background:** We compared influenza antibody titers among vaccinated and unvaccinated
26 pregnant and non-pregnant women.

27

28 **Methods:** During 1st June – 30th September 2018, four groups of cohort participants -
29 vaccinated pregnant, unvaccinated pregnant, vaccinated non-pregnant, and unvaccinated non-
30 pregnant women were selected by matching age, gestational age, and the week of
31 vaccination. Serum antibody titers against each strain of 2018 Southern Hemisphere
32 inactivated trivalent influenza vaccine (IIV3) were assessed by hemagglutination inhibition
33 (HI) assay on Day 0 (pre-vaccination) and Day 28 (one month post-vaccination) serum
34 samples. Geometric mean titer (GMT), GMT ratio (GMR), seroconversion (defined as ≥ 4
35 fold increase in HI titer), and seroprotection (i.e. HI titer $\geq 1:40$) were compared across the
36 study groups using multilevel regression analyses, controlling for previous year vaccination
37 from medical records and baseline antibody levels.

38

39 **Results:** A total of 132 participants were enrolled in the study (33 in each of the four study
40 groups). The baseline GMTs were similar for influenza A(H1N1), A(H3N2), and B vaccine
41 strains among all four groups (all p-values >0.05). After one month, both vaccinated groups
42 had significantly higher GMT, GMR, seroconversion, and seroprotection than their
43 unvaccinated controls (all p-values <0.05). The seroconversion rate was over 60% for any
44 strain among the vaccinated groups, with the highest (88.8%) observed against A(H1N1) in
45 the vaccinated pregnant group. Similarly, at least 75% of the vaccinated participants
46 developed seroprotective antibody levels against all three strains; the highest seroprotection
47 was found against A(H3N2) at 92.6% among vaccinated non-pregnant participants. Pregnant

48 women had similar antibody responses (post-vaccination GMT, GMR, seroconversion, and
49 seroprotection) to non-pregnant women for all three strains of IIV3 (all $p>0.05$).

50

51 **Conclusions:** The 2018 seasonal IIV3 was immunogenic against all three vaccine strains and
52 pregnancy did not seem to alter the immune response to IIV3. These findings support the
53 current influenza vaccination recommendations for pregnant women.

54

55 **Keywords:** Antibody response; influenza vaccine; matched cohort; pregnant women;
56 Thailand

57

58

59 **Introduction**

60 Pregnant women are at a higher risk of severe illness from influenza due to physiological and
61 immunological changes and are therefore recommended for influenza vaccination [1-3].

62 Recent meta-analyses show that influenza vaccination in pregnancy can reduce the incidence
63 of laboratory-confirmed influenza by 53-63%, reduce adverse birth outcomes such as pre-
64 term and low birth weight, and further extend prevention against influenza to their infants [4-
65 6]. The immunogenicity of influenza vaccine is an important measure of vaccine

66 effectiveness, and studies show that concerns related to influenza vaccine effectiveness can
67 be a major barrier to healthcare providers in their recommendations to pregnant women [7].

68 The data on antibody responses to influenza vaccines, however, remain unclear in pregnancy
69 and are particularly sparse in tropical middle-income countries like Thailand.

70

71 Although most studies conducted among pregnant women report adequate humoral immune
72 responses to the trivalent influenza vaccine (IIV3) albeit a lower response to influenza B

73 strain [8-10], only a few studies included a non-pregnant group for comparison [11, 12].
74 Using vaccinated non-pregnant women as controls, Schlaudecker et al. found that despite
75 similar seroconversion and seroprotection rates, the rise in post-vaccination antibody titers
76 against influenza A(H1N1) and A(H3N2) viruses was diminished in pregnant women [12].
77 This suggested that immunological changes in pregnancy may modulate the antibody
78 response [12, 13]. In contrast, other observational studies and randomized controlled trials
79 did not report any significant differences in antibody responses to IIV3 between pregnant and
80 non-pregnant women [11, 14].

81

82 In Thailand, serious outcomes of influenza including maternal and infant death have been
83 documented [15]. The Thai Ministry of Public Health (MOPH) has recommended seasonal
84 IIV3 for pregnant women since 2009, but the vaccine coverage has been low [16]. Previous
85 studies among Thai pregnant women consistently indicate that their decisions to get
86 vaccinated are mainly influenced by the recommendation of their physicians [17-19], for
87 whom the vaccine efficacy, safety, and immunogenicity data may be important indicators
88 [20]. Extended benefits of maternal vaccination in transferring influenza antibodies to their
89 infants was recently reported by Kittikraisak et al. in a study among Thai pregnant women at
90 a tertiary center in Bangkok [21]. We conducted a prospective cohort study with the main
91 objective of assessing the immune responses induced by IIV3 among both pregnant and non-
92 pregnant women and compared them along with their unvaccinated counterparts.

93

94 **Methods**

95 **Study design and setting**

96 This was a prospective, matched cohort study comprising two arms (pregnant and non-
97 pregnant) and four groups – vaccinated pregnant women, unvaccinated pregnant women,
98 vaccinated non-pregnant women, and unvaccinated non-pregnant women in the rural
99 northeastern province of Nakhon Phanom, Thailand (Fig 1). This study was conducted during
100 four months between 1st June – 30th September 2018 as nested research within a larger cohort
101 study assessing influenza vaccine effectiveness among pregnant women in Nakhon Phanom
102 province (Thai Clinical Trials Registry ID: TCTR20201014004). For willing participants,
103 2018 seasonal southern hemisphere inactivated IIV3 (Influvac®, Abbott Biologicals B.V.,
104 The Netherlands) provided free of charge by the Thai MOPH was offered at the provincial
105 hospital (one intramuscular dose of 0.5 ml) containing the following three antigens:
106 A/Michigan/45/2015 A(H1N1)pdm09, A/Singapore/INFIMH-16-0019/2016 A(H3N2), and
107 B/Phuket3073/2013 (Yamataga lineage) [22]. Serum antibody titers against each of the three
108 vaccine strains were assessed on the blood collected from the participants via venipuncture
109 on Day 0 (pre-vaccination) and Day 28 (one month post-vaccination).

110

111 **Fig 1. Study flow diagram**

112

113 **Participant selection**

114 The study population consisted of women of reproductive age above 18 years visiting
115 Nakhon Phanom Provincial Hospital during the study period. Pregnant women with at least
116 one visit to the hospital's antenatal care clinic (ANC) were selected if they were Thai
117 nationals, residents of the province since at least June 2018, and had no plans to relocate to

118 another place before giving birth. Pregnant women with gravida more than 33 weeks were
119 excluded to avoid delivery before the second venipuncture, which was scheduled one month
120 after the first venipuncture. Pregnant participants willing and not willing to receive seasonal
121 influenza vaccines were matched by age group, gestational age, and week of vaccination. For
122 comparison, non-pregnant women, both willing and not willing to receive influenza vaccines
123 were selected from the patients visiting the family planning services at the hospital after age-
124 matching with pregnant participants. Their non-pregnant status was confirmed by a negative
125 urine pregnancy test. Any potential participant with an acute illness that could hinder the
126 blood draw procedure was excluded from the study.

127

128 **Data collection**

129 After enrollment, demographic data were collected such as age, height and weight (for Body
130 Mass Index (BMI) calculation), gestational age of the baby, number of pregnancies,
131 underlying disease, and smoking status. Histories of the immediate prior year influenza
132 vaccination and presence of any pre-existing medical conditions were obtained from the
133 medical record forms. Particular focus was given to ICD-10 codes for immunosuppressive
134 conditions such as B20 (HIV infection), N18 (Chronic kidney disease), O24 (Gestational
135 DM), E08 (Diabetes mellitus), D89 (Autoimmune disease), C80 (Malignant neoplasm), and
136 C95 (Leukemia). Vaccine strain match data to circulating viruses was obtained from Thai
137 National Institute of Health (NIH) (Supplemental Table 1).

138

139 Immediately before vaccination, 5 ml or approximately one teaspoon of blood was drawn
140 from the participants by research nurses using aseptic technique. The blood was collected in a
141 Red Top Vacutainer tube labeled with a unique Study ID Number sticker. The second blood
142 draw was obtained after one month of vaccination. Similarly, for unvaccinated participants,

143 blood samples were drawn on the day of enrollment (Day 0) and after one month (Day 28).
144 For participants who could not travel to the provincial hospital, blood samples were collected
145 by the study nurses at the participant's home and transported to the provincial hospital on ice
146 packs. Sera were then separated from blood samples using a centrifuge at Nakhon Phanom
147 Hospital Laboratory and stored in a refrigerator at a controlled temperature of 4-8° C for up
148 to 48 hours and then in a freezer at -20° C until used. Serum samples were transported to the
149 Thai NIH laboratory in Nonthaburi every week.

150

151 **Serological testing and outcomes**

152 Serum antibody titers were determined by hemagglutination inhibition (HI) assay according
153 to the WHO standard protocol at the Thai NIH laboratory using goose red blood cells as
154 described previously [23, 24]. The laboratory staff were blinded to the participants' cohort
155 group information. Seroprotection was defined as HI titer $\geq 1:40$ and seroconversion as at
156 least a four-fold increase in antibody titer compared between Day 0 and Day 28 serum
157 samples. The geometric mean titer (GMT) was calculated by taking the antilog of the mean
158 of logarithmically transformed HI titers. Geometric mean titer ratio (GMR) or fold increase
159 was determined as the ratio of GMT of post-vaccination blood by GMT of pre-vaccination
160 blood.

161

162 **Sample size calculation**

163 The minimum sample size was calculated based on the Fleiss method [25], using STATA
164 software version 14.2 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX, USA). At least 28 participants
165 were needed in each of the vaccinated and unvaccinated groups to have 80% power to detect
166 30% or more seroconversion after vaccination at 5% type I error. To compensate for a

167 possible loss to follow-up, the sample size was inflated by 15% to 33 per group such that the
168 total sample size was 132 (i.e. 33×4).

169

170 **Statistical analyses**

171 Descriptive statistics were used to enumerate variables such as pregnancy trimester, number
172 of pregnancies, smoking status, and vaccination history. Mean and standard deviation were
173 used to report the central tendency of continuous variables like age, gestational age, and BMI.
174 Estimates of antibody responses (GMT, GMR, seroprotection, and seroconversion) were
175 compared between vaccinated and unvaccinated groups of both pregnant and non-pregnant
176 arms and also between the vaccinated pregnant and non-pregnant women using a multilevel
177 regression, controlling for previous year vaccination history and baseline antibody levels. The
178 use of multilevel regression allowed for adjustment of multiple comparisons by partial
179 pooling and shifting of point estimates and their 95% confidence intervals (CI) [26]. As a
180 sub-analysis, the proportions of vaccinated participants reaching higher HI titers of $\geq 1:80$ and
181 $\geq 1:160$ after one month of vaccination were compared between the pregnant and non-
182 pregnant groups. Statistical analyses were performed using STATA software version 14.2
183 and the significance was set at p-value < 0.05 .

184

185 **Ethical considerations**

186 The study protocol was reviewed and approved by the Ethical Review Committee of
187 Thammasat University (Ref no. MTU-EC-ES-4-217/60). Approval of local ethics committee
188 of Nakhon Phanom Hospital (No. NP-EC11-No.4/2560) was also received prior to the data
189 collection. Written informed consent was obtained from each participant by research nurses
190 who were not involved in ANC and/or family planning services at the hospital.

191

192 Results

193 Participant characteristics

194 A total of 132 participants (i.e. 66 pregnant and 66 non-pregnant women) were enrolled in the
 195 study, with 33 participants in each of the four groups (Fig 1). The baseline demographic
 196 characteristics are presented in Table 1. The mean age of the participants was 26.4 years
 197 (standard deviation [SD] 5.4 years). The matched frequencies of vaccinated and unvaccinated
 198 pregnant participants were 11 (33.3%), 18 (54.6%), and 4 (12.1%) in the first, second, and
 199 third trimesters, respectively. Fourteen vaccinated (42.4%) and nine unvaccinated
 200 participants (27.3%) were pregnant for the first time. None of the study participants had any
 201 pre-existing immunosuppressive medical conditions. BMI and smoking history were
 202 comparable across all four groups (p-value >0.05). A similar proportion of vaccinated
 203 pregnant and non-pregnant participants had not received influenza vaccination in the previous
 204 year (87.9% vs 78.8%, p=0.511) (Table 1).

205

206 **Table 1. Baseline characteristics of study participants (N=132)**

Characteristic	Pregnant women (n=66)		p- value	Non-Pregnant women (n=66)		p- value	p-value (vaccin ated group)*
	Vaccination			Vaccination			
	Yes (n=33)	No (n=33)		Yes (n=33)	No (n=33)		
Age (years)							
Mean (SD) [†]	26.5 (5.2)	26.4 (6.0)	0.931	26.8 (5.2)	26.1 (5.2)	0.555	0.795
Gestational age (in wks.)							
Mean (SD) [†]	17.4 (7.8)	19.2 (7.7)	0.338	-	-	-	-
(Min-Max)	(6-32)	(5-32)					
Trimester of pregnancy, n (%) [‡]							
1 st trimester (≤13 wks.)	11 (33.3)	11 (33.3)	1.000	-	-	-	-
2 nd trimester (14–27 wks.)	18 (54.6)	18 (54.6)		-	-		
3 rd trimester (≥ 28 wks.)	4 (12.1)	4 (12.1)		-	-		
Number of pregnancy, n (%) [‡]							
1	14 (42.4)	9 (27.3)	0.301	-	-	-	-
≥2	19 (57.6)	24 (72.7)		-	-		
BMI							

Mean (SD) [†]	22.3 (4.6)	21.1 (2.9)	0.931	22.3 (4.7)	22.9 (4.3)	0.545	0.795
Smoking history, n (%) [‡]							
Never smoked	33 (100.0)	33 (100.0)	1.000	33 (100.0)	33 (100.0)	1.000	1.000
Influenza vaccination history [‡]							
Received last year (2017)	4 (12.1)	1 (3.0)	0.355	7 (21.2)	2 (6.1)	0.110	0.511
Not received in last year	29 (87.9)	32 (97.0)		26 (78.8)	31 (93.9)		

207 *Abbreviations: SD, Standard deviation; wks, weeks; min, minimum; max, maximum; BMI, body mass index.*

208 **p-values calculated comparing vaccinated pregnant and vaccinated non-pregnant group*

209 *[†]p-value calculated using independent t-tests, [‡]p-value calculated using Exact probability test*

210

211 **Vaccine strain matching**

212 According to the sentinel surveillance data of the Thai NIH, A/Singapore/ INFIMH-16-
213 0019/2016 A(H3N2) was the dominant strain circulating before the study period and the 2018
214 seasonal IIV3 vaccine strain matching during the study period for A/Michigan/45/2015
215 A(H1N1)pdm09, A/Singapore/INFIMH-16-0019/2016 A(H3N2), and B/Phuket/3073/2013
216 (Yamataga lineage) was 100%, 78.2%, and 100%, respectively (Supplemental table 1).

217

218 **Antibody responses to influenza vaccination**

219 The baseline (pre-vaccination) GMTs of the participants were similar for each vaccine strain
220 among all four groups (all p-values >0.05; Table 2). At baseline, the proportion of
221 participants with seroprotective HI titers of $\geq 1:40$ were found to be in the range of 21.2-
222 28.0%, 37.9-48.6%, and 8.9-12.1% for A(H1N1), A(H3N2), and B, respectively.

223

224 After one month, both pregnant and non-pregnant vaccinated women had significantly higher
225 GMT, GMR, seroconversion, and seroprotection in comparison to their unvaccinated control
226 groups (all p-values <0.05; Table 2). Specifically, post-vaccination GMT against A(H1N1),
227 A(H3N2), and B viruses in pregnant women was 171.8 (95% CI 118.8-248.2), 195.7 (95% CI
228 131.2-291.9), and 94.7 (95% CI 70.4-127.5), respectively; while the same in vaccinated non-
229 pregnant women was estimated at 106.1 (95% CI 72.9-154.3), 241.1 (95% CI 161.4-360.0),
230 and 113.5 (95% CI 84.1-153.3), respectively (Fig 2). The GMR was similar among
231 vaccinated pregnant and non-pregnant women for A(H1N1) (20.9 vs 14.9, p=0.219),
232 A(H3N2) (26.4 vs 21.2, p=0.611), and B viruses (12.3 vs 21.1, p=0.133) (Table 2).

233

234

235 **Table 2. Comparison of antibody responses against influenza vaccine strains among the**
 236 **study participants (N=132)**

Antibody response*	Pregnant women (n=66)		p-value [†] (Pregnancy)	Non-Pregnant women (n=66)		p-value [‡] (Interaction)
	Vaccinated with IIV3			Vaccinated with IIV3		
	Yes (n=33)	No (n=33)		Yes (n=33)	No (n=33)	
Influenza A/Michigan/45/2015 (H1N1)pdm09						
Pre-vaccine GMT (Day 0)	16.5	15.6	0.704	18.4	16.2	0.677
Post-vaccine GMT (Day 28)	171.8	14.6	<0.001	106.1	17.0	0.089
GMR (Fold increase after 28 days)	20.9	0.3	<0.001	14.9	1.5	0.219
Seroconversion (%)	88.8	2.9	<0.001	62.5	2.9	0.797
Seroprotection (%) (Day 0)	21.3	23.4	0.899	28.0	21.2	0.490
Seroprotection (%) (Day 28)	88.2	23.0	<0.001	78.7	22.2	0.517
Influenza A/Singapore/INFIMH-16- 0019/2016 (H3N2)						
Pre-vaccine GMT (Day 0)	26.6	24.6	0.534	29.4	25.3	0.673
Post-vaccine GMT (Day 28)	195.7	26.7	<0.001	241.1	27.5	0.653
GMR (Fold increase after 28 days)	26.4	0.4	<0.001	21.2	0.3	0.611
Seroconversion (%)	69.5	8.4	<0.001	76.0	5.8	0.630
Seroprotection (%) (Day 0)	46.9	37.9	0.455	48.6	42.4	0.850
Seroprotection (%) (Day 28)	91.7	44.6	<0.001	92.6	43.8	0.896
Influenza B/Phuket/3073/2013						
Pre-vaccine GMT (Day 0)	13.6	13.2	0.677	13.3	13.3	0.758
Post-vaccine GMT (Day 28)	94.7	12.2	<0.001	113.5	13.1	0.720
GMR (Fold increase after 28 days)	12.3	<0.1	<0.001	21.1	0.5	0.133
Seroconversion (%)	76.9	0	<0.001	76.7	2.9	0.993
Seroprotection (%) (Day 0)	8.9	12.1	0.655	9.0	9.4	0.661
Seroprotection (%) (Day 28)	88.1	7.7	<0.001	82.0	10.0	0.434

237 *Abbreviations: IIV3, trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine; GMT, Geometric mean titer; GMR, Geometric*
 238 *mean titer ratio.*
 239 **Estimates of antibody response and p-values derived from multilevel regression analyses after controlling for*
 240 *baseline antibody titer and prior influenza vaccination*
 241 *p-value[†] (pregnancy); comparing vaccinated and non-vaccinated participants within pregnant group*
 242 *p-value[‡] (interaction); comparing effect of vaccination across pregnant and non-pregnant participants*
 243

244

245 **Fig 2. Comparison of influenza antibody geometric mean titers before and after**
 246 **vaccination between pregnant and non-pregnant participants**

247

248 The seroconversion rate among vaccinated pregnant women was 88.8%, 69.5%, and 76.9%
249 against A(H1N1), A(H3N2), and B viruses, respectively. The rates were similar among
250 vaccinated non-pregnant women at 62.5%, 76.0%, and 76.7%, respectively (all p-values
251 >0.05 ; Table 2). At least 78% of the vaccinated participants developed seroprotective
252 antibody levels against all three strains; the highest seroprotection was found against
253 A(H3N2) at 92.6% among vaccinated non-pregnant participants. Similar proportions of both
254 pregnant and non-pregnant participants developed seroprotective HI titers ≥ 40 after
255 vaccination ($p > 0.05$). When higher cut points of HI titer $\geq 1:80$ and $\geq 1:160$ were used for
256 seroprotection, the proportion of vaccinated pregnant women reaching seroprotective levels
257 for all vaccine strains were in the range of 73-85% and 38-67%, respectively. This was
258 similar among vaccinated non-pregnant women (65-77% and 50-67%, respectively) (Table
259 3).

260

261

262 **Table 3. Proportions of vaccinated participants reaching hemagglutination inhibition**
 263 **antibody titers of $\geq 1:40$, $\geq 1:80$, $\geq 1:160$ on one-month post vaccination**

IIV3 vaccine strain	HI titer cut point	Seroprotection on Day 28 among vaccinated participants*		p-value
		Pregnant (n=33)	Non-pregnant (n=33)	
		% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	
A/Michigan/45/2015 (H1N1)pdm09	$\geq 1:40$	88.2 (75.0, 101.4)	78.7 (65.2, 92.2)	0.517
	$\geq 1:80$	73.5 (61.6, 85.4)	65.9 (53.8, 78.0)	0.263
	$\geq 1:160$	67.7 (55.4, 80.0)	54.2 (41.7, 66.8)	0.119
A/Singapore/INFIMH-16-0019/2016 (H3N2)	$\geq 1:40$	91.7 (78.7, 104.7)	92.6 (79.6, 105.7)	0.896
	$\geq 1:80$	84.9 (72.5, 97.2)	77.6 (65.2, 90.0)	0.565
	$\geq 1:160$	62.7 (50.2, 75.2)	67.1 (54.6, 79.6)	0.921
B/Phuket/3073/2013	$\geq 1:40$	88.1 (77.6, 98.6)	82.0 (71.4, 92.7)	0.434
	$\geq 1:80$	78.7 (67.1, 90.4)	65.1 (53.3, 76.8)	0.256
	$\geq 1:160$	38.6 (26.7, 50.5)	50.4 (38.4, 62.4)	0.466

264 *Abbreviations: IIV3, trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine; HI, hemagglutination inhibition; CI, confidence*
 265 *interval.*

266 **Point estimates, 95% CI, and p-values calculated using multilevel regression, controlling for previous year*
 267 *vaccination and baseline antibody titer.*

268

269

270 Discussion

271 In our matched cohort analysis, we found that IIV3 induced high humoral immune responses
 272 in both pregnant and non-pregnant women compared with their unvaccinated counterparts. In
 273 addition, the antibody responses in form of post-vaccination GMT, GMR, and proportions of
 274 participants reaching seroconversion and seroprotection levels were not statistically different
 275 between the pregnant and non-pregnant women. These findings suggest that pregnancy did
 276 not alter immune responses to IIV3 in our study population.

277

278 Our results are in stark contrast with that of Schlaudecker et al. who had found significant
279 differences in post-vaccination GMT against influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 and A(H3N2) viruses
280 among pregnant and non-pregnant control group in a similar prospective study [12]. This
281 discordance may be attributed to some differences between the study sample characteristics.
282 The mean age of pregnant women in Schlaudecker et al.'s study was nearly 32 years and
283 almost all of them (97%) had received IIV3 the previous year [12]. Prior vaccination has
284 been associated with lower immune response in subsequent vaccination among pregnant
285 women [27, 28]. In comparison, our participants were younger and likely to be
286 immunologically naïve against the vaccine strains as most of them had not received any
287 influenza vaccines before and therefore could have mounted a higher immune response.
288 Additionally, we controlled for potential confounding factors between the pregnant and non-
289 pregnant women through cohort matching and multilevel regression which may have
290 produced more robust estimates. Similar results of equivalent post-vaccination antibody titers
291 have been found in other studies which have also controlled for baseline differences between
292 pregnant and non-pregnant women [11, 14].

293

294 Compared with influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 and B viruses, baseline seroprotection against
295 A(H3N2) was high in our study, conferred possibly by natural infection since it was the
296 dominant circulating strain and prior year vaccination was low. Nonetheless, immune
297 responses against all three influenza strains were strong one month after vaccination in both
298 pregnant and non-pregnant groups, exceeding the European Committee for Medicinal
299 Products for Human Use (CHMP) recommended serological criteria for influenza vaccine for
300 healthy adults aged less than 60 years (i.e. >2.5 GMR, >40% seroconversion rate, >70%
301 seroprotection rate) [29]. In Thailand, the Food and Drug Administration uses the CHMP
302 criteria as a reference for approval of influenza vaccines for public use. However, in 2014,

303 the CHMP adopted a more diversified approach to the measurement and reporting of the
304 immune response to influenza vaccines due to growing concerns of appropriateness of
305 clinical correlation of HI titer $\geq 1:40$ for different subgroups [29, 30]. For example, one study
306 demonstrated that for children, an HI titer $>1:110$ would be needed for 50% of clinical
307 protection and a titer of $1:330$ would be necessary to correlate with 80% clinical protection
308 [31]. This would mean that higher HI titers may be needed among pregnant women to confer
309 clinical protection to their infants, especially up to their first six months during which the
310 newborns are not indicated for influenza vaccination. Since there are no new suggested cut
311 points for pregnant women and an HI titer above $\geq 1:150$ may only correlate with marginal
312 benefits [32], we used HI titers of $\geq 1:80$ and $\geq 1:160$ to further analyze seroprotective levels
313 among our study sample. Our results showed that more than 70% pregnant women reached
314 HI titers $\geq 1:80$ against all three strains and more than 60% reached the titer $\geq 1:160$ after one
315 month of vaccination (except for influenza B), which was not different from those seen
316 among non-pregnant healthy women, denoting a strong immune response.

317

318 The vaccine was well-matched with the circulating strains and the antibody responses
319 observed in this study corresponded well with the overall vaccine effectiveness in the larger
320 cohort study which enrolled more than 1,700 participants and estimated the effectiveness of
321 IIV3 against laboratory-confirmed, influenza-associated acute respiratory illness among
322 pregnant women at 65% (95% CI 38%-80%) [33]. These data provide important empirical
323 support to the policy of recommending seasonal influenza vaccination to pregnant women,
324 particularly in countries like Thailand where the vaccine coverage among this group is
325 perennially low. A prior survey revealed that Thai physicians at ANC in public hospitals
326 were more likely to recommend influenza vaccines to pregnant women if they perceived the
327 vaccines to be effective [20]. As healthcare providers' recommendations are known

328 predictors of IIV3 uptake among pregnant women in Thailand [17, 18], epidemiological
329 evidence of vaccine benefit like effectiveness and immunogenicity in real-world settings may
330 reduce the hesitancy of healthcare providers and aid in their recommendation of IIV3 to
331 pregnant patients.

332

333 Despite the strengths of using matched cohorts and controlling for confounders using
334 multilevel regression, there are some limitations in our study. First, the sample size was
335 calculated initially to assess differences between vaccinated and unvaccinated groups which
336 may be small in number and lack sufficient power to draw confirmatory inference between
337 pregnant and non-pregnant women. Consequently, we did not conduct sub-group analyses on
338 the antibody responses by receipt of vaccination in different trimesters of pregnancy. Second,
339 we relied exclusively on HI titers for measuring humoral immunity. Additional measures
340 such as microneutralization assay and induction of plasmablasts may be needed in future
341 studies as they may be more sensitive and specific for pregnant women [11]. Third, the prior
342 vaccination data of the study participants was limited to one year. Although prior
343 vaccinations may affect the immune responses to influenza vaccine, it is less likely that
344 pregnant women have had multiple year vaccinations in Thailand as they are only
345 recommended for seasonal IIV3 in case of pregnancy and the vaccine uptake among pregnant
346 women is less than 1% [16]. Finally, we did not assess the antibody levels in infants which
347 may be an important consideration for the prevention of influenza in infants through maternal
348 vaccination. However, the findings of Kittikraisak et al. suggest that vaccinated Thai
349 pregnant women have higher placental transfer of influenza antibodies to their infants than
350 those unvaccinated [21].

351

352 In conclusion, seasonal IIV3 was immunogenic against all three vaccine strains and
353 pregnancy did not seem to alter the immune response to the IIV3. These findings support the
354 current influenza vaccination recommendations for pregnant women. Larger cohort studies
355 with supplementary markers of humoral and cellular immunity may be needed to assess the
356 immune response among pregnant women with subsequent vaccinations.

357

358 **Acknowledgments**

359 We are grateful to the participants and the study nurses at the Nakhon Phanom Provincial
360 Hospital for their consideration and co-operation in this study. We also thank the staff of Thai
361 NIH for their assistance in carrying out the laboratory investigations.

362

363 **Data Availability Statement**

364 All relevant data are within the paper and the supporting files.

365

366 **Funding**

367 This study was partially supported by the Nakhon Phanom Provincial Hospital Foundation
368 (ref no. NP 0032.202.3/7) secured by KP and SN. The funders had no role in study design,
369 data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

370

371 **Disclaimer**

372 The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily
373 represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or the
374 Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

375

376 **Competing Interests**

377 The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

378

379 **Author Contributions**

380 Conceptualization: SN KP JP PP

381 Data curation: SN KP MC

382 Formal analysis: SN KP JP MS PP

383 Funding acquisition: KP SN

384 Investigation: SN KP MC

385 Methodology: KP JP JAM PP

386 Project administration: SN KP

387 Resources: KP

388 Supervision: JP PP

389 Validation: MS MC JAM

390 Visualization: SN MS

391 Writing – original draft: SN MS

392 Writing – review & editing: SN JP MS KP MC JAM PP

393

394 **References**

- 395 1. Grohskopf LA, Alyanak E, Broder KR, Blanton LH, Fry AM, Jernigan DB, et al.
396 Prevention and control of seasonal influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the
397 advisory committee on immunization practices - United States, 2020-21 influenza
398 season. *MMWR Recomm Rep.* 2020;69(8):1-24. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.rr6908a1.
399 PubMed PMID: 32820746.

- 400 2. Buchy P, Badur S, Kassianos G, Preiss S, Tam JS. Vaccinating pregnant women
401 against influenza needs to be a priority for all countries: an expert commentary. *Int J*
402 *Infect Dis.* 2020;92:1-12. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2019.12.019.
- 403 3. World Health Organization. Vaccines against influenza WHO position paper—
404 November 2012. *Wkly Epidemiol Rec.* 2012;87(47):461-76.
- 405 4. Quach THT, Mallis NA, Cordero JF. Influenza vaccine efficacy and effectiveness in
406 pregnant women: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Matern Child Health J.*
407 2020;24(2):229-40. doi: 10.1007/s10995-019-02844-y.
- 408 5. Nunes MC, Madhi SA. Influenza vaccination during pregnancy for prevention of
409 influenza confirmed illness in the infants: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hum*
410 *Vaccin Immunother.* 2018;14(3):758-66. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2017.1345385.
- 411 6. Nunes MC, Aqil AR, Omer SB, Madhi SA. The effects of influenza vaccination during
412 pregnancy on birth outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Perinatol.*
413 2016;33(11):1104-14. Epub 2016/09/08. doi: 10.1055/s-0036-1586101. PubMed
414 PMID: 27603545.
- 415 7. Morales KF, Menning L, Lambach P. The faces of influenza vaccine recommendation:
416 a literature review of the determinants and barriers to health providers’
417 recommendation of influenza vaccine in pregnancy. *Vaccine.* 2020;38(31):4805-15.
418 doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.04.033.
- 419 8. Amin AB, Nunes MC, Tapia MD, Madhi SA, Cutland CL, Wairagkar N, et al.
420 Immunogenicity of influenza vaccines administered to pregnant women in randomized
421 clinical trials in Mali and South Africa. *Vaccine.* 2020;38(41):6478-83. doi:
422 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.07.020.

- 423 9. Steinhoff MC, Omer SB, Roy E, Arifeen SE, Raqib R, Altaye M, et al. Influenza
424 immunization in pregnancy — antibody responses in mothers and infants. *N Eng J*
425 *Med.* 2010;362(17):1644-6. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc0912599. PubMed PMID: 20427817.
- 426 10. Munoz FM, Jackson LA, Swamy GK, Edwards KM, Frey SE, Stephens I, et al. Safety
427 and immunogenicity of seasonal trivalent inactivated influenza vaccines in pregnant
428 women. *Vaccine.* 2018;36(52):8054-61. Epub 2018/11/13. doi:
429 10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.10.088. PubMed PMID: 30416018.
- 430 11. Kay AW, Bayless NL, Fukuyama J, Aziz N, Dekker CL, Mackey S, et al. Pregnancy
431 does not attenuate the antibody or plasmablast response to inactivated influenza
432 vaccine. *J Infect Dis.* 2015;212(6):861-70. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiv138.
- 433 12. Schlaudecker EP, McNeal MM, Dodd CN, Ranz JB, Steinhoff MC. Pregnancy
434 modifies the antibody response to trivalent influenza immunization. *J Infect Dis.*
435 2012;206(11):1670-3. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jis592.
- 436 13. Schlaudecker EP, Ambroggio L, McNeal MM, Finkelman FD, Way SS. Declining
437 responsiveness to influenza vaccination with progression of human pregnancy.
438 *Vaccine.* 2018;36(31):4734-41. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.05.117.
- 439 14. Munoz FM, Patel SM, Jackson LA, Swamy GK, Edwards KM, Frey SE, et al. Safety
440 and immunogenicity of three seasonal inactivated influenza vaccines among pregnant
441 women and antibody persistence in their infants. *Vaccine.* 2020;38(33):5355-63. Epub
442 2020/06/24. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.05.059. PubMed PMID: 32571718.
- 443 15. Thongnoi P, Praphasiri P, Dawood FS, Lindblade KA. Maternal death from influenza
444 in tropical Thailand. *Lancet.* 2017;389(10068):571-2. doi: 10.1016/S0140-
445 6736(16)31334-4.

- 446 16. Owusu JT, Prapasiri P, Ditsungnoen D, Leetongin G, Yoocharoen P, Rattanayot J, et al.
447 Seasonal influenza vaccine coverage among high-risk populations in Thailand, 2010–
448 2012. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(5):742-7. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2014.10.029.
- 449 17. Kaoiean S, Kittikraisak W, Suntarattiwong P, Ditsungnoen D, Phadungkiatwatana P,
450 Srisantiroj N, et al. Predictors for influenza vaccination among Thai pregnant woman:
451 the role of physicians in increasing vaccine uptake. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*.
452 2019;13(6):582-92. doi: 10.1111/irv.12674.
- 453 18. Ditsungnoen D, Greenbaum A, Praphasiri P, Dawood FS, Thompson MG, Yoocharoen
454 P, et al. Knowledge, attitudes and beliefs related to seasonal influenza vaccine among
455 pregnant women in Thailand. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(18):2141-6. Epub 2016/02/09. doi:
456 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.01.056. PubMed PMID: 26854910; PubMed Central PMCID:
457 PMC4811693.
- 458 19. Leewongtrakul T, Kunpalin Y, Ingviya T, Chaithongwongwatthana S. Acceptance of
459 influenza vaccination among pregnant women attending the antenatal care clinic, King
460 Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital. *Thai Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*.
461 2017;75-82. doi: 10.14456/tjog.2017.12
- 462 20. Praphasiri P, Ditsungneon D, Greenbaum A, Dawood FS, Yoocharoen P, Stone DM, et
463 al. Do thai physicians recommend seasonal influenza vaccines to pregnant women? A
464 cross-sectional survey of physicians' perspectives and practices in thailand. *PLoS One*.
465 2017;12(1):e0169221. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0169221.
- 466 21. Kittikraisak W, Phadungkiatwatana P, Ditsungnoen D, Kaoiean S, Macareo L,
467 Rungrojcharoenkit K, et al. Comparison of influenza antibody titers among women
468 who were vaccinated in the 2nd and the 3rd trimesters of pregnancy. *Vaccine*.
469 2021;39(1):18-25. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2020.11.032.

- 470 22. World Health Organization. Recommended composition of influenza virus vaccines for
471 use in the 2018 southern hemisphere influenza season. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO,
472 2017 [cited 2021 Feb 9]. Available from:
473 https://www.who.int/influenza/vaccines/virus/recommendations/2018_south/en/.
- 474 23. WHO Global Influenza Surveillance Network. Serological diagnosis of influenza by
475 haemagglutination inhibition testing. In: Manual for the laboratory diagnosis and
476 virological surveillance of influenza. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO, 2011.
- 477 24. Chittaganpitch M, Puthavathana P, Praphasiri P, Waicharoen S, Shrestha M, Mott JA,
478 et al. Antibody responses against influenza B lineages among community-dwelling
479 individuals 65 years of age or older having received trivalent inactivated influenza
480 vaccine during two consecutive seasons in Thailand. *Southeast Asian J Trop Med*
481 *Public Health*. 2019;50(3):500-13.
- 482 25. Fleiss JL, Levin B, Paik MC. Statistical methods for rates and proportions: John Wiley
483 & Sons; 2013.
- 484 26. Gelman A, Hill J, Yajima M. Why we (usually) don't have to worry about multiple
485 comparisons. *J Res Educ Eff*. 2012;5(2):189-211. doi: 10.1080/19345747.2011.618213.
- 486 27. Sperling RS, Engel SM, Wallenstein S, Kraus TA, Garrido J, Singh T, et al.
487 Immunogenicity of trivalent inactivated influenza vaccination received during
488 pregnancy or postpartum. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2012;119(3):631-9. doi:
489 10.1097/AOG.0b013e318244ed20. PubMed PMID: 00006250-201203000-00021.
- 490 28. Ohfuji S, Fukushima W, Deguchi M, Kawabata K, Yoshida H, Hatayama H, et al.
491 Immunogenicity of a monovalent 2009 Influenza A (H1N1) vaccine among pregnant
492 women: lowered antibody response by prior seasonal vaccination. *J Infect Dis*.
493 2011;203(9):1301-8. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jir026.

- 494 29. Wijnans L, Voordouw B. A review of the changes to the licensing of influenza vaccines
495 in Europe. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses*. 2016;10(1):2-8. doi: 10.1111/irv.12351.
- 496 30. European Medical Agency. Guideline on influenza vaccines. Non-clinical and clinical
497 module. London, England: Committee for Medicinal Products for Human Use,
498 European Medicines Agency, 2016. [cited 2021 Feb 9]. Available from:
499 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/influenza-vaccines-non-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/influenza-vaccines-non-clinical-clinical-module_en.pdf)
500 [clinical-clinical-module_en.pdf](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/influenza-vaccines-non-clinical-clinical-module_en.pdf)
- 501 31. Black S, Nicolay U, Vesikari T, Knuf M, Del Giudice G, Della Cioppa G, et al.
502 Hemagglutination inhibition antibody titers as a correlate of protection for inactivated
503 influenza vaccines in children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2011;30(12):1081-5. doi:
504 10.1097/INF.0b013e3182367662. PubMed PMID: 00006454-201112000-00014.
- 505 32. Coudeville L, Bailleux F, Riche B, Megas F, Andre P, Ecochard R. Relationship
506 between haemagglutination-inhibiting antibody titres and clinical protection against
507 influenza: development and application of a bayesian random-effects model. *BMC Med*
508 *Res Methodol*. 2010;10(1):18. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-10-18.
- 509 33. Sutthichai Nakphook, et al. Effectiveness of trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine
510 among pregnant women: a one-year prospective cohort study in Nakhon Phanom.
511 *Chiangrai Medical Journal*. Forthcoming 2021;13(1)

513 **Supporting information**

514 **S1 Table. Vaccine strain matching during the study period**

515 **S2 Dataset and codebook.**




Fig1. Study flow diagram

Pre and post-vaccination GMT among vaccinated pregnant and non-pregnant women




Figure 2. Comparison of influenza antibody geometric mean titers before and after vaccination between pregnant and non-pregnant participants