

## **Impact of ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept to accelerate cervical cancer elimination in Norway: A model-based analysis**

**Authors:** Allison Portnoy<sup>1,2</sup>, Kine Pedersen<sup>3</sup>, Jane J. Kim<sup>2</sup>, Emily A. Burger<sup>2,3</sup>

**Affiliations:** <sup>1</sup>Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA; <sup>2</sup>Center for Health Decision Science, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA; <sup>3</sup>Department of Health Management and Health Economics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

**Address correspondence to:** Allison Portnoy, Department of Global Health, Boston University School of Public Health, 801 Massachusetts Avenue, Boston MA 02118, USA. Phone: +1(617) 358-0041. ORCID: 0000-0002-8467-1324. Email: [aportnoy@bu.edu](mailto:aportnoy@bu.edu)

## **Abstract**

### **Background:**

Experts have proposed an ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept targeting age-groups maintaining circulation of human papillomavirus (HPV). We explored the effects of these proposals compared with cervical cancer (CC) screening-based interventions on age-standardized incidence rate (ASR) and CC elimination (<4 cases per 100,000 women) timing in Norway.

### **Methods:**

We used a model-based approach to evaluate alternative HPV vaccination and CC screening scenarios compared with a status-quo scenario reflecting previous vaccination and screening. For cohorts ages 25–35 years, we examined 11 vaccination scenarios that incrementally increased vaccination coverage from current cohort-specific rates. Each vaccination scenario was coupled with three alternative screening strategies that varied the frequency of HPV-based screening. Population- and cohort-level outcomes included ASR, lifetime risk of CC, and colposcopy referrals.

### **Results:**

Several vaccination strategies coupled with de-intensified screening frequencies lowered population ASR, but did not accelerate CC elimination unless incremental vaccination coverage reached ~90% for vaccine-naïve cohorts. Alternative strategies that increased screening adherence could both accelerate elimination and improve ASR compared to status-quo.

### **Conclusions:**

An ‘EVEN FASTER’ campaign is unlikely to accelerate CC elimination but may reduce population-level ASR. Alternatively, targeting under- and never-screeners may both eliminate CC faster and lead to greater health benefits compared with vaccination-based interventions.

## 1 **Background**

2

3 Following the proposal of ‘HPV FASTER’ to extend eligible vaccination age and pair with  
4 screening tests,<sup>1</sup> experts have recently proposed an ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept.<sup>2</sup> The concept  
5 involves intensifying concomitant screening and vaccination campaigns to age-groups  
6 maintaining circulation of human papillomavirus (HPV) infection, the causal agent of nearly all  
7 cervical cancer. Advocates suggest this approach could both accelerate elimination of cervical  
8 cancer as a public health problem (defined as an incidence rate of <4 cases per 100,000 women<sup>3</sup>)  
9 and reduce the need for screening.<sup>1,2,4</sup> While projections of elimination given current prevention  
10 efforts include Australia in 2028, USA in 2039–2046, and Norway in 2039,<sup>5-7</sup> the ‘EVEN  
11 FASTER’ concept implies that these timeframes could be accelerated.

12

13 The role of vaccination on the elimination timeframe is unclear based on current evidence given  
14 the relatively long dwell time from HPV infection to cervical cancer.<sup>8</sup> Models have estimated  
15 that most causal infections for women occur prior to the age of 25 years;<sup>9</sup> for the women who  
16 acquire their causal infection later in life, it will take at least 10–20 years from the time of  
17 prevention of their causal infection to the prevention of an invasive cancer. In a US-based  
18 cervical cancer elimination analysis, increasing vaccination coverage did not result in projections  
19 of an earlier elimination timeframe given the already-high levels of vaccination, although this  
20 analysis did not include vaccination of mid-adult women.<sup>6</sup> In contrast, the US analysis showed  
21 that improving screening coverage and follow-up adherence, particularly among women who  
22 screen infrequently, were likely to accelerate cervical cancer elimination.<sup>6</sup> The introduction and  
23 implementation of HPV self-sampling as a screening strategy could further increase the impact  
24 among women who infrequently screen.<sup>10</sup>

25

26 Furthermore, it remains unclear whether vaccination of mid-adult women could reduce the need  
27 for cervical cancer screening. Previous studies have shown that screening frequency may be  
28 reduced among vaccinated women, and will be necessary to maintain the harm-benefit balance  
29 and cost-effectiveness of screening, but these studies generally focused on girls vaccinated in  
30 adolescence rather than catch-up programs of older age cohorts.<sup>11,12</sup> While vaccination paired  
31 with less intensive screening strategies could be an important way to reduce dependence on

32 screening and related resources and harms, there are uncertainties around vaccine efficacy in  
33 older women as well as on latent infections, which may contribute to overestimations of vaccine  
34 impact.<sup>13</sup>

35  
36 Importantly, when deciding to de-intensify screening among fully or partially vaccinated cohorts,  
37 decision-makers must decide what benchmark of effectiveness they are willing to accept.  
38 Simulation models have been used to project the age-standardized incidence rates (ASR) among  
39 vaccine-eligible birth cohorts under alternative screening frequencies required to maintain harm-  
40 benefits ratios and cost-effectiveness.<sup>11,12</sup> As a common benchmark comparator is based on  
41 current levels of screening and vaccination practice, the ASR may appear to increase in order to  
42 maintain efficiency (i.e., a similar ratio of health gains to costs incurred).<sup>7,12</sup> Alternatively, a fully  
43 unvaccinated cohort of women screened under status-quo recommendations (e.g., 5-yearly  
44 screening) could be used as benchmark of an acceptable level of disease risk. De-intensifying  
45 screening alongside expanding vaccination coverage per the ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept could  
46 improve efficiency and harm-benefits ratio, but may not improve health benefits compared to a  
47 stringent status-quo of high vaccination coverage with frequent screening. Therefore, it is unclear  
48 whether ASR achieved under current screening guidelines should remain the benchmark for  
49 measuring effectiveness, as this population-level metric could mask relevant outcomes at the  
50 cohort level, such as cervical cancer cases averted, colposcopies avoided, and change in the  
51 lifetime risk of cervical cancer.<sup>14</sup>

52  
53 Implementation of programs based on HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ are time-sensitive in countries  
54 that introduced vaccination following approval and licensure, and may not be a one-size-fits-all  
55 recommendation. For example, as of 2023, vaccination coverage is high in Norway and few  
56 cohorts under age 35 years remain unvaccinated (women aged 33–35 years and boys 18–35 years  
57 remain fully naïve to direct vaccine protection, although likely receive considerable herd  
58 immunity benefits). In a recent white paper, the Cancer Registry of Norway proposes a new  
59 catch-up vaccination program (including re-vaccination of all men and women vaccinated with  
60 the first generation vaccines) for men and women up to age 30 years (inter alia) as an approach  
61 to expedite cervical cancer elimination.<sup>15</sup> However, recent and ongoing vaccine shortages

62 warrant careful evaluation of intensifying vaccination programs, particularly in settings like  
63 Norway with high coverage, prior to using resources that may not derive sufficient benefits.<sup>16</sup>

64  
65 The HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ hypotheses (acceleration of cervical cancer and reduction in the  
66 need for screening) need to be confirmed, first in terms of health impact and second in terms of  
67 efficiency. As a first step, we explored the health effects of the ‘EVEN FASTER’ proposals and  
68 alternative screening-based scenarios under context-specific contact patterns in Norway on  
69 cervical cancer burden and timing of cervical cancer elimination.

70  
71

## 72 **Methods**

73  
74 *Scenarios and model assumptions*

75 Using a multi-modeling approach that captured HPV transmission and cervical carcinogenesis,<sup>5</sup>  
76 we estimated the ASRs, HPV prevalence rates, and lifetime cervical cancer risk associated with  
77 alternative 2-valent vaccination and screening scenarios compared with a status-quo scenario  
78 reflecting previous vaccination and screening for cohorts ages 25–35 years (including women  
79 previously targeted by temporary catch-up vaccination campaigns). In our base case, we  
80 examined 11 vaccination scenarios that incrementally increased vaccination coverage by a  
81 maximum of 20%, i.e., from 2021 cohort-specific rates for previously vaccinated cohorts to 90%  
82 for girls and 89% for boys and to 20% for vaccine-naïve female cohorts aged 33–35 (Figure 1)  
83 and vaccine-naïve male cohorts aged 18–35 (Figure S1) in 2023.<sup>17</sup> These vaccination scenarios  
84 reflect the historic timing and age-specific receipt of any vaccine type relevant for prior routine  
85 and catch-up vaccination coverage of the specified cohorts. Norway introduced their temporary  
86 female catch-up program in 2016, seven years after their routine female 12-year-old program  
87 was implemented in 2009, and also switched from an initial 4-valent to 2-valent HPV vaccine  
88 program.<sup>5,18</sup> A routine program for 12-year-old boys was introduced in 2018. Our base case  
89 assumed vaccine efficacy of 100% against HPV-16/18 infections for all vaccines regardless of  
90 age of vaccine receipt.<sup>19-21</sup> Additionally, we assumed the 2-valent vaccine provided cross-  
91 protective efficacy of 93.8%, 79.1%, and 82.6% for HPV types 31, 33, and 45, respectively.<sup>22</sup>  
92 The duration of protection for type-specific vaccine efficacy was assumed to be lifelong. We

93 chose to take an optimistic approach by assuming that vaccine efficacy has an age-independent  
94 effect on reducing the probability of acquiring a newly acquired or reactivated latent infection,  
95 but has no effect on prevalent infections or clearance of infections on the causal pathway to  
96 cancer. Therefore, as the cumulative proportion of causal infections increases with age, the  
97 effectiveness of the vaccine against cancer remains age-dependent. The impact of age-specific  
98 vaccine efficacy against an incident infection was explored in sensitivity analysis. Vaccination  
99 was applied irrespective of current HPV status, i.e., vaccination was not paired with a primary  
100 HPV screening for this exploratory analysis.

101  
102 To explore the impact of vaccination and de-intensified screening, each vaccination scenario was  
103 coupled with a screening scenario that varied the frequency of HPV-based screening (5-yearly  
104 (status-quo), 7-yearly, or 10-yearly) for a total of 34 strategies including status-quo. To reflect  
105 the newly implemented 2023 screening guidelines in Norway that uniformly recommends HPV-  
106 based screening, i.e., replaces 3-yearly cytology with 5-yearly HPV testing for women aged 25–  
107 33 years,<sup>23</sup> the status-quo screening program assumed 5-yearly primary HPV-based screening for  
108 women aged 25 years beginning in 2023. For women aged 26–33 years, we assumed their next  
109 eligible primary screening involved primary HPV testing. For all women aged 34–69 years in  
110 2020, we assumed they were screened using primary HPV testing (reflecting the replacement of  
111 cytology screening with primary HPV screening in Norway for older women). The full list of  
112 analyzed scenarios is detailed in Table 1.

113  
114 All scenarios were conducted in the context of imperfect screening coverage centered around the  
115 5-yearly screening interval based on empirical data from the Norwegian screening  
116 program.<sup>5,11,24,25</sup> We assumed that Norwegian women would over-screen at a proportion of  
117 28.2% (3-yearly), under-screen at a proportion of 15% (10–15-yearly), or never attend screening  
118 at a proportion of 6%, with the proportion of screening-compliant women (50.8%) centered  
119 around the 5-yearly interval. For both the 7-yearly and 10-yearly intervals, we assumed an over-  
120 screen proportion of 28.2% (5-yearly), under-screen proportion of 11.3% (15-yearly), never-  
121 screen proportion of 6%, and screening-compliant proportion of 54.5% (7-yearly and 10-yearly,  
122 respectively).

123

124 *Analysis*

125 In order to unmask potentially important cohort-specific differences, we enumerated both  
126 population- and cohort-level outcomes. For population-level outcomes, we estimated the health  
127 impact on cervical cancer burden in terms of the following outcomes: ASRs of cervical cancer  
128 incidence per 100,000 woman-years between 2009 and 2110 (inclusive) and age-standardized  
129 HPV-16 prevalence.<sup>26</sup> For population-level outcomes, model outcomes were aggregated over  
130 multiple birth cohorts to capture the lifetime health benefits of women born prior to the year  
131 2110. We additionally estimated the number of lifetime colposcopies performed as a non-health  
132 effect and resources use. Importantly, the level of status-quo vaccination coverage varied greatly  
133 between the cohorts, e.g., status-quo for the 25-year-old women in 2023 included a very high  
134 baseline level of vaccination coverage of 88%, while the status-quo for the 35-year-old women  
135 in 2023 did not include any directly protected women. Therefore, we also compared the cohort-  
136 specific outcomes to a screening-only, no-vaccination scenario as a standardized comparator to  
137 benchmark health benefits under deintensified screening.

138  
139 We defined the elimination year as the year in which ASR of cervical cancer incidence  
140 consistently decreased to <4 new cases per 100,000 woman-years. Base-case results were age-  
141 standardized to the standard Norway population (0–84 years).<sup>27</sup> We calculated the number of  
142 colposcopies performed each year by applying the Norway female population projections for  
143 2009 to 2110 from United Nations World Population Prospects.<sup>28</sup> We extracted the lifetime risk  
144 of cervical cancer for cohorts aged 25, 30, and 35 years in 2023 and calculated percentage  
145 change in lifetime risk compared to status-quo and a screening-only, no-vaccination scenario.

146  
147 As the HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept combines the goal of accelerating elimination<sup>2</sup> with the  
148 ‘HPV-FASTER’ concept of reducing the need for frequent screening,<sup>1</sup> we combined the metrics  
149 of elimination year and ASR by 2050 as a proxy metric for monitoring the health impact of  
150 reducing screening intensity to evaluate our analytic scenarios. Specifically, we compared to a  
151 projected cervical cancer elimination year of 2038 and ASR of 2.29 cervical cancer cases per  
152 100,000 women by 2050 in the status-quo scenario. We categorized the 34 scenarios into one of  
153 five groups depending on potential outcomes: (1) scenarios that did not de-intensify screening,  
154 decreased ASR in year 2050, but did not accelerate cervical cancer elimination compared to

155 status-quo; (2) strategies that did not de-intensify screening, decreased ASR in year 2050, and  
156 accelerated cervical cancer elimination compared to status-quo; (3) strategies that de-intensified  
157 screening, decreased ASR in year 2050, but did not accelerate cervical cancer elimination  
158 compared to status-quo; (4) strategies that de-intensified screening, decreased ASR in year 2050,  
159 and accelerated cervical cancer elimination compared to status-quo; and (5) strategies that de-  
160 intensified screening and neither decreased ASR in year 2050 nor accelerated cervical cancer  
161 elimination compared to status-quo. Scenarios falling in group 4 would be considered  
162 confirmations of the HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept.

163

#### 164 *Alternative to ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept*

165 As prior analyses have shown that scaling up screening participation can accelerate cervical  
166 cancer elimination,<sup>6</sup> we also examined an alternative to the ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept which  
167 assumed increased screening adherence rather than increased vaccination coverage. We defined  
168 this alternative concept to screening adherence in two ways: (1) all women who currently under-  
169 screen (15% of women at a 10–15-yearly interval) are adherent with a 5-yearly screening  
170 interval; and (2) all women who under-screen and 50% of women who never screen (6% of  
171 women) are adherent with a 5-yearly interval. Screening adherence changes were operationalized  
172 with two different approaches: (a) restricted to ages 25–35 only; and (b) implementation for all  
173 women aged 25–69. Due to computational restrictions, we assumed that increasing adherence  
174 occurred in 2020 for women aged 35–69 and in 2023 for women 25–35 years, alongside the  
175 switch to primary HPV-based screening for the relevant cohorts.

176

#### 177 *Sensitivity analysis*

178 We conducted sensitivity analyses to assess the effect of certain assumptions on our results. First,  
179 we assumed two higher alternatives to vaccine coverage level for vaccine-naïve cohorts (i.e.,  
180 female cohorts aged 33–35 and male cohorts aged 18–35 in 2023), 50% coverage, and 90%  
181 coverage, compared to these cohorts reaching 20% coverage in the base-case. Second, we  
182 assessed the effect of the World Female Population 2015 (0–99 years)<sup>29</sup> as an alternative  
183 population structure on the elimination year and for comparison to elimination analyses in other  
184 countries as the benchmark population structure in use for global predictions by WHO).<sup>30,31</sup>  
185 Third, to account for the potential of reduced vaccine efficacy by age (also a proxy for reduced



186 efficacy in latent HPV infections), we assumed that vaccine efficacy was reduced by 25% for  
187 individuals aged 24 and older, consistent with vaccine-efficacy studies,<sup>32,33</sup> for both historical  
188 vaccination and any ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination strategies.

189

190

## 191 **Results**

192

### 193 *Population health impact and elimination timing*

194 Increasing vaccination by vaccinating women up to age 25–35 years is expected to decrease  
195 circulation of HPV-16, which confirms the ‘EVEN FASTER’ hypothesis; however, the  
196 reductions in prevalence decreased at a decreasing rate as vaccination age increased (Figure 2A).  
197 In addition, HPV-16 remains in circulation in the population beyond 2050. However, when  
198 isolating HPV-16 prevalence only among cohorts aged 25–35, prevalence is expected to plateau  
199 at its lowest level (0.1%) approximately one year earlier than status-quo, i.e., without ‘EVEN  
200 FASTER’ campaigns (Figure 2B).

201

202 With the recent introduction of universal primary HPV testing for all screening-age women in  
203 2023, Norway is projected to accelerate their elimination timeframe by one year (from 2039 to  
204 2038) compared with previous screening guidelines of 3-yearly primary cytology-based  
205 screening for women aged 25–33 years followed by a switch to 5-yearly primary HPV testing for  
206 women aged 34–69 years (Figure S2). The 2023 guideline also reached a lower cervical cancer  
207 incidence of 2.29/100,000 woman-years as compared with the previous prevention policies  
208 (2.51/100,000 woman-years).

209

210 Under ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination campaigns for men and women aged  $\leq 35$  years, increasing  
211 vaccination coverage by  $\leq 20\%$  coverage (depending on a cohorts’ prior coverage) accelerated  
212 the elimination timeframe by one additional year, to 2037, compared to the status-quo  
213 elimination year of 2038 (Figure 3A). However, the incremental vaccine coverage would need to  
214 be increased for both men and women up to at least age 34 years in order to achieve acceleration  
215 of cervical cancer elimination by 1 year (Table S1). All strategies that increased vaccination only  
216 (i.e., screening maintained a 5-yearly frequency) resulted in an ASR that was lower than status-

217 quo. When we coupled the vaccination strategies with de-intensified screening, we found 13  
218 strategies—that generally included primary HPV testing at 7-yearly or 10-yearly intervals  
219 alongside vaccination of a greater number of cohorts—lowered ASR by 2050 (Figure 3B). We  
220 identified a total of 22 strategies that yielded an ASR that was lower than status-quo but did not  
221 accelerate cervical cancer elimination (Groups 1 and 3), while no strategies both accelerated  
222 cervical cancer elimination and de-intensified screening (Group 4). In other words, our base-case  
223 scenario did not support the ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept in terms of projected acceleration of the  
224 elimination timeline.

225

### 226 *Alternative to ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept*

227 When we explored the impact of increasing screening adherence as an alternative to increasing  
228 vaccination coverage for women aged 25–35 years, we found elimination timing could be  
229 accelerated by one year, but only if both under-screener and prior never-screener were reached.  
230 A targeted approach to improving adherence among all screen-eligible women (aged 25–69  
231 years) was projected to accelerate elimination between 2 and 5 years depending on the program’s  
232 ability to reach never-screener. Importantly, all screening-adherence related scenarios improved  
233 ASR compared to status-quo.

234

### 235 *Cohort-specific health impact*

236 For cohorts aged 25, 30, and 35 years in 2023, all examined strategies resulted in a decreased  
237 number of colposcopies compared to status-quo; however, a larger number of colposcopies were  
238 avoided as screening frequency decreased and as vaccination age increased (Table 2). In contrast  
239 to resource use, the direction of the health effects varied with the strategy. For example, for  
240 women aged 25 years in 2023, strategies that incrementally increased vaccination coverage only  
241 (i.e., maintained 5-yearly screening frequency) decreased the lifetime risk of cervical cancer by  
242 3.7% compared with cohort-specific status-quo, but screening intensity could only be reduced  
243 from 5-yearly to 7-yearly without increasing lifetime risk for this cohort. Although the lifetime  
244 risk of cervical cancer for this cohort decreased by 8.7% as vaccination age increased to age 35  
245 years (due to herd immunity), decreasing screening frequency to 10-yearly consistently increased  
246 lifetime risk compared to status-quo. However, when changing the comparator, screening could  
247 be de-intensified to 10-yearly for 25-year-olds while achieving nearly a 66% reduction in

248 lifetime risk of developing cervical cancer compared with a screening-only (no-vaccination)  
249 scenario.

250  
251 For women aged 30 years in 2023, increasing vaccination coverage up to age 30 years yields the  
252 greatest health impact by maintaining the 5-yearly screening frequency (7.2% reduction in  
253 lifetime risk compared to status-quo), but this cohort can reduce screening frequency to 10-  
254 yearly and continue to maintain health benefits (2.9% reduction in lifetime risk compared to  
255 status-quo). Similarly for women aged 35 in 2023, increasing vaccination coverage up to age 35  
256 still allows for concomitantly decreasing screening frequency with improved lifetime health  
257 outcomes compared to status-quo. The projected reductions in lifetime risk were greater when  
258 compared to a screening-only, no-vaccination (and no circulating herd immunity) scenario.

259  
260 *Sensitivity analysis*

261 When we assumed that vaccine-naïve cohorts (i.e., female cohorts aged 33–35 years and male  
262 cohorts aged 18–35 years in 2023) could achieve 50% coverage (rather than 20%), we still did  
263 not identify any strategies that both accelerated cervical cancer elimination and de-intensified  
264 screening (Table S2). However, when we assumed that vaccine-naïve cohorts reached  
265 maximum-achieved coverage (i.e., 90% for females and 89% for males), we identified in two  
266 strategies that were projected to both accelerate cervical cancer elimination and de-intensify  
267 screening: vaccinating up to age 34 or age 35 with a 7-yearly screening frequency (Table S3).  
268 For example, compared to 20% coverage in the base-case scenario, assuming that vaccine-naïve  
269 cohorts achieved 50% coverage resulted in greater reductions in the lifetime risk of cervical  
270 cancer compared to status-quo: 11.4% for 5-yearly screening, 9.6% for 7-yearly screening, and  
271 6.7% for 10-yearly screening for the age 35 cohort in 2023 (Table S4). Similarly, assuming that  
272 vaccine-naïve cohorts achieved maximum-achieved coverage maximized the reductions in the  
273 lifetime risk of cervical cancer compared to status-quo: 15.3% for 5-yearly screening, 13.9% for  
274 7-yearly screening, and 11.2% for 10-yearly screening for the age 35 cohort in 2023 (Table S4).

275  
276 Compared to the optimistic full vaccine efficacy in the base-case scenario, assuming that vaccine  
277 efficacy was reduced by 25% for women aged 24 and older, for both historical vaccination and  
278 any additional ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination, resulted in a projected elimination year of 2038 or

279 later for all examined scenarios (i.e., no strategies in Groups 2 and 4) (Table S5). Among the 18  
280 strategies that decreased ASR, 7 strategies also involved a de-intensified screening frequency of  
281 7-yearly screening but required vaccination up to at least age 29 years. From an individual cohort  
282 perspective, the overall benefits of vaccination decreased and there was more uncertainty in the  
283 potential to simultaneously reduce the screening frequency (Table S6). For example, increasing  
284 vaccination to age 35 years and reducing screening frequency to 10-yearly no longer provided  
285 reductions in lifetime cancer risk compared with status quo for the 35-year-olds. Finally,  
286 compared to a projected elimination year of 2038 given age-standardization with the Norway  
287 standard population in the base-case scenario, age-standardization with the World Female  
288 Population 2015 resulted in a projected elimination year of 2034 or later for all examined  
289 scenarios (i.e., no strategies in Groups 2 and 4) (Table S7).

290

291

## 292 **Discussion**

293 In our analysis, we tested the hypotheses that HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ could accelerate cervical  
294 cancer elimination and reduce the need for screening. We also compared the ‘EVEN FASTER’  
295 vaccination-based interventions with screening-based interventions to achieve the same  
296 endpoints. Although we projected that 22 different analyzed strategies would yield an ASR that  
297 was lower than status-quo from a population perspective, none of the analyzed strategies both  
298 de-intensified screening and accelerated the timeline for cervical cancer to be eliminated as a  
299 public health problem, which does not support the proposed benefits of the ‘EVEN FASTER’  
300 concept. Two strategies did accelerate the timeline for elimination, involving incremental  
301 vaccine coverage added for all women up to age 34 or 35 with current screening intensity (5-  
302 yearly) maintained, resulting in a projected elimination year of 2037 (compared to 2038 in  
303 status-quo). However, vaccinating cohorts up to age 35 (assuming  $\leq 20\%$  coverage for vaccine-  
304 naïve cohorts) would involve administering 377,149 additional doses of HPV vaccine (to both  
305 males and females, assuming a 3-dose schedule for individuals aged 15 years and older) and cost  
306 more than \$141 billion USD (assuming a cost of \$375 USD per person). In sensitivity analysis,  
307 we identified at least one strategy that confirmed the ‘EVEN FASTER’ hypothesis, but would  
308 require vaccination of vaccine-naïve cohorts at maximum-achieved coverage levels (i.e., 90% for  
309 females and 89% for males).

310  
311 As an alternative to vaccine-based interventions to increase cervical cancer elimination  
312 according to the ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept, we looked at scenarios that increased the levels of  
313 adherence to screening and projected elimination timeframes that could be as early as the year  
314 2033. Importantly, we projected that increases to screening adherence achieved the greatest  
315 health impact in the long term (ASR by 2050 of 1.62–2.10/100,000 woman-years for the most  
316 optimistically increased screening adherence compared to 2.12/100,000 woman-years for the  
317 most optimistically increased vaccination coverage). Compared to clinician-collected HPV  
318 testing, self-collected HPV testing approaches have been shown to be effective and cost-  
319 effective.<sup>10,34,35</sup> A previous analysis of cervical cancer elimination in the United States has also  
320 shown that scaling up screening participation is a viable option to accelerate the timeline to  
321 elimination<sup>6</sup> and is likely considered cost-effective in Norway.<sup>36,37</sup> To move the needle on the  
322 elimination timeframe, comprehensive strategies that target women at ages where the burden of  
323 cervical cancer is greatest (ages 35–50 years in 2023), are required. Whether incremental  
324 vaccination coverage or increased screening adherence influence projected elimination  
325 timeframes, all examined scenarios in this analysis are time-sensitive as cohorts continue to age  
326 (and experience their causal HPV infection).

327  
328 There were some important differences in our results between our population-level outcomes and  
329 our cohort-specific outcomes. For example, at a population level, we found that vaccinating at  
330 least to age 29 or 30 years enabled reductions in screening frequency (Group 3); however, at a  
331 cohort level, some reduced screening frequencies implied increases in lifetime risk for the age 25  
332 cohort (when compared with status quo). In addition, we found seemingly counterintuitive  
333 results that screening frequency could not be reduced to 10-yearly screening and reduce the  
334 lifetime risk of cancer among the 25-year-olds but could be reduced to 10-yearly screening for  
335 the two older cohorts. As nearly 88% of women aged 25 in 2023 were vaccinated prior to the  
336 ‘EVEN FASTER’ campaign scenarios analyzed, the ‘EVEN FASTER’ campaign implied only  
337 an approximately 2% increase in coverage for women, which yields a relatively small marginal  
338 increase in the status-quo benefits. Consequently, and despite these women having the lowest  
339 status-quo lifetime cervical cancer risk (i.e., 0.175%), decreasing screening frequency under  
340 small incremental increases in coverage led to increases in lifetime risk when compared with

341 their own status-quo benefits. Additionally, this cohort only became eligible for screening in  
342 2023, whereas older cohorts that previously entered the screening program may have received  
343 protection from prior lifetime screens at 5-yearly screening intervals compared to the 25-year-old  
344 cohort. As previously mentioned, the benchmark against which we measure health improvements  
345 can be a moving target for vaccinated or partially-vaccinated cohorts. When compared against a  
346 more standardized comparator, i.e., a screening-only and no-vaccination scenario, the 25-year-  
347 olds can be screened less frequently while experiencing a nearly 66% reduction in lifetime risk,  
348 which may be important to maintain the harm-benefits ratios of screening.<sup>11</sup>

349  
350 We conducted an exploratory analysis looking at both feasible and maximum-achievable benefits  
351 of an ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination policy, but we did not assume that vaccination was paired  
352 with an initial primary HPV screen. In other words, we applied vaccination irrespective of HPV  
353 status as proposed in a recent white paper by the Cancer Registry of Norway.<sup>15</sup> However,  
354 compared to the white paper’s proposal, we neither explored the use of 9-valent vaccine, nor re-  
355 vaccination of women previously vaccinated with the 2-valent vaccine. As the majority of  
356 cervical cancers that occur among younger women (the target of ‘EVEN FASTER’ campaigns)  
357 are caused by HPV-16 and HPV-18,<sup>38</sup> of which both types are already directly protected by the  
358 2-valent vaccine, we do not expect the 9-valent to affect the timeframe to elimination  
359 substantially. In a prior analysis,<sup>5</sup> we found that the 9-valent vaccine yielded an incremental  
360 benefit compared with the 2-valent; however, these incremental benefits were not considered  
361 cost-effective in the routine childhood vaccination program unless there were large discounts on  
362 the vaccine price. The prior cost-effectiveness analysis also included the added benefits the 9-  
363 valent vaccine types may have on preventing screening-positives and precancer treatments, but  
364 these outcomes were not considered in this health impact analysis.

365  
366 There are several limitations to consider. Given the varied age-specific trends in vaccination  
367 coverage, there is much uncertainty in potential achievable coverage for a 1-year vaccination  
368 campaign. Therefore, we explored a range of coverage assumptions but assumed a conservative  
369 estimate of 20% in the base case, and 50% and 90% in scenario analyses. We made a simplifying  
370 assumption that the initial switch to primary HPV screening for women aged 34–69 occurred  
371 nationwide in 2020 rather than gradual scale-up over multiple years and that the switch to

372 primary HPV screening occurred immediately for women aged 25 and older in 2023 who had not  
373 previously switched. The exact timing of elimination of the new ‘status quo’ screening program  
374 in Norway is likely impacted by these assumptions. We also did not consider explicit  
375 reactivation of latent infections and potential differences in vaccine efficacy for reactivated  
376 infections, potentially overestimating vaccine benefit, but we included a scenario that assumed a  
377 25% reduction in vaccine efficacy for all individuals aged 24 years and older as a proxy. We did  
378 not consider the impact of ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination campaigns on non-cervical cancers;  
379 however, there are similar considerations around the proportion of men and women already  
380 infected with the causal HPV infections that will lead a non-cervical cancer and potential age-  
381 specific effects on efficacy for these individuals. Finally, we did not consider the potential  
382 correlation between women who are considered ‘over-screeners’ according to current Norwegian  
383 screening guidelines and who may then opt in for ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination, which may  
384 reduce the overall impact of a vaccination campaign.

385  
386 Finally, whether or not the ‘EVEN FASTER’ approach would be considered cost-effective  
387 according to priority-setting guidelines in Norway needs to be evaluated. In Norway, priority-  
388 setting is determined according to both health impact, such as ASR and/or the timing of cervical  
389 cancer elimination and the severity of the disease, and the economic efficiency, such as with a  
390 cost-effectiveness analysis framework. In addition, as the proposed ‘EVEN FASTER’ concept  
391 requires a large allocation of global vaccine supply resources, global vaccine equity  
392 considerations might need to be considered when prioritizing interventions to accelerate cervical  
393 cancer elimination in Norway.

394  
395 Increasing vaccination paired with less intensive screening frequencies can lead to greater  
396 benefits but would not accelerate cervical cancer elimination compared to current prevention  
397 policies. In contrast, interventions targeting under- and never-screeners may both eliminate  
398 cervical cancer faster and lead to greater cervical cancer health benefits compared with  
399 vaccination-based interventions. Future evaluations of HPV ‘EVEN FASTER’ will need to  
400 estimate the full economic implications of these policies. The next step to determine the best  
401 combination of strategies would be to conduct a full cost-effectiveness analysis to see if the  
402 health gains would be worth the costs.

**Additional Information:**

**Acknowledgements:**

The authors thank Bo T. Hansen, Berit Feiring, Ida Laake, Mari Nygård, Lill Trogstad, Megan A. Smith, and Stephen Sy for their collaboration and support on the previous analysis that this work builds on.

**Authors' contributions:**

AP and EAB conceptualized the study, conducted the data analysis, and drafted the initial manuscript. KP and JJK critically reviewed the analysis and manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

**Ethics approval and consent to participate:**

Not applicable.

**Consent for publication:**

Not applicable.

**Data availability:**

The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

**Competing interests:**

All authors have no competing interests to declare.

**Funding information:**

This study was funded by the Norwegian Cancer Society [grant number 198073; PI: EAB]. The views expressed in this Article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Norwegian Cancer Society.



**Table 1. Analyzed strategies**

Scenario	Vaccination coverage in 2023	Screening frequency
Status-Quo	Status-Quo	5y
Age25	Incremental coverage of ages 12–25 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age26	Incremental coverage of ages 12–26 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age27	Incremental coverage of ages 12–27 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age28	Incremental coverage of ages 12–28 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age29	Incremental coverage of ages 12–29 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age30	Incremental coverage of ages 12–30 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age31	Incremental coverage of ages 12–31 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age32	Incremental coverage of ages 12–32 to max coverage*	5y; 7y; 10y
Age33	Incremental coverage of ages 12–32 to max coverage* and incremental coverage of age 33 to 20%**	5y; 7y; 10y
	Incremental coverage of ages 12–32 to max coverage* and incremental coverage of ages 33–34 to 20%**	5y; 7y; 10y
Age34	Incremental coverage of ages 12–32 to max coverage* and incremental coverage of ages 33–35 to 20%**	5y; 7y; 10y
Age35	Incremental coverage of ages 12–32 to max coverage* and incremental coverage of ages 33–35 to 20%**	5y; 7y; 10y

\*Maximum coverage reached in routine program = 90% for girls, 89% for boys based on 2021 coverage levels.

\*\*Scenarios of 50% coverage and maximum coverage reached for vaccine-naïve cohorts examined in sensitivity analysis.

Note: status-quo = 5-yearly primary human papillomavirus screening for women aged 25–69 years and vaccination coverage based on 2021 coverage levels; y = yearly.

**Table 2. Lifetime outcomes for women by selected cohort age (25, 30, 35) in 2023\***

Scenario	Colposcopies avoided compared to status-quo			Change in lifetime cancer risk compared to status-quo**			Change in lifetime cancer risk compared to a screening-only, no-vaccination scenario**		
	25	30	35	25	30	35	25	30	35
Vax up to age 25, 10-yearly screening	2,824	2,385	3,158	9.1%	5.3%	6.3%	-65.5%	-29.6%	-7.4%
Vax up to age 25, 7-yearly screening	1,918	1,447	2,118	0.9%	1.4%	2.4%	-68.1%	-32.1%	-10.9%
Vax up to age 25, 5-yearly screening	441	163	73	-3.7%	-0.6%	-0.1%	-69.6%	-33.5%	-13.0%
Vax up to age 30, 10-yearly screening	3,198	3,800	3,594	3.8%	-2.9%	4.6%	-67.2%	-35.1%	-8.9%
Vax up to age 30, 7-yearly screening	2,354	3,096	2,623	-3.3%	-6.2%	0.8%	-69.5%	-37.3%	-12.2%
Vax up to age 30, 5-yearly screening	978	2,169	702	-8.1%	-7.2%	-1.4%	-71.0%	-37.9%	-14.2%
Vax up to age 35, 10-yearly screening	3,296	3,954	4,943	2.6%	-3.7%	-1.7%	-67.6%	-35.6%	-14.4%
Vax up to age 35, 7-yearly screening	2,466	3,270	4,173	-4.2%	-6.8%	-4.9%	-69.7%	-37.7%	-17.2%
Vax up to age 35, 5-yearly screening	1,111	2,385	2,636	-8.7%	-7.8%	-7%	-71.2%	-38.4%	-19.0%

\* Scaled to estimated number of women in Norway for each cohort age in 2023: 35,702 women aged 25; 37,160 women aged 30; 37,800 women aged 35.

\*\* Positive value indicates increase in lifetime cancer risk and negative value indicates decrease in lifetime cancer risk vs comparator scenario.

Note: Vax = vaccinate incrementally to maximum achieved vaccination coverage for previously vaccinated cohorts (females aged 12–32 and males aged 12–17 in 2023) and to 20% coverage for vaccine-naïve cohorts (females aged 33–35 and males aged 18–35 in 2023). Status-quo lifetime cervical cancer risk was 0.175%, 0.437%, and 0.588% for cohorts aged 25, 30, and 35 in 2023, respectively. Screening-only, no-vaccination scenario lifetime cervical cancer risk was 0.555%, 0.653%, and 0.675% for cohorts aged 25, 30, and 35 in 2023, respectively.

## References

1. Bosch FX, Robles C, Díaz M, Arbyn M, Baussano I, Clavel C, et al. HPV-FASTER: broadening the scope for prevention of HPV-related cancer. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2016;13(2):119-32.
2. Dillner J, Elfström M, Baussano I. The EVEN FASTER concept for cervical cancer elimination. [www.HPVWorld.com](http://www.HPVWorld.com), 182. [Online] Accessed 2 May 2022. Available at: <https://www.hpvworld.com/articles/the-even-faster-concept-for-cervical-cancer-elimination/>. 2021.
3. World Health Organization. Accelerating cervical cancer elimination. Report by the Director-General. Nov 30, 2018. [Online] Accessed 25 May 2020. Available at: [http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf\\_files/EB144/B144\\_28-en.pdf](http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB144/B144_28-en.pdf).
4. Dillner J, Elfström KM, Baussano I. Prospects for accelerated elimination of cervical cancer. *Prev Med*. 2021;153:106827.
5. Portnoy A, Pedersen K, Trogstad L, Hansen BT, Feiring B, Laake I, et al. Impact and cost-effectiveness of strategies to accelerate cervical cancer elimination: A model-based analysis. *Preventive Medicine*. 2021;144:106276.
6. Burger EA, Smith MA, Killen J, Sy S, Simms KT, Canfell K, et al. Projected time to elimination of cervical cancer in the USA: a comparative modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2020;5(4):e213-e22.
7. Hall MT, Simms KT, Lew JB, Smith MA, Brotherton JM, Saville M, et al. The projected timeframe until cervical cancer elimination in Australia: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health*. 2019;4(1):e19-e27.
8. Burger EA, de Kok I, Groene E, Killen J, Canfell K, Kulasingam S, et al. Estimating the Natural History of Cervical Carcinogenesis Using Simulation Models: A CISNET Comparative Analysis. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2020;112(9):955-63.
9. Burger EA, Sy S, Nygård M, Kristiansen IS, Kim JJ. Too late to vaccinate? The incremental benefits and cost-effectiveness of a delayed catch-up program using the 4-valent human papillomavirus vaccine in Norway. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;211(2):206-15.
10. Lozar T, Nagvekar R, Rohrer C, Dube Mandishora RS, Ivanus U, Fitzpatrick MB. Cervical Cancer Screening Postpandemic: Self-Sampling Opportunities to Accelerate the Elimination of Cervical Cancer. *Int J Womens Health*. 2021;13:841-59.
11. Pedersen K, Burger EA, Nygård M, Kristiansen IS, Kim JJ. Adapting cervical cancer screening for women vaccinated against human papillomavirus infections: The value of stratifying guidelines. *Eur J Cancer*. 2018;91:68-75.
12. Portnoy A, Pedersen K, Nygård M, Trogstad L, Kim JJ, Burger EA. Identifying a Single Optimal Integrated Cervical Cancer Prevention Policy in Norway: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *Med Decis Making*. 2022;42(6):795-807.
13. van Schalkwyk C, Moodley J, Welte A, Johnson LF. Estimated impact of human papillomavirus vaccines on infection burden: The effect of structural assumptions. *Vaccine*. 2019;37(36):5460-5.
14. O'Mahony JF, van Rosmalen J, Zauber AG, van Ballegooijen M. Multicohort models in cost-effectiveness analysis: why aggregating estimates over multiple cohorts can hide useful information. *Med Decis Making*. 2013;33(3):407-14.

15. Nygård M, Nygård S, Falkenthal T. Faster elimination of HPV and cervical cancer in Norway - the time window is open in 2023 and 2024. Cancer Registry of Norway. White Paper. 27 March 2023.
16. Garland SM, Stanley MA, Giuliano AR, Moscicki AB, Kaufmann A, Bhatla N, et al. IPVS statement on "Temporary HPV vaccine shortage: Implications globally to achieve equity". *Papillomavirus Res.* 2020;9:100195.
17. The Norwegian Immunization Registry. HPV Vaccine 2-Dose Coverage in Norway - Personal communication to Burger, E. 2020. Oslo, Norway: The Norwegian Immunization Registry.
18. Portnoy A, Nygård M, Trogstad L, Kim JJ, Burger EA. Impact of Delaying Effective and Cost-Effective Policy Decisions: An Example From Cervical Cancer Prevention in Norway. *MDM Policy Pract.* 2022;7(1):23814683211071093.
19. FUTURE II Study Group. Quadrivalent vaccine against human papillomavirus to prevent high-grade cervical lesions. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;356(19):1915-27.
20. Paavonen J, Naud P, Salmerón J, Wheeler CM, Chow SN, Apter D, et al. Efficacy of human papillomavirus (HPV)-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine against cervical infection and precancer caused by oncogenic HPV types (PATRICIA): final analysis of a double-blind, randomised study in young women. *Lancet.* 2009;374(9686):301-14.
21. Naud PS, Roteli-Martins CM, De Carvalho NS, Teixeira JC, de Borba PC, Sanchez N, et al. Sustained efficacy, immunogenicity, and safety of the HPV-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine: final analysis of a long-term follow-up study up to 9.4 years post-vaccination. *Hum Vaccin Immunother.* 2014;10(8):2147-62.
22. Kavanagh K, Pollock KG, Potts A, Love J, Cuschieri K, Cubie H, et al. Introduction and sustained high coverage of the HPV bivalent vaccine leads to a reduction in prevalence of HPV 16/18 and closely related HPV types. *Br J Cancer.* 2014;110(11):2804-11.
23. Cancer Registry of Norway. Cervical Cancer Screening Programme. [Online] Last updated: 22 February 2023. Accessed: 28 June 2023. Available at: <https://www.kreftregisteret.no/en/screening/cervix/org/>.
24. Pedersen K, Burger EA, Campbell S, Nygård M, Aas E, Lönnberg S. Advancing the evaluation of cervical cancer screening: development and application of a longitudinal adherence metric. *Eur J Public Health.* 2017;27(6):1089-94.
25. Andreassen T, Hansen BT, Engesaeter B, Hashim D, Støer NC, Tropé A, et al. Psychological effect of cervical cancer screening when changing primary screening method from cytology to high-risk human papilloma virus testing. *Int J Cancer.* 2019;145(1):29-39.
26. Baussano I, Lazzarato F, Ronco G, Lehtinen M, Dillner J, Franceschi S. Different Challenges in Eliminating HPV16 Compared to Other Types: A Modeling Study. *J Infect Dis.* 2017;216(3):336-44.
27. Cancer Registry of Norway. Cancer in Norway 2019 - Cancer incidence, mortality, survival and prevalence in Norway. Oslo: Cancer Registry of Norway, 2020. [Online] Available at: [https://www.kreftregisteret.no/globalassets/cancer-in-norway/2019/cin\\_report.pdf](https://www.kreftregisteret.no/globalassets/cancer-in-norway/2019/cin_report.pdf).
28. United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects: The 2019 Revision. [Online] Accessed 30 April 2020. Available at: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/>. 2019.
29. United Nations Population Division. World Population Prospects: The 2019 Revision. [Online] Accessed 30 April 2020. Available at: <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/>.

30. Brisson M, Kim JJ, Canfell K, Drolet M, Gingras G, Burger EA, et al. Impact of HPV vaccination and cervical screening on cervical cancer elimination: a comparative modelling analysis in 78 low-income and lower-middle-income countries. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10224):575-90.
31. Canfell K, Kim JJ, Brisson M, Keane A, Simms KT, Caruana M, et al. Mortality impact of achieving WHO cervical cancer elimination targets: a comparative modelling analysis in 78 low-income and lower-middle-income countries. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10224):591-603.
32. Castellsagué X, Muñoz N, Pitisuttithum P, Ferris D, Monsonego J, Ault K, et al. End-of-study safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy of quadrivalent HPV (types 6, 11, 16, 18) recombinant vaccine in adult women 24-45 years of age. *Br J Cancer*. 2011;105(1):28-37.
33. Szarewski A, Poppe WA, Skinner SR, Wheeler CM, Paavonen J, Naud P, et al. Efficacy of the human papillomavirus (HPV)-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine in women aged 15-25 years with and without serological evidence of previous exposure to HPV-16/18. *Int J Cancer*. 2012;131(1):106-16.
34. Osei EA. Innovations in healthcare delivery: Human papilloma virus self sampling diagnostics and participatory innovations for CCS. *Cancer Med*. 2023.
35. Daponte N, Valasoulis G, Michail G, Magaliou I, Daponte AI, Garas A, et al. HPV-Based Self-Sampling in Cervical Cancer Screening: An Updated Review of the Current Evidence in the Literature. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2023;15(6).
36. Burger EA, Sy S, Nygård M, Kim JJ. The Cost-Effectiveness of Cervical Self-Sampling to Improve Routine Cervical Cancer Screening: The Importance of Respondent Screening History and Compliance. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2017;26(1):95-103.
37. Knauss T, Hansen BT, Pedersen K, Aasbø G, Kunst N, Burger EA. The cost-effectiveness of opt-in and send-to-all HPV self-sampling among long-term non-attenders to cervical cancer screening in Norway: The Equalscreen randomized controlled trial. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2023;168:39-47.
38. Saraiya M, Unger ER, Thompson TD, Lynch CF, Hernandez BY, Lyu CW, et al. US assessment of HPV types in cancers: implications for current and 9-valent HPV vaccines. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2015;107(6):dju086.

## Figure legends


**Figure 1. Current levels of routine vaccination coverage for female cohorts aged 12 to 24 and incremental vaccination coverage for female cohorts aged 25 to 35 and in 2023**

**Figure 2. Age-standardized human papillomavirus (HPV) type 16 prevalence associated with ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination-only scenarios in Norway for women aged 25–69 years in 2023 (Panel A) and women aged 25–35 years in 2023 (Panel B)**

Note: Each line represents the greatest cohort age incrementally vaccinated in an ‘EVEN FASTER’ campaign in 2023 (e.g., the “Age26” scenario involved incrementally vaccinating both the age-25 cohort and the age-26 cohort).

**Figure 3. Time to cervical cancer elimination associated with ‘EVEN FASTER’ vaccination scenarios (Panel A) and vaccination + screening scenarios (Panel B) in Norway**


Note: The status-quo scenario was estimated to eliminate cervical cancer as a public health problem in 2038.







**Panel A**



**Panel B**

