Projected health and economic effects of nonavalent versus bivalent human papillomavirus vaccination in the Netherlands: a data-driven analysis

Birgit Sollie PhD [1,2], Prof. Johannes Berkhof PhD [1,2,3], Johannes A. Bogaards PhD [1,2,4]

Affiliations

[1] Amsterdam UMC, Dept. Epidemiology & Data Science, Amsterdam, Netherlands

[2] Amsterdam Public Health (APH), Amsterdam, Netherlands

[3] Cancer Center Amsterdam (CCA), Amsterdam, Netherlands

[4] Amsterdam Institute for Immunology & Infectious Diseases (AII), Amsterdam, Netherlands

Funding

This paper is part of the project "HPV-COMPARE: Comparing the health and economic effects of different HPV vaccines and catch-up strategies of young adults in the Netherlands" funded by the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw, grant 10150511910059). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

JAB is co-PI on the investigator-initiated research project “HPV4M: Human papillomavirus vaccine effectiveness study among men who have sex with men”, conducted at the Public Health Service of Amsterdam and financed by GSK. BS and JB report no financial relationships or conflicts of interest regarding the content herein.

Abstract

Background. The national immunization program in the Netherlands currently uses the bivalent human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine, targeting HPV genotypes 16 and 18. It is not yet clear whether it is cost-effective to switch to the nonavalent vaccine, targeting an additional seven HPV genotypes. This study compares the health and economic effects of both vaccines for the Dutch setting of sex-neutral vaccination with tender-based procurement and HPV-based screening for cervical cancer.

Methods. We estimated the population effects under bivalent or nonavalent HPV vaccination in a cohort of girls and boys, invited for vaccination at 10 years of age. The differential impact of nonavalent versus bivalent HPV vaccination was obtained by projecting type-specific risk reductions, obtained by an HPV transmission model, onto type-specific outcomes of HPV-based screening, incidence of HPV-related cancers in both men and women, as well as treatment for anogenital warts and recurrent respiratory papillomatosis. Bayesian analysis was applied to translate the uncertainty of the data into credible intervals (CI) for health and economic outcomes, under specific scenarios regarding long-term vaccine uptake, efficacy and cost. The base-case scenario assumed 50% uptake at age 10, life-long vaccine protection with cross-protective efficacy to HPV 31, 33 and 45 from the bivalent vaccine, and an additional cost of EUR 35 per 2-dose vaccination schedule for the nonavalent vaccine.

Results. In the base-case scenario, nonavalent vaccination is expected to prevent 1090 additional cases of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN2/3), 70 additional cases of HPV-related cancer, 34 000 episodes of anogenital warts and 28 onsets of RRP, relative to bivalent vaccination per cohort of 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys. These health effects translate into an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of EUR 2048 (95% CI: 716 to 3141) per life-year gained, under annual discounting of 1.5% and 4% for future health and economic effects, respectively. The ICER remained below the local threshold for cost-effective preventive interventions in all investigated scenarios, except when assuming waning efficacy for non-16/18 oncogenic HPV types with either vaccine or cross-protection to non-31/33/45 types for the bivalent vaccine.

Conclusions. Sex-neutral vaccination with the nonavalent vaccine is likely to be cost-effective relative to the currently used bivalent vaccine in the Netherlands. Monitoring long-term type-specific vaccine effectiveness is key to update projections on the impact and cost-effectiveness of HPV vaccination.

Keywords

Human papillomavirus – HPV vaccination – cross-protection – bivalent vaccine – nonavalent vaccine – cost-effectiveness analysis – health and economic evaluation – Netherlands

Introduction

The sexually transmitted human papillomavirus (HPV) can cause a variety of diseases in the anogenital and oropharyngeal body sites, predominantly cervical cancer [1]. Despite long-standing secondary prevention through population-based screening, the incidence of cervical cancer in the Netherlands has steadily increased since the turn of the century, from 611 cervical cancer diagnoses in 2001 to 948 diagnoses in 2021 [2]. In addition, HPV is estimated to cause about 600 cases of anal, oropharyngeal, vulvar, vaginal or penile cancer per year, making the HPV-associated disease burden higher than reported for any other infectious disease in the Netherlands before COVID-19 [3].

Since 2010, the Netherlands has added prophylactic HPV vaccination to its routine immunization program, initially as a primary prevention modality for preadolescent girls to complement cervical cancer screening [4]. Since 2021, HPV vaccination has been expanded to a sex-neutral immunization program, following a positive evaluation of the incremental benefit of vaccinating boys along with girls [5], and the Dutch policy intent of HPV vaccination has been broadened to prevent all HPV-related cancers in both men and women [6]. The Netherlands still uses the bivalent (2v) HPV vaccine, which targets oncogenic HPV genotypes 16 and 18 [7]. These types are associated with approximately 70% of cervical cancer cases and the majority of other HPV-related cancers. Yet genotypes other than HPV 16 or 18 account for up to 30% of cervical cancer cases and more than 50% of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN2/3), i.e. precancerous lesions detected through screening [8].

Since 2015, a nonavalent (9v) HPV vaccine has been licensed for use in the European Union [9]. This vaccine targets seven other HPV genotypes in addition to HPV 16 and 18. Five of these are oncogenic or high-risk (HR) HPV genotypes (31, 33, 45, 52 and 58) and two are low-risk (LR) HPV genotypes (6 and 11), which are not associated with cancer but can cause anogenital warts and recurrent respiratory papillomatosis (RRP). While the 9v vaccine is expected to avert more cancer cases and prevents warts and papillomatosis, it is also more expensive than the 2v vaccine [10]. Dynamic modelling studies that compared the projected health and economic effects from both vaccines arrived at different conclusions as regards the cost-effectiveness of 9v versus 2v vaccination [11-19].

Most high-income countries that implemented 9v vaccination used the quadrivalent (4v) vaccine (targeting HPV genotypes 6, 11, 16 and 18) before. Cost-effectiveness then followed directly from weighing the extra cost of the 9v vaccine to the extra protection afforded against the five additional HR-HPV types, as cross-protection was typically not considered for the 4v vaccine [20-25]. However, it is widely recognized that the 2v vaccine provides durable cross-protection against genotypes phylogenetically related to HPV 16 or 18, particularly HPV 31, 33, and 45 [7,26-31], which should be

considered in the comparison with the HR-HPV types targeted by the 9v vaccine. The comparison between the 2v and 9v vaccines is further challenging because it requires thoughtful consideration about the benefit of preventing diseases associated with LR-HPV types, as these may have different weights in decision-making. Moreover, the 9v and 2v vaccines are produced by different companies and vaccination costs are subject to competitive bidding [10], which should be reflected in realistic price differences in the health economic evaluation.

The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive comparison of the 9v and 2v HPV vaccines in the Dutch setting of sex-neutral vaccination with tender-based procurement. In doing so, we used a data-driven approach in which the population effects of vaccination were projected onto all HPV-associated diseases, including the outcomes of HPV-based screening for cervical cancer. In cost-effectiveness analyses, we include all cost savings, but focus primarily on health gains from cancer prevention. In addition, we present several scenarios related to vaccine efficacy (including cross-protection and waning), indirect protection through herd immunity, and expected price differences between the 9v and 2v vaccines.

Methods

Our assessment builds upon the evidence synthesis framework that we previously developed to estimate the health and economic impact of sex-neutral as compared to girls-only HPV vaccination [5,32,33]. This framework allows for lifetime evaluation of an HPV-naive birth cohort in terms of HPV-associated disease occurrence and medical costs incurred, by applying life-table methodology with Bayesian analysis to translate uncertainty about the data sources into credible intervals for the relevant outcomes. To compare the 9v and 2v HPV vaccines in the setting of sex-neutral vaccination, we simulated a cohort of girls and boys invited for HPV vaccination at 10 years of age, the age of routine HPV vaccination in the current national immunization program in the Netherlands. We estimated the total health and economic effects under either 9v or 2v HPV vaccination for this hypothetical cohort with respect to the following events: the colposcopy referrals and detected precancerous lesions within the HPV-based cervical screening program, the occurrence of cervical cancer as well as oropharyngeal, anal, vulvar, vaginal and penile cancers, which are to a varying extent caused by HPV, and treatment of anogenital warts and recurrent respiratory papillomatosis (RRP), associated with LR-HPV genotypes 6 and 11.

Our data-driven approach can be divided into three steps. First, we estimated the expected number of events in the hypothetical cohort in the absence of HPV vaccination. Second, we estimated how

many events are expected to be prevented under a particular HPV vaccination scenario, by projecting type-specific HPV infection risk reductions onto genotype-specific attributions of vaccine-preventable diseases. To translate reductions in HPV infection incidence at a particular age into age-specific reductions in the incidence of cancer, we developed a statistical model that describes the age distribution of the causal HPV infection in subjects with HPV-associated cancer. Third, we translated the difference in health and economic effects between the two vaccines into an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of 9v versus 2v vaccination, conditional on assumptions for long-term vaccine efficacy against vaccine-targeted and cross-protected genotypes, vaccination coverage, and costs. A detailed description is given in the Supplementary Annex A, and is summarized below.

Expected number of events in the absence of HPV vaccination

To estimate the number of expected events in the absence of HPV vaccination, we used population-level data on the age-specific incidence of HPV-associated cancers, RRP, anogenital warts, and HPV-based cervical cancer screening outcomes in the Netherlands (see Supplementary Annex A). We assumed that HPV vaccination effects on vaccine-preventable diseases were not yet measurable in the Netherlands until 2020. This is plausible because 2v vaccination is assumed to have no effect on LR-HPV genotypes, and HPV-vaccinated women were not eligible for population-based screening in the Netherlands until 2023 [34].

To estimate the detection rate of precancerous lesions through HPV-based screening, we analysed the outcomes of the Dutch cervical screening program between 2017-2019. The expected number of colposcopies per screening round was computed from the expected number of CIN2/3 diagnoses by multiplying the latter with the number of colposcopies needed to detect one precancerous lesion (stratified by screening round), estimated in [35]. The age-specific incidence and survival rates for cervical cancer and the other HPV-related cancers were estimated from data collected from the Netherlands Cancer Registry for the years 2015-2019. The rate of anogenital warts episodes was obtained from the national surveillance report on sexually transmitted infections, stratified by sex [36]. Detailed age trends below age 25 were obtained from a GP registry study [37] and age trends above the age of 25 were reconstructed from reported trends in numbers of sexual partners by 15-year age groups [38,39]. We had to rely on international publications to obtain the age-specific incidence of RRP [40,41]. We made a distinction between adult onset RRP, resulting from a self-acquired HPV infection, and juvenile onset RRP, due to mother-to-child HPV transmission during birth. Only the expected future children of the girls in the hypothetical cohort were considered at risk for juvenile onset RRP. For each patient we assumed an exponentially distributed duration of the disease with a mean of 10 years. Life expectancy of the cohort was based on recent life-tables collected from the Statistics Netherlands database [42].

In estimating age-specific event rates, we took into account the uncertainty of the data by applying a Bayesian analysis. Briefly, we ran 1000 simulations in which the parameters were sampled from posterior distributions, informed by data and non-informative priors (see Supplementary Annex A for details). The outcomes are reported in terms of 95% credible intervals (CI), containing the 2.5th and 97.5th percentiles of the results obtained via simulation.

Expected number of events prevented by HPV vaccination

The expected number of events prevented by HPV vaccination in the simulated cohort was computed for each specific vaccination scenario. To this end, we first estimated the event-specific attribution to HPV genotypes of interest, i.e. those to which 9v or 2v vaccination provides direct or indirect protection. The HPV genotype attribution of precancerous lesions was estimated from Dutch screening trial data [43,44], using a previously developed maximum likelihood method [8]. HPV genotype attributions for HPV-associated cancers, anogenital warts and RRP were obtained from the literature [45-50]. Next, we projected age- and type-specific risk reductions from vaccination onto the expected number of events in the absence of vaccination, under specific scenarios regarding long-term vaccine uptake and efficacy (see section “Vaccine uptake and efficacy”). HPV infection risk reductions for all relevant HR-HPV genotypes were obtained from a previously developed genotype-specific model for heterosexual HPV transmission [51]. We assumed that the simulated cohort experiences age-specific infection risks that are close to those in a post-vaccination equilibrium, an assumption that was previously shown to be approximately valid after 10 years of vaccine introduction [5].

To obtain the number of CIN2/3 diagnoses prevented, risk reductions on type-specific HPV prevalence at each screening round were projected onto the number of expected CIN2/3 diagnoses attributed to these genotypes. The number of colposcopies prevented was computed from re-calculation of the number of colposcopies needed to detect one precancerous lesion, with incorporation of altered CIN2/3 risks in HPV-positive women with abnormal cytology [33]. To translate type-specific HPV infection incidence reductions into risk reductions on cancer, we estimated the period from HPV infection to cancer diagnosis for each of the six cancers included in our analysis (see Supplementary Annex A). The risk reductions for the LR-HPV genotypes could not be obtained from our HPV transmission model, as the model was only calibrated to HR-HPV genotypes. However, there is strong evidence that the herd effects for the LR-HPV genotypes are large [52], and presumably at least as large as the herd effects for HPV 18 [53]. We therefore used the average risk reduction on HPV 18 prevalence to approximate the herd effects for HPV 6 and 11. Uncertainty in the differential impact of HPV vaccines primarily follows from uncertainty in HPV

genotype attributions to the events of interest, and these were incorporated via Bayesian analysis (see Supplementary Annex A).

Incremental cost-effectiveness analysis

We conducted a health-economic analysis from a societal perspective, in which we considered all medical and non-medical costs related to HPV-related diseases. Cost of medical procedures related to the events of interest (indexed to the year 2022 using the consumer price index) are listed in Table 1. For HPV vaccination at age 10, we assumed a total vaccination cost of EUR 65 per individual according to a 2-dose vaccination schedule for the 2v vaccine, as previously calculated for the Netherlands [33]. The anticipated price difference between 2v and 9v vaccination was obtained from a study on HPV vaccine dose price developments in European tender-based settings and was estimated at EUR 35 [10], which translates into a total vaccination cost of EUR 100 per 2-dose schedule for the 9v vaccine.

Table 1. Assumed costs (in €) indexed to the year 2022 using the CPI.

	Cost (€) indexed to 2022	**Reference**
Screening		
Colposcopy	361.5	69
CIN2 treatment + diagnosis	1578	Supplementary Annex A
CIN3 treatment + diagnosis	1934	Supplementary Annex A
Cancers	**treatment; death case**	
Cervix	10364; 25392	70
Anus (w)	6478; 24355	’’
Anus (m)	6478; 25262	’’
Oropharynx (w)	7773; 25262	’’
Oropharynx (m)	7773; 25392	’’
Vulva	10364; 21505	’’
Vagina	10364; 21505	’’
Penis	5182; 25262	’’
Anogenital warts		
Treatment per episode	128.7	UMCG (in preparation)
RRP		
Yearly treatment costs	2579	Supplementary Annex A

Events expected to be prevented by HPV vaccination were translated into cost savings and life-years gained for each specific vaccination scenario. The number of life-years gained by preventing cancer cases was calculated using cancer survival data collected from the Netherlands Cancer Registry [2], in combination with data on overall survival from the Statistics Netherlands database [42]. Future costs and effects were discounted by 4% and 1.5% per year, respectively, according to the Dutch guidelines for economic evaluations [54]. We then computed an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for

each particular comparison of 9v relative to 2v vaccination, based on the ratio of discounted incremental costs and effects, to assess cost-effectiveness in light of the Dutch threshold for preventive interventions of EUR 20 000 per (quality-adjusted) life-year (LY) gained [54].

This study adheres to HPV-FRAME, a quality framework for the reporting of mathematical modelling evaluations of HPV-related cancer control [55]. The checklist is reported in Supplementary Annex C.

Vaccine uptake and efficacy

Vaccine uptake among boys was set equal to that among girls in all scenarios. In the base-case scenario, we assumed 50% uptake in line with the average historic uptake in vaccine-eligible cohorts since the introduction of HPV vaccination in the Netherlands [4]. As there has been a slight upward trend in uptake recently, from 45% in 2019 to 67% in 2022 [56], we also considered a scenario of 70% uptake in sensitivity analysis. Vaccine efficacy (VE) against HPV genotypes 16 and 18 in our analysis was set to a pooled estimate of 0.98 in per-protocol populations of the bivalent and quadrivalent vaccine trials with endpoints of HPV16/18-associated CIN2/3 [32]. Although VE estimates for non-cervical sites are less precise, we conjectured the same type-specific efficacy against HPV-associated vaginal, vulvar, anal, penile, and oropharyngeal cancer as against cervical lesions. In addition, we assumed that the 9v vaccine has approximately similar VE against diseases associated with non-16/18 HPV genotypes as against HPV16/18-associated lesions [57]. In our base-case scenario we further assumed life-long protection and partial cross-protection for the 2v vaccine against HPV genotypes 31, 33 and 45. These are the HR-HPV genotypes against which protection has been consistently demonstrated in trials with the bivalent HPV vaccine [26], as well as in post-vaccination surveillance in the Netherlands [28-31] and beyond [27,58]. We assumed vaccine efficacies of 0.75, 0.50 and 0.80 against HPV 31, 33 and 45, respectively, in the base-case scenario. These efficacies are all between the 95% confidence bounds of the various empirical estimates. We also considered alternative scenarios in sensitivity analysis, with VE assumptions for the HR-HPV genotypes given in Table 2.

Sensitivity analysis

Apart from vaccine uptake and degree of cross-protection from 2v vaccination, we also analysed the influence of varying assumptions regarding the degree of protection for the LR-HPV genotypes, waning efficacy and vaccine price differences in the sensitivity analysis. We considered two extreme scenarios regarding the LR-HPV genotypes; one in which the LR-HPV genotypes are ignored in the analysis, and one in which we assumed complete elimination of anogenital warts and RRP due to herd immunity from 9v vaccination. Regarding duration of vaccine protection, we analysed a waning scenario for all non-16/18 HR-HPV genotypes, both for the 9v and for the 2v vaccine, where waning

starts at age 20 and the protection of the vaccine would decrease at a constant rate such that only 5% of initial efficacy is left at age 40. In any case, we assume that efficacy against non-16/18 HR-HPV infections would be sustained for at least ten years after vaccination, in line with recent data on long-term effectiveness of both the 9v and 2v vaccines [59,60]. We applied both one-way and two-way sensitivity analyses.

Furthermore, we also expressed the ICER in terms of incremental cost per quality-adjusted LY (QALY) gained, whereby we acknowledged the loss in quality of life from non-lethal conditions, i.e. CIN2/3 diagnoses, anogenital warts and RRP. We assumed a QALY loss of 0.035 per precancerous lesion detected [61], 0.018 per anogenital warts episode [62] and a QALY loss of 0.105 per RRP patient per year [63]. Finally, to accommodate international comparisons, we also considered a scenario with discounting according to international guidelines. Here both costs and effects were discounted by 3% per year and the cost-effectiveness threshold was adjusted to EUR 50 000 per LY gained, which is close to the Dutch GDP per capita.

Table 2. Vaccine efficacies for the high-risk HPV genotypes

	16	**18**	**31**	**33**	**39**	**45**	**51**	**52**	**58**
Base-case									
2v	0.98	0.98	0.75	0.50		0.80			
9v	0.98	0.98	0.97	0.97		0.97		0.97	0.97
Sensitivity analysis									
2v no cross-protection	0.98	0.98							
2v increased cross-protection	0.98	0.98	0.88	0.68	0.75	0.82	0.54		

The base-case scenario considers values that are consistent with empirical data across a range of settings [26-31, 58]. In the most conservative scenario, we only assume 2v protection against HPV genotypes 16 and 18. In a liberal scenario, we assume cross-protection against all HR-HPV genotypes for which significant protection against genotype-specific CIN2+ has been reported in the EMA EPAR documentation of the 2v vaccine [7].

Results

Base-case scenario

In a cohort of 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys, we estimate that a total of 17 310 colposcopies, 8100 related CIN2/3 diagnoses, 695 cervical cancer cases and 575 other HPV-associated cancers are expected without HPV vaccination. Through the combination of direct protection and herd effects, HPV vaccination with the 2v vaccine at 50% coverage already prevents 9105 of these colposcopies, 4650 related CIN2/3 diagnoses, 520 cervical cancer cases and 450 of the other cancer cases. HPV

vaccination with the 9v vaccine prevents an additional 1380 colposcopies, 1090 CIN2/3 diagnoses, 45 cervical cancer cases and 25 other cases of HPV-associated cancer (Fig. 1).

For the non-lethal diseases associated with HPV 6 and 11, we estimate approximately 40 000 anogenital warts episodes and 34 RRP patients per cohort of 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys, including 8 cases of juvenile onset RRP. These diseases can only be prevented by the 9v vaccine, and we estimate that, by the combination of direct protection and herd effects, vaccination with the 9v vaccine at 50% coverage prevents 34 000 anogenital warts episodes and 28 RRP patients (Fig. 1).

Figure 1: Expected number of events per cohort of 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys



Number of CIN2/3 diagnoses expected (panel A), cervical cancer cases expected (panel B), total number of other cancer cases expected (panel C), other cancer cases expected separately (panel D), anogenital warts episodes expected (panel E) and number of RRP patients expected (panel F) in case of no vaccination (red), vaccination with the 2v vaccine (blue) and vaccination with the 9v vaccine (purple). Panels A-C and E-F show the direct effects only and total effects, consisting of direct plus herd protection. Panel D only shows the results for direct effects plus herd effects. Boxplots display median and interquartile range of predictions, with whiskers denoting the 95% credible intervals.

The health and economic effects of HPV vaccination follow from the expected number of events prevented. At 50% coverage, sex-neutral vaccination with the 2v vaccine gains 6.1 thousand life-years (3.2 thousand discounted) per 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys, and saves a total of EUR 25.6 million (EUR 5.9 million discounted) through prevention of colposcopies, CIN2/3 diagnoses and HPV-related cancer cases. Vaccination with the 9v vaccine provides an additional gain of 407 life-years (214 discounted) and additional savings of EUR 8.3 million (EUR 2.9 million discounted), mainly through prevention of warts and RRP and improved protection against CIN2/3. Figure 2 shows the total costs and life-years saved by HPV vaccination, either with the 9v or 2v vaccine, broken down by type of HPV-associated disease. Most undiscounted costs are saved because of prevention of cervical cancer, but if costs are discounted at 4% annually, savings are highest because of prevention of CIN2/3.

Figure 2: Expected health and economic effects per cohort of 100 000 girls and 100 000 boys



Total health and economic effects of HPV vaccination with 2v vaccine (blue) or 9v vaccine (purple), either not discounted (left) or discounted (right). Boxplots display median and interquartile range of predictions, with whiskers denoting the 95% credible intervals.

The ICER of 9v versus 2v vaccination at annual discount rates of 1.5% for effects and 4% for costs is EUR 2048 (95% CI: 716 to 3141) per LY gained, which is far below the local cost-effectiveness threshold for preventive interventions of EUR 20 000 per LY gained.

Sensitivity analysis

The 9v vaccine remained cost-effective compared to the 2v vaccine in almost all scenarios investigated in our sensitivity analysis. Figure 3 summarizes the results of all the one-way sensitivity analyses, displaying the ICER of 9v versus 2v vaccination under varying assumptions. Each scenario should be considered in comparison to the base-case scenario, displayed at the top of Figure 3 as a reference. The cost-effectiveness threshold of EUR 20 000 per LY gained is displayed by the vertical dashed line. All scenarios with an ICER to the left of this line support the conclusion that the 9v vaccine is cost-effective compared to the 2v vaccine. The results of two-way sensitivity analyses are presented to the extent that the combination of scenarios led to qualitatively different assessments of cost-effectiveness as compared to one-way analyses.

Ignoring LR-HPV genotypes 6 and 11 in the analysis increases the ICER of 9v versus 2v vaccination, while assuming complete elimination of genotypes 6 and 11 at 50% vaccination coverage lowers the ICER. In both scenarios, however, the ICER remains below the threshold of EUR 20 000 per LY gained. The same holds for increasing or ignoring the degree of cross-protection for the 2v vaccine. The former scenario increases the ICER but the ICER still lies below the threshold, while the latter scenario is in favor of the 9v vaccine and would even lead to a cost saving intervention. Increased cross-protection from 2v vaccination would only result in an ICER above the threshold when the cost savings from preventing LR-HPV genotypes are also ignored (Fig. 3).

Including QALYs to the analysis increases the health benefits and results in a lower ICER compared to the base-case scenario. Increasing the vaccination coverage to 70% is in favor of the 2v vaccine, because vaccination becomes more expensive and the scope for herd effects becomes smaller. However, the ICER still remains below the threshold, unless LR-HPV genotypes are ignored or one assumes increased cross-protection from 2v vaccination. Decreasing the price difference between the 9v and the 2v vaccine by EUR 10 for a fully vaccinated individual (2-dose schedule) results in a cost saving intervention. Increasing the price difference by EUR 10 is in favor of the 2v vaccine, but the ICER still remains below the threshold, unless one also assumes increased cross-protection for the 2v vaccine. The 9v vaccine is no longer cost-effective compared to the 2v vaccine under the scenario of waning efficacy from age 20 for all non-16/18 HPV genotypes with either vaccine, except when one ignores cross-protective efficacy for the 2v vaccine.

Figure 3: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) by scenario in sensitivity analysis



ICERs of 9v- vs 2v HPV vaccination for different scenarios with respect to low-risk (LR) HPV genotypes, cross-protection from the 2v vaccine, inclusion of quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs), vaccine uptake, expected price differences between the 9v and 2v vaccines, and waning efficacy for non-16/18 high-risk genotypes. The light-grey vertical line corresponds to an ICER equal to zero. The cost-effectiveness threshold of €20 000 is displayed by the dashed vertical line. Boxplots display median and interquartile range of predictions, with whiskers denoting the 95% credible intervals.

Our conclusions remain similar under the international discounting of 3% for both costs and effects with the corresponding cost-effectiveness threshold of EUR 50 000 per LY gained (see Supplementary Annex B).

Discussion

In this study, we compared the projected health and economic effects of HPV vaccination in the Dutch national immunization program under either 9v or 2v vaccination. Our results suggest that using the 9v instead of the 2v vaccine is likely to be cost-effective according to criteria for preventive interventions in the Netherlands.

In our base-case scenario, assuming 50% vaccine uptake at age 10 and life-long protection against vaccine-targeted and cross-protected HPV types, 9v versus 2v vaccination has a favourable cost-effectiveness ratio of EUR 2048 per LY gained at an additional vaccination cost of EUR 35 per vaccinated individual. The favourable cost-effectiveness profile of 9v versus 2v vaccination was retained with realistic increases in vaccination coverage and costs. However, cost-effectiveness is less clear when the 2v vaccine provides life-long cross-protection against a broad range of HR-HPV genotypes, or when efficacy against non-16/18 HR-HPV genotypes would start to decline 10 years after vaccination with either vaccine. Conversely, if cross-protection was not obtained by 2v vaccination, the switch to 9v vaccination would even be cost-saving.

Our analysis pinpoints to the importance of durable cross-protection when assessing the incremental merit of 9v versus 2v HPV vaccination. Precise estimates of cross-protective efficacy are still uncertain, and seem to vary by setting. The specific values that we used are consistent with empirical data across a range of settings [26-31,58]. We could have considered more variation in cross-protection against HPV 31, 33 and 45, but instead we chose to explore two extreme scenarios in sensitivity analysis: one without any cross-protection to non-16/18 HPV types, and one in which cross-protection extends to HR-HPV genotypes other than HPV 31, 33 and 45. In the latter scenario, we included cross-protection to HPV 35, 39 and 51 because the EMA has documented significant cross-protection for the 2v vaccine against CIN2/3 attributed to these genotypes [7]. Cross-protection against (persistent) infection with these types (except HPV 51) has been confirmed in post-vaccine surveillance in the Netherlands [28-31]. Phylogenetic analyses suggest that cross-protection from the 2v vaccine might also extend to HPV 52 and 58 [29], but this was not included in our projections. We do not feel that a scenario of no cross-protection is relevant for the Netherlands in light of context-specific data, but results under this scenario highlight the importance of cross-protective efficacy and also make our results comparable to other studies.

Dynamic modelling studies that did not account for cross-protection invariably concluded that 9v vaccination would be cost-effective or even cost-saving relative to 2v vaccination, both in girls-only and in sex-neutral vaccination programs [12,13,17,18,23,24]. In dynamic modelling studies that did allow for cross-protection, conclusions were less straightforward [11,14-16,19]. However, most of these only looked at cervical disease outcomes [11,14-16], and did not consider additional gains from preventing non-cervical cancers, warts and papillomatosis. Including non-cervical disease outcomes likely would have resulted in more favourable assessments of 9v versus 2v vaccination [64], yet health authorities decided to disregard these gains because of the strong imbalance in health gains between cancers and anogenital warts, with warts being much more prevalent than cancers but leading to only a small loss in health per individual. However, we did incorporate all cost savings from

the additional prevention of warts and papillomatosis by 9v vaccination. Leaving these out still gave a favourable cost-effectiveness ratio at 50% vaccination coverage, but no longer at 70% vaccination coverage. While it might be defendable to ignore non-lethal conditions in health evaluation of HPV vaccination programs, we feel that direct medical savings that follow from an intervention should be included in economic evaluations from a healthcare payer or societal perspective.

Our analysis considered the benefit of broadening protection against HR-HPV types in the context of cervical screening via primary HR-HPV testing. This is important, because the switch to HPV-based screening in the Netherlands as of 2017 has resulted in substantial increases in gynaecologic referral and colposcopy rates, and in the number of CIN2/3 diagnoses [65]. As the share of non-16/18 HPV types in screen-positives and precancerous lesions is much higher than in cervical cancer [8], the expanded protection offered by 9v vaccination should yield considerable savings in HPV-based screening. Indeed, we found that the incremental cost savings from broader protection against HR-HPV types were driven by the extra prevention of colposcopies and CIN2/3 treatment rather than by the extra prevention of cancers. In absolute terms, the discounted cost savings through HPV-based screening would even surpass those from preventing warts and papillomatosis in a sex-neutral 9v vaccination program. It remains to be determined whether HPV-based screening at five-year intervals is viable in cohorts eligible for 9v vaccination.

So far, only one other dynamic modelling study has made a direct comparison between the 2v and 9v vaccines in the setting of sex-neutral HPV vaccination, with consideration of all HPV-related diseases and outcomes in HPV-based screening for cervical cancer [19]. In this study, situated in Norway, the investigators considered cross-protective efficacy from the 2v vaccine against HPV 31, 33, and 45, with base-case assumptions comparable to ours. However, whereas the protection afforded by the 9v vaccine was assumed to be life-long, cross-protection was invariably assumed to wane at rates between 10-30% per year. In such a fast-waning scenario, only 3-33% of initial cross-protective efficacy would persist at age 20 when the vaccine is given at age 10, which is clearly at odds with observations of sustained cross-protective efficacy for at least ten years after 2v vaccination in the Netherlands [28,31]. Of note, the 9v HPV vaccine has also demonstrated sustained immunogenicity and effectiveness through 10 years post-vaccination in preadolescence [60]. For this reason, we only considered scenarios of waning efficacy starting from age 20, i.e. 10 years after vaccination.

Our data-driven approach deviates somewhat from other dynamic modelling studies that aimed to project the long-term impact of HPV vaccination, including our own as regards the Dutch setting [66]. The main difference with our previously employed hybrid modelling framework is that we did not use a microsimulation model for carcinogenesis to project outcomes on HPV-based screening and

HPV-related cancers. The differential impact of 9v and 2v vaccination on HR-HPV genotypes is driven by types, notably HPV 52 and 58, for which a detailed specification in terms of natural disease progression is still challenging. We are comparatively much more certain about their specific attributions to CIN2/3 and cancer, and therefore devised a work-around that relied on projections of type-specific risk reductions onto the expected CIN2/3 and cancer diagnoses attributed to these genotypes. In doing so, we used well-grounded statistical methods for estimating genotype attributions in precancerous lesions [8], and for estimating the period from HPV infection to cancer diagnosis [67].

This study has some notable limitations. First, our analysis relied on recent population-level data but ignored the upward trend in the HPV-related burden of disease over the past decades [3]. If this trend would continue in the absence of HPV vaccination, our estimates of HPV vaccination impact are likely on the conservative side, and the same holds for the incremental benefit of 9v as compared to 2v vaccination. Second, we projected the population effects from a heterosexual HPV transmission model, and did not account for the clustering of HPV infections and HPV-related cancers in men who have sex with men (MSM). On the basis of a recently developed model for homosexual transmission of HPV 16, we concluded that the population effects among MSM from vaccinating boys in preadolescence are comparable to those estimated from heterosexual transmission models [68]. Third, in the absence of a calibrated transmission model for HPV 6 and 11, we made a conservative assumption as regards the herd effects to the LR-HPV genotypes covered by the 9v vaccine, and considered an extreme scenario wherein the LR-HPV genotypes would be eliminated in sensitivity analysis. Finally, the cost savings in HPV-based screening are slightly underestimated, because we did not account for a possible reduction in the need for cytological/repeat testing due to lower HPV-positivity at screening. Even so, the cost savings in HPV-based screening will mainly be determined by the reduction in colposcopy referrals and CIN2/3 diagnoses, which are captured accordingly.

In conclusion, sex-neutral vaccination with the 9v vaccine is likely to be cost-effective compared to the 2v vaccine within the national immunization program of the Netherlands. The ratio of discounted incremental costs and effects was driven by savings from LR-HPV prevention under 9v vaccination, but whether this ratio remained below the Dutch cost-effectiveness threshold was mainly determined by the presumed breadth and duration of protection afforded by the 2v vaccine. It is therefore advisable to reconsider the relative benefit of the 9v vaccine once new data on long-term effectiveness of 2v vaccination become available. The influx of HPV-vaccinated birth cohorts in the Dutch cervical screening program will provide unique insights in this respect, that can be used to update projections on the impact and cost-effectiveness of HPV vaccination in the near future.

References

1. Roden RBS, Stern PL. Opportunities and challenges for human papillomavirus vaccination in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 2018; 18:240–54.
2. IKNL: cervical cancer [Available from: https://iknl.nl/kankersoorten/baarmoederhalskanker/registratie/incidentie]
3. McDonald SA, Qendri V, Berkhof J, de Melker HE, Bogaards JA. Disease burden of human papillomavirus infection in the Netherlands, 1989-2014: the gap between females and males is diminishing. Cancer Causes Control. 2017;28(3):203-14.
4. Qendri V, Schurink-Van 't Klooster TM, Bogaards JA, Berkhof J. Ten years of HPV vaccination in the Netherlands: current evidence and future challenges in HPV-related disease prevention. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2018 Dec;17(12):1093-1104.
5. Qendri V, Bogaards JA, Baussano I, Lazzarato F, Vänskä S, Berkhof J. The cost-effectiveness profile of sex-neutral HPV immunisation in European tender-based settings: a model-based assessment. Lancet Public Health. 2020 Nov;5(11):e592-e603.
6. RIVM: national immunization program [Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/rivm/kennis-enkunde/expertisevelden/rijksvaccinatieprogrammas]
7. EMA: EPAR Cervarix [Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/cervarix#product-information-section]
8. Lissenberg-Witte BI, Bogaards JA, Quint WGV, Berkhof J. Estimating the Human Papillomavirus Genotype Attribution in Screen-detected High-grade Cervical Lesions. Epidemiology. 2019 Jul;30(4):590-596.
9. EMA: EPAR Gardasil 9 [Available from: https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/medicines/human/EPAR/gardasil-9#product-information-section]
10. Qendri V, Bogaards JA, Berkhof J. Pricing of HPV vaccines in European tender-based settings. Eur J Health Econ. 2019 Mar;20(2):271-280.
11. Durham DP, Ndeffo-Mbah ML, Skrip LA, Jones FK, Bauch CT, Galvani AP. National- and state-level impact and cost-effectiveness of nonavalent HPV vaccination in the United States. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2016 May 3;113(18):5107-12.
12. Mennini FS, Bonanni P, Bianic F, de Waure C, Baio G, Plazzotta G, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the nine-valent HPV vaccine in Italy. Cost Eff Resour Alloc. 2017 Jul 11;15:11.
13. Tay SK, Hsu TY, Pavelyev A, Walia A, Kulkarni AS. Clinical and economic impact of school-based nonavalent human papillomavirus vaccine on women in Singapore: a transmission dynamic mathematical model analysis. BJOG. 2018 Mar;125(4):478-486.
14. Burger EA, Portnoy A, Campos NG, Sy S, Regan C, Kim JJ. Choosing the optimal HPV vaccine: The health impact and economic value of the nonavalent and bivalent HPV vaccines in 48 Gavi-eligible countries. Int J Cancer. 2021 Feb 15;148(4):932-940.
15. Phua LC, Choi HCW, Wu J, Jit M, Low J, Ng K, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of the nonavalent human papillomavirus vaccine for the prevention of cervical cancer in Singapore. Vaccine. 2021 Apr 15;39(16):2255-2263.
16. Portnoy A, Pedersen K, Trogstad L, Hansen BT, Feiring B, Laake I, et al. Cost-effectiveness of nonavalent HPV vaccine in Norway considering current empirical data and validation. Prev Med. 2021 Sep;150:106688.

17. Cheung TH, Cheng SSY, Hsu DC, Wong QW, Pavelyev A, Walia A, et al. The impact and cost-effectiveness of 9-valent human papillomavirus vaccine in adolescent females in Hong Kong. Cost Eff Resour Alloc. 2021 Nov 20;19(1):75.
18. Chou HH, Chang SC, Sukarom I, Saxena K, Pavelyev A, Wu YH, Chang CJ. The Clinical and Economic Impact of a Nonavalent Versus Bivalent Human Papillomavirus National Vaccination Program in Taiwan. Value Health Reg Issues. 2022 Nov;32:79-87.
19. Diakite I, Nguyen S, Sabale U, Pavelyev A, Saxena K, Tajik AA, et al. Public health impact and cost-effectiveness of switching from bivalent to nonavalent vaccine for human papillomavirus in Norway: incorporating the full health impact of all HPV-related diseases. J Med Econ. 2023 Jan-Dec;26(1):1085-1098.
20. Brisson M, Laprise JF, Chesson HW, Drolet M, Malagón T, Boily MC, Markowitz LE. Health and Economic Impact of Switching from a 4-Valent to a 9-Valent HPV Vaccination Program in the United States. J Natl Cancer Inst. 2015 Oct 4;108(1):djv282.
21. Simms KT, Laprise JF, Smith MA, Lew JB, Caruana M, Brisson M, Canfell K. Cost-effectiveness of the next generation nonavalent human papillomavirus vaccine in the context of primary human papillomavirus screening in Australia: a comparative modelling analysis. Lancet Public Health. 2016 Dec;1(2):e66-e75.
22. Boiron L, Joura E, Largeron N, Prager B, Uhart M. Estimating the cost-effectiveness profile of a universal vaccination programme with a nine-valent HPV vaccine in Austria. BMC Infect Dis. 2016 Apr 16;16:153.
23. Largeron N, Petry KU, Jacob J, Bianic F, Anger D, Uhart M. An estimate of the public health impact and cost-effectiveness of universal vaccination with a 9-valent HPV vaccine in Germany. Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res. 2017 Feb;17(1):85-98.
24. De La Fuente J, Hernandez Aguado JJ, San Martín M, Ramirez Boix P, Cedillo Gómez S, López N. Estimating the epidemiological impact and cost-effectiveness profile of a nonavalent HPV vaccine in Spain. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2019;15(7-8):1949-1961.
25. Owusu-Edusei K, Palmer C, Ovcinnikova O, Favato G, Daniels V. Assessing the Health and Economic Outcomes of a 9-Valent HPV Vaccination Program in the United Kingdom. J Health Econ Outcomes Res. 2022 Jun 6;9(1):140-150.
26. Skinner SR, Apter D, De Carvalho N, Harper DM, Konno R, Paavonen J, et al. Human papillomavirus (HPV)-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine for the prevention of cervical cancer and HPV-related diseases. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2016;15(3):367-87.
27. Kavanagh K, Pollock KG, Cuschieri K, Palmer T, Cameron RL, Watt C, et al. Changes in the prevalence of human papillomavirus following a national bivalent human papillomavirus vaccination programme in Scotland: a 7-year cross-sectional study. Lancet Infect Dis. 2017;17(12):1293-302.
28. Donken R, King AJ, Bogaards JA, Woestenberg PJ, Meijer C, de Melker HE. High Effectiveness of the Bivalent Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccine Against Incident and Persistent HPV Infections up to 6 Years After Vaccination in Young Dutch Women. J Infect Dis. 2018;217(10):1579-89.
29. Bogaards JA, van der Weele P, Woestenberg PJ, van Benthem BHB, King AJ. Bivalent Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccine Effectiveness Correlates With Phylogenetic Distance From HPV Vaccine Types 16 and 18. J Infect Dis. 2019;220(7):1141-6.
30. Woestenberg PJ, King AJ, Van Benthem BHB, Leussink S, Van der Sande MAB, Hoebe CJPA, Bogaards JA. Bivalent Vaccine Effectiveness Against Anal Human Papillomavirus Positivity Among Female Sexually Transmitted Infection Clinic Visitors in the Netherlands. J Infect Dis. 2020 Mar 28;221(8):1280-1285.

31. Hoes J, King AJ, Klooster TMSV, Berkhof J, Bogaards JA, de Melker HE. Vaccine Effectiveness Following Routine Immunization With Bivalent Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Vaccine: Protection Against Incident Genital HPV Infections From a Reduced-Dosing Schedule. J Infect Dis. 2022 Sep 4;226(4):634-643.
32. Bogaards JA, Wallinga J, Brakenhoff RH, Meijer CJ, Berkhof J. Direct benefit of vaccinating boys along with girls against oncogenic human papillomavirus: bayesian evidence synthesis. BMJ. 2015 May 12;350:h2016.
33. Qendri V, Bogaards JA, Berkhof J. Health and Economic Impact of a Tender-Based, Sex-Neutral Human Papillomavirus 16/18 Vaccination Program in the Netherlands. J Infect Dis. 2017;216(2):210-9.
34. Schurink-van 't Klooster TM, Siebers AG, Hoes J, van Kemenade FJ, Berkhof J, Bogaards JA, de Melker HE. Early effect of bivalent human papillomavirus vaccination on cytology outcomes in cervical samples among young women in the Netherlands. Cancer Med. 2023 May;12(10):11786-11794.
35. Inturrisi F, Lissenberg-Witte BI, Veldhuijzen NJ, Bogaards JA, Ronco G, Meijer CJLM, Berkhof J. Estimating the direct effect of human papillomavirus vaccination on the lifetime risk of screen-detected cervical precancer. Int J Cancer. 2021 Jan 15;148(2):320-328.
36. RIVM: sexually transmitted infections in the Netherlands in 2021. [Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/publicaties/sexually-transmitted-infections-in-netherlands-in-2021]
37. Woestenberg PJ, Guevara Morel AE, Bogaards JA, Hooiveld M, Schurink-van 't Klooster TM, Hoebe CJPA, et al. Partial Protective Effect of Bivalent Human Papillomavirus 16/18 Vaccination Against Anogenital Warts in a Large Cohort of Dutch Primary Care Patients. Clin Infect Dis. 2021 Jul 15;73(2):291-297.
38. Wijsen C, De Haas S. Seksuele gezondheid in Nederland 2011 [in Dutch]. Tijdschrift voor Seksuologie. 2012;36(2):83-86.
39. Kerncijfers leefstijlmonitor seksuele gezondheid 2019 [in Dutch]. Rutgers/Soa Aids Nederland; 2021.
40. San Giorgi MR, van den Heuvel ER, Tjon Pian Gi RE, Brunings JW, Chirila M, Friedrich G, et al. Age of onset of recurrent respiratory papillomatosis: a distribution analysis. Clin Otolaryngol. 2016;41(5):448-53.
41. Pogoda L, Ziylan F, Smeeing DPJ, Dikkers FG, Rinkel R. Bevacizumab as treatment option for recurrent respiratory papillomatosis: a systematic review. Eur Arch Otorhinolaryngol. 2022;279(9):4229-40.
42. CBS: Life expectancy table [Available from: https://www.cbs.nl/en-gb/our-services/methods/definitions/life-expectancy-table]
43. Bulkmans NW, Rozendaal L, Snijders PJ, Voorhorst FJ, Boeke AJ, Zandwijken GR, et al. POBASCAM, a population-based randomized controlled trial for implementation of high-risk HPV testing in cervical screening: design, methods and baseline data of 44,102 women. Int J Cancer. 2004;110(1):94-101.
44. Rijkaart DC, Berkhof J, van Kemenade FJ, Rozendaal L, Verheijen RH, Bulk S, et al. Comparison of HPV and cytology triage algorithms for women with borderline or mild dyskaryosis in population-based cervical screening (VUSA-screen study). Int J Cancer. 2010;126(9):2175-81.
45. de Sanjose S, Quint WG, Alemany L, Geraets DT, Klaustermeier JE, Lloveras B, et al. Human papillomavirus genotype attribution in invasive cervical cancer: a retrospective cross-sectional worldwide study. Lancet Oncol. 2010;11(11):1048-56.
46. de Sanjose S, Alemany L, Ordi J, Tous S, Alejo M, Bigby SM, et al. Worldwide human papillomavirus genotype attribution in over 2000 cases of intraepithelial and invasive lesions of the vulva. Eur J Cancer. 2013;49(16):3450-61.

47. Alemany L, Saunier M, Tinoco L, Quiros B, Alvarado-Cabrero I, Alejo M, et al. Large contribution of human papillomavirus in vaginal neoplastic lesions: a worldwide study in 597 samples. Eur J Cancer. 2014;50(16):2846-54.
48. Alemany L, Cubilla A, Halec G, Kasamatsu E, Quiros B, Masferrer E, et al. Role of Human Papillomavirus in Penile Carcinomas Worldwide. Eur Urol. 2016;69(5):953-61.
49. Alemany L, Saunier M, Alvarado-Cabrero I, Quiros B, Salmeron J, Shin HR, et al. Human papillomavirus DNA prevalence and type distribution in anal carcinomas worldwide. Int J Cancer. 2015;136(1):98-107.
50. Ndiaye C, Mena M, Alemany L, Arbyn M, Castellsague X, Laporte L, et al. HPV DNA, E6/E7 mRNA, and p16INK4a detection in head and neck cancers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol. 2014;15(12):1319-31.
51. Bogaards JA, Xiridou M, Coupe VM, Meijer CJ, Wallinga J, Berkhof J. Model-based estimation of viral transmissibility and infection-induced resistance from the age-dependent prevalence of infection for 14 high-risk types of human papillomavirus. Am J Epidemiol. 2010;171(7):817-25.
52. Drolet M, Bénard É, Pérez N, Brisson M; HPV Vaccination Impact Study Group. Population-level impact and herd effects following the introduction of human papillomavirus vaccination programmes: updated systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet. 2019 Aug 10;394(10197):497-509.
53. Brisson M, Bénard É, Drolet M, Bogaards JA, Baussano I, Vänskä S, et al. Population-level impact, herd immunity, and elimination after human papillomavirus vaccination: a systematic review and meta-analysis of predictions from transmission-dynamic models. Lancet Public Health. 2016 Nov;1(1):e8-e17.
54. Richtlijn voor het uitvoeren van economische evaluaties in de gezondheidszorg [in Dutch]. Zorginstituut Nederland; 2016.
55. Canfell K, Kim JJ, Kulasingam S, Berkhof J, Barnabas R, Bogaards JA, et al. HPV-FRAME: A consensus statement and quality framework for modelled evaluations of HPV-related cancer control. Papillomavirus Res. 2019 Dec;8:100184.
56. RIVM: vaccination coverage HPV [Available from: https://www.vzinfo.nl/prestatie-indicatoren/vaccinatiegraad-hpv]
57. Joura EA, Giuliano AR, Iversen OE, Bouchard C, Mao C, Mehlsen J, et al. A 9-valent HPV vaccine against infection and intraepithelial neoplasia in women. N Engl J Med. 2015;372(8):711-23.
58. Gray P, Kann H, Pimenoff VN, Adhikari I, Eriksson T, Surcel HM, et al. Long-term follow-up of human papillomavirus type replacement among young pregnant Finnish females before and after a community-randomised HPV vaccination trial with moderate coverage. Int J Cancer. 2020;147(12):3511-22.
59. Hoes J, King AJ, Berkhof J, de Melker HE. High vaccine effectiveness persists for ten years after HPV16/18 vaccination among young Dutch women. Vaccine. 2023 Jan 9;41(2):285-289.
60. Restrepo J, Herrera T, Samakoses R, Reina JC, Pitisuttithum P, Ulied A, et al. Ten-Year Follow-up of 9-Valent Human Papillomavirus Vaccine: Immunogenicity, Effectiveness, and Safety. Pediatrics. 2023 Sep 5:e2022060993.
61. Berkhof J, Bogaards JA, Demirel E, Diaz M, Sharma M, Kim JJ. Cost-effectiveness of cervical cancer prevention in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Vaccine. 2013;31 Suppl 7:H71-9.
62. Jit M, Chapman R, Hughes O, Choi YH. Comparing bivalent and quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccines: economic evaluation based on transmission model. BMJ. 2011;343:d5775.

63. Chesson HW, Forhan SE, Gottlieb SL, Markowitz LE. The potential health and economic benefits of preventing recurrent respiratory papillomatosis through quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccination. Vaccine. 2008;26(35):4513-8.
64. Suijkerbuijk AW, Donken R, Lugnér AK, de Wit GA, Meijer CJ, de Melker HE, Bogaards JA. The whole story: a systematic review of economic evaluations of HPV vaccination including non-cervical HPV-associated diseases. Expert Rev Vaccines. 2017 Apr;16(4):361-375.
65. Aitken CA, van Agt HME, Siebers AG, van Kemenade FJ, Niesters HGM, Melchers WJG, et al. Introduction of primary screening using high-risk HPV DNA detection in the Dutch cervical cancer screening programme: a population-based cohort study. BMC Med. 2019 Dec 11;17(1):228.
66. Bogaards JA, Coupé VM, Xiridou M, Meijer CJ, Wallinga J, Berkhof J. Long-term impact of human papillomavirus vaccination on infection rates, cervical abnormalities, and cancer incidence. Epidemiology. 2011 Jul;22(4):505-15.
67. Vink MA, Bogaards JA, van Kemenade FJ, de Melker HE, Meijer CJ, Berkhof J. Clinical progression of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: estimating the time to preclinical cervical cancer from doubly censored national registry data. Am J Epidemiol. 2013 Oct 1;178(7):1161-9.
68. Bogaards JA, Mooij SH, Xiridou M, Schim van der Loeff MF. Potential effectiveness of prophylactic HPV immunization for men who have sex with men in the Netherlands: A multi-model approach. PLoS Med. 2019 Mar 4;16(3):e1002756.
69. Jansen E, Naber SK, Aitken CA, de Koning HJ, van Ballegooijen M, de Kok I. Cost-effectiveness of HPV-based cervical screening based on first year results in the Netherlands: a modelling study. BJOG. 2021;128(3):573-82.
70. de Kok IM HJ, van Rosmalen J, van Ballegooijen M. Would the effect of HPV vaccination on non-cervical HPV-positive cancers make the difference for its cost-effectiveness? Eur J Cancer. 2011;47(3):428-35.