

1 **Dengue Vaccine Effectiveness: Results from a Six-Year Population-Based** 2 **Cohort Study in Southern Brazil**

3 **Keywords:** dengue, tetravalent dengue vaccine, vaccine effectiveness, population-based cohort,
4 Brazil

5 **Running title:** Dengue vaccine effectiveness in Southern Brazil

6 Karin Regina Luhm^a, Silvia Emiko Shimakura^a, Sonia Mara Raboni^a, Magda Clara Vieira da Costa-
7 Ribeiro^a, Fredi Alexander Diaz-Quijano^b, Angela Maron de Mello^c, Lineu Roberto da Silva^a,
8 Marilene da Cruz Magalhães Buffon^a, Eliane Mara Cesário Pereira Maluf^a, Gabriel Graeff^d, Clara
9 Preto^a, Gustavo Araújo de Almeida^a, Gabriela Amanda de Sousa^a, Elias Teixeira Krainski^a, Allan
10 Arnold Evans^a, Denise Siqueira de Carvalho^{a*}

11 a - Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba, Brazil

12 Address: Rua Padre Camargo, 280 - Alto da Glória, Curitiba - PR, 80060-240, Brazil

13 b - Universidade de São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, Brazil

14 Address: Av. Dr. Arnaldo, 715 - São Paulo/SP, 01246-904, Brazil

15 c – Health Ministry, Curitiba, Brazil

16 Address: Av. Cândido Lopes, 208, 8º andar, sala 804 – Centro, Curitiba – PR, 80020-060,
17 Brazil

18 d - Faculdade UNISE, Campo Largo, Paraná, Brazil

19 Address: R. XV de Novembro, 1609 - Centro, Campo Largo - PR, 83601-030, Brazil

20 ***Corresponding author:**

21 Denise Siqueira de Carvalho^a (PhD Preventive Medicine – FM/USP)

22 Address: Rua Padre Camargo, 280 - Alto da Glória, Curitiba - PR, 80060-240, Brazil

23 Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR), Curitiba, Brazil

24 Phone number: +55 41 999710498 Email: denisecarvalho@ufpr.br

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

25 **Author Contributions Statement**

26 **K.R.L., S.E.S., S.M.R.: conceptualization, methodology, data collection, analysis,**
27 **interpretation, supervision, article revising and editing. M.C.V.C-R., F.A.D-Q analysis,**
28 **interpretation and article drafting. A.M.M, L.R.S., M.C.M.B., E.M.C.P.M.: methodology, data**
29 **collection and article drafting. G.G., E.T.K.: data curation and analysis. C.P., G.A.A., G.A.S.,**
30 **A.A.E.: investigation, article drafting and article editing. D.S.C: conceptualization,**
31 **methodology, analysis, interpretation, and article revising and editing, funding acquisition and**
32 **project administration. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.**

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 The alarming growth of dengue worldwide and its social and economic impact have demanded more
35 effective responses for its prevention and control. Currently, the first vaccine approved in Brazil for
36 its prevention, Dengvaxia®, was administered to a target population of around 500,000 residents in
37 southern Brazil. This study reports its effectiveness after a six-year follow-up period from August 2016
38 to July 2022. Dengue vaccination campaign was carried out in a target population of individuals aged
39 15–27 in 28 municipalities and 9–44 years in the other two. In this population-based cohort study,
40 exposure to the vaccine included groups with different numbers of doses and adherence to the complete
41 schedule. The primary outcome was probable dengue case. Other endpoints included laboratory-
42 confirmed dengue, serotype, dengue with warning signs or severe illness, and hospitalization.
43 Approximately 60.4% of the participants received at least one vaccine dose. A total of 50,658 probable
44 dengue cases (PDC) were notified of which 15,131 were laboratory-confirmed dengue cases. Overall
45 effectiveness for at least one dose was 33.7% (95% CI: 32.5–34.9) for PDC and 20.1% (95%
46 confidence interval [CI]: 17.1–22.9) for laboratory-confirmed cases. Greater vaccine effectiveness was
47 observed in older individuals and for the DENV-4 and DENV-1 serotypes. The vaccine showed no
48 effectiveness against DENV-2; no DENV-3 cases occurred. A lower hospitalization rate was observed
49 among the vaccinated group. Differences in the incidence of severe dengue cases and warning signs
50 could not draw a definite conclusion. Vaccination was associated with a one-third reduction in the
51 incidence of probable dengue cases. By serotypes, the reduction was significant only for DENV-1 and
52 DENV-4.

53 **Author Summaries**

54 Outcomes resulting from dengue mass vaccination remains limited.
55 Study on Dengvaxia®'s effectiveness in a target population of 501,000 with unknown serostatus.
56 Dengue risk reduction was significant for DENV-1 and DENV-4.

57

58 **Introduction**

59 Vector-borne diseases, including dengue, cause approximately 17% of infectious diseases
60 worldwide. It is the fastest-spreading viral infection caused by mosquito bites, endangering 3.97 billion
61 people in 128 countries on nearly every continent, with approximately 400 million infections annually
62 [1]. Incidence rates are highest in South Asia, followed by Southeast Asia, the Caribbean, tropical
63 Latin America, and Central Latin America [2]. In 2022, the Americas reported 2.8 million dengue
64 cases, of which 82% were from Brazil [3]. In the same year, Paraná was Brazil's third most affected
65 state, with an incidence rate of 1,413.6 per 100,000 inhabitants [4].

66 There is no specific treatment for dengue, and control strategies for its main vector, *Aedes*
67 *aegypti*, have presented some limitations [5]. Thus, a vaccine is needed as part of an integrated
68 approach to prevent and control dengue. The first licensed dengue vaccine, Dengvaxia[®], developed
69 by Sanofi, was introduced in Brazil in December 2015 for individuals aged 9–44 years [6] as a three-
70 dose regimen vaccine with six-month intervals between doses. In clinical trials involving over 30,000
71 subjects, its overall efficacy against virologically confirmed symptomatic dengue was 65.6% for
72 participants of 9 years of age or older after a 25-month follow-up period. Its efficacy also varied with
73 respect to serotype (DENV-1: 58.4%; DENV-2: 47.1%; DENV-3: 73.6%; DENV-4: 83.2%) [7–9].

74 This dengue vaccine has been approved in over 20 countries. However, large-scale vaccination
75 campaigns were only organized in Brazil (Paraná state) and the Philippines [6]. The Paraná State
76 Department of Health (SESA/PR) vaccinated free of charge over 300,000 people in 30
77 municipalities highly affected by dengue between 2016 and 2018, regardless of previous serological
78 status [10], and its effect has been assessed [11]. Hence, we assessed the dengue vaccine's effectiveness
79 in a population-based cohort six years following the launch of the vaccination initiative in Paraná,
80 Brazil.

81 **Methods**

82 *Study design and participants*

83 This six-year population-based cohort study focused on a dengue-vaccinated target population
84 residing in 30 municipalities within Paraná state, Brazil, spanning from August 2016 to July 2022.

85 Paraná is in Brazil's southern region and dengue vaccination was carried out in the municipalities
86 chosen based on epidemiological criteria. The target population in 28 municipalities comprised
87 individuals aged 15–27 and 9–44 years in other two. The vaccination roll-out consisted of five
88 consecutive phases (Table 1) from August 13, 2016, to December 20, 2018, with intervals of
89 approximately six months [10].

90 Table 1 Dengue vaccination timeline in Paraná, Brazil from 2016 to 2018

Phase	Doses administered	Vaccination period
1 st	1 st dose	August 13 to September 24, 2016
2 nd	1 st dose / 2 nd dose	March 1 to April 7, 2017
3 rd	2 nd dose / 3 rd dose	September 20 to November 11, 2017
4 th	2 nd dose / 3 rd dose	March 20 to June 29, 2018
5 th	3 rd dose	November 5 to December 20, 2018

91 Source: SESA/PR

92 Dengue is a mandatory notification disease, and suspected and confirmed cases nationwide are
93 registered in the National Reportable Disease Information System (Sinan) [12]. Since 1995, dengue
94 has been reported in Paraná, and in recent years, the disease incidence has been the highest ever
95 observed, mainly between 2015–2016 and 2019–2020. Despite this, there is no data on the
96 seroprevalence of the disease in this population. Dengue cases in the 30 municipalities showed a
97 similar pattern to that observed at the state level, with these municipalities accounting for 47.6% of all
98 dengue cases between 2008 and 2016. Four serotypes have circulated in the region since 1995, and
99 DENV-1 has been the most prevalent serotype, except for 2019–2020, in which DENV-2 surpassed
100 the values previously observed for serotype 1 (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Distribution of probable dengue cases in the state of Paraná and the 30 selected municipalities based on the epidemiological weeks (A), and proportion of dengue serotypes identified in the state of Paraná, Brazil (B), between 2008 and 2019.



Source: **National Epidemiological Surveillance System (Sinan)**

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

The study population was derived from the population defined by SESA/PR to receive public vaccination and included about 500,000 individuals [10]. These individuals were divided into the vaccinated group, constituted of those who had received any number of dengue vaccine doses, and the non-vaccinated group, comprised of individuals who were eligible for vaccination but were not listed in the vaccinated database. The reference population was obtained by subtracting the number of vaccinated individuals from the target population size.

Procedures

109

110

111

112

113

114

Exposure variables (vaccinations) were obtained from the SESA/PR vaccine database. They were defined based on the number of vaccine doses received (one, two, or three). A subset of individuals who received three doses in consecutive phases, with an interval of ≥ 160 days between doses, was considered to have the complete regimen as recommended and was called the compliance group.

The primary outcome was probable dengue cases (PDC) constituted either by clinical-

115 epidemiological criteria and/or laboratory tests. Secondary outcomes were defined as: i) laboratory-
116 confirmed dengue; ii) confirmed cases with identified serotypes (DENV-1, 2, 3, and 4); iii) cases with
117 warning signs or severe disease identified based on PDC; and iv) dengue hospitalizations with warning
118 signs or severe disease identified based on PDC.

119 Control variables included sex, age group, and municipality of residence, which may be
120 associated with adherence to the vaccination schedule and disease risk. Age groups were categorized
121 into 9–14, 15–27, and 28–44 years according to the following criteria: a) individuals aged 15–27 years
122 constituted the target population for vaccination in all 30 municipalities; b) individuals aged 9–14 and
123 28–44 years constituted the target population for vaccination in only two municipalities.

124 To identify outcomes in vaccinated patients, the Sinan probabilistic record linkage (PRL)
125 procedure was performed in the SESA/PR vaccination database using OpenRecLink 3.1 [14]. The
126 PRL, with an accuracy of 94.1% (95% CI: 91.9–95.7%) and a Kappa concordance index of 96.1%
127 (95% CI: 95.4–96.8%), was validated in a previous study (unpublished).

128 According to Table 2, we provided different start times for each exposure variable to define
129 follow-up time in the cohort. Among the vaccinated individuals, follow-up was initiated 30 days after
130 the first vaccine dose was administered (Table 2). Among the non-vaccinated individuals, follow-up
131 was initiated 30 days after the end of the vaccination phase, when approximately 75% of vaccinated
132 individuals had received their respective doses.

Table 2 Initial follow-up date according to the exposure variables for the vaccinated and non-vaccinated groups

Exposure variable	Group	
	Vaccinated	Non-vaccinated
Any number of doses or a single dose	30th day after the first vaccine dose	October 23, 2016 (30 days after the end of the first phase of vaccination)
Two doses	30th day after the second vaccine dose	May 7, 2017 (30 days after the end of the second phase of vaccination).
Three doses or <i>compliant</i>	30th day after the third vaccine dose	December 11, 2017 (30 days after the end of the third phase of vaccination)

133

134 For analytical purposes, the follow-up duration for each participant was extended up to the date

135 of their first confirmed dengue episode in case of disease occurrence. For those who remained dengue-
136 free, the predetermined endpoint for follow-up was set at July 31, 2022, with no recorded losses
137 considered in this group.

138 *Case definitions*

139 Dengue is a mandatorily reportable disease, and the system relies on the notification of all
140 suspected cases of the disease at public and private health facilities based on the initial clinical
141 diagnosis (not laboratory confirmed) [12,15]. The primary outcome was a probable case of dengue
142 (PDC), which includes clinical-epidemiological criteria or laboratory confirmation [13,15], as it is a
143 more sensitive criterion for the diagnosis of dengue and is helpful in the context of epidemiological
144 surveillance of the disease. Laboratory-confirmed dengue was defined as PCR, NS1, or IgM positive
145 test. IgM result was only considered if performed 90 days after any vaccine dose for those vaccinated.

146 *Statistical analysis*

147 Incidence rates per 10,000 person-years (IR/10⁴py) and incidence rate ratios (IRR) were
148 calculated for both primary outcomes under consideration. These measures were determined for
149 individuals who received at least one, two, or three vaccine doses or complete regimen as
150 recommended compared to non-vaccinated individuals. Other secondary outcomes were evaluated in
151 patients who received at least one dose.

152 Poisson regression was used to adjust for confounders, with the time of follow-up used as an
153 offset. Age, sex, and municipality were included in the models. Individuals aged 9–14 and 28–44
154 years (11.5%) were excluded, except when specific analysis by age group was performed, as they were
155 restricted to only two municipalities.

156 Vaccine effectiveness and 95% confidence intervals (95% CIs) were calculated using the
157 formula: $Effectiveness = [1 - IRR_a] \times 100$ (eq. 1)
158 where IRR_a is the adjusted incidence rate ratio. Statistical analyses were performed using R 2020
159 (version 4.0.2) and Stata® (version 15.1) [16,17]. Absolute risk reduction (ARR) and the number

160 necessary for vaccine (NNV) were also calculated and presented for each exposure regimen [18].

161 For sensitivity analysis, the effectiveness of PDC was evaluated considering the period from
162 2019 onwards.

163 This study was approved by the Research Ethics Committee of the Federal University of Paraná
164 (N# 2,308,662) and registered in the institution's Integrated Agreement Management System under
165 Process number 23075.040144/2019-49 and published in the DOU on 04/June/ 2020.

166 **Results**

167 This cohort consisted of 501,208 individuals from the vaccination's target population program,
168 302,603 (60.4%) individuals who received at least one vaccine dose and 198,605 (39.6%)
169 unvaccinated individuals. A total of 142,687 individuals received the three planned doses, among
170 which 122,564 met the compliance criteria.

171 Demographic characteristics and vaccination-related aspects are shown in Table 3. A higher
172 percentage of men received at least one vaccine dose (51.1%) and women had a higher compliance
173 rate (52.4%). The highest frequency of dengue notifications was recorded in 2020 (44.9%).

Table 3. Demographic characteristics, exposure, and dengue notifications in the target population in the 30 municipalities in Paraná from epidemiological week 33/2016 to 52/2019

Characteristic	Vaccinated				Non-vaccinated		Total	
	<i>Compliant</i>		Total vaccinated					
	(Total: 122,614)		(Total: 302,603)		(Total: 198,605)		(Total: 501,208)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Sex								
Male	59,914	48.9	158,654	52.4	90,391	45.5	249,045	49.7
Female	62,700	51.1	143,949	47.6	108,214	54.5	252,163	50.3
Age group								
9 to 14*	7,980	6.5	14,409	4.8	4,894	2.5	19,303	3.9
15 to 19	48,718	39.7	111,993	37.0	56,354	28.4	168,347	33.6
20 to 24	32,776	26.7	94,124	31.1	79,822	40.2	173,946	34.7
25 to 27	16,813	13.7	48,509	16.0	52,811	26.6	101,320	20.2
28 to 44*	16,327	13.3	33,568	11.1	4,724	2.4	38,292	7.6
Cohort group								
First	104,484	85.2	205,927	68.1	198,605	100.0	404,532	80.7
Second	18,130	14.8	96,676	31.9	96,676	19.3
Number of doses								
3 doses	122,614	100.0	142,700	47.2	142,700	28.5
2 doses	0	..	78,337	25.9	78,337	15.6
1 dose	0	..	81,566	27.0	81,566	16.3
None	0	..	0	..	198,605	100.0	198,605	39.6
Notifications								
2016	349	7.9	935	8.4	1,029	7.8	1,964	8.1
2017	831	18.7	2,280	20.6	2,253	17.1	4,533	18.7
2018	533	12.0	1,281	11.6	1,584	12.0	2,865	11.8
2019	2,729	61.4	6,591	59.4	8,300	63.0	14,891	61.4
Total	4,442	100.0	11,087	100.0	13,166	100.0	24,253	100.0

The denominator of the proportions was the total number of individuals in each group (compliant, vaccinated, non-vaccinated, and total cohort). Total vaccinated includes individuals who received any number of vaccine doses. * For the municipalities of Assaí and Paranaguá, the study population was only composed of the age groups 9–14 and 28–44 years.

174

175

176

177

178

Among the 90,373 notifications recorded from 2016–2022, PDC numbered 50,658, of which 24,219 (47.8%) in the vaccinated group (Table 4). A total of 15,131 (16.7%) were laboratory-confirmed cases with 8,364 (55.3%) in the vaccinated group. Warning signs were identified in 912 cases, with 520 (57.0%) in the vaccinated group.

Table 4. Probable dengue cases (PDC) in the target population in 30 municipalities in Paraná.

Characteristics	Vaccinated		Non-vaccinated		Total	
	No. 24,219		No. 26,439		No. 50,658	
	N	%	N	%	n	%
Sex						
Male	11,969	49.4	12,027	45.5	23,996	47.4
Female	12,250	50.6	14,412	54.5	26,662	52.6
Age group						
9 to 14*	745	3.1	198	0.7	943	1.9
15 to 19	10,352	42.7	8,085	30.6	18,437	36.4
20 to 24	7,520	31.1	10,002	37.8	17,522	34.6
25 to 27	3,648	15.1	7,085	26.8	10,733	21.2
28 to 44*	1,954	8.1	1,069	4.0	3,023	6.0
Number of doses						
None	0	0	26,439	100.0	26,439	52.2
1 dose	6,487	26.8	0	-	6,487	12.8
2 doses	6,176	25.5	0	-	6,176	12.2
3 doses	11,556	47.7	0	-	11,556	22.8
Laboratory confirmed cases						
2016	22	0.1	35	0.1	57	0.1
2017	105	0.4	219	0.9	324	0.6
2018	39	0.1	40	0.2	79	0.2
2019	1,463	5.5	1,409	5.8	2,872	5.7
2020	2,765	10.5	4,082	16.9	6,847	13.5
2021	1,349	5.1	1,502	6.2	2,851	5.6
2022	1,024	3.9	1,077	4.4	2,101	4.1
Probable dengue cases						
2016	51	0.2	28	0.1	79	0.2
2017	274	1.1	145	0.5	419	0.8
2018	62	0.3	45	0.2	107	0.2
2019	2,343	9.7	2,378	9.0	4,721	9.3
2020	15,478	63.9	16,598	62.8	32,076	63.3
2021	2,926	12.1	3,208	12.1	6,134	12.1
2022	3,085	12.7	4,037	15.3	7,122	14.1
Classification of cases						
Dengue	23,680	97.8	26,027	98.4	49,707	98.1
Warning signs	520	2.1	392	1.5	912	1.8
Severe dengue	19	0.1	20	0.1	39	0.1
Hospitalization						
Dengue	389	1.6	318	1.2	707	1.4
Warning signs	214	0.9	174	0.7	388	0.8
Severe dengue	16	0.1	18	0.1	34	0.1
Total identified	619	2.6	510	1.9	1,129	2.2
Laboratory dengue confirmed**						
PCR	1,288	5.3	1,197	4.5	2,485	4.9
NS1	4,265	17.6	2,848	10.8	7,113	14.0
IgM	2,811	11.6	2,722	10.3	5,533	10.9
Any test (total)	8,364	34.5	6,767	25.6	15,131	29.9
Identified serotypes						
DENV-1	342	1.4	502	1.9	844	1.7
DENV-2	936	3.9	571	2.2	1,507	3.0
DENV-4	14	0.1	123	0.5	137	0.3
Total identified	1,292	5.3	1,196	4.5	2,488	4.9

The denominator of the proportions was the total number of probable dengue cases in each group (vaccinated, non-vaccinated, and total cases). Total vaccinated: Individuals who received any number of vaccine doses. *The 9–14 years and 28–44 years age groups constituted the study population only for the municipalities of Assaí and Paranaguá. ** Prioritization of the most specific Laboratory test in decreasing order i.e., PCR, NS1, and IgM.

179

180

Thirty-nine severe cases were observed among PDC, 19 in the vaccinated group and 20 in the

181 non-vaccinated. Dengue-related deaths were reported in both groups during the study period, 5 cases
 182 in the vaccinated and 14 occurrences in the non-vaccinated (IR 0.39; 95% CI: 0.14-1.08). Of the 1,129
 183 hospitalizations, 619 (54.0%) were in the vaccinated group, of which 16 (2.6%) involved severe forms,
 184 while of the 510 hospitalizations in the non-vaccinated group, 18 (3,5%) were severe.

185 Vaccine effectiveness on PDC ranged from 31.5% (95% CI: 29.5–33.5) to 35.1% (95% CI: 33.3–
 186 36.8) among those with two doses and those with compliance, respectively (Table 5).

Table 5. Number of probable dengue cases, incidence rates in 10, 000 person-year, crude and adjusted incidence rate ratios, vaccine effectiveness, absolute risk reduction and number needed to vaccinate according to exposure characteristics and primary outcome in 30 municipalities in Paraná.

No.	IR	No.	IR	IRR _c (95% CI)	IRR _a (95% CI)	Vaccine Effectiveness (95% CI)	ARR ^{***} (%)	NNV ^{****}
Vaccinated**		Non-vaccinated						
21,520	154.9	25,172	242.0	0.640(0.628 to 0.652)	0.663(0.651 to 0.675)	33.7(32.5 to 34.9)	0.872	115
1 dose		Non-vaccinated						
6,039	157.3	25,172	242.0	0.650(0.632 to 0.669)	0.655 (0.636 to 0.674)	34.5 (32.6 to 36.4)	0.847	118
2 doses		Non-vaccinated						
5,623	175.1	25,103	267.5	0.655(0.636 to 0.674)	0.685(0.665 to 0.705)	31.5(29.5 to 33.5)	0.924	108
3 doses		Non-vaccinated						
9,858	195.6	25,039	303.0	0.645(0.631 to 0.661)	0.663(0.646 to 0.681)	33.7(31.9 to 35.4)	1.074	93
Compliance		Non-vaccinated						
8,459	192.9	25,039	303.0	0.637(0.621 to 0.653)	0.649(0.632 to 0.667)	35.1(33.3 to 36.8)	1.101	91

*IR = Incidence rate/10,000 person-year. IRR_c: crude incidence rate ratio calculated using the ratio of incidence rates in each group; IRR_a: incidence rate ratio adjusted by sex, 15–27 years age group, and municipality of residence; Vaccine Effectiveness was calculated using the adjusted incidence rate ratio in %. ** Vaccinated: individuals who received any number of vaccine doses. ***ARR = Absolute risk reduction. ****NNV = Number needed to vaccinate.

187

188 Based on laboratory- confirmed cases, overall effectiveness was 20.1 (95% CI: 17.1-22.9)
 189 for at least one dose (Table 6). It ranged from 17.5 (95% CI:12,9–21.9) among those who received
 190 two doses to 24.3% (95% CI: 20.1–28.2) for those with one dose.

Table 6. Number of laboratory confirmed dengue cases, incidence rates in 10, 000 person-year, crude and adjusted incidence rate ratios, vaccine effectiveness, absolute risk reduction and number needed to vaccinate according to exposure characteristics and primary outcome in 30 municipalities in Paraná.

No.	IR	No.	IR*	IRR _c (95% CI)	IRR _a (95% CI)	Vaccine Effectiveness (95% CI)	ARR*** (%)	NNV****
Vaccinated**		Non-vaccinated						
6,869	51.4	6,074	62.8	0.818(0.790 to 0.847)	0.799 (0.771 to 0.829)	20.1(17.1 to 22.9)	0.142	876
1 dose		Non-vaccinated						
1,817	49.2	6,074	62.8	0.783(0.743 to 0.826)	0.757 (0.718 to 0.799)	24.3 (20.1 to 28.2)	0.136	735
2 doses		Non-vaccinated						
1,810	58.3	6,018	68.7	0.849(0.805 to 0.895)	0.825(0.781 to 0.871)	17.5(12.9 to 21.9)	0.104	966
3 doses		Non-vaccinated						
3,242	66.5	5,987	77.2	0.861(0.825 to 0.899)	0.817(0.777 to 0.858)	18.3(14.2 to 22.3)	0.107	934
Compliance		Non-vaccinated						
2,825	66.6	5,987	77.2	0.863(0.825 to 0.903)	0.806(0.766 to 0.849)	19.4(15.1 to 23.4)	0.106	945

*IR = Incidence rate/10,000 person-year. IRR_c: crude incidence rate ratio calculated using the ratio of incidence rates in each group; IRR_a: incidence rate ratio adjusted by sex, 15–27 years age group, and municipality of residence; Vaccine Effectiveness was calculated using the adjusted incidence rate ratio in %. ** Vaccinated: individuals who received any number of vaccine doses. ***ARR = Absolute risk reduction. ****NNV = Number needed to vaccinate.

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

Higher effectiveness was observed in the 28–44 age group (78.1%; 95% CI: 76.2–79.9%), irrespective of the number of vaccine doses (Table 7). Data for the 28–44 age group were limited to the municipalities of Paranaguá and Assaí. When vaccine effectiveness was stratified by serotype, it was found to be 51.9% (95% CI: 44.6–58.2) and 92.0% (95% CI: 86.2–95.4) for DENV-1 and DENV-4, respectively. No effectiveness was found for DENV-2 (-10.8%; 95% CI: -23.5–0.60), and no DENV-3 cases were reported. Hospitalization was reduced among the vaccinated group (16.5%; CI: 5.5 to 26.3). Dengue cases with warning signs and/or severe forms presented wide confidence intervals for effectiveness, and no definite conclusions may be drawn.

Table 7. Other secondary outcomes, incidence rates in 10, 000 person-year, crude and adjusted incidence rate ratios, vaccine effectiveness, absolute risk reduction and number needed to vaccinate according to exposure characteristics in 30 municipalities in Paraná.

	No.	IR	No.	IR	IRR _c (95% CI)	IRR _a (95% CI)	Vaccine Effectiveness (95% CI)	ARR*** (%)	NNT****
Age groups	Vaccinated**		Non-vaccinated						
9 to 14 years	745	91.9	198	71.1	1.292(1.103 to 1.519)	1.090(0.928 to 1.281)	-9.0(-28.1 to 7.2)	-0.201	-
15 to 27 years	21,520	154.9	25,172	242.0	0.640(0.628 to 0.652)	0,672((0.660 to 0.685)	32.8 (31.5 to 34.0)	0.872	115
28 to 44 years	1,954	103.4	1,069	425.6	0.243(0.225 to 0.262)	0,219((0.201 to 0.238)	78.1 (76.2 to 79.9)	3.222	31
Serotypes	Vaccinated**		Non-vaccinated						
DENV-1	333	2.5	495	5.2	0.485(0.420 to 0.558)	0.481(0.418 to 0.554)	51.9(44.6 to 58.2)	0.027	4
DENV-2	836	6.4	546	5.8	1.102(0.988 to 1.230)	1.108(0.994 to 1.235)	-10.8(-23.5 to 0.60)	0.006	17
DENV-4	14	0.1	123	1.3	0.082(0.044 to 0.143)	0.080(0.046 to 0.139)	92.0(86.2 to 95.4)	0.012	8
Clinical characteristics	Vaccinated**		Non-vaccinated						
Alarm/Severe signs	509	3,9	405	4.3	0.905(0.792 to 1.033)	0.901(0.789 to 1.029)	9.9(-2.9 to 21.1)	0.004	25
Severe dengue	18	0.14	20	0.21	0.648(0.323 to 1.290)	0.588(0.304 to 1.137)	41.2(-13.7 to 69.6)	0.001	133
Hospitalization	537	3.9	484	4.7	0.830(0.733 to 0.941)	0.835(0.737 to 0.945)	16.5(5.5 to 26.3)	0.008	13

*IR = Incidence rate/10,000 person-year. IRR_c: crude incidence rate ratio calculated using the ratio of incidence rates in each group; IRR_a: incidence rate ratio adjusted by sex and 15–27 years age group; Vaccine Effectiveness was calculated using the adjusted incidence rate ratio in %. ** Vaccinated: individuals who received any number of vaccine doses. ***ARR = Absolute risk reduction. ****NNT = Number needed to vaccinate.

200

201 In the sensitivity analysis, 21,252 cases were identified among individuals who received at least
 202 one dose (IR 245.2/10⁴py) and 24,993 among non-vaccinated individuals (IR 399.1/10⁴py). The
 203 measured vaccine effectiveness was 36.6% (95% CI: 35.4–37.8), similar to that obtained in the primary
 204 analysis with PDC.

205 Discussion

206 In this study, we report the findings on the effectiveness of dengue vaccine, administered in a
 207 large population-based cohort in 30 municipalities in Paraná, Southern Brazil [10], after six years of
 208 monitoring. Effectiveness was higher among vaccinated individuals but lower than that obtained in
 209 efficacy studies [9]. There was significant variability in vaccine effectiveness (VE) for the different
 210 viral subtypes; VE was highest for DEN-4 and DEN-1 and lowest for DEN-2 (negative VE values).
 211 The VE for serotype 3 could not be evaluated. The high prevalence of serotype 2 during the study
 212 period may explain the differences in effectiveness observed here and previous clinical trials. PDC
 213 was used as the primary endpoint as it better represents the real scenario of health services in
 214 diagnosing dengue in countries like Brazil [18].

215 Since 2014, when Brazil adopted the WHO classification for dengue, PDC has been the

216 parameter used for dengue disease monitoring through epidemiological surveillance [15]. The signs
217 and symptoms of dengue are well known by health professionals in endemic areas, favoring
218 homogeneity in diagnosing the disease among vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals.
219 Furthermore, it is crucial to work with probable cases to respond to epidemics promptly, as case
220 confirmation might be expensive and time-consuming [18].

221 The challenge in anti-dengue vaccine effectiveness studies is defining the primary endpoint.
222 Ideally, this should be based on laboratory-confirmed disease. Laboratory confirmation, however,
223 is not feasible in regions where thousands of suspected cases of dengue occur each year. Therefore,
224 surveillance systems conclude reported cases based on clinical-epidemiological criteria and, anti-dengue
225 vaccine efficacy studies should consider this criterion in their analysis of results.

226 Dengue notification processes were affected by the outbreak of the large-scale Zika virus in
227 2014, which spread across the Pacific and reached Brazil, causing an explosive epidemic in South
228 America. Zika infection can be misdiagnosed clinically as Dengue fever, reducing the accuracy of the
229 clinical-epidemiological diagnosis. Moreover, the high genetic similarity between both viruses
230 contributes to a substantial cross-reactivity in the antibody responses, compromising the results of
231 point-of-care serological tests [19].

232 However, evaluating VE using laboratory methods exclusively presents limitations. Their use
233 depends on the availability of infrastructure and laboratory capacity, making it challenging to offer
234 and apply these procedures universally across municipalities and healthcare sites. Testing rates
235 differed between municipalities, although there was no significant difference in laboratory testing
236 between vaccinated and non-vaccinated individuals. According to De Smedt et al. [20], the laboratory
237 criterion may introduce a differential misclassification bias by underestimating effectiveness, as
238 observed by comparing PDC-based effectiveness estimates with PCRNS1 endpoints. Furthermore,
239 adding IgM tests to the PDC for case identification ratified the primary outcome-based evaluation.

240 The “exposure to at least one dose” criterion seems the most appropriate because it represents

241 the natural condition of community intervention and reflects population adherence to multiple-dose
242 vaccinations [10]. There was no difference between compliant individuals and those who received the
243 three doses. However, further studies are needed to compare regimens with different numbers of doses,
244 considering different epidemiological contexts [21], the prevalence of circulating serotypes [22], and
245 the change in vaccine recommendations concerning previous seropositivity [23-25].

246 Effectiveness was higher in older age groups. Since there is a greater probability of previous
247 dengue infection in older individuals, these data corroborate the results of efficacy studies [7,9,26,27].
248 Although the basal seroprevalence of dengue in Paraná is unknown, a survey of dengue seroprevalence
249 in a Brazilian city with a history of recurrent epidemics showed seropositivity values ranging from 63–
250 75% in the 10–19 and 40–59 years age groups, respectively [28].

251 In line with the findings of efficacy studies (CYD14 and CYD15) [9], effectiveness varied
252 according to viral serotype, with the highest values observed for DENV-4 and DENV-1. Notably,
253 global vaccine effectiveness is significantly associated with serotype-related efficacy and depends
254 on identified circulating serotypes, baseline serostatus, and dengue seroprevalence during the study
255 period [22].

256 All four dengue serotypes have been circulating in Paraná since 1995, including areas where the
257 vaccination campaign was carried out. Throughout the epidemic years spanning from 2008 to 2016,
258 DENV-1 predominated, with minimal circulation of DENV-2 and DENV-4, and negligible presence
259 of DENV-3. However, in 2017, there was an important upsurge in the circulation of DENV-2. In 2019–
260 2020, it was responsible for two-thirds of cases, with a low DENV-1 (37%) and 4 (8%) circulation and
261 the absence of DENV-3 observed. In 2021–2022, there was a rise in the DENV-1 detection, but DENV-
262 2 was predominant [4].

263 The ineffectiveness of DENV-2 observed in the study population regardless of the serostatus was
264 previously reported by Sabchareon et al. (2012) [29] in a phase IIb Dengvaxia[®] efficacy study in
265 Thailand and subsequently in the CYD14 and CYD15 studies [30]. The antigenic incompatibility

266 between the vaccine virus (Asian-American genotype) and DENV-2 circulating in Southeast Asia
267 (Asian genotype 1) and the unbalanced replication of vaccine viruses is likely responsible for the
268 variability in vaccine effectiveness against different viral types. [31]. Furthermore, Heinen et al.
269 studies indicate that, among children who were seronegative for DENV at baseline, impaired
270 replication of DENV-4 from the tetravalent vaccine stimulates antibodies capable of neutralizing
271 DENV-1 and DENV-3 *in vitro* but not protecting *in vivo* [32].

272 Further, studies have shown that viruses obtained directly from infected patients' plasma are
273 significantly more infectious than those obtained from cell cultures. Although genotypically identical,
274 DENVs obtained in cell lines are structurally immature and hypersensitive to neutralization by human
275 antibodies compared to DENVs of an infected patient. This phenotypic difference is due to the mature
276 state of the virion obtained in plasma samples compared with immature particles abundantly recovered
277 in cell cultures. In this way, the antibodies induced by the vaccine efficiently neutralize the DENVs in
278 cell culture assays, but they are ineffective in protecting the vaccinated individual [33].

279 Tetravalent dengue vaccines have been developed on the premise that intra-serotype variability
280 does not interfere with vaccine-generated immune responses. However, in a recent analysis of the
281 genetic diversity of DENV-2 pre-membrane (Pre-M) and envelope (E) proteins, its genotypic variants
282 were evaluated, and were found to be neutralized in different ways by monoclonal antibodies and
283 polyclonal sera derived from DENV-2-infected individuals. They also showed differential responses
284 to antibodies induced by both monovalent dengue 2 vaccines and tetravalent vaccines [34]. Therefore,
285 a high antigenic match between vaccine strains and circulating DENVs may be essential to achieve
286 high vaccine efficacy [30].

287 A study conducted in Brazil using clinical samples from two cities of São Paulo in 2019, a new
288 genotype, DENV-2 III BR4, was identified. It was probably introduced in Brazil in 2014 and has
289 replaced other DENV-2 strains circulating in the region [35]. However, in this study, we did not
290 perform a molecular analysis of DENV-2 strains circulating in the studied municipalities. Dengue

291 viruses are constantly under selective pressure, with the consequent emergence of new genotypes that
292 progressively replace previous strains. Thus, the possibility of DENV immune response evasion should
293 be considered in designing vaccines against dengue, which will probably systematically include viral
294 genotypes circulating in the region at that time [22, 29–31, 34]. Therefore, viral genetic surveillance
295 studies are required to understand better the relationship between the vaccine, viral evolution, and
296 dengue virus genotypic variability.

297 Vaccine effectiveness was not statistically significant in cases with warning signs, although this
298 outcome was not evaluated in efficacy studies. Few severe cases or warning signs resulted in low
299 accuracy, limiting the assessment of these outcomes. However, it is essential to note that higher
300 incidence rates of hospitalization due to severe cases and warning signs occurred in the non-
301 vaccinated group. The increased risk of hospitalization observed among seronegative participants in
302 follow-up studies led to recommending the vaccine only to seropositive individuals. [24,25]. The
303 results obtained in this study refer to a population with no information about their previous disease
304 situation. Despite this, hospitalization in dengue cases with alarming or severe signs did not pose a
305 greater risk.

306 The present study was based on a mixed population of dengue-naïve and previously infected
307 individuals when the vaccine was still indicated for all living in regions with high endemicity. From
308 2018 onwards, the vaccine has only been indicated for people with previous dengue infection (i.e.,
309 seropositive) [21]. Therefore, the replication of this study is precluded. Considering future scenarios
310 of effectiveness evaluation, given that the vaccine's efficacy is increased in baseline seropositive
311 subjects the results of studies limited to seropositive populations would potentially be improved
312 compared to this present study.

313 This study was conducted using secondary databases, which have some limitations. The
314 probabilistic matching of three bases minimized these limitations, allowing us to retrieve individual
315 information with high agreement and accuracy, exclude duplicates, and complement data. Owing to

316 the data sources used, we could not individually assess the socioeconomic and educational
317 characteristics of the target population, which may be associated with vaccine adherence, health care,
318 and the risk of dengue infection. Studies on factors affecting the acceptance of the dengue vaccine
319 have reported controversial data regarding the effects of socioeconomic status [36,37] and schooling
320 [36–39]. Previous experiences with dengue may also constitute confounding factors, which lead to
321 the vaccination of individuals at a higher risk of developing dengue [37]; however, other studies have
322 not found this association [36,39]. In our study, conditioning for a municipality variable, age, sex,
323 and other characteristics of the municipality are controlled, as they are associated with both the
324 exposure variable (vaccine) and the outcome (notification), minimizing these biases.

325 The vaccine has proven effective in reducing the incidence of symptomatic dengue in clinical
326 trials, but evidence is lacking regarding the impact it would have on epidemiological surveillance. In
327 this study, we estimated a reduction in reported PDC, representing 33.7% among individuals who
328 received at least one dose of the vaccine.

329 DENVs are heterogeneous and dynamic, with consequent implications for vaccine research.
330 Recent human natural dengue infection studies have shown that only the presence of anti-DENV
331 antibodies is not enough to define neutralization and protection, as not all neutralizing antibodies are
332 equally protective to the same degree. Therefore, the quality and quantity of anti-DENV neutralizing
333 antibodies are critical. Most importantly, dengue research must focus on understanding DENV
334 immunity and searching for reliable protection markers [40].

335 The evaluation of effectiveness on laboratory-confirmed cases and serotype-specific infections
336 would have the limitation that the identification of the outcome would be conditioned to a series of
337 known and unknown factors that affect access to diagnosis. These factors can either be a consequence
338 of consultation patterns, also associated with vaccination adherence, or be associated with
339 immunization outcomes (manifestations and disease severity). Thus, there would be a high risk of
340 selection bias when focusing the analysis only on confirmed ones [37]. By estimating the impact of

341 vaccination on the total PDC, which more sensitively and robustly represents the burden of the disease
342 in the health system, these results become more relevant for planning and actions on public health.

343 **Funding:**

344 This work was supported by Sanofi Pasteur.

345 The funder of this collaborative study, participated in discussing the study's findings and
346 reviewing the manuscript. The authors analyzed and interpreted the data and submitted the manuscript
347 for publication.

348 **Data Availability:**

349 All relevant data are within the manuscript and its Supporting Information files.

350 **Competing interests:**

351 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

352 **References**

353 [1] World Health Organization. Vector-borne diseases. Available at:
354 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/vector-borne-diseases> . Accessed Feb 19, 2023.

355 [2] Zeng Z, Zhan J, Chen L, Chen H, Cheng S. Global, regional, and national dengue burden from
356 1990 to 2017: A systematic analysis based on the global burden of disease study 2017.
357 *EClinicalMedicine*. 2021;32:100712.

358 [3] Pan American Health Organization •. Epidemiological Update for Dengue, Chikungunya and
359 Zika in 2022. Available at: [https://www3.paho.org/data/index.php/en/mnu-topics/indicadores-dengue-](https://www3.paho.org/data/index.php/en/mnu-topics/indicadores-dengue-en/annual-arbovirus-bulletin-2022.html)
360 [en/annual-arbovirus-bulletin-2022.html](https://www3.paho.org/data/index.php/en/mnu-topics/indicadores-dengue-en/annual-arbovirus-bulletin-2022.html) . Accessed Feb 19, 2023.

361 [4] Brazilian Ministry of Health/ Health Surveillance Secretariat. Monitoramento dos casos de
362 arboviroses urbanas transmitidas pelo *Aedes*. *Boletim Epidemiológico*. 2023;54:1–14.
363 Available at: [https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/boletins/epidemiologicos/edicoes/2023/boletim-epidemiologico-volume-54-no-01/view)
364 [conteudo/publicacoes/boletins/epidemiologicos/edicoes/2023/boletim-epidemiologico-volume-54-no-](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/boletins/epidemiologicos/edicoes/2023/boletim-epidemiologico-volume-54-no-01/view)
365 [01/view](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/boletins/epidemiologicos/edicoes/2023/boletim-epidemiologico-volume-54-no-01/view). Accessed Feb 19, 2023.

- 366 [5] Garcia GdA, David MR, Martins AdJ, Maciel-de-Freitas R, Linss JGB, Araújo SC, et al. The
367 impact of insecticide applications on the dynamics of resistance: The case of four *Aedes aegypti*
368 populations from different Brazilian regions. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2018;12(2): e0006227.
- 369 [6] Thomas SJ, Yoon IK. A review of Dengvaxia®: development to deployment. *Hum Vaccin*
370 *Immunother*. 2019;15:2295–314.
- 371 [7] Capeding MR, Tran NH, Hadinegoro SRS, Ismail HIHM, Chotpitayasunondh T, Chua MN,
372 et al. Clinical efficacy and safety of a novel tetravalent dengue vaccine in healthy children in Asia: A
373 phase 3, randomised, observer-masked, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2014;384:1358–65.
- 374 [8] Villar L, Dayan GH, Arredondo-García JL, Rivera DM, Cunha R, Deseda C, et al. Efficacy
375 of a Tetravalent Dengue Vaccine in Children in Latin America. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;372:113–23.
- 376 [9] Hadinegoro SR, Arredondo-García JL, Capeding MR, Deseda C, Chotpitayasunondh T,
377 Dietze R, et al. Efficacy and long-term safety of a dengue vaccine in regions of endemic disease. *N*
378 *Engl J Med*. 2015;373:1195–206. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1506223>.
- 379 [10] Preto C, Maron de Mello A, Cesário Pereira Maluf EM, Teixeira Krainski E, Graeff G, de
380 Sousa GA, et al. Vaccination coverage and adherence to a dengue vaccination program in the state of
381 Paraná, Brazil. *Vaccine*. 2021;39:711–9.
- 382 [11] Moraes JC, Riediger IN, Crosewski F, Garrett DO, Fantinato FF, Ribeiro KB, Luna EJA. A
383 case-control study to determine the effectiveness of a tetravalent dengue vaccine in the state of Parana.
384 *Lancet Reg Health Am*. 2022;7:100141.
- 385 [12] Coelho GE, Leal PL, Cerroni MdP, Simplicio ACR, Siqueira JB, Jr. Sensitivity of the Dengue
386 Surveillance System in Brazil for Detecting Hospitalized Cases. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis*. 2016;10:
387 e0004705.
- 388 [13] Hadinegoro SRS. The revised WHO dengue case classification: Does the system need to be
389 modified? *Paediatr Int Child Health*. 2012;32:33–8.
- 390 [14] Camargo Jr. KR, Coeli CM. Going open source: some lessons learned from the development

- 391 of OpenRecLink. *Cad Saude Publica*. 2015;31:257–63.
- 392 [15] Guia de Vigilância em Saúde, 5ª. edição. Available at: [https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/svsa/vigilancia/guia-de-vigilancia-em-saude_5ed_21nov21_isbn5.pdf/view)
393 [br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/svsa/vigilancia/guia-de-vigilancia-em-](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/svsa/vigilancia/guia-de-vigilancia-em-saude_5ed_21nov21_isbn5.pdf/view)
394 [saude_5ed_21nov21_isbn5.pdf/view](https://www.gov.br/saude/pt-br/centrais-de-conteudo/publicacoes/svsa/vigilancia/guia-de-vigilancia-em-saude_5ed_21nov21_isbn5.pdf/view) . Accessed in Jan 26, 2022.
- 395 [16] R Core Team. (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
396 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 397 [17] Stata Corp (2017). Stata Statistical Software: Release 15. College Station, TX: StataCorp
398 LLC.
- 399 [18] Olliaro P, Torreale E, Vaillant M. Covid-19 vaccine efficacy and effectiveness – the
400 elephant (not) in the room. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021; (published online April 20.).
401 Available at: [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanmic/article/PIIS2666-5247\(21\)00069-0/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanmic/article/PIIS2666-5247(21)00069-0/fulltext).
402 Accessed in Feb 19, 2023.
- 403 [17] Sharp TM, Anderson KB, Katzelnick LC, Clapham H, Johansson MA, Morrison MA, et al.
404 Knowledge gaps in the epidemiology of severe dengue impede vaccine evaluation. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
405 2021;12:30871-9
- 406 [18] Angelo M, Ramalho WM, Gurgel H, Bell N, Pillot E. Dengue Surveillance System in Brazil:
407 A Qualitative Study in the Federal District. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2020;2062:2-17.
- 408 [19] Sreaton G, Mongkolsapaya J. Which dengue vaccine approach is the most promising, and
409 should we be concerned about enhanced disease after vaccination? The challenges of a dengue vaccine.
410 *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*. 2018;10(6):a029520..
- 411 [20] De Smedt T, Merrall E, Macina D, Perez-Vilar S, Andrews N, Bollaerts K. Bias due to
412 differential and non-differential disease and exposure misclassification in studies of vaccine
413 effectiveness. *PLoS ONE*. 2018;13:1–13.
- 414 [21] World Health Organization. Dengue vaccine: WHO position paper – July 2016. *Weekly*
415 *Epidemiological Record*. 2016;30:349–364.

- 416 [22] Rabaa MA, Girerd-Chambaz Y, Hue KDT, Tuan TV, Wills B, Bonaparte M, et al. Genetic
417 epidemiology of dengue viruses in phase III trials of the CYD tetravalent dengue vaccine and
418 implications for efficacy. *ELife*. 2017;6:1–22.
- 419 [23] World Health Organization. Dengue vaccine: WHO position paper – September 2018. *Weekly
420 Epidemiological Record*. 2018;36:457–476.
- 421 [24] Sridhar S, Luedtke A, Langevin E, Zhu M, Bonaparte M, Machabert T, et al. Effect of dengue
422 serostatus on dengue vaccine safety and efficacy. *N Eng J Med*. 2018;379:327–40.
- 423 [25] Wilder-Smith A, Hombach J, Ferguson N, Selgelid M, O'Brien K, Vannice K, et al.
424 Deliberations of the Strategic Advisory Group of Experts on Immunization on the use of CYD-TDV
425 dengue vaccine. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2019;19(1):e31-e38.
- 426 [26] Dayan GH, Langevin E, Gilbert PB, Wu Y, Moodie Z, Forrat R, et al. Assessment of the
427 long-term efficacy of a dengue vaccine against symptomatic, virologically confirmed dengue disease
428 by baseline dengue serostatus. *Vaccine*. 2020;38:3531–6.
- 429 [27] Carabali M, Lim JK, Velez DC, Trujillo A, Egurrola J, Lee KS, et al. Dengue virus serological
430 prevalence and seroconversion rates in children and adults in Medellin, Colombia: implications for
431 vaccine introduction. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2017;58:27–36.
- 432 [28] Chiaravalloti-Neto F, Da Silva RA, Zini N, Da Silva GCD, Da Silva NS, Parra MCP, et al.
433 Seroprevalence for dengue virus in a hyperendemic area and associated socioeconomic and
434 demographic factors using a cross-sectional design and a geostatistical approach, state of São Paulo,
435 Brazil. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019;19:1–14.
- 436 [29] Sabchareon A, Wallace D, Sirivichayakul C, Limkittikul K, Chanthavanich P, Suvannadabba
437 S, et al. Protective efficacy of the recombinant, live-attenuated, CYD tetravalent dengue vaccine in
438 Thai schoolchildren: A randomised, controlled phase 2b trial. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9853):1559-67.
439 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61428-7.
- 440 [30] Juraska M, Magaret CA, Shao J, Carpp LN, Fiore-Gartland AJ, Benkeser D, et al. Viral

- 441 genetic diversity and protective efficacy of a tetravalent dengue vaccine in two phase 3 trials. Proc
442 Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018;115:E8378–87.
- 443 [31] Torresi J, Richmond PC, Heron LG, Qiao M, Marjason J, Starr-Spires L, et al. Replication
444 and Excretion of the Live Attenuated Tetravalent Dengue Vaccine CYD-TDV in a Flavivirus-Naive
445 Adult Population: Assessment of Vaccine Viremia and Virus Shedding. J Infect Dis. 2017;216:834–
446 41.
- 447 [32] Henein S, Adams C, Bonaparte M, Moser JM, Munteanu A, Baric R, et al. Dengue vaccine
448 breakthrough infections reveal properties of neutralizing antibodies linked to protection. J Clin Invest.
449 2021;131(13):e147066.
- 450 [33] Raut R, Corbett KS, Tennekoon RN, Premawansa S, Wijewickrama A, Premawansa G, et al.
451 Dengue type 1 viruses circulating in humans are highly infectious and poorly neutralized by human
452 antibodies. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2019;116(1):227-232.
- 453 [34] Martinez DR, Yount B, Nivarthi U, Munt JE, Delacruz MJ, Whitehead SS, et al. Antigenic
454 Variation of the Dengue Virus 2 Genotypes Impacts the Neutralization Activity of Human Antibodies
455 in Vaccines. Cell Rep. 2020;33:108226.
- 456 [35] de Jesus JG, Dutra KR, Sales FC da S, Claro IM, Terzian AC, Candido D da S, et al. Genomic
457 detection of a virus lineage replacement event of dengue virus serotype 2 in Brazil, 2019. Mem Inst
458 Oswaldo Cruz. 2020;115:2–7.
- 459 [36] Harapan H, Anwar S, Setiawan AM, Sasmono RT. Dengue vaccine acceptance and associated
460 factors in Indonesia: A community-based cross-sectional survey in Aceh. Vaccine. 2016;34:3670–5.
- 461 [37] Hadisoemarto PF, Castro MC. Public Acceptance and Willingness-to-Pay for a Future Dengue
462 Vaccine: A Community-Based Survey in Bandung, Indonesia. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2013;7(9):1-11.
- 463 [38] Panchapakesan C, Sheldenkar A, Cayabyab YM, Ng JS, Lu J, Lwin MO. A comparison
464 between the predictors of vaccine uptake intentions for influenza and dengue. Int J Environ Res Public
465 Health. 2018;15:1-10.

- 466 [39] Yeo HY, Shafie AA. The acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP) for hypothetical dengue
467 vaccine in Penang, Malaysia: A contingent valuation study. *Cost Eff Resour Alloc.* 2018;16:1–10.
- 468 [40] de Silva AM, Harris E. Which Dengue Vaccine Approach Is the Most Promising, and Should
469 We Be Concerned about Enhanced Disease after Vaccination? *The Path to a Dengue Vaccine:
470 Learning from Human Natural Dengue Infection Studies and Vaccine Trials.* Cold Spring Harb
471 *Perspect Biol.* 2018;10(6): a029371.
- 472 [41] Munafo MR, Tilling K, Taylor AE, Evans DM, Smith GD. Collider scope: when selection
473 bias can substantially influence observed associations. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2018;47:226–235.
- 474