1	Optimal deployment of limited vaccine
2	supplies to combat mpox
3	
4	
5	
6	Matthew T Berry ¹
7	C Raina MacIntyre ²
8	Deborah Cromer ¹
9	Adam Hacker ³
10	Miles P Davenport ¹
11	David S Khoury ^{1*}
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	^{1.} Infection Analytics Program, Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney, Kensington NSW 2052
17	Australia
18	^{2.} Biosecurity Program, Kirby Institute, UNSW Sydney, Kensington NSW 2052 Australia
19	^{3.} Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, Post box 1030 Hoff, 0218 Oslo,
20	Norway
21	
22	
24	*Address for correspondence:
25	dkhoury@kirby.unsw.edu.au
26	
27	
28	

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

29 Abstract:

- 30 Mpox outbreaks in Central Africa have been declared a public health emergency of
- 31 international concern by the World Health Organization. Fortunately, real-world effectiveness
- 32 studies of the MVA-BN vaccine indicate that it has an effectiveness of 74% after one dose,
- 33 and 82% after two doses against mpox. However, given the very limited supply of vaccines in
- 34 Central Africa, there remain questions around the optimal deployment of limited MVA-BN
- 35 doses. In this study, we consider whether more mpox cases might be averted by following the
- 36 traditional two-dose vaccine regimen (4 week dosing interval), or by giving a single dose of
- 37 MVA-BN to as many individuals as possible. We find that the optimal strategy depends on
- 38 both, (i) the degree to which a subpopulation might be at higher risk of mpox, or severe
- 39 mpox, infections, and (ii) how long ago the first dose was administered to the most at-risk
- 40 subpopulation.
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44

45 Introduction

There are concurrent outbreaks of mpox clades I and II globally¹. Of great concern is the 46 47 current clade I outbreak in central Africa with high case rates, increasing transmission and 48 case-fatality ratio reported at approximately 2% (African continent average), and higher in 49 children^{2,3}. Fortunately, there is considerable evidence that vaccinia-based vaccines are 50 effective at preventing both mpox infection and at reducing the severity of illness⁴⁻⁶. The 51 evidence of vaccine effectiveness (VE) is derived from real-world effectiveness studies of the 52 third generation MVA-BN vaccine in western populations during the clade IIb pandemic of 2022-2023⁷⁻¹⁰. A number of older studies in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC, 53 formally Zaire) have also shown that vaccination with first generation vaccinia-based 54 55 vaccines is protective against mpox¹¹⁻¹³. However, third generation vaccines are preferable to 56 early vaccinia-vaccines because of the superior safety and utility in immunosuppressed individuals¹⁴. Despite the urgent need to vaccinate at-risk populations, particularly in the 57 DRC and neighbouring countries, vaccine availability is limited¹⁵. Africa CDC estimate 10 58 59 million doses are required to control the epidemic¹⁶. Japan has committed 3 million doses of 60 LC16, although to date no supply has reached DRC or neighbouring countries. 61 Approximately 200,000 doses of MVA-BN (Jynneos) arrived in DRC in September 2024. 62 LC16 is a single dose regimen, while MVA-BN is currently recommended as a two-dose 63 regimen (given 4 weeks apart)¹⁷. The DRC has a population of more than 110 million. 64 Therefore, how to optimally deploy a limited stock of vaccines to avert the greatest number 65 of clinical cases, particularly severe cases, is a critical question at present. 66 Recently, multiple meta-analyses of real-world effectiveness studies of MVA-BN have 67 68 analysed the effectiveness of one-dose and two-dose MVA-BN against clade IIb mpox⁴⁻⁶. 69 These have shown a relatively incremental improvement in vaccine effectiveness after two 70 doses compared with a single dose. For example, the World Health Organization (WHO)

71 states that one dose and two doses of MVA-BN provide 76% and 82% effectiveness against

72 mpox, respectively¹⁸. In our own meta-analysis we estimated very similar vaccine

73 effectiveness of 74% after one dose and 82% after two doses. Based on this comparison, we

74 commented that in the case of limited vaccine supply, it would be optimal to deploy a single

75 dose of vaccine to as many individuals as possible rather than administer two doses to half as

76 many individuals⁴. However, this analysis did not include modelling of the waning of vaccine

77 effectiveness with time after one dose vaccination (i.e. the comparison was based on reported 78 vaccine effectiveness from clinical studies, and did not model the predicted decay of vaccine

79 effectiveness over time). Further, the analysis only considered the situation of a population at 80 homogeneous risk of infection, but did not consider the implications of high-risk groups for 81 both infection and for severe outcomes, as is currently observed across age groups in the clade I outbreak in the DRC^{2,19}. Here we consider the question of the optimal deployment of 82 83 a limited number of MVA-BN doses given the likely waning of vaccine effectiveness, and in a population where there are subgroups at different risk of infection and severe outcomes. In 84 85 particular, we are interested in the decision, at a particular time point, of whether to use a 86 limited supply of MVA-BN vaccines to deliver a second dose to those who have already 87 received a first dose of MVA-BN or to deploy a first dose of the limited vaccine stock to 88 naïve individuals. This question does not consider the reason individuals may have received a 89 first dose in the past (e.g. either as post-exposure prophylaxis or as primary prevention), or 90 the protection the first vaccine doses have provided up to the time our decision must be made. 91 But rather, we only ask, from the time of our current decision on deployment, what is the 92 relative advantage of deploying a limited stock of these vaccines as second doses to those 93 already partially vaccinated or as first doses to those who have not yet received any vaccine 94 doses?

95

96 It is important to note that, in this study, we rely on data and modelling of MVA-BN 97 effectiveness derived from the clade IIb global outbreaks, but throughout our analysis we 98 discuss these results assuming they are translatable to the contemporaneous clade I outbreaks 99 in Africa. Although it is generally thought that these vaccines will also be effective against 100 clade I mpox (since immunity to orthopoxviruses is often cross-protective¹⁴), confirmatory 101 studies showing that these vaccines are effective against clade I mpox are currently lacking, 102 and are urgently needed. Further, in this analysis we do not explicitly model mpox 103 transmission or consider the impact of different vaccination strategies on transmission or the 104 epidemic trajectory, since there is limited data to inform these outcomes. Instead, we consider 105 the distribution of a limited supply of vaccines where the primary goal is to reduce risk of 106 infection and severe outcomes in particular cohorts. 107

108

109





112 Figure 1: Estimating the protection from using MVA-BN in a one versus two-dose

111

113 schedule. A) The previously reported vaccine effectiveness of first-generation vaccinia immunisation, and one and two dose MVA-BN vaccination (against clade IIb virus) from a 114

- 115 systematic review and meta-analysis of the available data⁴. B) The predicted vaccine
- 116 effectiveness over time for one dose, two doses spaced 4 weeks apart, and delayed two dose

117 (administered at 2 years). These predictions are from reference ⁴, where a model-based metaanalysis was performed that linked reports of vaccinia-binding antibody titres after MVA-BN 118 119 vaccination and real-world effectiveness studies, and vaccine effectiveness over time was 120 extrapolated by assuming these binding titres predict vaccine effectiveness (which is not yet confirmed). C) Schematic of potential vaccine allocation options assuming additional vaccine 121 122 is available 4 weeks after primary vaccination (top) or at some later timepoint (bottom). In 123 each case we compare the outcome of either giving a second dose to those already vaccinated 124 or allocating the additional vaccine as first doses to a naïve population. D) The ratio of cases 125 averted by administering a first dose to naïve individuals compared to a second dose 126 administered at 4 weeks, measured over the first two years after vaccination. The ratio does 127 not vary much over the time interval being considered. E) The ratio of cases averted by 128 giving a one dose regimen rather than a two-dose regimen, estimated using the vaccine 129 effectiveness observed in a meta-analysis of real world effectiveness studies⁴ (left, black) or 130 predicted from a model-based meta-analysis using predictions of waning and different dose 131 spacing⁴. Note that in the case of giving a second dose at 6 and 12 months we make the 132 assumption that peak antibody binding titres and decay in titres will resemble that seen after giving a second dose at 2 years (the only delayed interval for which immunogenicity data was 133 134 available⁴). This assumption inflates the predicted benefit of the two-dose regimen. 135

136

137

138 Results

139 Comparing one-dose versus two-dose MVA-BN vaccination strategies over two years

140 In a previous study we estimated that distributing limited doses of MVA-BN as a single dose 141 regimen would avert around 1.8-fold more cases of mpox than deploying the same number of doses as a two-dose regimen⁴. This was based only on the comparative reported effectiveness 142

of the one and two dose regimens (fig. 1A). However, vaccinia-binding antibody titres wane 143

- 144 over time, and if antibody responses are predictive of protection, vaccine effectiveness
- against symptomatic infection may wane in parallel⁴ (fig. 1B). Therefore, in this case, it is 145

146 important to model the possible effect of this decay on the comparative benefits of a one- vs.

147 two-dose regimen. We consider a scenario where one dose of vaccine has been deployed to

some groups of individuals either as primary prevention or post-exposure prophylaxis, and at 148

149 some later timepoint authorities will have a choice to either administer a second dose to those

150 same individuals already primed, or to administer a first dose of vaccine to naïve individuals

- (fig. 1C). Without modelling the effects of waning immunity, using only the estimates of 151
- vaccine effectiveness from our previous meta-regression of real world effectiveness studies⁴, 152
- a one-dose vaccination schedule is predicted to avert 1.80-fold (CI: 1.50-1.92), as we 153
- 154 reported previously. In order to account for the impact of waning vaccine effectiveness,
- 155 assuming a fixed force of infection over time, the ratio of the cases averted with each strategy

156 can be calculated as the ratio of the average vaccine effectiveness over a given time interval, 157 beginning when the vaccines are deployed under one or the other strategy (note that we also 158 consider the more general case of a varying force of infection in the supplementary material). 159 Modelling of the decay of vaccinia-binding antibody titres and protection suggests that the 160 benefit of administering a first dose to as many people as possible is relatively constant over 161 the first two years after vaccination (fig. 1D). In the subsequent analysis we focus on a time 162 interval of 2 years after deployment, by which time, if an outbreak continues to intensify, 163 vaccine manufacturing and supply are likely to have increased.

164

165 The analysis above considers the scenario where sufficient vaccine is available to deliver a 166 second dose 4 weeks after the first. However, if vaccine becomes available later after the first dose, does this change the relative benefit of a one-dose vs. a two-dose strategy? Studies have 167 shown that delaying the second dose until 2 years after the first dose leads to a higher peak 168 titre and slower decay of antibody titres post-vaccination²⁰. Thus, in addition to declining 169 protection from the initial one-dose vaccination over time, the relative benefit of 170 171 administering a delayed second dose is expected to increase over time. To model this 172 scenario, we take the same function of waning one-dose immunity as above (fig. 1B). Of 173 note, we only have data on the impact of increasing the spacing of two doses from 1 month to 174 2 years (fig. 1B), and do not have detailed data on the effects of different dose-spacing 175 intervals on antibody titres. However, we make the assumption that delaying the second dose 176 to six months or more induces a similar peak immune response to that achieved with a second 177 dose at 2 years (fig. 1B), which is an assumption that is expected to overestimate the protection from the two-dose regimen when the second dose is administered at 6 or 12 178 179 months. After accounting for waning immunity and higher predicted protection with a 180 delayed second dose, administering a first dose to as many individuals as possible is still 181 predicted to maximise the cases averted from mpox compared to a two-dose strategy (fig. 182 1E). This is observed whether additional vaccine becomes available, 4 weeks, 6 months or 12 months after priming and despite our use of a conservative approach to estimating the effect 183 184 of a delayed second dose (that will favour a two-dose regimen). We estimate there is still a 185 1.59-fold (CI: 1.24-1.84) advantage of administering first doses to naïve individuals 186 compared to a strategy of administering a second dose to those already vaccinated individuals 187 at 12 months. 188

- 189



191

192 Figure 2: Predicting the effects of distributing vaccine doses between risk groups. A)

193 Schematic of allocation scenario. We assume that a first dose of vaccine has been 194 administered to a high-risk group, and at some later time more vaccine becomes available. 195 These vaccines could either be allocated as second doses to the high-risk group, or 196 administered as a first dose to a lower-risk group. (B) Depending on the ratio of risk in the 197 high-risk and lower-risk groups (x-axis), then the predicted ratio of cases averted by the one-198 dose compared to the two-dose strategy (y-axis) will vary. This will also vary with the 199 spacing between doses (colours), with longer delays since first dose in the high-risk group 200 favouring the strategy of a second dose to the high-risk group. The horizontal dashed line 201 shows a ratio of one (i.e. where we flip from favouring a one-dose approach to favouring a two-dose approach). Results are shown for prevention of any clinical mpox infection. (C) The 202 203 risk threshold (y-axis) is the risk ratio at which the optimal strategy changes from favouring a 204 one-dose to favouring a two-dose regimen. The risk threshold predicted from the vaccine 205 effectiveness reported in clinical studies is on the left (black), and the threshold estimated 206 from model-based meta-analysis (including vaccine waning for vaccine administered at 4, 26,

- 207 208
- 209

210 **Considering heterogenous risk groups**

or 52 weeks) is shown on the right.

211 In the analysis above we see that in the case of a population at-risk and limited vaccine doses,

212 giving as many people as possible a first dose of MVA-BN would avert more cases than

213 giving half as many people two doses of MVA-BN. However, this only considers a 214 population with homogenous risk of infection and does not consider the possibility of some 215 subgroups being at greater risk of infection and / or of severe outcomes than others. The latest 216 data from the DRC highlights that risk of both infection and the case-fatality ratios of clade I 217 are much higher in young children than older children and adults². Therefore, it is important 218 to consider when it might be optimal to deploy a second dose of MVA-BN to those most at 219 risk, rather than to give a first dose to people at a lower risk for primary prevention of mpox. 220 We consider a scenario of two identifiable risk groups, one with high risk, and one with lower risk of mpox infection. Initially, it is favourable to target the high-risk individuals with a first 221 222 dose. However, when the majority of the high-risk individuals have already received a first 223 dose of MVA-BN, we ask whether it is optimal to administer a second dose to the high-risk 224 group or deliver a first dose to those in the lower risk group (fig. 2A). Specifically, we 225 consider how many times higher the risk would need to be in a population before it becomes 226 optimal to target high-risk individuals with a second dose instead of targeting lower risk 227 individuals with a first dose (which we refer to as a 'risk-threshold' above which the two-228 dose regimen is preferred). 229 Using only the vaccine effectiveness from our meta-analysis of real-world data, we estimate

230 that unless the high-risk group is at least 9.0-fold (95% CI: 3.0-25) more likely to be infected 231 than the lower risk group, it is preferable to administer any additional vaccines as first doses 232 to the lower risk group. If we take into account waning immunity and protection over the first two years after deployment, we see a similar risk-threshold for when we should favour a two-233 234 dose regimen (fig. 2B). If additional vaccines only become available at 6 months or 12 235 months after the first dose, the risk-threshold is reduced to 3.9-fold (CI: 1.6-11) because of 236 waning immunity after the first dose and a higher response after a delayed second dose (fig. 237 2C) (using the assumption that a second dose at 6 months or 12 months gives the same peak 238 protection as it would at 2 years, which is a conservative assumption, as it tends to decrease 239 the risk-threshold). Together this suggests that given the relative effectiveness of one vs two 240 doses, unless a subgroup is known to have at least a 3.9-fold (CI:1.6-11) higher risk of 241 infection, it is optimal to continue to administer a first dose to lower risk populations before 242 giving second doses to the high-risk population.



244

245 Figure 3: Comparison of vaccine strategies against preventing severe mpox cases. A)

246 The ratio of severe cases averted by giving a one-dose regimen compared to a two-dose 247 regimen - based on the vaccine effectiveness observed in the clinical studies (left, black) or predicted (when the doses are spaced at 4, 26, or 52 weeks) from a model-based meta-

248 249 analysis (right). B) The risk threshold (the ratio of risk in the high-risk group compared to the 250 low risk) that favours the switch from the one-dose to the two-dose regimen for severe mpox.

251 The risk threshold predicted from the vaccine effectiveness reported in clinical studies (left, 252 black), and the model-based meta-analysis for vaccine administered at 4, 26, or 52 weeks

253 (right). C) The ratio of severe cases averted when comparing vaccination strategies between

254 administering second doses to a high-risk group or first dose to a lower risk group with

- 255 different dosing intervals (colours). The dashed horizontal line represents the risk threshold
- 256 where a switch occurs from favouring a one-dose to favouring a two-dose regimen.
- 257

258 **Averting severe outcomes**

259 In the scenario above we only considered the optimal strategy to avoid the most mpox cases 260 of any severity (mild, moderate or severe). However, case-fatality rates in children under 5 years of age have been reported at 3.2-times higher than in adults and children older than 15 261 262 years². These observations are based on very limited epidemiological data and may suffer 263 from a range of confounding²¹. However, if the goal of vaccination were to reduce severe mpox (rather than any clinical mpox infection), this raises the question of whether we should 264

265 favour deploying limited vaccine stocks as a one- or two-dose regimen, and under what

266 conditions we should target high-risk groups for two-dose vaccination?

267 Unfortunately, there is very limited data available on vaccine effectiveness in preventing

268 severe mpox infection (and none for clade I infection). However, a comprehensive meta-

269 analysis of studies of individuals with breakthrough mpox clade IIb infection suggested a

270 66.6% (95% CI: 55-78%) vaccine effectiveness against progression from mild infection to

271 hospitalisation⁵, and there appears similar vaccine effectiveness in preventing progression to

272 severe mpox after either one or two doses of MVA-BN. Assuming that one dose MVA-BN

has 74% effectiveness at preventing infection and two doses of MVA-BN has 82% 273

274 effectiveness, and assuming both provide 66% protection against progressing to severe

275 outcomes, we can estimate from this that the vaccine effectiveness at preventing severe

276 infections that lead to hospitalisation is around 91% for a one-dose, and 94% for a two-dose 277 regimen.

278 Using only these estimates of vaccine effectiveness from the meta-analysis of real-world

279 studies, we can predict that, for a homogenous population, administering additional vaccines

280 as a first dose to naïve individuals will prevent 1.94-fold (CI: 1.86-1.98) more cases of severe

281 mpox (fig. 3A). We observe similar results when accounting for waning of protection (fig.

282 3A). Thus, as was the case when looking at averting mpox cases of any severity (fig. 1E), the

283 one-dose strategy is predicted to be optimal if the goal of vaccination is to maximise

284 protection from severe mpox infection.

to the lower risk group (fig. 3B).

285 As we did above for mpox cases of any severity, we can also analyse the situation where 286 there are identifiable subgroups that are at higher risk of severe infection. Again, here we 287 consider a scenario where the high-risk group has already received one dose of vaccine, and 288 we have the choice of deploying additional vaccine doses as second doses to the high-risk 289 group, or as first doses to a low-risk group. Using only the data from the real-world studies of 290 vaccine effectiveness, we predict that unless the high-risk group were at greater than 33-fold 291 (CI:14-93) higher risk of severe infection than the low-risk group, we should favour 292 administering one dose of the vaccine to as many people as possible rather than giving a 293 second dose to the high-risk population (fig. 3B). The result is similar when accounting for the predicted waning of vaccine effectiveness with time (fig. 3C). That is, applying our 294 295 predictions of waning vaccine effectiveness⁴, we predict that early after vaccination, giving a 296 first dose to more people would be favoured unless the high-risk group had at least 37-fold 297 (CI:17-107) times higher risk of severe infection compared to the low-risk group (fig. 3B). 298 Finally, if a second dose is delayed to 6 months or 12 months after the first dose (again using 299 the conservative assumption that a second dose at 6 months or 12 months gives the same peak 300 protection as it would at 2 years), the single dose strategy will remain favoured unless the 301 high-risk group has more than a 15-fold (CI: 7-43) higher risk of severe infection compared

302 303

304

306 **Discussion**

307 In the context of adequate vaccine availability, delivering the recommended two dose MVA-308 BN schedule to as many people as possible can achieve rapid population protection. Here we 309 do not advocate for changes to the recommended vaccine schedule generally, or delaying the 310 second dose of MVA-BN as a standard approach. However, in the current mpox public health 311 emergency there are limited vaccine stocks in the countries most in need, which raises a 312 number of questions about the optimal deployment of limited vaccine resources. Here we find 313 that in a population of homogenous risk, deploying limited vaccine stocks as single doses to 314 as many people as possible is always favoured. In the presence of high-risk populations, 315 deploying vaccine as single doses is favoured unless the high-risk population is at greater 316 than 9 times higher risk of clinical mpox infection compared to the low-risk population. For 317 sub-populations at high risk for severe disease, administering one dose to as many people as possible is still favoured unless the high-risk group is at greater than 33-fold higher risk of 318 319 severe mpox infection (Figure 2E). However, if additional doses of vaccine only become 320 available 6 months to a year after the first dose, the estimated benefit of the one-dose regimen 321 is slightly lower. Waning immunity from the earlier first dose of vaccine and the higher 322 (vaccinia-binding) antibody titres achieved after a delayed second dose (and the assumed 323 greater protection this may yield), suggests that the risk threshold favouring a second dose to 324 high-risk subpopulations declines to be only a 3.9-fold higher risk of clinical mpox, or 15fold higher risk of severe outcomes. These predicted thresholds have wide credibility 325 326 intervals and rely on a number of assumptions discussed below.

327

It is important to note that although we discuss in this paper the ratio of cases averted under 328 329 the different vaccine deployment strategies, this quantity was only possible to calculate here 330 under the assumption of a constant force of infection with time. Given expanding case 331 numbers during an outbreak and the potential impact of public health interventions, risk of 332 infection will likely vary over time. Fortunately, in the supplementary material we show that 333 the same results hold when considering the more complex case of a time varying force of 334 infection (supplementary material). In fact, we show when the force of infection is time 335 variable, a similar quantity to that which we calculate in the main analysis (the ratio of 336 vaccine effectiveness between the two strategies, equation 5) is similarly indicative of the 337 optimal strategy.

339 Experience with smallpox and Ebola showed that using contact tracing and ring vaccination 340 was a dose-sparing and efficient strategy, albeit with lower vaccine effectiveness due to being administered in a post-exposure prophylaxis setting²². Such strategies have the potential to 341 342 further increase the number of cases averted by controlling the epidemic sooner. However, in 343 our modelling here we have not considered these complementary vaccine deployment strategies. This is largely because there are very limited data available on the risks of 344 345 infection among contacts, and current estimates for vaccine effectiveness when used as postexposure prophylaxis have high uncertainty, but may be quite low⁵. 346

347348

349 We consider two different methods in our analysis to compare the effectiveness of one- and 350 two-dose regimens. Each of these approaches come with a number of caveats and limitations. 351 In the first approach, we use only the estimates of vaccine effectiveness from meta-analyses 352 of real-world effectiveness studies to compare the ratio of cases averted under the different 353 vaccination strategies (Figs 1E,2C). A strength of this approach is that it does not assume any 354 relationship between antibody titres and protection, and does not consider waning immunity 355 (other than any waning that may have been present in the clinical studies themselves). 356 However, as a result this approach implicitly assumes vaccine effectiveness does not wane. 357 The second approach involves analysis of the relationship between vaccinia-binding antibody 358 titres and vaccine protection, along with analysis of antibody boosting and waning antibody levels to predict vaccine effectiveness at different times⁴. This is of course significantly less 359 360 direct than the approach described above and relies on the assumption that vaccinia-binding 361 antibody levels are predictive of vaccine effectiveness against mpox over time, and that 362 antibody titres and immunity will wane in a similar way in the populations at risk of mpox. 363 The limitations of this modelling approach are outlined in detail in the original study⁴. 364 Further, rather than relying on predictions of the vaccine effectiveness over time from the 365 decay in antibody responses, real world effectiveness data out to 1 to 2 years post MVA-BN vaccination (with either one or two doses) would be very informative. Fortunately, this data is 366 367 likely available, or soon to be available, in many settings given vaccination during the 368 2022/2023 clade IIb outbreaks and ongoing clade IIb transmission globally. Further work is clearly needed to validate antibody levels as a predictor of vaccine effectiveness against 369 370 clinical mpox, against severe mpox, and to investigate antibodies and protection over time in 371 the context of clade I virus.

373 Both our analysis approaches assume that vaccine supply is low compared to the total 374 susceptible population, such that the deployment strategies do not impact the force of 375 infection. Further, neither approach considers time to epidemic control, where the delay 376 between dose 1 and dose 2 would be influential. Also, both of these methods rely on the 377 results of our meta-analysis of real-world effectiveness studies⁴. There are now three 378 systematic reviews of MVA-BN vaccine effectiveness⁴⁻⁶, which give similar estimates of one 379 and two-dose vaccine effectiveness in the context of clade IIb infection. However, the 380 underlying real-world studies included in these meta-analyses each have considerable 381 limitations^{4,5}. Further, there is very limited data on vaccine effectiveness against severe mpox 382 infection, and we base our analysis of severe protection on a single meta-analysis of vaccine 383 effectiveness against progression from symptomatic to severe clade IIb infection⁵. Clearly 384 further studies of vaccine effectiveness against clade Ia and Ib and against severe mpox 385 would be valuable to provide data directly relevant to these clades. 386

Our analysis of vaccine effectiveness against severe mpox relies on the assumption that the 387 388 vaccine effectiveness estimates we used from real-world effectiveness studies will also apply 389 to the at-risk population. However, vaccine effectiveness may differ for groups at risk of 390 severe mpox such as children, people with HIV, or immunocompromised individuals²³. 391 Differences in one- and two-dose effectiveness in such risk groups would change the relative 392 advantage of a one-dose regimen. Recent reports of vaccine effectiveness in people with HIV suggest that this may be similar to the general population²⁴. However further studies are 393 394 clearly needed to understand vaccine immunogenicity and effectiveness across different at-395 risk populations in order to guide rational vaccine deployment.

396

397 Notwithstanding the many limitations of the available data, this analysis suggests that where 398 limited stocks of MVA-BN vaccine are available, deploying them as a single dose regimen to 399 as many people as possible will usually be the most effective strategy to reduce the incidence 400 of mpox. However, providing second doses to high-risk populations may be favoured if the 401 risk-ratio to the general population is sufficiently high. Delaying second doses in the context 402 of limited vaccine supply is not a novel approach. During the COVID-19 pandemic limited supply of the AstraZeneca vaccine in the UK led to increased dosing intervals²⁵, and this was 403 accompanied by higher vaccine efficacy than reported with the original (4 week) dosing 404 schedule²⁶. These conclusions do not advocate for a change in the recommended vaccine 405

406 schedule for MVA-BN, or for health authorities to ignore this schedule. Vaccine should be

- deployed with the intention of giving a second dose at four weeks or as soon as possible.
- However, limited vaccine availability may at times dictate that allocating limited vaccine
- supplies as a second dose to those already vaccinated is not an efficient strategy to maximise
- population protection.

414 Methods

415 Modelling the averted cases

To compare different vaccine strategies, we calculated the ratio of cases averted between two alternative deployment strategies. Using the estimates for vaccine effectiveness of one- and two-dose regimens reported from the meta-analysis of real-world effectiveness studies, and assuming that effectiveness does not change with time, we previously calculated the ratio of cases averted (RCA) by using the one-dose regimen compared to the two-dose⁴ is given by,

$$RCA = \frac{2VE_1}{VE_2}.$$
 (1)

421 where, VE_1 and VE_2 are the vaccine effectiveness conferred by one and two doses of MVA-422 BN, respectively.

424 However, the above approach does not take into account the potential impact of waning 425 immunity over time. We can therefore extend this analysis using our modelled estimates of 426 immune waning and the impact of administering second doses at different times⁴. To model 427 this, we considered a constant force of infection (infection rate), r, within the population of 428 concern. We analyse a scenario in which a proportion of individuals has already received the 429 first dose of vaccine, and at some later time more vaccine doses become available that can 430 either be deployed as second doses to those already vaccinated or as first doses to naïve individuals. We assume the number of additional vaccines available (for which a deployment 431 432 decision is required), d, is much less than the vulnerable population, N, and that at least d 433 people have received a first dose s days earlier (see supplementary methods). By assuming 434 the number of vaccines is small, we assume that the vaccine deployment decision does not 435 affect the force of infection.

436

The cases averted, CA, by a given vaccine strategy compared to a naïve population is thengiven by,

439 $CA = Vaccine Effectiveness \times Number of people vaccinated \times Force of infection.$ 440 In the case where additional vaccine is deployed in a one-dose regimen to naïve individuals, 441 then the overall protection in the population includes the protection of already vaccinated 442 individuals, plus the protection from the vaccination of naïve subjects. It follows that the 443 expected number of cases averted if the *d* doses are administered to naïve individuals who 444 have not been previously vaccinated is,

445
$$CA_1(t) = \int_0^t VE_1(x+s)dx \times d \times r + \int_0^t VE_1(x)dx \times d \times r, \qquad (2)$$

446 where, $CA_1(t)$, is the cumulative number of cases averted by time t (in days), and 447 $\int_0^t VE_1(x)dx$ is the cumulative vaccine effectiveness of one dose of MVA-BN over time, t, 448 and r is the infection rate (i.e. force of infection, see supplement for full derivation). Note 449 that the term $VE_1(x + s)$ captures that those who were vaccinated with one dose already 450 received this dose s days before the current batch of vaccines were deployed, and thus the 451 effectiveness from this dose will have waned for longer than those who have just received 452 their first dose.

453 Similarly, if these doses are administered as second doses, the number of cases averted by454 time *t* is given by,

455
$$CA_2(t) = \int_0^t VE_{2,s}(x)dx \times d \times r.$$
(3)

456 where, $CA_2(t)$, is the cumulative number of cases averted by time (t) by the two-dose

457 strategy, $\int_0^t VE_{2,s}(x) dx$ is the cumulative vaccine effectiveness of two doses of MVA-BN

458 over time, t, and s is the interval between the two doses administered.

459 For simplicity we assume that the maximum effectiveness is obtained 14 days after

460 vaccination for both one and two doses.

461 Thus, we can define the ratio of cases averted by time t as,

462
$$RCA(t) = \frac{CA_1(t)}{CA_2(t)} = \frac{\int_0^t VE_1(x)dx + \int_0^t VE_1(x+s)dx}{\int_0^t VE_{2,s}(x)dx}.$$
 (4)

This ratio of cases averted by time t is equivalent to the ratio of the average vaccine 463 464 effectiveness in the population. To calculate the RCA, we require estimates of vaccine effectiveness and the waning of immunity. For this we use our estimated vaccine 465 466 effectiveness, and waning of vaccine effectiveness with time, from our previously published model-based meta-analysis of real world-effectiveness data⁴. In particular, we use the 467 posterior samples of our parameters from our meta-analysis to calculate the ratio in equation 468 469 4, and the credible intervals around these ratios. The accuracy for the waning of vaccine 470 effectiveness depends on a number of assumptions from our modelling of the relationship 471 between antibody titres and vaccine effectiveness estimates⁴.

472

473 Note that we have employed a model of the ratio of cases averted in this work for ease of

474 interpretation. Importantly, the ratio described in equation 4 only represents the ratio of cases

475 averted under the simplifying assumption of a uniform force of infection over time

476 (supplementary material). However, it should be noted that even in the case where the force

477 of infection is not constant, a very similar ratio, which we call the ratio of vaccine

478 effectiveness in the vaccinatable population (RVE),

479

$$RVE(t) = \frac{VE_1(t+s) + VE_1(t)}{VE_{2,s}(t)},$$
(5)

is descriptive of the optimal strategy. As we show in the supplementary material for a time 480

481 varying force of infection, if this ratio is greater than 1 at all time points, the one dose

482 strategy will be optimal (see derivation in the supplementary methods).

483

484 Incorporating groups with different risk of infection or severe disease

485 We can further extend this model to consider vaccinating two subpopulations with different 486 risks (different force of infection). In this scenario we consider a high-risk group in which 487 everyone has received a first dose of the vaccine. We then consider a scenario where 488 additional vaccine becomes available and we must decide whether to deploy them as second 489 doses for the already vaccinated high-risk population, or as first doses to a lower-risk 490 population. We can estimate the 'risk threshold', which is how much higher the risk of 491 infection must be in the high risk population before targeting the high-risk group with a 492 second dose is favoured. Using only the real-world effectiveness data our meta-analysis⁴, and 493 assuming no waning of immunity, we can estimate that this ratio is,

494
$$RCA = \frac{r_l V E_1 + r_h V E_1}{r_h V E_2}$$
(6)

495 where, r_h and r_l are the rate of infection in the high and low risk groups, respectively. We 496 define the risk threshold, r_c , to be the ratio such that when $r_h/r_l > r_c$, then more cases are averted by administering second doses to the high-risk group. This risk threshold occurs 497 498 when RCA = 1. Thus, more cases will be averted by a one dose strategy, except when

499
$$\frac{r_h}{r_l} > \frac{VE_1}{VE_2 - VE_1} = r_c.$$
 (7)

500 We can also extend this to incorporate the effects of waning immunity and delayed 501 vaccination. In this case, the cases averted by administering a single dose is given by,

502
$$CA_1(t) = \int_0^t VE_1(x)dx \times n \times r_l + \int_0^t VE_1(x+s)dx \times n \times r_h,$$
(8)

and the cases averted in the two-dose strategy is given by, 503

504
$$CA_{2}(t) = \int_{0}^{t} VE_{2,s}(x)dx \times n \times r_{h}.$$
 (9)

505 Thus, we can calculate the ratio of cases as,

506
$$RCA(t) = \frac{\left(\int_0^t VE_1(x)dx \times 1/(r_h/r_l)\right) + \int_0^t VE_1(x+s)dx}{\int_0^t VE_{2,s}(x)dx}.$$
 (10)

507 This relationship depends on the infection risk ratio between high risk and lower risk 508 individuals (r_h/r_l) . If the two populations have equal risk $(r_h/r_l = 1)$, then we obtain equation 4. Using equation 10, it follows that the risk threshold is given by, 509

510
$$r_{c} = \frac{\int_{0}^{t} V E_{1}(x) dx}{\int_{0}^{t} V E_{2,s}(x) dx - \int_{0}^{t} V E_{1}(x+s) dx}.$$
 (11)

511 This quantity can be calculated across any time period and in our analysis, and we use a 512 period of two years.

513

514 **Conflicts of Interest**

- 515 CRM is a member of the WHO SAGE advisory group on smallpox and mpox and was a
- 516 member of the advisory board for Bavarian Nordic in 2022. DSK has collaborated with
- 517 employees from Merck KGaG, Merck Co., GSK and Zydus Cadila to provide data analysis
- 518 relating to therapeutic products being developed for treatment of malaria. The authors have
- 519 no other conflicts of interest to declare.
- 520

521 **Funding declaration**

- 522 This work is supported by National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia
- 523 Investigator Grants (GNT2016907 to CRM, GNT1173528 to DC, GNT1173027 to MPD).
- 524 DSK is supported by a University of New South Wales Scientia Fellowship.

525

526 **Ethical approval**

- 527 The analysis and modelling of publicly available de-identified clinical trial data was approved
- 528 under the UNSW Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee (approval HC200242).
- 529
- 530
- 531

532 References

- 533 Rivers, C., Watson, C. & Phelan, A.L. The Resurgence of Mpox in Africa. JAMA 332, 1. 534 1045-1046 (2024).
- 535 WHO. Disease Outbreak News: Mpox - Democratic Republic of the Congo. 14 June 2. 536 2024, https://www.who.int/emergencies/disease-outbreak-news/item/2024-DON2522 537 (Accessed: 14 Oct 2024).
- 538 3. Africa CDC. Africa CDC Epidemic Intelligence Weekly Report, October 2024. 1 Oct 539 2024, https://africacdc.org/download/africa-cdc-weekly-event-based-surveillance-540 report-october-2024/ (Accessed: 14 Oct 2024).
- 541 4. Berry, M.T., et al. Predicting vaccine effectiveness for mpox. Nat Commun 15, 3856 542 (2024).
- 543 5. Pischel, L., et al. Vaccine effectiveness of 3rd generation mpox vaccines against mpox 544 and disease severity: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Vaccine 42, 126053 545 (2024).
- 546 6. Taha, A.M., et al. Effectiveness of a single dose of JYNNEOS vaccine in real world: 547 A systematic review and meta-analysis. Health Science Reports 7, e70069 (2024).
- 548 7. Bertran, M., et al. Effectiveness of one dose of MVA-BN smallpox vaccine against 549 mpox in England using the case-coverage method: an observational study. Lancet 550 Infect Dis 23, 828-835 (2023).
- 551 Dalton, A.F., et al. Estimated Effectiveness of JYNNEOS Vaccine in Preventing 8. 552 Mpox: A Multijurisdictional Case-Control Study — United States, August 19, 2022– 553 March 31, 2023. MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report 72, 553-558 (2023).
- 554 9. Deputy, N.P., et al. Vaccine Effectiveness of JYNNEOS against Mpox Disease in the 555 United States. N Engl J Med 388, 2434-2443 (2023).
- 556 Payne, A.B., et al. Reduced Risk for Mpox After Receipt of 1 or 2 Doses of 10. 557 JYNNEOS Vaccine Compared with Risk Among Unvaccinated Persons-43 US 558 Jurisdictions, July 31-October 1, 2022. Mmwr-Morbid Mortal W 71, 1560-1564 559 (2022).
- 560 11. Breman, J.G., et al. Human monkeypox, 1970-79. Bull World Health Organ 58, 165-561 182 (1980).
- 562 12. Fine, P.E., Jezek, Z., Grab, B. & Dixon, H. The transmission potential of monkeypox 563 virus in human populations. Int J Epidemiol 17, 643-650 (1988).
- 564 13. Jezek, Z., et al. Human monkeypox: a study of 2,510 contacts of 214 patients. J Infect 565 Dis 154, 551-555 (1986).
- 566 14. WHO. Smallpox and mpox (orthopoxviruses): WHO position paper. 23 Aug 2024, 567 https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/who-wer-9934-9429-9456 (Accessed: 16 Oct 568 2024).
- 569 15. Adepoju, P. African mpox surges show lack of vaccine access. *The Lancet* **404**, 18 570 (2024).
- 571 Ndembi, N. & Abdool Karim, S.S. Africa aims to avert an mpox pandemic. Science 16. 572 **386**, 7-7 (2024).
- 573 17. FDA. Smallpox and Monkeypox Vaccine, Live, Non-Replicating (JYNNEOS): 574 Package Insert. 31 May 2024,
- 575 https://www.fda.gov/media/131078/download?attachment (Accessed: 22 Oct 2024).
- WHO. WHO prequalifies the first vaccine against mpox. 13 Sept 2024, 576 18. 577 https://www.who.int/news/item/13-09-2024-who-pregualifies-the-first-vaccine-578 against-mpox (Accessed: 24 Oct 2024).
- 579 19. Gostin, L.O., Jha, A.K. & Finch, A. The Mpox Global Health Emergency — A Time 580 for Solidarity and Equity. New England Journal of Medicine 391, 1265-1267 (2024).

- 581 20. Ilchmann, H., et al. One- and Two-Dose Vaccinations With Modified Vaccinia Ankara-Bavarian Nordic Induce Durable B-Cell Memory Responses Comparable to 582 583 Replicating Smallpox Vaccines. J Infect Dis 227, 1203-1213 (2023).
- Hoffmann, C. Mpox-is there a more dangerous new clade? Lancet Infect Dis (2024). 584 21.
- 585 22. Kucharski, A.J., et al. Effectiveness of Ring Vaccination as Control Strategy for Ebola Virus Disease. Emerg Infect Dis 22, 105-108 (2016). 586
- 587 23. Yinka-Ogunleye, A., et al. Mpox (monkeypox) risk and mortality associated with HIV 588 infection: a national case-control study in Nigeria. BMJ Glob Health 8(2023).
- 589 24. Montaño, M., et al. Mpox in People With Human Immunodeficiency Virus: Predictors 590 of Diagnosis, Outcomes, and Vaccine Effectiveness in a Multisite Cohort. Clinical 591 Infectious Diseases (2024).
- Roozen, G.V.T., Roukens, A.H.E. & Roestenberg, M. COVID-19 vaccine dose 592 25. 593 sparing: strategies to improve vaccine equity and pandemic preparedness. Lancet 594 Glob Health 10, e570-e573 (2022).
- Voysey, M., et al. Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of the 595 26. 596 booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222)
- 597 vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials. Lancet 397, 881-891 (2021).
- 598