

# 1 Performance characteristics and potential public health impact of improved pre- 2 erythrocytic malaria vaccines targeting childhood burden

3  
4 Josephine Malinga,<sup>1,2</sup> Lydia Braunack-Mayer,<sup>3,4</sup> Thiery Masserey,<sup>3,4</sup> Matthew Cairns<sup>5</sup> Sherrie L Kelly,<sup>3</sup>  
5 Epke A Le Rutte,<sup>1,2</sup> Narimane Nekkab,<sup>3,4</sup> Melissa A Penny<sup>1,2,3,4,\*</sup>

6  
7 <sup>1</sup> The Kids Research Institute Australia, Nedlands, WA, Australia

8 <sup>2</sup> Centre for Child Health Research, University of Western Australia, Crawley, WA, Australia

9 <sup>3</sup> Swiss Tropical and Public Health Institute, Allschwil, Switzerland

10 <sup>4</sup> University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

11 <sup>5</sup> London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London, UK

12  
13 \*Corresponding author

14 Email: [melissa.penny@thekids.org.au](mailto:melissa.penny@thekids.org.au)

## 15 Abstract

16  
17  
18 New malaria vaccine development builds on groundbreaking recommendations and roll-out of  
19 two approved pre-erythrocytic vaccines (PEVs); RTS,S/AS01 and R21/MM. Whilst these vaccines are  
20 effective in reducing childhood malaria within yearly routine immunization programs or seasonal  
21 vaccination, there is little evidence on how different PEV efficacies, durations of protection, and  
22 spacing between doses influence the potential to avert uncomplicated and severe childhood malaria.  
23 Mainly, lacking understanding of the required vaccine properties and delivery strategies that lead to an  
24 effective childhood vaccine with multi-year protection. We used an individual-based model of malaria  
25 transmission informed by trial data to quantify trade-offs between PEV performance properties and  
26 impact across different endemicities, deployment schedules, and coverage levels.

27 We found that deploying a vaccine with 90% initial efficacy, with a six to 12-month half-life  
28 duration of protection, co-administered with a blood-stage drug, followed by yearly boosters, results in  
29 60-80% yearly incidence reduction, consistent with seasonal RTS,S and R21 trials. Halting vaccination  
30 after five years, leads to sustained protection of at least a 35% incidence reduction in children <six years  
31 in the 12 months following cessation in settings where  $PfPR_{2-10} < 30\%$ . Increasing the half-life duration  
32 to 12 -18 months or reaching more children provides the same health impact with lower vaccine  
33 efficacy. Without a booster (fourth dose), high efficacy (>90%) and longer half-life duration (>12  
34 months) are required to sustain impact beyond primary vaccination, averting up to half the preceding  
35 year's burden. The contribution of each property to the overall impact varies by setting and clinical  
36 endpoint, indicating that public health goals should dictate key vaccine performance criteria.

37 Overall, our findings support the need for well-defined target product profiles for long duration  
38 vaccines linking priority use cases of where, how, and to whom to deploy new malaria vaccines, to  
39 maximize public health impact.

40  
41  
42 **Keywords:** malaria; vaccines; *Plasmodium falciparum*; mathematical modelling; seasonality; RTS,S;  
43 R21

44

## 45 Introduction

46

47 As of 2024, the World Health Organization (WHO) has recommended two pre-erythrocytic vaccines  
48 (PEVs), RTS,S/AS01 and R21/Matrix M, for global use against *Plasmodium falciparum* (*Pf*) malaria  
49 in pediatric populations.(1) It is anticipated that vaccine delivery will be aligned with existing routine  
50 childhood immunization platforms in perennial settings, or as seasonal mass vaccination before peak  
51 transmission among children in areas with moderate to high malaria transmission.(1,2) RTS,S (3) and  
52 R21 (4) both act at the pre-erythrocytic stage by targeting the sporozoite surface antigen of the  
53 *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite to prevent infection. The groundbreaking WHO recommendation for  
54 RTS,S followed three extensive studies confirming the safety and efficacy of the vaccine. These include  
55 the RTS,S Phase 3 trials,(5–7) an implementation program for vaccination of children aged five to nine  
56 months via the expanded program of immunization (EPI) with a fourth dose at 27 months,(8) and an  
57 implementation study of seasonal use case of RTS,S deployed in combination with, or as an alternative  
58 to, seasonal malaria chemoprevention (SMC) with sulfadoxine-pyrimethamine and amodiaquine  
59 (SPAQ).(9) Most recently, promising evidence from Phase 2 and 3 clinical trials for R21 for both  
60 seasonal and perennial use cases reports protective efficacy of more than 75% over 12 months  
61 (comparable to RTS,S protective efficacy six months after administration)(10), with further analysis of  
62 the follow-up results pending.(11,12) In the short-term, these are likely to be the only malaria vaccines  
63 in use, with the choice of implementation strategy predominantly depending on their supply and  
64 operational system factors.

65

66 Besides RTS,S and R21, other vaccine candidates are in pre-clinical or clinical trial stages, such as the  
67 whole sporozoite vaccine *Pf*SPZ(13) and the blood-stage protein vaccine RH5 VLP.(14) There is also  
68 a renewed interest and investment in developing novel malaria vaccines, including mRNA  
69 vaccines.(15) Development of these new vaccine candidates comes at a crucial time when global  
70 progress in the malaria response has stalled.(2,16) Due to drug-resistant parasites, insecticide-resistant  
71 mosquito's, funding needs, climate change and other factors, many African countries are off-track to  
72 meet the 2016–2030 Global Technical Strategy (GTS) targets to reduce global malaria incidence and  
73 mortality rates by at least 90% by 2030 over 2015 levels.(2) Consequently, the WHO and partners have  
74 called for revitalized efforts and the use of new tools to maintain the substantial gains witnessed in  
75 previous years and accelerate progress towards malaria elimination. (2) Incorporating a vaccine into the  
76 existing and diverse malaria toolbox of interventions is a major milestone that could aid in achieving  
77 these targets and increase the proportion of children covered by any intervention.(17) Therefore, there  
78 is a need to optimize current vaccine implementation using existing delivery strategies and to  
79 understand the preferred vaccine properties, such as efficacy, duration of protection and dosage  
80 intervals of new and improved vaccines on their own, as well as alongside other novel interventions for  
81 malaria prevention and control.(2) Assessing how such vaccine properties are linked to public health  
82 benefits and understanding vaccine performance early in clinical development, including the vaccine's  
83 mode of action and immunogenicity, is essential to support new vaccines to achieve more significant  
84 impact. This will enable stakeholders to make informed investment decisions and streamline candidate  
85 selection in the Research and Development (R&D) phase of vaccine development.

86

87 In 2022, the WHO issued preferred product characteristics (PPCs) for malaria vaccines, providing  
88 updated advice on requirements for new vaccine candidates.(18) Informed by multiple stakeholders and  
89 public consultation, three strategic goals were identified, the first of which is to develop malaria  
90 vaccines that reduce morbidity and mortality in individuals at risk. While the document did not specify  
91 strict modes of action, it is outlined in the strategic goals that vaccines are envisaged to provide  
92 immunological protection against clinical and severe malaria targeting pre-erythrocytic or blood-stage  
93 antigens. Strict efficacy and duration requirements for burden reduction only vaccines were not  
94 explicitly defined, though preferred targets against clinical malaria over 12 months were identified. Of  
95 note, the PPC highlights that lower clinical efficacy thresholds can be justified in parallel with longer  
96 duration of protection, as well as other key drivers of public health impact, including vaccination  
97 coverage.(18)

98

99 The PPCs document also identified the role of mathematical transmission modelling to support and  
100 guide discussions around vaccine impact and performance characteristics. To date, mathematical  
101 modelling groups have provided a range of quantitative analyses to support thinking and policy  
102 decisions on malaria vaccines. Several studies have used results from RTS,S clinical trials to inform  
103 detailed models of malaria transmission and intervention dynamics, predicting the likely population-  
104 level health impact and cost-effectiveness of such vaccines. These studies examined vaccines deployed  
105 alone or in combination with other malaria interventions,(7) as part of EPI for infants and children,(5)  
106 mass vaccination(19), or seasonal use.(7) Other modelling studies have explored target efficacy profiles  
107 and decay properties of vaccines for mass vaccination with expanded age groups to support significant  
108 prevalence reduction,(20) vaccines for transmission-blocking,(21) or for improved childhood vaccines  
109 for EPI use.(22) However, there is still limited evidence from modelling studies of how improving pre-  
110 erythrocytic vaccine performance properties and optimizing vaccine deployment could increase public  
111 health impact. This includes understanding the impact of vaccine delivery, where boosters are given  
112 every other year rather than yearly, and how implementation factors drive vaccine impact.

113

114 In this study, we link the full range of vaccine properties, deployment schedules and vaccination  
115 coverage to different health outcomes using a detailed simulation model of malaria transmission and  
116 vaccines. Firstly, we identify the impact of improving the initial efficacy and duration of vaccine  
117 protection on different clinical outcomes, such as averting uncomplicated and severe childhood malaria.  
118 Secondly, we investigate how vaccine impact differs by delivery strategy or how impact is driven by  
119 system factors such as coverage. More specifically, we focus on understanding the public health impact  
120 of implementing improved PEVs, with duration of protection longer than existing vaccines (such as  
121 RTS,S), delivered via routine immunization or mass vaccination campaigns followed by annual  
122 boosters for five years. We assess vaccine impact by predicting the reduction in infection prevalence,  
123 and incidence of clinical and severe cases achieved over the 12 months following the final annual  
124 booster in the fifth year. To explore the potential for multi-year vaccine impact, we evaluate the  
125 extended protection in the year following primary vaccination for children who do not receive any  
126 booster. Through simulation and sensitivity analysis, we provide a quantitative understanding of the  
127 trade-offs between vaccine performance and implementation impact-drivers across different  
128 endemicities and delivery schedules.

129

130 The novel insights from our modelling around the impact of improved PEVs can support the  
131 optimization of new malaria vaccine development. Moreover, our findings support improved  
132 understanding of current PEVs and their population impact, as well as our understanding of the potential  
133 public health benefits of deploying improved PEVs.

134

135

## 136 **Materials and Methods**

137

### 138 ***Malaria transmission model***

139 Model simulations were performed using a validated stochastic, individual-based model of malaria  
140 transmission in humans, linked to a deterministic model of malaria in mosquitoes, known as  
141 OpenMalaria.(23–27) The model is fully open access, has previously been described in (27), and the  
142 details regarding our current application with this model are summarized in *SI Text*. OpenMalaria  
143 facilitates impact predictions for a wide range of interventions that target different stages in the parasite  
144 life cycle, including bed nets, chemoprevention, and vaccines. Intervention impact can be assessed for  
145 various health outcomes, including infection prevalence, uncomplicated and severe malaria cases and  
146 deaths. Malaria vaccine strategies have previously been simulated using this model, informed by and  
147 calibrated against estimates for RTS,S vaccine’s protective efficacy from clinical trial data(28) and a  
148 range of other vaccine trial and implementation data across varying transmission settings.(5,23,28) As  
149 outlined below, we simulated a range of vaccine properties, namely, potential efficacies and durations  
150 of protection for improved PEVs for different endemicities, seasonal profiles and deployment strategies.

151

152 **Simulated model scenarios, settings, and intervention dynamics**

153 The scenarios modelled in this study include a range of vaccine properties of probable values for initial  
154 efficacy and half-life duration for PEVs (Table 1). The range of settings represent different archetypal  
155 transmission profiles (short season, long season and constant transmission), prevalence levels and  
156 intervention coverage levels (reflecting access and uptake). The simulated vaccine deployment  
157 schedules encompass vaccine dosage either through EPI or through yearly mass vaccination, co-  
158 administration with or without curative malaria treatment and probabilities for accessing antimalarials.  
159 These scenarios were developed and refined based on estimates from modelling studies and stakeholder  
160 engagement. We further informed the scenarios given our *in-silico* vaccine dose efficacy validation  
161 exercise, which used data from a clinical trial on seasonal vaccine use(9) (*SI Text*). By simulating these  
162 scenarios with wide-ranging parameter values, we captured an extensive spectrum of epidemiological  
163 malaria dynamics.

164 **Table 1. Simulated model parameters**

Parameter	Description	Parameter range
<b>Intervention characteristics</b>		
Intervention	Pre-erythrocytic malaria vaccine (PEV)	
Intervention cohort	Children aged at least five months at recruitment until five years of age	
Population vaccinated with primary doses	Coverage of initial vaccine doses (dose 1-3)	50–100%
Population vaccinated with booster doses	Coverage at each annual boosting of those that received the primary doses (doses 4-7)	80% of primary series doses coverage
<b>Vaccine properties</b>		
Initial efficacy	Maximum efficacy against pre-erythrocytic infection following three-dose primary vaccination before decay	50–100%
Boosting efficacy	Protective efficacy against pre-erythrocytic infection following the booster dose	50% and 75%
Half-life duration	Time until the initial vaccine efficacy reaches 50% of original value	6–18 months
Decay shape	Weibull function, biphasic decay profile	k=0.69(28), rate of decay parameter, L=half-life duration
<b>Setting characteristics</b>		
$PfPR_{2-10}^{\#}$	Baseline parasite prevalence before intervention (diagnostic detectable)	<10–60%
Seasonality	Short season (4-month profile), long season (6-month profile) and constant transmission	70% of total cases occurring within four or six months, or constant transmission all year round
Mosquito species	<i>Anopheles gambiae</i>	
<b>Health system characteristics</b>		
Access to care	Probability of accessing effective curative malaria treatment within 14-days of symptomatic malaria	Default (30%), high (70%)
Diagnostic	Rapid diagnostic tests (RDTs)	RDT sensitivity and specificity is 95.0% and 94.2%, respectively
<b>Other interventions</b>		
Co-administration	Blood-stage antimalarial clearance drug modelled as complete blood-stage parasite clearance within a five-day timestep following administration	

166  $^{\#}PfPR_{2-10}$ : *Plasmodium falciparum* parasite rate in 2- to 10-year-olds

167  
168 **Vaccine properties:** The initial vaccine efficacy against the pre-erythrocytic stage is assumed to reach  
169 its maximum level following the primary series. For RTS,S and R21, the primary series includes three  
170 vaccine doses, but for new vaccines the primary series may involve fewer doses. In our current study,  
171 the vaccine-induced efficacy is assumed to be negligible before administering the final dose in a primary

172 series. Booster doses are assumed to restore the waning vaccine efficacy to levels between 50% and  
173 75% lower than the initial maximum efficacy reached, based on reported values from previous  
174 studies(28,29) and our validation results (see next section and *SI Text*). The decay in protective efficacy  
175 over time is assumed to follow a Weibull function with a biphasic shape parameter  $k=0.69$ , with a rapid  
176 decay in the initial months, which is identical both after the initial dose as well as the booster doses as  
177 estimated previously.(28) Additionally, in a field trial in seasonal settings, the RTS,S protective efficacy  
178 was shown to decline over a three-year trial period, with more rapid decline in the initial six  
179 months.(9,10) A two year extension of the same trial also showed sustained protection following  
180 additional annual booster doses given before peak transmission until children reached five years of  
181 age.(30)

182  
183 **Vaccine booster efficacy validation:** Using a Bayesian optimization approach (*SI Text*), we used results  
184 from a recently completed Phase three 3 clinical trial for seasonal vaccination with RTS,S in Mali and  
185 Burkina Faso(9) to validate the properties of a seasonal vaccine booster. More explicitly, this meant  
186 better understanding how the vaccine efficacy following the boosters contrasted against data from the  
187 pivotal RTS,S clinical trial, conducted in seven African countries.(6,28) This comparison informed  
188 model assumptions around efficacy estimates of the first booster dose given 12 months after the three-  
189 dose primary series, rather than 18 months after, as implemented in the original RTS,S trial.(6,28) The  
190 initial vaccine induced efficacy following the primary series, 91.1% [95% CI 74.5–99.7%], was used  
191 as a model input and this efficacy was separately reproduced *in silico* using the OpenMalaria model to  
192 match the trial results (*SI Text*). The booster doses, given 12 and 24 months following the primary  
193 series, were assumed to partially restore waning efficacy, although it remains unclear by how much and  
194 for how long protection is extended. We used our Bayesian approach, which utilizes a Gaussian process  
195 regression model as the objective function(31), to find the optimal parameter values for booster  
196 efficacies for the different trial arms, that minimize of the residual sum of squares between the observed  
197 data and modelled outputs.

198  
199 **SMC with SPAQ half-life validation:** Similarly, using the Bayesian optimization approach described  
200 and the results from the same Phase 3 clinical trial in Mali and Burkina Faso(9), we sought to calibrate  
201 the preventive half-life duration of seasonal chemoprevention using SPAQ. In the control arm, SPAQ  
202 was deployed to a cohort of children alone then in another arm in combination with seasonal  
203 vaccination. We incorporated past estimates of initial efficacy following dosing with SPAQ as inputs  
204 for our model.(32) We assumed that SPAQ acts by first clearing all blood stage infections, followed by  
205 preventive action represented by a Weibull decay function with shape parameter  $k = 5.40$ .(32)

206  
207 **Vaccine deployment:** As described above, we defined primary vaccination as receiving the first series  
208 of doses (for example, up to three doses) and full vaccination as receiving the primary series of doses  
209 and annual boosters up to age five. In this study, all vaccinations are delivered through two approaches  
210 to allow comparison between deployment schedules. In the first approach, which we refer to as hybrid  
211 vaccination, we deploy the three-dose primary series as part of the age-based immunization schedule.  
212 The initial vaccine doses are given continuously during the intervention period to children aged five,  
213 seven and a half, and nine months. In the second approach, which we refer to as mass vaccination,  
214 children aged between five and 17 months receive the three-dose primary series through a mass  
215 campaign, timed so that the third dose is given one month before the transmission season's peak. For  
216 both approaches, additional annual boosters are deployed over four years to the same children up to five  
217 years of age, one month prior to peak malaria transmission in seasonal settings (Fig 1). In settings where  
218 the transmission is constant throughout the year, we follow the same delivery schedules for the primary  
219 series with the additional booster doses given through yearly mass campaigns (*Fig A in SI Text*). The  
220 dropout rate is assumed to be 20% for all booster doses compared to the primary series. Vaccine doses  
221 are deployed singly or co-administered with a highly efficacious antimalarial treatment, modelled as  
222 blood-stage parasite clearance over five days to represent treatment with artemether-lumefantrine.

223  
224  
225

226 **Fig 1: Schematic illustration of the simulated vaccine deployment schedules for a five-year vaccination**  
227 **program shown for a seasonal setting.**

228 Illustration shows the five-year vaccination program with a primary series dosage, the timing of the annual  
229 boosters and at the bottom of the figure the age groups at each dose for both vaccine delivery schedules, hybrid  
230 vaccination (grey boxes) and mass vaccination (yellow boxes). For the mass vaccination schedule the primary  
231 series and annual booster doses are deployed before the peak transmission season. For the hybrid vaccination  
232 schedule doses for the primary series are deployed continuously as part of an age-based immunization schedule  
233 while the annual boosters are also deployed before the peak transmission season. The zero to 18 months period  
234 (green shaded areas) shows when the multi-seasonal or multi-year vaccine impact is evaluated by comparing  
235 a cohort of children who received the primary series doses and the first booster (dose four) and those who only  
236 received the primary series doses. The 12-month period (grey shaded area) follows the final annual booster  
237 dose (dose seven) in the fifth year where the public health vaccine impact is evaluated for children who  
238 received the primary series followed by annual boosters.  
239

240  
241

242 ***Endpoints to assess vaccine impact***

243 Three public health outcomes were evaluated, including the relative reduction in infection prevalence,  
244 incidence of clinical cases, and incidence of severe cases, all compared to a no-intervention  
245 counterfactual. All three health outcomes were evaluated for two target age groups and follow-up  
246 periods. First, the vaccine impact was evaluated in children aged six years and below, 12 months  
247 following the final annual booster dose (dose seven) in the fifth year. We estimated vaccine impact  
248 across all the simulated scenarios for the two deployment schedules (Fig 1). Second, we evaluated the  
249 multi-year vaccine impact in the two years following the three-dose primary series by comparing a  
250 cohort of children who received only the primary series with those who received the primary series plus  
251 one booster dose (dose four). For the multi-year impact, the 24-month follow-up period was divided  
252 into six-month intervals. This multi-year impact is intended to assess a vaccine's extended protection in  
253 the first and second years if children do not receive booster doses, particularly in seasonal settings.  
254

255 ***Statistical and global sensitivity analyses to evaluate vaccine impact***

256 Using our individual-based stochastic malaria transmission model, we simulated experiments matching  
257 the scenarios described above. For the vaccine properties (initial efficacy and half-life duration) and  
258 coverage, we generated a Latin hypercube of 1000 samples, and for each combination simulated  
259 outcomes for five replicates. We used heteroskedastic Gaussian process regression (hetgp package in  
260 R(33)) for each scenario to fit a model emulator to our database of model simulations. This emulator  
261 could capture the relationship between key vaccine performance properties and other factors, such as  
262 coverage or access to treatment, as regression inputs, and health outcomes, as outputs.(34) Exploring  
263 the entire parameter space for the different combinations of vaccine properties, deployment schedules,  
264 endemicities, and seasonality profiles requires a large number of simulations, which is computationally  
265 intensive. At low computational cost, emulators captured the relationships between vaccine properties  
266 and system factors, as well as the predicted health outcomes.(20) These emulators were then used to  
267 predict the vaccine's impact over the different follow-up periods and target age groups. We evaluated  
268 emulator performance by testing 10% of the total simulations against 90% used in the training set.  
269

270 To identify the most important drivers of vaccine impact for different settings, health outcomes, and  
271 follow-up periods, we conducted a global sensitivity analysis of our Gaussian process regression model  
272 results using the Sobol method(35) and reported total effect indices. To calculate the relative  
273 contribution of each property, the total-order effect indices were normalised. The sensitivity analysis  
274 measured the extent to which a small change in an intervention's key performance property  
275 corresponded to a change in its impact. For example, an increase in the initial maximum vaccine  
276 efficacy from 50% to 90% may lead to a larger change in the achievable clinical incidence reduction  
277 than a six-month increase in the vaccine's duration of protection. All analyses were conducted in R-  
278 software (version 4.1.0).(36)  
279

280

## 281 Results

282

### 283 *Validation of vaccine booster efficacy using clinical trial data*

284 Using the earlier described Bayesian optimization approach(31), we could determine booster efficacy  
285 estimates from the clinical trial arm where only the RTS,S vaccine was deployed and in the arm when  
286 combined with SMC. By incorporating past estimates of the vaccine's initial efficacy following the  
287 three-dose primary series of 91.1% and the half-life duration of 7.32 months as model inputs,(28) we  
288 were able to approximate observed data from the trial to match our simulated modelling outcomes in  
289 both countries. Assuming a biphasic decay in vaccine efficacy and our Bayesian optimization approach  
290 (*SI Text*), we estimated a best fit to incidence data for the vaccine's maximum efficacy after the first  
291 booster (dose 4 given 12 months after dose 3) of between 80.50% to 88.00% in the vaccine only arm  
292 and 80.50% to 85.40% in the combination arm in Burkina Faso (high prevalence, seasonal transmission)  
293 and Mali (moderate prevalence, highly seasonal transmission). Following the second booster (dose 5,  
294 given 12 months after dose 4), the maximum boosting efficacy was reduced to between 65.95% to  
295 80.00% in the vaccine only arm and 76.48% to 80.00% in the combination arm in these countries. Fig  
296 2 shows the monthly clinical incidence throughout the study period, reflecting the known estimates for  
297 initial efficacy achieved following primary vaccination and the estimated assumptions for the efficacy  
298 achieved following the two booster doses (doses four and five) administered prior to the peak malaria  
299 season in Burkina Faso and Mali that best fit the clinical trial data.

300

301 **Fig 2: Monthly clinical incidence and hazard ratios for the clinical trial data (black dots) compared with**  
302 **model simulations (blue lines/triangles) using the best fit assumption for the efficacy of annual booster**  
303 **doses four and five and SPAQ preventive half-life duration.**

304 A) Best fit for Burkina Faso ( $PfPR_{6-12}$  is 50–60% and seasonal transmission), Mali ( $PfPR_{6-12}$  is 20–30% and  
305 highly seasonal transmission) and both countries combined shown for the three trial arms, B) Hazard ratios  
306 between the trial arms for both countries separately and combined. The black dots shown with 95% confidence  
307 intervals represent the trial field data and the blue lines/triangles illustrate the modelled output from the  
308 simulations with the shaded region showing the confidence intervals averaged over 100 seeds. In this figure,  
309 the parameters were optimized for the arms where chemoprevention or vaccination were given alone and used  
310 to predict the model results for the arm where the vaccine and chemoprevention were combined.

311

312 The vaccine boosting efficacy estimates varied between the two countries and also within each country,  
313 exhibiting broad error margins of uncertainty. The estimates ranged from 5% to 30% lower than the  
314 initial efficacy against infection reached after primary vaccination (Fig 2 and *Fig C in SI Text*). These  
315 differences could be attributed to reported variations in malaria epidemiology between the two  
316 countries, as measured in children aged six to 12 years old at the end of the peak transmission seasons  
317 during the trials, but also likely due to differential profiles of exposure and acquisition of immunity in  
318 the non-vaccine SMC arm (larger drop in 4<sup>th</sup> dose efficacy in the higher transmission site).(9) Thus  
319 understanding of country- or endemicity-specific evaluation of vaccine performance in addition to  
320 global or archetypical estimates of vaccine efficacy and duration is important. Hazard ratios calculated  
321 from both countries were also shown to fit the clinical trial data for both countries across all the trial  
322 years (*Fig 2, Fig D in SI Text*).

### 323 *Validation of SP-AQ preventive half-life using clinical trial data*

324 We replicated the optimization approach for the chemoprevention only arm where SPAQ was deployed  
325 for four monthly cycles each year of the trial and in the arm where chemoprevention was combined  
326 with seasonal vaccination. We estimated the optimal range for the half-life duration of protection to be  
327 between 20 days and 27 days in both arms in both Burkina Faso and Mali. These estimates were lower  
328 than what has been reported previously from clinical studies(37) and through modelling.(32,38) We  
329 were also able to approximate the decay shape parameter which matched our simulated modelling  
330 outcomes in both countries. This ranged between 2.55 and 4.30 in Burkina Faso, and between 4.30 and  
331 5.30 in Mali. Fig 2 shows the monthly clinical incidence rate and cumulative hazard estimates  
332 throughout the study period, reflecting the best fit assumptions for the half-life following administration  
333 of SPAQ administered prior to the peak malaria season in Burkina Faso and Mali. Results for the trial

334 arm where RTS,S was deployed in combination with SMC are also shown in Fig 2, with additional  
335 results on best fit in *Fig C in SI Text*.

336

### 337 **Public health impact of improved PEVs on *Plasmodium falciparum* malaria burden**

338 Modelling results indicate that implementing an improved PEV, targeting children aged over five  
339 months at recruitment, is expected to yield substantial impact on reducing infection prevalence,  
340 followed by decreases in clinical incidence, and then severe disease, when assessed among children  
341 under six years of age (Fig 3). As described above, vaccine impact is evaluated in the 12 months  
342 following the final annual booster dose in the fifth year. Across all modelled scenarios, our findings  
343 consistently confirm that co-administering a PEV with a blood-stage parasite clearance drug leads to a  
344 substantially greater reduction in disease burden compared to vaccination alone (*Fig E in SI Text*).  
345 Subsequent sections present results for scenarios where each vaccine dose was co-administered with a  
346 blood-stage clearance drug.

347

348 The most notable relative reduction in disease burden occurred in areas with low and low-moderate  
349 transmission ( $PfPR_{2-10} < 30\%$ ) and decreased with increasing transmission (Fig 3b). Vaccine impact  
350 defined as the relative reduction in burden 12 months after the final annual booster, increased with  
351 improved vaccine performance and higher vaccination coverage (Fig 3a, 3b). Improving the initial  
352 efficacy by, for instance, increasing it from 50% to 90% or by increasing vaccination coverage from  
353 50% to 90%, resulted in almost a twofold increase in impact. Vaccines with extended half-life durations  
354 could offer protection for multiple years, while booster doses strengthen this protection, albeit  
355 contingent on dropout rates. From our trade-off analysis, our results show that we still need high initial  
356 efficacy if the half-life duration is less than 12 months. Increasing this half-life to between 12 and 18  
357 months or reaching more children can allow us to achieve the same impact with lower levels of vaccine  
358 efficacy (Fig 3, *Fig H in SI Text*).

359

360

### 361 **Fig 3. Predicted relative burden reduction in the 12-month period following the final annual booster 362 dose, compared with a no-intervention counterfactual.**

363 A) Target reduction (%) in infection prevalence (top row), clinical incidence (middle row), and severe disease  
364 (bottom row) illustrating trade-offs between initial efficacy and half-life duration of protection in settings  
365 where baseline  $PfPR_{2-10}$  ranged between 10% and 20%. The initial efficacy ranged from 50% to 100%, half-  
366 life duration from six to 18 months, and assuming a primary series vaccination coverage of 90%. B) Median  
367 (interquartile range (IQR)) relative reduction in infection prevalence (top row), clinical incidence (middle  
368 row), and severe disease (bottom row), considering varying levels of baseline  $PfPR_{2-10}$ , coverage, and initial  
369 efficacy for a long duration vaccine with a half-life duration between 12 and 18 months. Results are shown  
370 for a PEV co-administered with a blood stage clearance drug, for a four-month short seasonality profile, for  
371 both deployment schedules, in settings with a 30% probability of accessing curative treatment within 14 days  
372 of symptom onset.

373

374

375

376 Across all contexts, burden reduction varied only slightly between the two delivery schedules (Fig 3).  
377 In highly seasonal settings, the hybrid vaccination schedule demonstrated a marginally better potential  
378 when compared to settings with longer seasons where the mass vaccination schedule showed a higher  
379 impact (*Fig F in SI Text*). This preference stems from the fact that when vaccines are administered  
380 through mass campaigns, they simultaneously provide maximum protection to more children and this,  
381 in turn, leads to a greater impact on the transmission dynamics and, as such, to less infections.  
382 Conversely, administering the primary series continuously through a hybrid schedule could provide  
383 more protection, especially during short peak seasonal transmission. We observed similar findings in  
384 settings where transmission is assumed to be constant throughout the year. Burden reduction was  
385 slightly more pronounced when all vaccine doses were deployed through yearly mass campaigns, as  
386 opposed to hybrid vaccination (*Fig F in SI Text*). We also found that, in all settings, relative burden  
387 reduction was substantially lower if health systems were strong, particularly where higher levels of  
388 access to curative malaria treatment for a clinical case were available (*Fig G in SI Text*).

389



### 390 ***Factors influencing vaccine impact following the five-year vaccination program***

391 Reaching more children with a vaccine leads to greater impact. From our sensitivity analysis, the most  
392 important driver of impact is the proportion of children reached with the primary series doses, or  
393 vaccination coverage, followed by the vaccine's initial efficacy and half-life duration. This is especially  
394 the case for infection-related endpoints and on a smaller scale, when vaccine administration is through  
395 hybrid vaccination compared to the mass vaccination schedule (Fig 4).

396  
397  
398

#### 399 **Fig 4: Factors influencing vaccine impact on predicted burden reduction for the 12 months period** 400 **following the final annual booster dose compared with a no-intervention counterfactual.**

401 A) Bars indicate the total Sobol effect indices, which explain the variance in predictions of relative reduction  
402 in infection prevalence (top row), clinical incidence (middle row), and severe disease (bottom row). These  
403 indices can be interpreted as the proportion of variation in the outcome attributed to changes in each variable.  
404 Results are shown across various baseline  $PfPR_{2-10}$  values and span different parameter ranges for initial  
405 efficacy (70% to 100%), half-life duration (six to 18 months), and vaccination coverage (60% to 90%). B) The  
406 influence of the impact-driving factors on predicted reduction in infection prevalence (top row), clinical  
407 incidence (middle row), and severe disease (bottom row) for settings where  $PfPR_{2-10}$  lies between 20% and  
408 30%. The different lines and shaded areas depict the median and interquartile range (IQR) of proportional  
409 contribution, as estimated through global sensitivity analysis over the variable parameter ranges for initial  
410 efficacy (60% to 100%), half-life duration (six to 18 months) and vaccination coverage of (60% to 95%).  
411 Results are shown for a PEV co-administered with a blood stage clearance drug, for a 4-month short  
412 seasonality profile, for both deployment schedules, in settings with a 30% probability of accessing curative  
413 treatment within 14 days of symptom onset.

414

415 We assessed outcome metrics over a range of baseline prevalence levels and seasonality patterns. While  
416 the relative reduction in disease burden differed between the modelled settings, our key findings  
417 underscore the crucial role played by both the initial efficacy against infection and the half-life duration  
418 of protection. We found that the relative contribution of each vaccine property to the overall impact  
419 depends on the clinical endpoint of interest, the seasonality patterns, the timing and length of the  
420 evaluation period, and whether the vaccine was co-administered with a blood-stage clearance drug (Fig  
421 4 and *Fig I, J in SI Text*). For instance, when endpoints are evaluated closer to the biological time of  
422 action, such as the 12 months following the final annual booster, burden reduction is primarily driven  
423 by the initial efficacy, as shown in Fig 4. However, by enhancing the initial efficacy to >90% and  
424 achieving an 80-95% coverage with primary doses, the half-life duration becomes the predominant  
425 driver for burden reduction following the final annual booster, which in some instances accounts for  
426 over 60% of the total impact. While our findings regarding the significance of initial efficacy and half-  
427 life duration hold consistent across different delivery schedules, our results suggest higher requirements  
428 for vaccine performance when existing infections are not pre-cleared during vaccination. The vaccine  
429 properties drive most of the impact in these cases, particularly for severe clinical outcomes (*Fig I in SI*  
430 *Text*).

431

432

### 433 ***Multi-year vaccine impact in the two years following primary vaccination***

434 To estimate the extended protection in the second year following primary vaccination, we evaluated  
435 impact in the 24-month period by following children who did not receive booster doses (Fig 5). Multi-  
436 year impact was evaluated by comparing children who received only the primary series doses in the  
437 first year to those who received the primary series doses plus one booster (fourth dose) in the second  
438 year (Fig 5, *Fig M in SI Text*). Without the booster, a modeled PEV with a half-life between six and 12  
439 months still provided extended protection beyond the first year following primary vaccination, covering  
440 part of the subsequent year's second season (Fig 5). Notably, when the half-life duration of protection  
441 was longer than 12 months, a substantially higher burden reduction was predicted in the second year.  
442 This was due to the vaccine's protection extending to encompass the entirety of the second season,  
443 although at reduced efficacy. This phenomenon was particularly apparent in settings with pronounced  
444 seasonality, characterized by shorter periods of higher transmission, suggesting that the vaccine could  
445 be classed as multi-seasonal or multi-year (Fig 5). With yearly boosters given through mass vaccination

446 in seasonal settings, our results show a 60-80% incidence reduction each year (*Fig M in SI Text*),  
447 consistent with seasonal RTS,S and R21 trials in settings where  $PfPR_{2-10} < 30\%$ . For both cohorts, our  
448 findings show a higher impact during the second year when the primary doses were deployed through  
449 the mass vaccination schedule before the first year's peak season, in comparison to hybrid vaccination.  
450 This could be attributed to the mass deployment of primary series doses to more children simultaneously  
451 in the first year, preventing a higher proportion of infections even when booster doses were not given  
452 (*Fig 5, Fig L in SI Text*).

453  
454

455 **Fig 5: Predicted relative reduction and impact-drivers on clinical incidence in the 24 months following**  
456 **primary vaccination for children who did not receive a booster, compared to a no-intervention**  
457 **counterfactual.** A) Trade-offs between initial efficacy and half-life duration of protection for clinical  
458 incidence reduction in settings where baseline  $PfPR_{2-10}$  ranged between 10% and 20%, initial efficacy ranged  
459 from 50% to 100%, and half-life duration from six to 18 months, assuming a primary series vaccination  
460 coverage of 100%. B) Median (interquartile range (IQR)) relative reduction in clinical incidence for different  
461 levels of  $PfPR_{2-10}$  and initial efficacy, for a long duration vaccine with a half-life between 12 and 18 months  
462 and primary series vaccination coverage of 100%. C) Bars indicate the total Sobol effect indices, which explain  
463 the variance in predictions of relative reduction in clinical incidence. These indices can be interpreted as the  
464 proportion of variation in the outcome attributed to changes in each variable. Results are shown over different  
465 parameter ranges for initial efficacy (75% to 100%) and half-life duration (six to 18 months), where  
466 vaccination coverage was fixed at 100%. Results are shown for a PEV co-administered with a blood stage  
467 clearance drug, for the zero- to six-, six- to 12-, 12- to 18- and 18- to 24-month periods following primary  
468 vaccination, for a four-month short seasonality profile, for the mass vaccination deployment schedule, in  
469 settings with a 30% likelihood of accessing curative treatment within 14 days of symptom onset.

470

471 Compared to the factors driving vaccine impact after five years of vaccination with boosters in previous  
472 sections, our analysis of multi-year impact confirms the vital role played by both the initial efficacy  
473 against infection and the half-life duration of protection (*Fig 5c*). Vaccinating all children in the cohort  
474 with the primary doses, we found that the importance of each vaccine property in driving impact varied  
475 by the delivery schedule and follow-up period. The impact of a multi-year PEV with an initial efficacy  
476  $>75\%$  (comparable to existing vaccines like RTS,S) during the 12 to 24 months following primary  
477 vaccination is determined by the duration of antibody protection (*Fig 5c* and *Fig L in SI Text*). However,  
478 while the initial efficacy is a less influential driver for extended protection in the second year, a multi-  
479 year vaccine still needs to have a relatively high initial efficacy to achieve adequate burden reduction  
480 (*Fig 5*). Such a vaccine would require a half-life duration longer than existing vaccines (at least 12  
481 months) to achieve a burden reduction in the second season that is at least half of that estimated in the  
482 first season (*Fig 5a, 5b* and *Fig L in SI Text*). For instance, in both the deployment schedules and  
483 without boosters, to achieve a  $>30\%$  reduction in clinical incidence in the 12- to 18-month period  
484 following a  $>60\%$  reduction during the zero- to six-month period after primary vaccination, a half-life  
485 duration of at least 12 months and an initial vaccine efficacy of  $>70\%$  are both required, if the  
486 vaccination coverage is 100%. The initial efficacy drove most of the impact in the six-month period  
487 following the mass vaccination schedule (*Fig 5c*). However, this was not the case for the hybrid  
488 vaccination approach, where the main driver of impact was the half-life duration across all the follow-  
489 up periods (*Fig L in SI Text*).

490

## 491 Discussion

492

493 Our modelling results show that PEVs with improved duration of protection and vaccine-induced  
494 protective efficacy have the potential for increased benefit in reducing childhood malaria. Moving  
495 beyond current CSP-targeting vaccines (i.e., RTS,S), we provide additional evidence on the trade-offs  
496 and relationships between vaccine performance and drivers of impact for these improved vaccines.  
497 Longer duration PEVs could provide extended protection in the years following primary vaccination,  
498 and while efficacy wanes over time, boosting can restore protection. Our results suggest that deploying  
499 a PEV with a half-life duration that could be extended by three to five months compared to that of  
500 RTS,S may result in sustained impact into the second and third year following primary vaccination. If  
501 the initial efficacy for a new vaccine candidate is more than 90%, improving the half-life duration to

502 more than 12 months can achieve a burden reduction of more than half relative to the preceding year's  
503 level, even when a booster is not given in the second year. Moreover, if the duration of protection can  
504 be increased further, trade-offs could be made with lower initial efficacy for a similar impact. This  
505 means there is a crucial need to reliably measure the duration of protection by a vaccine. While it is  
506 currently challenging to adequately measure duration before large scale clinical trials, early evidence  
507 could be measured in a controlled human malaria infection (CHMI) trial alongside reliable immune  
508 correlates of protection.

509  
510 Recent evidence has shown promising results for the RTS,S vaccine delivered through EPI or seasonal  
511 mass campaigns,(8,9,30) with additional encouraging results reported for R21.(11,12). While these  
512 might be the only vaccines available for a few years, our findings indicate that use cases for improved  
513 PEVs should adapt and capitalize on the benefits of multi-year protection. If a new vaccine can provide  
514 multi-year protection, a program can reduce the number of booster doses to be delivered to at least  
515 every two years instead of annually. In addition, when implementing multi-year PEVs with a duration  
516 of protection greater than 12 months, children missed during annual seasonal vaccination will remain  
517 partially protected. If more children are reached with the vaccine, individuals could also benefit from  
518 the indirect effects of reduced malaria transmission across the entire population. Developing such a  
519 vaccine and combining it with other malaria interventions, such as vector control or chemoprevention,  
520 can potentially reduce severe disease burden, save lives, and accelerate elimination efforts.

521  
522 We parameterized boosting efficacies and SMC properties in our model using trial results of  
523 RTS,S/SMC.(9) Accounting for trial site characteristics we were able to match our modelling results to  
524 trial data from both Mali and Burkina Faso. We also reproduced trial findings that showed increased  
525 impact following seasonal boosting, similar to our modelling results. These findings emphasize the need  
526 to understand how vaccines work in settings with varying transmission dynamics or how vaccines  
527 interact with other interventions. In particular, we recognize the importance of clearly defining temporal  
528 transmission profiles for vaccines to ensure they are deployed before or during the maximum risk period  
529 in seasonal settings for increased impact. We carefully explored the parameterization of the RTS,S  
530 vaccine given alone or in combination with SMC in these seasonal settings, thus also validating  
531 intervention properties. Similar to the clinical trial findings (9), we found higher impact when  
532 combining the PEV with antimalarials. From our modelled scenarios, co-administering a PEV with a  
533 blood-stage clearance drug to clear existing infections leads to higher impact than when the vaccine is  
534 deployed alone. It has previously been shown that combining vaccines with mass drug administration  
535 in the final stages of an elimination program, may enhance the success of interrupting transmission as  
536 opposed to single deployments.(19) Where the goal has been predominantly to reduce burden, higher  
537 impact was seen when RTS,S was deployed in combination with antimalarials, as shown in a Phase 3  
538 trial for seasonal vaccination plus SMC using SPAQ(9,30) and in a Phase 2 trial combining RTS,S with  
539 dihydroartemisinin, piperaquine, or primaquine.(39) Interactions with combination drugs should be  
540 investigated and resolved to understand their relative and joined efficacies, as well as to cultivate  
541 community uptake of such treatment strategies.

542  
543 Overall, we show that the impact of PEVs on reducing burden is both more consistent across  
544 transmission settings and higher for infection endpoints than clinical and severe outcomes. This  
545 indicates that, considering alternative clinical endpoints may allow better evaluation of vaccine efficacy  
546 in Phase 2 and 3 clinical trials conducted in diverse settings. For PEVs, an infection endpoint is closer  
547 to the mode-of-action of the vaccine and this endpoint can be translated across settings and, furthermore,  
548 offers a systematic and unbiased way to compare different malaria vaccines. At present, efficacy  
549 endpoints for current vaccines are generally reported against uncomplicated and severe disease.  
550 Endpoints from existing trials are difficult to interpret and compare, as they are measured for varying  
551 transmission settings, follow-up periods, and underlying age patterns of disease.(6,12,13) Future  
552 clinical trials could evaluate all infection endpoints with sensitive diagnostics or appropriate serological  
553 monitoring, particularly if vaccines are to be considered as part of the toolkit for achieving malaria  
554 elimination. Monitoring the incidence of any malaria infection in a clinical trial sub-cohort will confirm

555 the underlying efficacy of a vaccine against infection Moreover, validating immune correlates to inform  
556 the early phases of clinical trials, including CHMIs, will support the evaluation of dosing regimens prior  
557 to conducting larger scale, later-stage clinical trials. This will be essential for reducing the time required  
558 to evaluate longer duration vaccines.

559  
560 Our modelling results show that, for all health outcomes examined, impact increased with  
561 improvements in vaccine performance and the proportion of children vaccinated, with more pronounced  
562 changes to impact for duration of protection improvements. While it may take several years to develop  
563 and approve a next-generation malaria vaccine (such as multi-stage vaccines or non PEV), improving  
564 the efficacy, duration, or the delivery of PEVs could improve their impact. Furthermore, as presented  
565 in this study, modelling new candidates with optimized deployment strategies, such as through  
566 decreased doses or timed deployment to increase coverage, or both, will aid in the assessment of the  
567 required performance characteristics for their suitability as novel vaccines. Product characteristics  
568 which could influence vaccine coverage include its formulation and the number of doses required, as  
569 they could impact acceptability and adherence, cold storage requirements and a potential low frequency  
570 of adverse effects. All such considerations for a prospective vaccine candidate should be evaluated in  
571 parallel with determining their initial efficacy, duration of protection, and the scheduling of booster  
572 doses. Based on the results from our trade-offs analysis, we find that a vaccine candidate with a low  
573 initial efficacy of 50%, less than for RTS,S, would likely have substantially lower impact, an outcome  
574 which is contingent on vaccine durability as well as factors such as health system capacity in the  
575 affected community. However, an implementation strategy that seeks to reduce the number of vaccine  
576 doses per child at the cost of reducing vaccine efficacy while, at the same time, improving vaccination  
577 coverage to allow two rather than three vaccine doses per child during the primary series, may still  
578 translate to a public health benefit. This implies that continued efforts to develop vaccine candidates  
579 that are less efficacious than RTS,S remain worthwhile, even in the context of the current focus for  
580 vaccine development strategies to maintain protectiveness over time.

581  
582 From our results, reaching children with a vaccine is the most important determinant of vaccine impact,  
583 particularly for low efficacy or shorter duration PEVs. This underscores the importance of evaluating  
584 and understanding both vaccine properties and operational factors that influence intervention access,  
585 delivery, and uptake. Particularly, in-addition to reducing primary series doses, if vaccines are delivered  
586 through routine health systems. Improving coverage, for instance, by matching current booster dose  
587 timing to routine immunization schedules, fractional dosing, reducing supply and demand gaps, or sub-  
588 national targeted vaccination, could improve the expected impact.(22,40) Several challenges, including  
589 health system constraints, gaps in communication and engagement between stakeholders, and  
590 inadequate training and community sensitization, were identified in the piloting of RTS,S in Ghana,  
591 Kenya, and Malawi.(17,41,42) These are postulated to have contributed to inefficiencies in delivery,  
592 impeding high vaccine uptake.(43) The timing of the RTS,S fourth dose was also not aligned with  
593 existing childhood immunization schedules (the booster was given at 27 months of age whilst the more  
594 common measles and meningococcal vaccines are given at 18 months of age). Additionally, the age  
595 eligibility criteria did not match the burden in some countries.(17,43) We did not explicitly explore the  
596 influence of the efficacy of all doses in the primary series, or of reducing the number of primary doses  
597 in our study. However, a competitive edge could be provided by a PEV with fewer doses at a lower  
598 cost, with an advantage in supply, or with safety and efficacy demonstrated in school-going children  
599 and adults.

600  
601 Our study has several limitations to consider when interpreting the results. First, we based our model  
602 parameterizations for an improved PEV on data and estimates from two clinical trials: a Phase 3 trial  
603 of RTS,S that included the likely protective efficacy decay profile after a three-dose primary series,(28)  
604 and a trial of seasonal vaccination with RTS,S in two countries(9) to validate model assumptions of  
605 boosting efficacy. Estimates surrounding boosting efficacy have yet to be exhaustively validated in the  
606 field and are hence uncertain. While our validation exercise captured some of these uncertainties, future  
607 modelling studies must describe these ambiguities fully. In particular, it will be critical to onboard new

608 clinical evidence or knowledge around a new vaccine candidate's decay in protection. Better informed  
609 efficacy decay parameter estimates will directly improve model predictions of the potential PEV  
610 impact. Second, our findings are influenced by our assumptions on vaccine performance properties,  
611 including the selected parameter ranges for initial efficacy and half-life duration of protection. We also  
612 evaluated limited values for boosting efficacy and we did not examine vaccines with a half-life greater  
613 than 18 months. Third, our modelling scenarios are composed of archetypal seasonal transmission  
614 profiles and health system characteristics that broadly indicate the range of results for a particular  
615 prevalence setting. Moreover, we did not account for the heterogeneities in transmission or care-seeking  
616 likely to occur in endemic malaria settings. Previous comparisons between model estimates for  
617 geographic specific locations and setting archetypes do, however, show that estimates are similar for  
618 childhood vaccination with limited indirect benefits.(44) Lastly, vaccination coverage does not account  
619 for the nuances of access and uptake and only represents a broad metric of real-life implementation.

620

## 621 **Conclusions**

622

623 The development of a highly efficacious, durable vaccine remains a priority for the malaria vaccine  
624 research and development community. Thus, obtaining an early understanding of a vaccine's duration  
625 of protection and its efficacy decay profile is crucial to consider. It is critical to incorporate an  
626 understanding of the duration of protection with appropriate clinical trial endpoints for burden reduction  
627 or infection prevention, alongside correlates of immunity. This will allow developers and stakeholders  
628 to assess and prioritize use cases aiming for greater public health benefits. Our modelling suggests that  
629 PEVs with high initial efficacy of more than 90% and a half-life duration of protective efficacy greater  
630 than 12 months offer opportunities for protection over multiple years, suggesting that yearly booster  
631 doses may not be needed, particularly in lower transmission settings. Our modelling results also provide  
632 a better understanding of trade-offs between vaccine performance properties, health system, and  
633 programmatic factors, and could support decision making for both clinical investment in and  
634 recommendations for new or next-generation malaria vaccines.

635

## 636 **Author contributions**

637 JM and MAP conceived the study. JM conducted the analysis and wrote the first draft of the manuscript,  
638 MAP provided overall guidance and led development of the initial modelling framework. JM, LBM  
639 and NN were involved in updating the modelling framework for this study. All authors provided input,  
640 critically reviewed the manuscript and approved the final draft for submission.

641

## 642 **Declaration of interests**

643 We declare no competing interests.

644

## 645 **Data and code sharing**

646 The datasets, code, and plot scripts used and analyzed in our study are all open access and available  
647 via the following link: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14012674>.

648

## 649 **Funding**

650 This study was funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (INV-002562 to MAP). MAP and  
651 TM acknowledge support from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF Professorship  
652 PP00P3\_170702 and PP00P3\_203450 to MAP).

653

## 654 **Acknowledgements**

655 We would like to thank our colleagues in the intervention and Infectious Disease Modelling (iIDM)  
656 unit at The Kids Research Institute Australia, and the Disease Modelling research unit at the Swiss  
657 Tropical and Public Health Institute, University of Basel for the support and discussions. We would  
658 like to acknowledge all participants of the 2021 'Malaria Prevention: Shaping Next-Gen Medical  
659 Interventions' convening for their discussions and feedback. We also thank Jean-Luc Bodmer (Bill &  
660 Melinda Gates Foundation), Scott Miller (Gates Medical Research Institute), and Mary Hamel and  
661 Lindsay Wu (World Health Organization) for their support and discussions. Calculations were

662 performed at the sciCORE Center for Scientific Computing at the University of Basel  
663 (<http://scicore.unibas.ch/>).  
664  
665

666 **References**

667

- 668 1. WHO. WHO recommends groundbreaking malaria vaccine for children at risk. 2021
- 669 2. WHO. World malaria report 2021. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2022
- 670 3. Gordon DM, McGovern TW, Krzych U, Cohen JC, Schneider I, LaChance R, et al. Safety,  
671 immunogenicity, and efficacy of a recombinantly produced Plasmodium falciparum  
672 circumsporozoite protein-hepatitis B surface antigen subunit vaccine. *J Infect Dis.* 1995  
673 Jun;171(6):1576–85.
- 674 4. Dattoo MS, Natama MH, Somé A, Traoré O, Rouamba T, Bellamy D, et al. Efficacy of a low-  
675 dose candidate malaria vaccine, R21 in adjuvant Matrix-M, with seasonal administration to  
676 children in Burkina Faso: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet.* 2021  
677 May;397(10287):1809–18.
- 678 5. Penny MA, Verity R, Bever CA, Sauboin C, Galaktionova K, Flasche S, et al. Public health  
679 impact and cost-effectiveness of the RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine: a systematic comparison of  
680 predictions from four mathematical models. *Lancet Lond Engl.* 2016 Jan 23;387(10016):367–75.
- 681 6. RTS,S Clinical Trials Partnership. Efficacy and safety of RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine with or  
682 without a booster dose in infants and children in Africa: final results of a phase 3, individually  
683 randomised, controlled trial. *Lancet Lond Engl.* 2015 Jul 4;386(9988):31–45.
- 684 7. Thompson HA, Hogan AB, Walker PGT, Winskill P, Zongo I, Sagara I, et al. Seasonal use case  
685 for the RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine: a mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Glob Health.* 2022  
686 Dec 1;10(12):e1782–92.
- 687 8. WHO. Malaria: The malaria vaccine implementation programme (MVIP). 2021 [cited 2021 May  
688 18]. Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/malaria-vaccine-implementation-](https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/malaria-vaccine-implementation-programme)  
689 [programme](https://www.who.int/news-room/q-a-detail/malaria-vaccine-implementation-programme)
- 690 9. Chandramohan D, Zongo I, Sagara I, Cairns M, Yerbanga RS, Diarra M, et al. Seasonal Malaria  
691 Vaccination with or without Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Sep  
692 9;385(11):1005–17.
- 693 10. Cairns M, Barry A, Zongo I, Sagara I, Yerbanga SR, Diarra M, et al. The duration of protection  
694 against clinical malaria provided by the combination of seasonal RTS,S/AS01E vaccination and  
695 seasonal malaria chemoprevention versus either intervention given alone. *BMC Med.* 2022 Oct  
696 7;20:352.
- 697 11. Dattoo MS, Natama HM, Somé A, Bellamy D, Traoré O, Rouamba T, et al. Efficacy and  
698 immunogenicity of R21/Matrix-M vaccine against clinical malaria after 2 years' follow-up in  
699 children in Burkina Faso: a phase 1/2b randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022 Sep 7
- 700 12. Dattoo MS, Dicko A, Tinto H, Ouédraogo JB, Hamaluba M, Olotu A, et al. Safety and efficacy of  
701 malaria vaccine candidate R21/Matrix-M in African children: a multicentre, double-blind,  
702 randomised, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet.* 2024 Feb 10;403(10426):533–44.
- 703 13. Sissoko MS, Healy SA, Katile A, Zaidi I, Hu Z, Kamate B, et al. Safety and efficacy of a three-  
704 dose regimen of Plasmodium falciparum sporozoite vaccine in adults during an intense malaria  
705 transmission season in Mali: a randomised, controlled phase 1 trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2021  
706 Nov;S1473309921003327.

- 707 14. Payne RO, Silk SE, Elias SC, Miura K, Diouf A, Galaway F, et al. Human vaccination against  
708 RH5 induces neutralizing antimalarial antibodies that inhibit RH5 invasion complex interactions.  
709 JCI Insight. 2017 Nov 2 [cited 2022 Aug 8];2(21). Available from:  
710 <https://insight.jci.org/articles/view/96381>
- 711 15. BioNTech. BioNTech Initiates Phase 1 Clinical Trial for Malaria Vaccine Program BNT165 |  
712 BioNTech. 2022
- 713 16. Noor AM, Alonso PL. The message on malaria is clear: progress has stalled. *The Lancet*. 2022  
714 May 7;399(10337):1777.
- 715 17. Praet N, Asante KP, Bozonnat MC, Akité EJ, Ansah PO, Baril L, et al. Assessing the safety,  
716 impact and effectiveness of RTS,S/AS01E malaria vaccine following its introduction in three  
717 sub-Saharan African countries: methodological approaches and study set-up. *Malar J*. 2022 Apr  
718 25;21(1):132.
- 719 18. WHO. Malaria vaccines: preferred product characteristics and clinical development  
720 considerations. 2022
- 721 19. Camponovo F, Ockenhouse CF, Lee C, Penny MA. Mass campaigns combining antimalarial  
722 drugs and anti-infective vaccines as seasonal interventions for malaria control, elimination and  
723 prevention of resurgence: a modelling study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2019 Oct 29;19(1):920.
- 724 20. Golumbeanu M, Yang GJ, Camponovo F, Stuckey EM, Hamon N, Mondy M, et al. Leveraging  
725 mathematical models of disease dynamics and machine learning to improve development of  
726 novel malaria interventions. *Infect Dis Poverty*. 2022 Jun 4;11(1):61.
- 727 21. Sherrard-Smith E, Sala KA, Betancourt M, Upton LM, Angrisano F, Morin MJ, et al. Synergy in  
728 anti-malarial pre-erythrocytic and transmission-blocking antibodies is achieved by reducing  
729 parasite density. *eLife*. 2018 Jun 19;7:e35213.
- 730 22. Hogan AB, Winskill P, Ghani AC. Estimated impact of RTS,S/AS01 malaria vaccine allocation  
731 strategies in sub-Saharan Africa: A modelling study. *PLOS Med*. 2020 Nov 30;17(11):e1003377.
- 732 23. Smith T, Ross A, Maire N, Chitnis N, Studer A, Hardy D, et al. Ensemble Modeling of the Likely  
733 Public Health Impact of a Pre-Erythrocytic Malaria Vaccine. *PLOS Med*. 2012 Jan  
734 17;9(1):e1001157.
- 735 24. Smith T, Killeen GF, Maire N, Ross A, Molineaux L, Tediosi F, et al. Mathematical modeling of  
736 the impact of malaria vaccines on the clinical epidemiology and natural history of *Plasmodium*  
737 *falciparum* malaria: Overview. *Am J Trop Med Hyg*. 2006 Aug;75(2 Suppl):1–10.
- 738 25. Smith T, Maire N, Ross A, Penny M, Chitnis N, Schapira A, et al. Towards a comprehensive  
739 simulation model of malaria epidemiology and control. *Parasitology*. 2008 Nov;135(13):1507–  
740 16.
- 741 26. Chitnis N, Hardy D, Smith T. A Periodically-Forced Mathematical Model for the Seasonal  
742 Dynamics of Malaria in Mosquitoes. *Bull Math Biol*. 2012;74(5):1098–124.
- 743 27. Reiker T, Golumbeanu M, Shattock A, Burgert L, Smith TA, Filippi S, et al. Emulator-based  
744 Bayesian optimization for efficient multi-objective calibration of an individual-based model of  
745 malaria. *Nat Commun*. 2021 Dec 10;12(1):7212.
- 746 28. Penny MA, Pemberton-Ross P, Smith TA. The time-course of protection of the RTS,S vaccine  
747 against malaria infections and clinical disease. *Malar J*. 2015 Nov 4;14(1):437.



- 748 29. Thompson HA, Hogan AB, Walker PGT, White MT, Cunnington AJ, Ockenhouse CF, et al.  
749 Modelling the roles of antibody titre and avidity in protection from *Plasmodium falciparum*  
750 malaria infection following RTS,S/AS01 vaccination. *Vaccine*. 2020 Nov 3;38(47):7498–507.
- 751 30. Dicko A, Ouedraogo JB, Zongo I, Sagara I, Cairns M, Yerbanga RS, et al. Seasonal vaccination  
752 with RTS,S/AS01E vaccine with or without seasonal malaria chemoprevention in children up to  
753 the age of 5 years in Burkina Faso and Mali: a double-blind, randomised, controlled, phase 3 trial.  
754 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2024 Jan 1;24(1):75–86.
- 755 31. Balandat M, Karrer B, Jiang D, Daulton S, Letham B, Wilson AG, et al. BoTorch: A Framework  
756 for Efficient Monte-Carlo Bayesian Optimization. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing*  
757 *Systems*. Curran Associates, Inc.; 2020
- 758 32. Burgert L, Reiker T, Golumbeanu M, Möhrle JJ, Penny MA. Model-informed target product  
759 profiles of long-acting-injectables for use as seasonal malaria prevention. *PLOS Glob Public*  
760 *Health*. 2022 Mar 14;2(3):e0000211.
- 761 33. Binois M, Gramacy RB. hetGP: Heteroskedastic Gaussian Process Modeling and Sequential  
762 Design in R. *J Stat Softw*. 2021 Jul 8;98:1–44.
- 763 34. Rasmussen CE. Gaussian Processes in Machine Learning. In: Bousquet O, von Luxburg U,  
764 Rätsch G, editors. *Advanced Lectures on Machine Learning: ML Summer Schools 2003*,  
765 Canberra, Australia, February 2 - 14, 2003, Tübingen, Germany, August 4 - 16, 2003, Revised  
766 Lectures. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer; 2004
- 767 35. Sobol' IM. Global sensitivity indices for nonlinear mathematical models and their Monte Carlo  
768 estimates. *Math Comput Simul*. 2001 Feb 15;55(1):271–80.
- 769 36. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for  
770 Statistical Computing, Vienna. 2021
- 771 37. Zongo I, Milligan P, Compaore YD, Some AF, Greenwood B, Tarning J, et al. Randomized  
772 Noninferiority Trial of Dihydroartemisinin-Piperaquine Compared with Sulfadoxine-  
773 Pyrimethamine plus Amodiaquine for Seasonal Malaria Chemoprevention in Burkina Faso.  
774 *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2015 Aug;59(8):4387–96.
- 775 38. Mousa A, Cuomo-Dannenburg G, Thompson HA, Bell DJ, D'Alessandro U, Gosling R, et al.  
776 Estimating the Impact of DHPS Mutations on Sulfadoxine-Pyrimethamine Protective Efficacy: A  
777 Pooled Analysis of Individual Patient Data and Implications for Malaria Chemoprevention in  
778 Sub-Saharan Africa. Rochester, NY; 2024.
- 779 39. von Seidlein L, Hanboonkunupakarn B, Jittamala P, Pongsuwan P, Chotivanich K, Tarning J, et  
780 al. Combining antimalarial drugs and vaccine for malaria elimination campaigns: a randomized  
781 safety and immunogenicity trial of RTS,S/AS01 administered with dihydroartemisinin,  
782 piperaquine, and primaquine in healthy Thai adult volunteers. *Hum Vaccines Immunother*.  
783 2020;16(1):33–41.
- 784 40. Regules JA, Cicatelli SB, Bennett JW, Paolino KM, Twomey PS, Moon JE, et al. Fractional  
785 Third and Fourth Dose of RTS,S/AS01 Malaria Candidate Vaccine: A Phase 2a Controlled  
786 Human Malaria Parasite Infection and Immunogenicity Study. *J Infect Dis*. 2016 Sep  
787 1;214(5):762–71.
- 788 41. Mwangoka G, Ogutu B, Msambichaka B, Mzee T, Salim N, Kafuruki S, et al. Experience and  
789 challenges from clinical trials with malaria vaccines in Africa. *Malar J*. 2013 Mar 4;12(1):86.

- 790 42. Guignard A, Praet N, Jusot V, Bakker M, Baril L. Introducing new vaccines in low- and middle-  
791 income countries: challenges and approaches. *Expert Rev Vaccines*. 2019 Feb;18(2):119–31.
- 792 43. Grant J, Gyan T, Agbokey F, Webster J, Greenwood B, Asante KP. Challenges and lessons  
793 learned during the planning and early implementation of the RTS,S/AS01E malaria vaccine in  
794 three regions of Ghana: a qualitative study. *Malar J*. 2022 May 12;21(1):147.
- 795 44. Galactionova K, Tediosi F, Savigny D de, Smith T, Tanner M. Effective Coverage and Systems  
796 Effectiveness for Malaria Case Management in Sub-Saharan African Countries. *PLOS ONE*.  
797 2015 May 22;10(5):e0127818.
- 798

799 **Supporting information caption**

800  
801 Supplemental Information for ‘Performance characteristics and potential public health impact of  
802 improved pre-erythrocytic malaria vaccines targeting childhood malaria burden’.  
803