

1 Full Title: Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Alternative Infant and Neonatal 2 Rotavirus Vaccination Schedules in Malawi

3 Short Title: Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Rotavirus Vaccination in Malawi

4
5 **Authors:** Catherine Wenger¹, Ernest O. Asare^{1,2}, Jiye Kwon^{1,2}, Xiao Li^{2,3}, Edson
6 Mwinjiwa^{4,5,6}, Jobiba Chinkhumba^{4,6}, Khuzwayo C. Jere^{4,5,7,8}, Daniel Hungerford^{4,7},
7 Nigel A. Cunliffe^{4,7}, A. David Paltiel^{2,9}, Virginia E. Pitzer^{1,2}

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹ Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases, Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New
10 Haven, CT, United States

11 ² Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven, CT, United
12 States

13 ³ Centre for Health Economics Research and Modelling Infectious Diseases (CHERMID), University of
14 Antwerp, Belgium

15 ⁴ NIHR Global Health Research Group on Gastrointestinal Infections, University of Liverpool, Liverpool,
16 Merseyside, UK

17 ⁵ Malawi-Liverpool-Wellcome Programme, Blantyre, Malawi

18 ⁶ School of Global and Public Health, Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi

19 ⁷ Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and Immunology, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and
20 Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

21 ⁸ Department of Medical Laboratory Sciences, Faculty of Biomedical Sciences and Health Profession,
22 Kamuzu University of Health Sciences, Blantyre, Malawi

23 ⁹ Department of Health Policy & Management, Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven,
24 CT, United States

25 **Abstract:** Rotavirus is the leading cause of severe diarrhea among children under five
26 worldwide, especially in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). Although
27 vaccination is the best strategy for preventing rotavirus infection, obstacles leading to
28 poor vaccine effectiveness undermine its impact in LMICs. This study aimed to evaluate
29 the impact and cost-effectiveness of the current two-dose Rotarix vaccine schedule in
30 Malawi compared to two alternative vaccine delivery schedules and a next-generation
31 neonatal vaccine (RV3-BB) from 2025-2034. The cost-effectiveness of rotavirus vaccine
32 strategies in Malawi was evaluated from both the government and societal perspectives
33 using estimates of moderate-to-severe and non-severe rotavirus cases derived from a
34 mathematical model of rotavirus transmission dynamics and published estimates of
35 health-seeking behaviors and costs as inputs. A probabilistic sensitivity analysis was
36 performed to evaluate the robustness of our results to parameter uncertainty. Over a
37 ten-year time horizon, the current two-dose strategy was predicted to avert over 1.5
38 million cases and 90,000 disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) and cost \$104.87 per
39 DALY averted compared to no vaccination from the government perspective. Adding a
40 third dose at 14 weeks could avert about 1 million more cases and cost \$5 million more
41 than the current strategy. The neonatal RV3-BB vaccine could avert 1.1 million cases
42 and 41,000 DALYs due to rotavirus and save about \$3.7 million compared to the current
43 strategy. The current rotavirus vaccine program in Malawi is cost-effective and saves
44 lives compared to no vaccination. However, adding a third dose is likely to be cost-
45 effective at a willingness to pay (WTP) of \$138.38 per DALY averted, while switching to
46 the neonatal RV3-BB vaccine when available is likely to be cost-effective at a WTP
47 above \$45.89 per DALY averted.

48 Introduction

49 Rotavirus causes non-severe to severe gastroenteritis in people of all ages and
50 is the leading cause of deaths related to diarrhea globally(1, 2). Children less than 5
51 years old in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) are most at risk for both getting
52 infected with and dying from rotavirus-associated gastroenteritis (RVGE)(2, 3). Such
53 high rates of disease in young and vulnerable populations lead to substantial years lost
54 to disability and death, with over 6,000 disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) per
55 100,000 children <5 years old attributed to RVGE occurring in sub-Saharan Africa every
56 year(4).

57 Although there are generic approaches to preventing diarrheal disease in
58 children, the only rotavirus-specific intervention currently available is vaccination.
59 Rotavirus vaccines have been licensed since 2006, and in 2009, the World Health
60 Organization (WHO) recommended that countries worldwide add rotavirus vaccines to
61 their routine immunization programs (5). Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, has subsidized
62 rotavirus vaccine costs in eligible countries, with the two-dose, live-oral monovalent
63 Rotarix (RV1; GlaxoSmithKline; Rixensart, Belgium) vaccine being the most widely used
64 option(6, 7). However, rotavirus vaccine efficacy and effectiveness tend to be lower in
65 LMICs due to multiple factors that might lead to poor seroconversion, such as
66 interference from co-administered oral poliovirus vaccines (OPVs), maternal antibodies,
67 and malnutrition(8).

68 Malawi was one of the first LMICs to incorporate the two-dose Rotarix vaccine
69 schedule into its Expanded Program of Immunization (EPI). Since the vaccine was
70 introduced in 2012, the proportion of hospital admissions due to diarrheal disease

71 caused by rotavirus has declined by 30% due to the prevention of severe disease in the
72 first year of life(9, 10). Still, the overall vaccine impact has been modest and plateaued
73 in recent years(9, 10). A previous model that evaluated vaccine strategies in Malawi
74 estimated that adding a third dose to the current two-dose schedule could modestly
75 increase vaccine impact(11). However, it is important to consider the cost-effectiveness
76 and optimal timing of the third dose. Alternatively, a recent phase 2 vaccine trial
77 conducted in Malawi suggests that it may be possible to achieve better seroconversion
78 and earlier protection against rotavirus using a new oral neonatal vaccine (RV3-BB)
79 administered in three doses at birth, 6, and 10 weeks of age(12). Malawi's robust
80 immunization program, early adoption of the rotavirus vaccine, and experience with low
81 vaccine effectiveness make it an ideal case study to evaluate the impact of new vaccine
82 strategies on disease burden and healthcare spending.

83 The primary aim of this study was to identify the optimal rotavirus vaccine
84 schedule for Malawi using a transmission dynamic model of vaccine impact and a cost-
85 effectiveness model with a probabilistic sensitivity analysis over a ten-year time horizon
86 (2025-2034). We compared the cost and performance of five different vaccination
87 selection and dosing strategies, which allowed us to ask important questions for three
88 different decision-making scenarios. First, in the event of a change in availability,
89 funding, or priority, how does any vaccination strategy compare to no rotavirus
90 vaccination? Second, how might decision-makers choose between currently available
91 vaccine options? And finally, how might the future introduction of the RV3-BB neonatal
92 vaccine change this assessment? We evaluated each strategy's cost from the
93 government and societal perspectives and its health outcomes in averting DALYs. The

94 results of this study can help decision-makers in Malawi identify the optimal vaccine and
95 corresponding dosing schedule and set price thresholds for the potential future adoption
96 of the RV3-BB neonatal vaccine.

97 Methods

98 Transmission Dynamic Model

99 A transmission dynamic model developed by Pitzer et al. to simulate RVGE
100 incidence in low-income settings provided the epidemiological outputs, including the
101 number of rotavirus cases by severity (moderate-to-severe and non-severe) and age
102 (by year under 5) and the number of doses administered(11). The transmission model
103 had disease states for vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals stratified by age group.
104 We assumed that disease severity decreases with subsequent infections and that
105 maternal, natural, and vaccine-induced immunity wanes over time(11). The model
106 structure and other details are in the Supplementary Materials.

107 We used previously estimated model parameters when the model was fitted to
108 rotavirus surveillance data obtained from Blantyre for the entirety of Malawi (Table
109 S1)(11). The proportion of individuals responding to each dose of the vaccine was
110 estimated using vaccine immunogenicity data from clinical trials in Malawi for both
111 Rotarix and RV3-BB vaccines using the formulation proposed by Pitzer et al.(11-13).
112 We randomly generated 1000 samples from the key model parameter sets, assuming a
113 beta distribution, to project RVGE cases over ten years. For the fitted parameters (R_0 , b ,
114 ϕ , h , ω_v), we sampled within the 95% credible intervals (Table S1). For the estimated
115 parameters (Sc_1 , Sc_2 , Sc_3 , Sc_{2n} , Sc_{3n}), we sampled within 20% uncertainty ($\pm 20\%$)

116 around the point estimates (Table S1). For this simulation, we utilized demographic data
117 for Malawi.

118 Strategies & Outcomes

119 We evaluated five vaccine strategies over a 10-year time horizon from 2025 to
120 2034, including: (1) no vaccination; (2) two doses of Rotarix administered at 6 and 10
121 weeks (current strategy); (3) three doses of Rotarix administered at 6, 10, and 14
122 weeks; (4) three doses of Rotarix administered at 6, 10, and 40 weeks; and (5) three
123 doses of the neonatal RV3-BB vaccine administered at 1, 6, and 10 weeks. We
124 considered three-dose Rotarix schedules because they coincide with other routine
125 vaccines, the 6/10/14 schedule reflecting the dosing schedule of other rotavirus
126 vaccines that many countries use, and the 6/10/40 schedule simulating adding a
127 booster dose of Rotarix to the current strategy.

128 The primary analysis considered all five options. Recognizing that the RV3-BB
129 vaccine is not yet available, we also evaluated whether Malawi should end vaccination,
130 remain with the current two-dose Rotarix vaccine schedule, or add a third dose to the
131 schedule at 14 weeks or 40 weeks of age. For each strategy, outputs from the dynamic
132 model included the number of vaccine doses administered, moderate-to-severe RVGE
133 cases, and non-severe RVGE cases per year for children <5 years old across 1000
134 simulations.

135 Economic Evaluation Model

136 The probability tree in Figure 1 depicts the various possible treatment paths for
137 children with moderate-to-severe and non-severe RVGE and the costs incurred at the
138 government and household levels. Treatment and survival probabilities determined the

139 proportion of individuals with RVGE who travel each treatment pathway. Those with
140 non-severe RVGE were assumed to either seek outpatient care or no care at all, and
141 we assumed all non-severe RVGE cases survive. Those with moderate-to-severe
142 RVGE sought care at higher rates and were assumed to receive inpatient care more
143 than outpatient care because of the severity of the disease and in keeping with local
144 treatment practices. In addition, cases of moderate-to-severe RVGE may not seek care
145 at all, incurring no cost but also having a higher case fatality risk (CFR).

146 **Fig 1. Probability tree of seeking treatment for rotavirus-associated**
147 **gastroenteritis (RVGE).** Output from the transmission dynamic model on the number of
148 moderate-to-severe and non-severe RVGE cases was combined with data on the
149 probability of healthcare-seeking and case fatality risks (CFR) (red) and data on the per-
150 case cost to the government (blue) and the household (green). Costs from the societal
151 perspective included both government and household costs. All values are further
152 described in Table 1. $CFR^*(0,1)$ represents the probability of dying as an outpatient is
153 some fraction of the inpatient CFR, sampled from a uniform distribution from 0 to 1.

154 Input Parameters & Data

155 Table 1 includes all parameter estimates and uncertainty distributions for the
156 input parameters used in the cost-effectiveness analysis. Most parameters were derived
157 from secondary sources. Health-seeking probability parameter estimates were extracted
158 from a series of related studies conducted in Kenya about the impact of RVGE of
159 varying severities on the population and their health-seeking behaviors, as data from
160 Malawi was unavailable(14, 15). CFR estimates were derived from a recent systematic
161 review that found hospital-based studies reported lower CFRs than community-based
162 studies(16). We assumed the outpatient CFR is some fraction of the likelihood of dying
163 from moderate-to-severe RVGE when treated as an inpatient. The model parameters
164 are further described in the supplemental materials.

165

166 **Table 1. Input parameters for cost-effectiveness analysis**

Parameter	Estimate	Uncertainty Distribution	Source
<i>Treatment probabilities for moderate-to-severe RVGE</i>			
Probability of seeking treatment	0.8	Beta(2600,650)	(14)
Probability of not seeking treatment	0.2	1- Beta(2600,650)	(14)
Probability of care - inpatient	0.6	Beta(1432,955)	(14)
Probability of care - outpatient	0.4	1 - Beta(1432,955)	(14)
Probability of death - inpatient (CFR _{inpatient})	0.011	Beta(6.74,606.29)	(16)
Probability of death - outpatient (CFR _{outpatient})	0.0055	CFR _{inpatient} *Unif(0,1)	(16)
Probability of death - no treatment (CFR _{no treatment})	0.025	Beta(6.63,258.72)	(16)
<i>Treatment probabilities for non-severe RVGE</i>			
Probability of care - outpatient	0.55	Beta(833,681)	(14)
Probability of no care	0.45	1 - Beta(833,681)	(14)
Probability of death – non-severe	0	Fixed	Assumption
<i>Vaccine-related costs*</i>			
Cost of vaccine (per dose) - Rotarix	1.94 USD	Fixed	(17)
Cost of vaccine (per dose) - Neonatal	1.32 USD	Fixed	(18)
Cost of delivery of vaccine (per dose)	0.58 USD	Fixed	(19)
Cost of switching - Neonatal	1,024,365 USD	Fixed	(20)
Vaccine wastage rate	0.05	Fixed	(21)
<i>Treatment costs*</i>			
Cost of treatment [†] - inpatient, moderate-severe	62.39 USD	Gamma(1.39,43.54)	(22)
Cost of treatment - outpatient, moderate-severe	22.20 USD	Gamma(15.18, 1.46)	(22)
Cost of treatment - outpatient, non-severe	11.10USD	Gamma(7.56,1.47)	(22)
Household cost [‡] - inpatient, moderate-severe	15.20 USD	Gamma(0.81,18.76)	(22)
Household cost - outpatient, moderate-severe	9.44 USD	Gamma(0.79,11.94)	(22)
Household cost - outpatient, non-severe	0.68 USD	Gamma(0.24,2.87)	(22)
<i>Disability-adjusted life-year (DALY) parameters</i>			
DALY weight - moderate-to-severe	0.281	Beta(18.59,47.57)	(22)
DALY weight - non-severe	0.202	Beta(17.96,70.93)	(22)
Duration of infection	6 days	Fixed	(22)
Life expectancy at birth	63 years	Fixed	(23)
<i>Economic evaluation</i>			
½ * Gross domestic product (GDP) per capita - Malawi	335 USD	Fixed	(24)
Discount rate	0.03	Fixed	(25)

167 *All costs are inflated by 3% per year to reflect predicted 2025 prices

168 †Per case costs to the government used in both government and societal perspective analysis

169 ‡Per case direct and indirect costs (including loss of productivity) to the household used in the societal

170 perspective analysis

171

172 DALYs were calculated by summing the years of life lost due to disability (YLDs)
173 and years of life lost due to premature mortality (YLLs)(26). YLDs were calculated by
174 multiplying the number of cases, the duration of infection, and the DALY weight (a
175 quantification of the severity of non-severe or moderate-to-severe rotavirus). The YLLs
176 were calculated using the life expectancy minus the age of death for each age group
177 times the number of deaths proportional to each age group. Treatment probabilities and
178 CFRs were parameterized using beta distributions; shape parameters for each
179 probability and DALY weight were calculated from sample means and standard errors
180 (derived from 95% confidence intervals)(27).

181 The cost of delivery of an individual dose of the rotavirus vaccine included all EPI
182 purchasing and program costs needed to administer a dose, including vaccine delivery,
183 cold chain storage, and personnel costs(19). We assumed this cost was the same for
184 both Rotarix and the neonatal RV3-BB vaccine. We also assumed that the cost of the
185 neonatal vaccine per dose would be \$1.32 based on a study that estimated the optimal
186 cost of goods given the current manufacturing process(18). A 2023 study estimated the
187 cost of switching from Rotarix to the Rotavac rotavirus vaccine in Ghana, and given that
188 Ghana and Malawi both have Rotarix in their routine national immunization programs,
189 the one-time cost of switching was used as the cost of switching to the neonatal vaccine
190 in this analysis(20). We assumed no upfront cost to adding a third dose to the Rotarix
191 schedule given that the health system can already deliver Rotarix. The total cost of
192 vaccination for each strategy was adjusted for 5% vaccine wastage based on a global
193 immunization strategy costing study by Wolfson et al.(21). The analysis was conducted

194 from the government perspective using the treatment costs paid by the government per
195 case of RVGE. Analysis from the societal perspective includes the treatment costs to
196 the government, direct treatment costs to the household, and indirect costs of
197 productivity loss, transportation, and food per case of RVGE(22).

198 For all cost data, the sample means and standard deviations (derived from 95%
199 confidence intervals) were used to calculate the shape and scale parameters for a
200 gamma distribution using the method of moments(27). One-time costs, such as the cost
201 of switching to the neonatal vaccine, and set costs, such as the price of a single dose of
202 the Rotarix vaccine, were fixed. We inflated all cost data by 3% per year to reflect
203 predicted prices in 2025 to match the start of the simulation and converted costs to
204 USD, as necessary. Costs and DALYs were discounted at 3% per year after the start of
205 the simulation, a standard practice when costs and outcomes are used to inform
206 resource allocation decisions(25).

207 Sensitivity & Scenario Analyses

208 We conducted a probabilistic sensitivity analysis by sampling 1,000 times from
209 the output of the transmission dynamic model (for different parameter sets), the cost
210 distributions, and the event probability distribution. Each simulation produced the cost of
211 vaccination and treatment and a summary of cases, hospitalizations, deaths, and
212 DALYs averted by each strategy compared to the status quo. Incremental costs and the
213 number of DALYs averted by each strategy compared to the status quo for the 1,000
214 simulations were plotted in a cost-effectiveness plane that illustrates the cost-
215 effectiveness of each strategy relative to the comparator strategy. Incremental cost-
216 effectiveness ratios (ICER) were calculated using the equation $ICER = \text{Difference in}$

217 Cost / Difference in DALYs to demonstrate the efficient use of resources when
218 compared to a WTP threshold. We used a net benefits framework to portray the
219 robustness of the model's findings in the face of parameter uncertainty. Specifically, we
220 reported the probability that a given strategy would be cost-effective (i.e., the
221 percentage of simulations in which it yielded the highest net benefit) across a range of
222 WTP thresholds (28).

223 Since the RV3-BB vaccine is not on the market yet, there is an opportunity to
224 evaluate the range of prices over which the neonatal vaccine strategy might be cost-
225 effective. We used a one-way threshold analysis to determine the price per dose at
226 which the neonatal vaccine would cease to be cost-effective compared to the current
227 two-dose Rotarix vaccine strategy and the optimal three-dose strategy. Without an
228 established WTP threshold for Malawi, we used 0.5x GDP per capita, which will likely
229 be around \$335 in 2025(24, 29).

230 Results

231 Over the ten-year simulation period (2025-2034), rotavirus vaccination programs
232 were predicted to avert at least 1.5 million cases, 120,000 hospitalizations, 90,000
233 DALYs, and 3,000 deaths caused by RVGE compared to no vaccination, regardless of
234 the vaccine type, number of doses, or immunization schedule (Fig 2, Table S2). The
235 model suggested the current Rotarix strategy (6/10 schedule) averted over 1.5 million
236 cases and 3,000 deaths compared to no vaccination. When a third dose was added to
237 the current schedule, the 6/10/14 schedule averted an additional estimated 1 million
238 cases and 1200 deaths compared to the 6/10 strategy, while the 6/10/40 schedule
239 averted 1 million cases and only 800 deaths (Table S3). The neonatal RV3-BB vaccine

240 led to the greatest estimated reduction in the burden of RVGE overall across all health
241 outcomes evaluated, averting 2.5 million cases and 4,200 deaths compared to no
242 vaccination and 1.1 million cases, 40,000 DALYs, and 1,200 deaths compared to the
243 current two-dose Rotarix strategy.

244 **Fig 2. Total cases, hospitalizations, DALYs, and deaths for each vaccine strategy**
245 **from 2025-2034.** Strategies depicted: No vaccination (dark gray), Neonatal RV3-BB
246 1/6/10 (orange), Rotarix 6/10 (red), Rotarix 6/10/14 (blue), Rotarix 6/10/40 (light gray).
247 Violin plots show the distribution of the total number of health outcomes for each
248 simulation of each strategy. The lines connect simulations using the same sampled
249 parameter sets.

250
251 The predicted healthcare expenditure for the treatment of RVGE with no vaccine
252 strategy in effect was the cheapest strategy, totaling \$89.7 million over ten years from
253 the government perspective (Table 2). We estimated that the current two-dose Rotarix
254 vaccine strategy costs about \$99.6 million, and the 6/10/14 and 6/10/40 Rotarix
255 schedules cost about \$5.3 and \$5.8 million more than the current strategy, respectively.
256 We also estimated that the intervention cost of the Rotarix 6/10 strategy is cheaper than
257 the neonatal strategy, but the treatment costs are much higher (Table 2). While the
258 neonatal strategy cost more than no vaccination, it was cost-saving compared to all
259 Rotarix strategies, saving about \$3.7 and \$4.8 million in total costs compared to the
260 current two-dose schedule from the government and societal perspectives, respectively
261 (Table 2). From the societal perspective, all vaccine strategies cost about \$8-10 million
262 more, while no vaccination costs about \$11 million more compared to the government
263 perspective.

264 **Table 2. The ten-year cost of each vaccine strategy and the difference in total cost compared to the current**
 265 **Rotarix 6/10 strategy from the government and societal perspectives.**

Cost by Vaccine Schedule (in Millions)								
	Government Perspective				Societal Perspective			
Strategy	Intervention Cost	Treatment Cost	Total Cost	Cost Difference*	Intervention Cost	Treatment Cost**	Total Cost	Cost Difference*
No vaccine	\$0.0	\$89.7	\$89.7	-\$9.9	\$0.0	\$101.1	\$101.1	-\$7.4
Neonatal 1/6/10	\$29.2	\$66.7	\$95.9	-\$3.7	\$29.2	\$74.5	\$103.7	-\$4.8
Rotarix 6/10	\$25.1	\$74.5	\$99.6	---	\$25.1	\$83.4	\$108.5	---
Rotarix 6/10/14	\$37.7	\$67.2	\$104.9	\$5.3	\$37.7	\$74.9	\$112.6	\$4.1
Rotarix 6/10/40	\$37.7	\$67.7	\$105.4	\$5.8	\$37.7	\$75.7	\$113.4	\$4.9

Costs reflect 2025 USD

*relative to status quo (Rotarix 6/10)

**Including direct and indirect household costs

266

267
 268 Compared to the current 6/10 Rotarix strategy, we estimated the 6/10/14
 269 schedule averted more moderate-to-severe RVGE cases and fewer non-severe cases
 270 than the 6/10/40 schedule, leading to \$500,000 in higher treatment costs for the 6/10/40
 271 strategy (Table 2, Table S3). Nevertheless, the three-dose Rotarix schedules were
 272 strongly dominated by the neonatal RV3-BB vaccine (meaning they were more
 273 expensive and averted fewer DALYs) (Table 3). The model estimated that the RV3-BB
 274 vaccine had an ICER of \$45.89 per DALY averted compared to no vaccination from the
 275 government perspective and, therefore, is likely to be highly cost-effective (Table 3).
 276 Viewed from the societal perspective, the RV3-BB vaccine had an ICER of \$19.25 per
 277 DALY averted (Table S5).

278 **Table 3. DALYs averted and incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for all vaccine**
 279 **strategies compared to the current Rotarix 6/10 schedule from the government**
 280 **perspective.**

Cost-Effectiveness Comparison of All Vaccine Strategies

Government perspective

Strategy	Cost (millions)	DALYs (thousands)	Incremental Cost (millions)	DALYs Averted (thousands)	ICER (\$/DALY averted) vs next best alternative
No vaccine	\$89.70	358.1	---	---	---
Neonatal 1/6/10	\$95.90	223.0	\$6.2	135.1	\$45.89
Rotarix 6/10	\$99.60	263.7	\$3.7	-40.70	Dominated
Rotarix 6/10/14	\$104.90	225.4	\$9.0	-2.40	Dominated
Rotarix 6/10/40	\$105.40	236.2	\$9.5	-13.20	Dominated

Costs reflect 2025 USD

In conformity with accepted practice, all incremental costs and DALYs averted are computed compared to the next smallest, non-dominated strategy

281
 282 Understanding that RV3-BB is not yet on the market, we conducted the cost-
 283 effectiveness analysis a second time with that option removed. The Rotarix 6/10
 284 strategy had an estimated ICER of \$104.87 per DALY averted compared to no
 285 vaccination (Table 4). The ICER for the Rotarix 6/10/14 schedule compared to the 6/10
 286 strategy was \$138.38 per DALY averted from the government perspective. From the
 287 societal perspective, the ICERs were \$78.39 and \$107.05 per DALY averted for the
 288 Rotarix 6/10 and 6/10/14 strategies, respectively (Table S6). The Rotarix 6/10/40
 289 strategy was once again strongly dominated (Table 4, Table S6).

290 **Table 4. DALYs averted and incremental cost-effectiveness ratios for Rotarix**
 291 **vaccine strategies compared to no vaccination from the government perspective.**

Cost-Effectiveness Comparison of Available Vaccine Strategies

Government perspective

Strategy	Cost (millions)	DALYs (thousands)	Incremental Cost (millions)	DALYs Averted (thousands)	ICER (\$/DALY averted) vs next best alternative
No vaccine	\$89.70	358.1	---	---	---
Rotarix 6/10	\$99.60	263.7	\$9.9	94.4	\$104.87
Rotarix 6/10/14	\$104.90	225.4	\$5.3	38.3	\$138.38
Rotarix 6/10/40	\$105.40	236.2	\$0.5	-10.8	Dominated

Costs reflect 2025 USD

In conformity with accepted practice, all incremental costs and DALYs averted are computed compared to the next smallest, non-dominated strategy

292

293 When we conducted a probabilistic sensitivity analysis, in 81% of the PSA
294 iterations, the neonatal vaccine yielded lower costs and fewer DALYs than the Rotarix
295 6/10 schedule. In other words, the neonatal vaccine was cost-saving—denoted by points
296 in the lower-right quadrant—81% of the simulations we conducted (Fig 3). We predicted
297 that the neonatal vaccine was cost-saving, while the three-dose Rotarix strategies each
298 had ICERs exceeding \$130 per DALY averted compared to the status quo (Fig 3). The
299 probability of the neonatal vaccine being cost-effective peaked at an estimated 90% at a
300 WTP of about \$150 (Fig 4a,b). The model suggested that switching to RV3-BB would be
301 optimal at any WTP threshold above \$45 per DALY averted from the government
302 perspective (Fig 4b) and would have an 87% probability of being cost-saving compared
303 to the status quo from the societal perspective (Fig S3).

304 ***Fig 3. Cost-effectiveness plane for the cost-effectiveness ratios of the four***
305 ***strategies compared to the current Rotarix 6/10 schedule from the government***
306 ***perspective. Points represent the average cost-effectiveness ratio for each strategy.***
307 ***The WTP threshold is \$335 per DALY averted (0.5x Malawi's GDP per capita).***

308 ***Fig 4. Cost-effectiveness acceptability (a) curves and (b) frontier for all strategies***
309 ***and (c) curves and (d) frontier for currently available strategies from the***
310 ***government perspective. The vertical green line represents 0.5x Malawi's GDP per***
311 ***capita.***

312 No vaccination was estimated to be cost-effective only at very low WTP
313 thresholds from the government's perspective. At a WTP threshold of 0.5x GDP per
314 capita (US\$335), the Rotarix 6/10/14 strategy was cost-effective compared to the
315 current 6/10 strategy, although all Rotarix strategies were dominated by the RV3-BB
316 vaccine. If we exclude the RV3-BB vaccine from the analysis, there was greater
317 uncertainty in the preferred strategy at low WTP thresholds (Fig 4c, Fig S4c). The
318 Rotarix 6/10/14 schedule had a high probability of being cost-effective at WTP
319 thresholds above \$200 per DALY averted, but the simulation distributions suggested the

320 strategies had very similar costs and outcomes (Fig S2). No vaccination was optimal up
321 to an estimated WTP of about \$105 per DALY averted, Rotarix 6/10 at a WTP between
322 \$105 and \$140, and 6/10/14 at any WTP above \$140 from the government perspective
323 (Fig 4d).

324 The price threshold analysis for RV3-BB revealed that compared to Malawi's
325 current two-dose vaccine strategy and at a WTP threshold equal to 0.5x GDP per
326 capita, the neonatal vaccine was the optimal strategy up to a maximum estimated per-
327 dose price of \$2.40 (Fig 5a). This price is almost twice the predicted price of one dose
328 of RV3-BB. Compared to the Rotarix 6/10/14 schedule, the neonatal vaccine was the
329 optimal strategy up to an estimated per-dose price of \$1.90 (Fig 5b). Even at a WTP of
330 \$10, the neonatal vaccine was optimal up to a price between \$1.50 and \$1.90 per dose,
331 which is still greater than the predicted price.

332 ***Fig 3. Sensitivity analyses of the price per dose of the RV3-BB neonatal vaccine***
333 ***compared to the current Rotarix schedule and the optimal three-dose Rotarix***
334 ***schedule from the government perspective. The Rotarix price remained fixed at***
335 ***\$1.94 per dose. The WTP is \$335 per DALY averted.***

336 Discussion

337 Despite the introduction of the two-dose Rotarix vaccine into the Malawi national
338 immunization program over ten years ago, RVGE still poses a substantial burden on the
339 population. This study contributes to the small body of literature evaluating alternative
340 rotavirus vaccine strategies to address lower vaccine efficacy in LMICs. Clinical trials
341 have suggested that a third dose of Rotarix could improve the seroconversion rate, but
342 the potential impact and cost-effectiveness of a third dose are unknown(8).
343 Furthermore, the neonatal RV3-BB vaccine, which concluded a phase 3 trial in 2023,
344 offers the opportunity to improve seroconversion and immunize neonates before they

345 have the chance to become infected as infants. Still, decision-makers need information
346 on the cost of potential vaccination strategies compared to the benefits. Our analysis
347 shows that switching Malawi's EPI rotavirus vaccination strategy from the current two-
348 dose Rotarix vaccine to the three-dose RV3-BB vaccine with a neonatal schedule might
349 be cost-saving relative to the current vaccination program. Adding a third dose of
350 Rotarix to the schedule at 14 weeks of age (i.e., the same age as a third dose of
351 pentavalent vaccine and OPV) would also likely be cost-effective in the absence of the
352 neonatal vaccine.

353 A 2022 cost-effectiveness study modeled injectable and oral next-generation
354 rotavirus vaccines and found that an injectable Next Generation Rotavirus Vaccine
355 (iNGRV) administered as part of a diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis (DTP)-containing
356 combination would be the most cost-effective strategy in LMICs(30). However, the
357 development of an iNGRV faced recent setbacks; a Phase 3 study of the leading
358 iNGRV candidate ended early after an interim analysis concluded it was no better than
359 the current vaccines on the market(31). Without iNGRVs, the oral RV3-BB was also
360 found to be cost-effective compared to all rotavirus vaccines currently on the market,
361 including Rotarix(30). Other rotavirus vaccination cost-effectiveness studies in Malawi
362 showed results consistent with our findings that the Rotarix two-dose schedule is cost-
363 effective. Bar-Zeev et al. conducted a prospective cohort study in 2016 that
364 demonstrated that the two-dose Rotarix schedule is more cost-effective than no
365 vaccination, costing \$19 per DALY averted(22). A 2018 study by Pecenka et al. found
366 Rotarix to be the most cost-effective strategy in Malawi when considering the Rotavac
367 and Rotasiil three-dose schedules, with an ICER of \$7 per DALY averted(19). Our ICER

368 for the two-dose Rotarix vaccine compared to no vaccination is higher than previous
369 analyses, likely driven by the lower vaccine impact predicted by our transmission model,
370 which we validated against the observed reduction in RVGE hospitalizations in Blantyre
371 from 2012 to 2022(9).

372 In Malawi, we estimate that a neonatal rotavirus vaccine program would cost
373 about \$28 million over ten years, including about \$1 million in the first year to switch, but
374 it would save about \$8 million in treatment costs compared to the current vaccine
375 strategy over ten years. Even if the market price of the new RV3-BB vaccine is higher
376 than the projected price of \$1.32, it is still likely to be cost-effective at a WTP of \$335
377 per DALY averted compared to the current vaccine strategy, provided the price per
378 dose is less than \$2.40 with Gavi support. Even when we assume that the societal
379 willingness to pay is low, the projected price of the neonatal vaccine is likely to be
380 comfortably below our estimate of the maximum permissible price.

381 Cost-effectiveness analyses provide a way to evaluate and compare different
382 vaccine strategies, assigning costs per unit benefit to inform decision-making. However,
383 this analysis only captures a few considerations in the decision-making process. While
384 the WTP threshold used in our primary analysis is 0.5x Malawi's GDP per capita
385 (US\$335), the Malawi strategic health plan suggests the government's WTP is between
386 \$3-\$116 per DALY averted(32). Even with this much lower threshold, in all government
387 and societal-perspective scenarios, the Rotarix 6/10 and neonatal RV3-BB 1/6/10
388 vaccine strategies remain cost-effective. From the societal perspective, the Rotarix
389 6/10/14 schedule falls within this range as well. These analyses account for the one-
390 time cost of switching to the neonatal vaccine, which we conservatively estimated to be

391 \$1 million. In deciding to switch to the neonatal vaccine, Malawi must be willing to pay
392 the upfront cost.

393 Given that the RV3-BB vaccine is not yet available, we also evaluated the cost-
394 effectiveness of adding a third dose to the Rotarix vaccine schedule. At a marginally
395 higher cost per DALY averted compared to the current two-dose schedule, a third dose
396 administered at 14 weeks would be cost-effective well below the assumed WTP
397 threshold and is a good option for improving rotavirus vaccine impact in Malawi in the
398 absence of RV3-BB vaccine availability. Administering a third dose at 14 weeks is more
399 favorable than at 40 weeks in our analysis. While the 6/10/40 strategy averted more
400 cases overall, and the difference in overall cost is marginal, the 6/10/14 strategy averted
401 more moderate-to-severe cases and, therefore, more DALYs. However, we assumed
402 the probability of responding to the third dose is the same at 14 and 40 weeks. Children
403 who failed to respond to the first two doses may be more likely to respond to a third
404 dose administered later due to less interference from maternal antibodies, co-
405 administered oral polio vaccines, better nutritional status, or other factors impacting the
406 immune response(33, 34). There is very little clinical research on the benefits of more
407 than two doses of Rotarix, and most available studies compared the three-dose findings
408 with a 10/14 schedule, not a 6/10 schedule(35). In Ghana, a randomized control trial
409 found that adding a third dose at 14 weeks resulted in greater seroconversion than the
410 two-dose schedule alternatives(8). Another clinical trial conducted in Malawi found that
411 a third dose reduced RVGE incidence, although it was not powered to detect any
412 differences(13). A 6/10/40 schedule may improve the chances that children respond to

413 vaccination, although it would prevent RVGE in older children in whom the disease
414 tends to be less severe.

415 Three other vaccines on the market are administered in three-dose schedules,
416 two of which are cheaper per dose than Rotarix(17, 36). We did not consider these less
417 expensive three-dose vaccines for comparison to the Rotarix schedules because there
418 is no robust evidence on how the vaccine effectiveness of each of these three-dose
419 vaccines compares to two-dose Rotarix. Assuming the other rotavirus vaccines'
420 effectiveness was comparable to the modeled impact of the three-dose Rotarix
421 schedule, we may find other vaccines on the market are more cost-effective than the
422 current two-dose schedule simply because they are cheaper.

423 While adding a third dose to the Rotarix schedule is not as cost-effective as
424 switching to the neonatal vaccine, it may be more organizationally feasible and cost less
425 upfront. Minimal training would be required to use the same vaccine. Other routine EPI
426 vaccines, such as OPV and DTP, begin at six weeks, typically with 4-week intervals
427 between two or more subsequent doses, so most patients are already returning for a
428 vaccine appointment around 14 weeks of age(37). In the face of vaccine hesitancy, this
429 strategy also maintains the use of a vaccine that caretakers are already familiar with
430 and has been used for over a decade in Malawi. Given concerns about OPV
431 interference with rotavirus vaccine response, future analyses could consider dosing
432 schedules matching other routine immunizations, such as the new malaria vaccine at 22
433 weeks.

434 The results of this analysis should be considered with some limitations in mind.
435 While many parameters for the cost-effectiveness analysis were specific to Malawi,

436 values such as healthcare-seeking probabilities for those with RVGE were based on
437 global estimates or derived from data from other countries. In addition, the estimated
438 CFR for outpatients is unknown and was assumed to be some fraction of the inpatient
439 CFR due to a lack of available data. The model assumed that non-severe RVGE cases
440 do not incur any inpatient costs when, in reality, this may not be the case. Similarly,
441 intussusception, a potential side effect of both vaccines (although RV3-BB may have
442 lower risk) that occurs very rarely, was not considered in our analysis, and the final
443 costs did not include the resulting cost of treatment for these cases(38). Most
444 parameters were specific to Malawi or eastern sub-Saharan Africa and may not reflect
445 other populations' disease dynamics, costs, or health-seeking behaviors.

446 This analysis also combined moderate and severe cases of RVGE into one
447 group to compare to non-severe cases. It assumed that they seek healthcare at the
448 same rates, incur the same cost of treatment, and have the same duration of infection
449 and DALY weight. As a result, the reported costs and outcomes may not accurately
450 reflect the actual values. If a vaccine strategy prevents more severe cases with higher
451 treatment costs than moderate cases from occurring, this analysis may not reflect the
452 greater savings. We have taken measures to manage these limitations responsibly,
453 choosing conservative base values whenever possible and conducting extensive
454 sensitivity analyses.

455 This country-level analysis provides a framework for considering new rotavirus
456 vaccine options where a program is already in place, although more research is needed
457 to understand how these strategies and others not considered in this analysis compare
458 in other settings. Using a validated model of rotavirus disease dynamics and country-

459 specific cost data, this study predicted the RV3-BB neonatal vaccine would be highly
460 cost-effective and may offer solutions to low vaccine efficacy in Malawi and other
461 LMICs. In the absence of the RV3-BB vaccine, adding a third dose of Rotarix at 14
462 weeks to the current two-dose schedule is likely a cost-effective strategy to further
463 reduce the rotavirus burden. Routine vaccination is critical to reducing disease and
464 deaths due to rotavirus overall and can lead to financial savings in the long run. As
465 decision-makers consider new vaccine strategies to improve rotavirus prevention
466 efforts, these results can inform how employing innovative vaccine strategies may
467 provide additional impact and be cost-effective in Malawi.

468

469 **Code availability**

470 Code for the model and analysis was written and implemented in R v4.3.1 (R Core
471 Team, 2023) and is available at [https://github.com/CatherineWenger/RotavirusCEA-](https://github.com/CatherineWenger/RotavirusCEA-Malawi)
472 [Malawi](https://github.com/CatherineWenger/RotavirusCEA-Malawi).

473

474 **S1 Checklist. CHEERS 2022 checklist.**

475 (DOCX)

476 File Name: CHEERS_Checklist.docx

477

478 **S1 Appendix. Supplementary descriptions and figures.**

479 Fig S1. Diagram of Transmission-Dynamic Model.

480 Table S1. The fixed, fitted, and estimated parameter definitions and their sources for the
481 dynamic model.

482 Table S2. Outcomes by Vaccine Schedule. T

483 able S3. Outcomes Averted by Vaccine Schedule.

484 Fig S2. Cost-effectiveness plane for the cost-effectiveness ratios of the Rotarix

485 strategies compared to no vaccination from the government perspective.

486 Table S4. The dosing schedules, the number of doses, and the age of vaccination.

487 Table S5. Cost-Effectiveness Comparison of All Vaccine Strategies.

488 Fig S3. Cost-effectiveness plane for the cost-effectiveness ratios of the four strategies

489 compared to the current Rotarix 6/10 schedule from the societal perspective.

490 Fig S4. Cost-effectiveness acceptability curves and frontiers.

491 Table S6. Cost-Effectiveness Comparison of Available Vaccine Strategies.

492 Fig S5. Cost-effectiveness plane for the cost-effectiveness ratios of the Rotarix

493 strategies compared to no vaccination from the societal perspective.

494 Fig S5. Sensitivity analyses of the price per dose of the RV3-BB neonatal vaccine

495 compared to the current Rotarix schedule and the optimal three-dose Rotarix schedule

496 from the societal perspective.

497 (DOCX)

498 File Name: RotaCEA_Supp.docx

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507


508 References





- 509 1. Greenberg HB, Estes MK. Rotaviruses: from pathogenesis to vaccination.
510 *Gastroenterology*. 2009;136(6):13.
- 511 2. Du Y, Chen C, Zhang X, Yan D, Jiang D, Liu X, et al. Global burden and trends of
512 rotavirus infection-associated deaths from 1990 to 2019: an observational trend study.
513 *Virology Journal*. 2022;19(166):10.
- 514 3. Collaborators GDD. Estimates of global, regional, and national morbidity, mortality,
515 and aetiologies of diarrhoeal diseases: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of
516 Disease Study 2015. *Lancet Infectious Disease*. 2017;17:40.
- 517 4. Janko MM, Joffe J, Michael D, Earl L, Rosettie KL, Sparks GW, et al. Cost-
518 effectiveness of rotavirus vaccination in children under five years of age in 195 countries: A
519 meta-regression analysis. *Vaccine*. 2022;40:15.
- 520 5. Strategic Advisory Group of Experts. Rotavirus vaccines: an update. World Health
521 Organization.
- 522 6. Haider S, Chaikledkaew U, Thavorncharoensap M, Youngkong S, Islam MA,
523 Thakkinstian A. Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Cost-effectiveness of Rotavirus
524 Vaccine in Low-Income and Lower-Middle-Income Countries. *Open Forum Infectious
525 Diseases*. 2019:11.
- 526 7. Troeger C, Khalil IA, Rao PC, Cao S, Blacker BF, Ahmed T, et al. Rotavirus Vaccination
527 and the Global Burden of Rotavirus Diarrhea Among Children Younger Than 5 Years. *JAMA
528 Pediatrics*. 2018;172(10):16.
- 529 8. Armah G, Lewis KDC, Cortese MM, Parashar UD, Ansah A, Gazley L, et al. A
530 Randomized, Controlled Trial of the Impact of Alternative Dosing Schedules on the Immune
531 Response to Human Rotavirus Vaccine in Rural Ghanaian Infants. *The Journal of Infectious
532 Diseases*. 2016;213:8.
- 533 9. Pitzer VE, Ndeketa L, Asare EO, Hungerford D, Lopman BA, Jere KC, et al. Impact of
534 rotavirus vaccination in Malawi from 2012 to 2022 compared to model predictions. *npj
535 Vaccines*. 2024;9(227).
- 536 10. Bennett A, Pollock L, Jere KC, Pitzer VE, Parashar U, Tate JE, et al. Direct and
537 possible indirect effects of vaccination on rotavirus hospitalisations among children in
538 Malawi four years after programmatic introduction. *Vaccine*. 2018;36:7.
- 539 11. Pitzer VE, Bennett A, Bar-Zeev N, Jere KC, Lopman BA, Lewnard JA, et al. Evaluating
540 strategies to improve rotavirus vaccine impact during the second year of life in Malawi.
541 *Science Translational Medicine*. 2019;11:12.
- 542 12. Witte D, Handley A, Jere KC, Bogandovic-Sakran N, Mpakiza A, Turner A, et al.
543 Neonatal rotavirus vaccine (RV3-BB) immunogenicity and safety in a neonatal and infant
544 administration schedule in Malawi: a randomised, double-blind, four-arm parallel group
545 dose-ranging study. *Lancet Infectious Disease*. 2022;22:11.
- 546 13. Cunliffe NA, Witte D, Ngwira BM, Todd S, Bostock NJ, Turner AM, et al. Efficacy of
547 human rotavirus vaccine against severe gastroenteritis in Malawian children in the first two
548 years of life: a randomised, double-blind, placebo controlled trial. *Vaccine*. 2012;30(1):16.

- 549 14. Omore R, O'Reilly CE, Williamson J, Moke F, Were V, Farag TH, et al. Health Care-
550 Seeking Behavior During Childhood Diarrheal Illness: Results of Health Care Utilization and
551 Attitudes Surveys of Caretakers in Western Kenya, 2007–2010. *American Journal of Tropical*
552 *Medicine*. 2013;89:12.
- 553 15. Omore R, Khagayi S, Ogwel B, Onkoba R, Ochieng JB, Juma J, et al. Rates of
554 hospitalization and death for all-cause and rotavirus acute gastroenteritis before rotavirus
555 vaccine introduction in Kenya, 2010–2013. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2019;19(47):11.
- 556 16. Asare EO, Hergott D, Seiler J, Morgan B, Archer H, Wiyeh AB, et al. Case fatality risk
557 of diarrhoeal pathogens: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of*
558 *Epidemiology*. 2022;00:12.
- 559 17. Rotavirus vaccine (RV) price data: UNICEF; 2024 [updated 22 February 2024].
560 Available from: <https://www.unicef.org/supply/documents/rotavirus-vaccine-rv-price-data>.
- 561 18. Hamidi A, Hoeksema F, Velthof P, Lemckert A, Gillissen G, Luitjens A, et al.
562 Developing a manufacturing process to deliver a cost effective and stable liquid human
563 rotavirus vaccine. *Vaccine*. 2021;39:12.
- 564 19. Pecenka C, Debellut F, Bar-Zeev N, Anwari P, Nonvignon J, Shamsuzzaman M, et al.
565 Re-evaluating the cost and cost-effectiveness of rotavirus vaccination in Bangladesh,
566 Ghana, and Malawi: A comparison of three rotavirus vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2018;36:7.
- 567 20. Owusu R, Mvundural M, Nonvignon J, Armah G, Bawa J, Antwi-Agyei KO, et al.
568 Rotavirus vaccine product switch in Ghana: An assessment of service delivery costs,
569 switching costs, and cost-effectiveness. *PLOS Global Public Health*. 2023;3(8):17.
- 570 21. Wolfson LJ, Gasse Fo, Lee-Martin S-P, Lydon P, Magan A, Tibouti A, et al. Estimating
571 the costs of achieving the WHO–UNICEF Global Immunization Vision and Strategy, 2006–
572 2015. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. 2008;86(1):13.
- 573 22. Bar-Zeev N, Tate JE, Pecenka C, Chikafa J, Mvula H, Wachepa R, et al. Cost-
574 Effectiveness of Monovalent Rotavirus Vaccination of Infants in Malawi: A Postintroduction
575 Analysis Using Individual Patient–Level Costing Data. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
576 2016;62:9.
- 577 23. Life expectancy at birth, total (years) - Malawi: World Bank; 2021 [Available from:
578 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.DYN.LE00.IN?locations=MW>].
- 579 24. GDP per capita - Malawi: World Bank; 2022 [Available from:
580 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD?locations=MW>].
- 581 25. Department of Immunization Vaccines and Biologicals. WHO Guide on
582 Standardization of Economic Evaluations of Immunization Programmes. Geneva; 2019
583 October 2019.
- 584 26. Claxton K, Martin S, Soares M, al. e. Methods for the estimation of the National
585 Institute for Health and Care Excellence cost-effectiveness threshold. *Health Technology*
586 *Assessment*. 19. Southampton, UK: NIHR Journals Library; 2015.
- 587 27. Edlin R, McCabe C, Hulme C, Hall P, Wright J. Probability Distributions for Cost and
588 Utility Parameters. *Cost Effectiveness Modelling for Health Technology Assessment: Adis,*
589 *Cham*; 2015.
- 590 28. Michael Drummond, Mark Sculpher, George Torrance, Bernie O'Brien, Stoddart G.
591 *Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. Methods for the Economic Evaluation of Health Care*
592 *Programmes*. Third ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press; 2005. p. 34.

- 593 29. Kazibwe J, Gheorghe A, Wilson D, Ruiz F, Chalkidou K, YL. C. The Use of Cost-
594 Effectiveness Thresholds for Evaluating Health Interventions in Low- and Middle-Income
595 Countries From 2015 to 2020: A Review. *Value Health*. 2022;25(3):5.
- 596 30. Debellut Fdr, Clark A, Pecenka C, Tate J, Baral R, Sanderson C, et al. Re-evaluating
597 the potential impact and cost-effectiveness of rotavirus vaccination in 73 Gavi countries: a
598 modelling study. *Lancet Global Health*. 2019;7:11.
- 599 31. PATH. PATH announces early closure of pivotal Phase 3 study of an injectable
600 rotavirus vaccine candidate: PATH; 2022 [updated 30 August 2022. Available from:
601 [https://www.path.org/our-impact/media-center/path-announces-early-closure-of-pivotal-
602 phase-3-study-of-an-injectable-rotavirus-vaccine-
603 candidate/#:~:text=and%20institutional%20foundations.-,PATH%20announces%20early%
604 20closure%20of%20pivotal%20Phase%203,an%20injectable%20rotavirus%20vaccine%2
605 0candidate&text=The%20trial%20aimed%20to%20determine,vaccine%20in%20preventin
606 g%20infant%20diarrhea](https://www.path.org/our-impact/media-center/path-announces-early-closure-of-pivotal-phase-3-study-of-an-injectable-rotavirus-vaccine-candidate/#:~:text=and%20institutional%20foundations.-,PATH%20announces%20early%20closure%20of%20pivotal%20Phase%203,an%20injectable%20rotavirus%20vaccine%20candidate&text=The%20trial%20aimed%20to%20determine,vaccine%20in%20preventin%20infant%20diarrhea).
- 607 32. Health Sector Strategic Plan II (2017-2022). In: Health Mo, editor.: Governemnt of
608 the Republic of Malawi; 2017. p. 122.
- 609 33. Patel M, Shane AL, Parashar UD, Jiang B, Gentsch JR, Glass RI. Oral rotavirus
610 vaccines: how well will they work where they are needed most? *J Infect Dis*. 2009;200 Suppl
611 1(0 1):S39-48.
- 612 34. Folorunso OS, Sebolai OM. Overview of the Development, Impacts, and Challenges
613 of Live-Attenuated Oral Rotavirus Vaccines. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2020;8(3).
- 614 35. Gruber JF, Gruber LM, Weber RP, Becker-Dreps S, Funk MJ. Rotavirus Vaccine
615 Schedules and Vaccine Response Among Infants in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A
616 Systematic Review. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases*. 2017;10.
- 617 36. Rotavirus vaccines: WHO position paper – July 2021. World Health Organization;
618 2021 16 July 2021.
- 619 37. WHO. WHO recommendations for routine immunization - summary tables. World
620 Health Organization; 2023.
- 621 38. Bines JE, Thobari JA, Satria CD, Handley A, Watts E, Cowley D, et al. Human
622 Neonatal Rotavirus Vaccine (RV3-BB) to Target Rotavirus from Birth. *The New England
623 Journal of Medicine*. 2018;378(8):12.


624




Cases**Hospitalizations****DALYs****Deaths**

Cost-Effectiveness Plane


Government Perspective - Strategies Compared to Rotarix 6/10




a. Cost-Effectiveness Acceptability Curve
All Vaccine Strategies




b. Cost-Effectiveness Acceptability Frontier
All Vaccine Strategies




c. Cost-effectiveness Acceptability Curve
No Vaccination v. Rotarix Schedules



d. Cost-effectiveness Acceptability Frontier
No Vaccination v. Rotarix Schedules



a. Sensitivity Analysis of RV3 Price
Compared to Rotarix 6/10, Government Perspective



b. Sensitivity Analysis of RV3 Price
Compared to Rotarix 6/10/14, Government Perspective

