Longitudinal phase 2 clinical trials of live, attenuated tularemia vaccine in otherwise healthy research laboratory workers operating in containment laboratories

3

David L. Saunders^{1,2,§}, Benjamin C. Pierson¹, Jeannine Haller¹, Sarah Norris¹, Anthony P. Cardile^{1,3},
Ronald B. Reisler^{1,4}, Arthur C. Okwesili^{1,5}, Ellen Boudreau¹, Janice Rusnak¹, Denise K. Danner¹, Bret K.
Purcell^{1,6}, James F. Barth¹, Erin L. Tompkins¹, Isaac L. Downs¹, Dani Liggett¹, Patricia Pettit^{*}, Tami
Pratt⁷, Mark Goldberg¹, Mark G. Kortepeter^{1,2}, Fernando B. Guerena¹, John W. Aldis¹, Maryam Keshtkar^{1,8}, and Phillip R. Pittman¹

- 9
- ¹ US Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases, Fort Detrick, MD, United States of America
- ² Uniformed Services University School of Medicine, Bethesda, MD, USA
- ³ Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense, Frederick, MD, USA
- ⁴ Davis Defense Group, Stafford, VA, USA
- 14 ⁵ San Antonio Military Medical Center, San Antonio, TX, USA
- ⁶ University of Florida Research and Academic Center, Orlando, FL
- ⁷ US Army Medical Materiel Development Activity, Fort Detrick, MD, USA
- 17⁸ Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD
- 18
- 19 * deceased
- 20 § Corresponding author:
- 21 E-mail: david.saunders@usuhs.edu
- 22
- 23 Short Title: Phase 2 open label live attenuated tularemia vaccine

Abstract 24

25 **Background:** Tularemia is a bacterial disease caused by the intracellular bacterium Francisella

26 tularensis (F. tularensis or Ft). It has been weaponized historically by multiple state actors due

to its low infectious aerosol dose, high morbidity and high mortality rate of the pneumonic form. 27

The US Army developed the attenuated Live Vaccine Strain (LVS) from stocks provided by the 28 29 former Soviet Union in the 1950s. The vaccine has proven to be safe and immunogenic over the

ensuing decades in numerous clinical trials and animal as well as human challenge studies. 30

31 Despite the threat, there are no FDA-approved vaccines nor clinical stage candidates against

tularemia. LVS remains unlicensed due to instability in culture and the potential for reversion to 32

33 the wild-type pathogen. We report here two sequential LVS trials in at-risk laboratory personnel

working on tularemia in bio-containment. 34

35

Methods: Volunteers received a single dose of the Live Vaccine Strain (LVS) live, attenuated 36

- 37 tularemia vaccine by scarification under 2 FDA-regulated non-randomized, single-arm protocols
- 38 (IND 157). Positive immunization was based on local scarification site 'take reaction', and
- 39 either a >1:20 tularemia antigen microagglutination (MA) titer (protocol FY03-24; 2004-8) or
- greater than 4-fold rise in MA titer (protocol FY07-15; 2009-2017). Those still negative by 40
- week 4 were offered a second dose. 41

42

Results: The LVS vaccine was safe, well tolerated and highly immunogenic. Between the two 43

44 studies, all recipients (100%) had positive 'take reactions', with 95.5% of those in study FY03-

- 24 having a positive response following initial vaccination. All but 3 subjects (98%) in protocol 45
- FY03-24 had positive MA titer results defined as >1:20, most within 28-35 days. In protocol 46
- 47 FY07-15, 95% of subjects had a 4-fold or greater rise in MA titer, the primary immunogenicity endpoint for that study.
- 48
- 49

50 *Conclusions*: LVS vaccine administered to laboratory workers at risk for tularemia exposure

over a 12 year period was safe and highly immunogenic. Findings were in line with more than 4 51

52 decades of prior similar results. Response rates remained robust despite the vaccine lots

- 53 employed having been manufactured 2-3 decades prior to the present studies. In the absence of a
- commercial development effort, or another tularemia vaccine in clinical development, a vaccine 54
- 55 protocol under investigational new drug (IND) application could be considered based on the
- large body of favorable data for this vaccine. The results as well as historical comparator data 56
- presented here should serve as a benchmark for future studies. 57
- 58
- 59

60 Introduction

61

Francisella tularensis infects vertebrate and invertebrate animal hosts causing the disease 62 63 tularemia (1). Transmission to mammals in nature occurs largely through multiple vectors including 64 ticks, mosquitos and biting flies, and contact with remains of infected animals. Clinical presentations 65 vary with skin, eye, lymphatic, gastrointestinal and pharyngeal involvement common following a 3-5 day incubation period (2, 3). While less commonly fatal, even naturally transmitted disease can last several 66 weeks followed in some cases by months of chronic fatigue (4). An extremely low infectious dose (10-50 67 68 organisms via aerosol), ease of aerosolization, and greater virulence when inhaled make it an ideal 69 bioweapon (5) capable of incapacitating and killing large enemy formations. Aerosolized tularemia may 70 be fatal in 60% of untreated individuals (6). Tularemia has been classified on the U.S. Federal Select 71 Agents and Toxins List as a Tier 1, CDC Category A biological agent, and Risk Group 3 pathogen 72 capable of causing serious disease (7).

73

74 Tularemia can cause infection by multiple routes, causing various cutaneous, glandular and ocular 75 syndromes. The more serious pneumonic form of the disease occurs commonly in laboratory workers 76 exposed by the aerosol or oral routes. Laboratory-acquired infection with F. tularensis is a well-77 recognized hazard of Ft biomedical research, with >200 cases described in the American medical 78 literature (8, 9). Pneumonic disease is the syndrome most likely to be encountered in a deliberate attack. 79 It is characterized by fever, malaise, pneumonic infiltrates on x-ray, severe prostration, and diarrhea 80 lasting 3-6 weeks. Survivors may suffer chronic fatigue for months. Individuals suffering pneumonia or 81 pleuritic infection face a poor prognosis. Death is most common with the pneumonic form. Tularemia 82 contracted from zoonotic sources can be treated with antibiotics including streptomycin, gentamicin, doxycycline, and ciprofloxacin. Recommended treatment duration is 10-21 days depending on the stage 83 84 of illness and medication used, though it is unclear how well conventional antibiotics would perform in a 85 deliberate aerosol attack. Substantial insights on its potential for weaponization were gained in part by 40

challenge experiments on healthy volunteers, participants in 'Operation White Coat', exposed to various doses over 10 years starting in 1958 (10). There is a clear infectious dose-response relationship with reduced time of onset and more severe disease occurring at higher exposures. Aerosolized tularemia may relapse if not treated with 10-14 days of sufficient antibiotic therapy equivalent to ≥ 2 grams per day tetracycline (10). Though tetracycline itself is no longer recommended, doxycycline continues to be a treatment option as well as fluoroquinolones and aminoglycosides (11).

92

93 While there are no approved vaccines in the US, the attenuated 'live vaccine strain' (LVS) for 94 tularemia has been used experimentally in the US since the 1950s (12). By further attenuating original 95 tularemia vaccine stocks provided by the N. F. Gamaleya Federal Research Center for Epidemiology & 96 Microbiology (13, 14), the US Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Disease (USAMRIID) 97 subsequently derived the LVS vaccine. The vaccine is derived from a milder subspecies of F. tularensis 98 known as *Ft. holarctica* or type B, found in the Northern hemisphere and the only naturally occurring 99 European subspecies. The vaccine has been used in nearly 4,000 volunteers since the late 1950s [See 100 Table 1]. Both cellular and humoral immunity play a role in the vaccine's effectiveness. It is 101 administered by scarification, similar to the smallpox vaccine. The most reliable sign of successful immunization remains a 'take' reaction at the scarification site. This has been attributed to a delayed 102 103 hypersensitivity T-cell response to the tularin protein (15). While the extent of clinical protective efficacy 104 has been explored perhaps more than any other biodefense vaccine produced to date including human 105 challenge trials, specific immune correlates of protection in humans remain elusive.

106

107 Although studied under IND for decades, LVS has never received marketing approval by a 108 stringent regulatory authority. Pursuit of full licensure has been hampered by concerns regarding vaccine 109 strain reversion to wild type (though this has not been documented in clinical studies), purported 110 challenges for vaccine manufacture at commercial scale, and lack of a commercial partner. In the absence

of an alternative candidate in clinical development, USAMRIID has continued to vaccinate laboratory 111 112 workers at risk for occupational tularemia exposure under the Special Immunizations Program (SIP) (16). 113 The SIP was maintained for several decades at USAMRIID and vaccinated workers from numerous bio-114 containment laboratories in the US working on tularemia and other select agents. The work has continued under IND in the hopes of adding to the clinical database, providing critical comparative data for 115 116 emerging alternatives. The vaccine is also thought to impart volunteer laboratory workers a potential 117 added layer of protection against Ft infection beyond standard biosafety laboratory practices. We report 118 here data from two longitudinal protocols of LVS administered open label to at-risk personnel. The first 119 study (FY03-24) began in 2004 and the second (FY07-15) concluded in 2017. At present no further 120 studies of LVS are planned and these may represent the last clinical trial data of the LVS vaccine.

121

Methods 122

123

125

Study Design 124

Two consecutive longitudinal uncontrolled open-label, Phase 2 safety and immunogenicity 126 127 studies of the LVS vaccine were conducted at USAMRIID under separate but similar protocols between 128 2004 and 2017 under IND 157 (US FDA). Individuals who entered containment laboratory suites where 129 tularemia might be aerosolized, those with possible contact with contaminated equipment or materials, 130 and in some cases those travelling to endemic countries were vaccinated. Placebo and/or other controls were not used as the volunteers were all at -risk of occupational laboratory-acquired tularemia infection. 131

- **Ethics** Statement 132
- 133

All human subjects research studies described were approved by the Institutional Review Board 134 135 of the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command (formerly Medical Research and 136 Materiel Command) prior to commencement. Protocol FY03-24 was conducted from 1 October 2004 to 6 October 2009, while protocol FY07-15 ran from 28 August 2009 to 4 December 2017. The studies 137 138 were registered at ClinicalTrials.gov as NCT00584844 (trial FY03-24) and NCT00787826 (trial FY07-

139 15). An additional protocol FY15-14 was registered as NCT03867162 but never enrolled subjects.
140 Written informed consent was obtained from all subjects prior to enrollment.

141 142

143 *Vaccine*

144

The vaccine used for both studies was F. tularensis Vaccine, Live, NDBR 101, Lot 4 145 manufactured by the National Drug Company in 1962 under Investigational New Drug Application 157. 146 The vaccine consists of live, attenuated F. tularensis, in a modified casein partial hydrolysate medium 147 148 manufactured on 28 May 1962. Vaccine was stabilized with a solution of glucose cysteine hemin agar and sucrose gelatin agar stabilizer solution without preservative and stored between -10° and -30° C. 149 150 Potency testing in guinea pigs under Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) was performed on an annual basis 151 by Southern Research Institute and/or USAMRIID and reported to FDA. Vaccine use was continued annually based on demonstrated protection of guinea pigs against challenge with virulent F. tularensis 152 153 under FDA Good Laboratory Practices.

154

Vaccine vial vacuum seal integrity was confirmed using a high frequency generator (the SPARK test). Vials with an intact seal were reconstituted in 2.0 mL sterile water for injection, USP at concentration of approximately 1.0 X 10⁹ organisms/mL. Vaccine could be stored once reconstituted for up to 8 hours at 2-8° C. Roughly 0.06 mL of vaccine was administered to the volar forearm with 15 superficial punctures in protocol FY07-15, compared to 0.0025mL in protocol FY03-24. Excess vaccine was gently dabbed with sterile gauze and allowed to air dry for 30 minutes.

161

162 Study Subjects

Volunteers at risk for infection with tularemia from various BSL-3 laboratories in the US were
enrolled under USAMRIID IND protocols FY07-15 and FY03-24. Volunteers had to be at least 18-65

165 years old with known risk for F. tularensis exposure and willing to participate in the protocol for the 166 duration of the study, approximately 6 months. They had to be medically cleared to participate by an 167 investigator based on history, physical exam and laboratory testing. They could not have had a 168 documented tularemia infection, been vaccinated against tularemia in the preceding 10 years for 169 enrollment in FY07-15. For study FY03-24, volunteers could not have ever received a tularemia 170 vaccination. Subjects could not have received antibiotics within the prior 7 days or vaccination with 171 another vaccine within 4 weeks, be immunodeficient, have confirmed HIV or use immunosuppressing 172 medications. Volunteers were also excluded if pregnant or lactating, allergic to vaccine components, or 173 had clinically significant abnormal laboratory results within 60 days prior to vaccination.

174

175 **Experimental Methods**

176 Following informed consent, volunteers were screened for inclusion in the study by medical history, physical examination, chest X-ray, electrocardiogram (EKG), CBC, chemistry, 177 178 urinalysis, liver function tests, hepatitis and HIV antibodies. A baseline microagglutination titer was obtained and volunteers were excluded if positive. Females had a urine or serum pregnancy 179 180 test. Those eligible were administered vaccine on study day 0, with follow-up for take reaction on days 1, 2 and between day 5 and 9. Volunteers returned between days 12-16 and 28-35 for 181 adverse event assessment, with microagglutination titers (MA) obtained between days 28-35. A 182 183 close-out interview, and final scarification site assessment were completed at 6 months for protocol 07-15 and at one year for 03-24. Second doses of vaccine were not routinely 184 administered unless a subject did not have an initial take reaction. Subjects with insufficient 185 186 initial responses to vaccine at 28-35 days had MA titers recorded. In protocol 07-15, subjects returned for follow-up examination on days 1 and 2, between days 5-9, 12-16, and 28-35, and at 187 188 6 months (±14 days) after vaccination or revaccination for clinical evaluation of AEs and to

document responses to vaccine. Additionally, subjects were in some cases asked to return ondays 56-84 for laboratory tests.

191

192 Immunogenicity and Serology

Vaccination effectiveness was assessed based on formation of an erythematous papule, 193 vesicle, and/or eschar with or without underlying induration, known as a 'take reaction' between 194 5 and 9 days after vaccination. Microagglutination titers (MA) were performed by the 195 USAMRIID Research Serology lab using previously described methods (17, 18). 196 Briefly, 197 patient serum collected at the indicated time points below was incubated with a standardized 1:5 dilution *Ft* antigen for 24+/- 4 hours at serial dilutions from 1:10 to 1:20,480. The highest serum 198 199 dilution observed with an even lattice of agglutination and only a small transparent button of 200 stained cells at the bottom of the microtube well was considered the endpoint titer. Rabbit 201 antiserum was used as a positive control, and pre-tested human serum as a negative control. An 202 MA titer >1:20 was considered a positive response in protocol FY03-24 while a 4-fold rise in 203 titer from baseline were considered a positive antibody response for protocol FY07-15. The 204 change in protocol FY07-15 was made at least partly in response to a participant who had a high 205 background titer of 1:40. The participant was not vaccinated and subsequently developed 206 tularemia due to a laboratory exposure(19). MA titer was repeated at day 56-84 if the day 28-35 MA titer increased less than 4-fold. If there was no positive take reaction following the initial 207 208 vaccination, a second dose was recommended and offered at least 28 days after the previous vaccination. If there was no positive take reaction 28-35 days after the second dose, or MA titer 209 210 increased less than 4-fold, a third dose was considered.

212 *Safety*

Participants were monitored continuously for adverse events throughout the study. Adverse events were described using contemporary versions of the National Cancer Institute Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events (CTCAE). Adverse events and subject safety concerns were reviewed by the Investigator as well as the Sponsor's clinical research and medical monitors. Subjects were monitored for 30 minutes following vaccination. Subjects were seen in clinic for follow-up on Days 1, 2, 7, 14 and 28. Study staff contacted subjects at week 3 by phone or email to ensure attendance at the week 4-5 safety and immunogenicity assessment.

220

221 Statistical Analysis

At the conclusion of the study, data were transformed to SAS® data format using DBMS/COPYTM or system-specific data transfer programs. Descriptive tables of demographics, compliance, frequency and rate of each reaction, responder and non-responder rates, study deviations, concomitant medications, any local injection measurements or vitals taken, and outof-reference range laboratory values were compiled.

Endpoint measurements were evaluated for all intent-to-treat subjects regardless of compliance with titer schedule. However, titers obtained on samples collected outside the protocol prescribed window were excluded from further analysis. Data from the final statistical analysis report from each study was reviewed. Key immunogenicity outcome measures included 'take reaction' and MA titers. MA titer criteria differed by study with a >1:20 considered positive in the FY03-24 study compared to a 4-fold rise for the FY07-15 study. Safety endpoints included vaccine relatedness of adverse events as well as frequency and severity.

For the purposes of this analysis comparisons of titer response and take reaction by categorical variables (i.e. sex) were conducted using t-test and Pearson's chi-squared analysis respectively. Comparisons of titer response and take reaction by continuous variables (i.e. age) were conducted using simple linear regression and simple logistic regression analysis respectively. Statistical significance was defined at the two-tailed 95% confidence level. All analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism version 8.0.0 for Windows (GraphPad Software, San Diego, California USA, www.graphpad.com).

241

242 **Results**

243

There were 484 subjects screened for study FY03-24 which ran between October 2004 and 244 245 September 2008. Of the 462 vaccinated, 405 completed the final study visit at 6 months. To enroll in the 246 study, subjects had to have a titer <1:20, no previous vaccination, and no documented tularemia infection. 247 A small number (21) were revaccinated with the same initial dose of vaccine, based on inadequate 248 response to the initial vaccination (titer <1:20) and two required a second revaccination (3rd dose) (Figure 249 1a). There were 191 subjects screened and 177 vaccinated for study FY07-15 which ran between August 250 2009 and May 2017. In contrast to FY03-24, subjects could not have had a prior tularemia vaccination 251 within the past 10 years. In FY07-15 subjects with inadequate titers were not revaccinated. Adequate 252 titers were also defined differently as greater than 4-fold rise over baseline. There were 170 completing 253 FY07-15 with 7 withdrawals before the final study visit at 6 months.

Figure 1a: CONSORT diagram. Disposition of subjects enrolled to LVS tularemia vaccine study

FY03-24 (enrollment from 10/01/2004 to 09/15/2008). Reasons for screening failures included having

256 previously received the vaccine or having a positive titer (n=10), previous exposure (1), medical reason

- (1), not able to travel to USAMRIID to receive the vaccine (1), or no longer at risk (7).
- 258



260 Figure 1b: CONSORT diagram. Disposition of Subjects enrolled to LVS tularemia vaccine FY 07-15

261 (enrollment from 08/28/2009 to 05/05/2017). To enroll in the study, subjects could not have had a prior

tularemia vaccination within the past 10 years. Reasons for screening failure included medical (5),

relocation prior to vaccination (3), and no longer at occupational risk (6). Subjects were considered to be

fully vaccinated if they had a 4-fold rise from baseline, and a positive 'take reaction'.



266



271 old, >60% male, and >85% Caucasian.

- 272 Table 1: Participant Demographics. Characteristics of participants screened for the two studies FY
- 273 03-24 (2004-2008) and FY 07-15 (2009-2017).

Study	FY 03-24 (N	=484)	FY 07-15 (N=191)		Total	
Characteristic	Ν	%	Ν	%	Ν	%
Sex						
Male	310	64.0	112	58.6	422	62.5
Female	174	36.0	79	41.4	253	37.5
Race						
White	421	87.0	162	84.8	583	86.4
African American	26	5.4	10	5.2	36	5.3
American Native	2	0.4	1	0.5	3	0.4
Asian	14	2.9	13	6.8	27	4.0
Pacific Islander	2	0.4	0	0	2	0.3
Other	19	3.9	5	2.6	24	3.6
Age						
< 20	2	0.4	0	0	2	0.3
20 - 29	128	26.4	53	27.7	181	26.8
30 - 39	152	31.4	77	40.3	229	33.9
40 - 49	124	25.6	46	24.1	170	25.2
50 - 59	66	13.6	14	7.3	80	11.9
60 - 69	12	2.5	1	0.5	13	1.9
Baseline Titer						
\geq 1:20	49	10.1	54	28.3	103	15.3
< 1:20	435	89.9	137	71.7	572	84.7

274 275

276 *Immunogenicity*

277

278 Overall, the Live F. tularensis Vaccine (NDBR-101, Lot 4) had comparable rates of 279 immunogenicity to those seen in prior studies based on the two principle measures - microagglutination 280 antibody titers and take reaction (**Table 3**). Immunogenicity response rates were uniformly high. In both 281 studies, all protocol-compliant subjects had a measurable immune response (titer $\ge 1:20$ and 'take 282 reaction'). A positive 'take reaction' was defined as development of one of the following: erythematous 283 papule, vesicle, and/or eschar formation. All 177 subjects vaccinated (100%) in FY07-15 had a positive 284 'take reaction' within 9 days of vaccination, suggesting a robust qualitative cellular immunity response 285 within 14 days. In FY03-24, 95.5% of subjects (n=441; SEM=0.010) had a positive take reaction at first 286 vaccination. Subjects in FY03-24 without adequate initial responses were revaccinated. Positive take reactions were seen in 89.5% (n=17; SEM 0.007) of those receiving a first revaccination, and 100% 287

receiving a 2nd revaccination. No statistically significant differences in 'take reaction' rates for any
vaccination event were observed when analyzed by sex (via Pearson's chi-square) or age (simple logistic
regression).

292	In protocol FY03-24, of 454 protocol-compliant post-vaccination titers collected at day 28-35,
293	442 (98.6%) were \geq 1:20. LVS was also highly immunogenic in the FY07-15 study where
294	immunogenicity was defined as \geq 4-fold rise in MA antibody titer following vaccination. This
295	immunogenicity endpoint definition differed from prior studies, including FY03-24 where a 1:20 titer
296	value was considered immunogenic. All but 9 subjects vaccinated in FY07-15 had a \geq 4-fold rise in titer
297	by day 28-35 and were not evaluated again. There were 9 subjects (5%) who had titers repeated at day
298	56-84, and of these 6 of 9 (67%) had a \geq 4-fold rise in titer while 3 remained non-responders (33.3%).
299	However, all 3 of the latter individuals had 'take reactions'. One of the 3 non-responders developed an
300	upper respiratory infection and was treated with antibiotics within the 1st week after vaccination,
301	providing a likely cause for non-response. The study duration of individual subjects in the FY07-15
302	protocol was limited to 6 months.
303	
304	Microagglutination titers over time are shown in Figure 2A. For study FY07-15 titers were
305	obtained in 191 subjects at baseline (mean ($\bar{\chi}$)=15.4, SEM=3.7), and 177 subjects at day 28-35 ($\bar{\chi}$ =535,
306	SEM=51.2). A small number (n=14) had follow-up titers at 6 months (μ =262, SEM=97.0). Titers for
307	subjects from FY03-24 are shown at baseline ($\bar{\chi}$ =9.3, SEM=0.4; n=484), day 28-35 ($\bar{\chi}$ =379.7,
308	SEM=27.3; n=459) and 12 months ($\bar{\chi}$ =194.3, SEM=11.3; n = 407) after first vaccination. Responses
309	were modest but nearly all \geq 1:20 for the 19 subjects receiving a 1 st revaccination ($\bar{\chi}$ =55.16, SEM=17.06),
310	and 2 receiving a 2 nd revaccination ($\bar{\chi}$ =30.0, SEM=10). Geometric mean titers are shown in Figure 2B
311	with baseline values for FY03-24 of 7.98 (95% confidence interval (95%CI) =7.69-8.28), and 9.56
312	(95%CI=8.67-10.54) for FY07-15. Peak geomean titers at vaccination day 28-35 were 181 for FY03-24
313	(95%CI=161-204) but significantly higher at 269 for FY07-15 (95%CI=223-323; p=0.0006 for t-test of

314	log-transformed data). Month 12 geomean titers were 117 (95%CI=105–130) in FY03-24 while month 6
315	geomean titers where available for FY07-15 were 101.7 (95%CI=24.6-421).
316	
317	There were very few follow-up titers at the 6 month time point for FY 07-15 (n=14 of the original
318	191 vaccinated) as these were only performed if the day 28-35 response was inadequate. Substantially
319	more had 12 month follow-up titers in FY 03-24 (n=407 of the 459 vaccinated). Where available, titer
320	levels were largely sustained at month 12 for the small number revaccinated with mean values of 33.9
321	(SEM=9.7; n=18) for first revaccination and 30.0 (SEM=10) for the 2 undergoing a 2 nd revaccination. It
322	is noteworthy that the same lot of vaccine was used for both studies, though titer responses were higher
323	following initial vaccination in study FY07-15 (535 vs 380; p= 0.004).
324	
325	There were no significant difference in mean titer values for either study by sex (Figure 3A).
326	There was not a statistically significant difference between males and females for month 12 titer in FY03-
327	24 (185.2 vs 209.8; $p = 0.296$). There was not a statistically significant difference by age for month 12
328	titer, though the observed modest decrease in titer with age did approach statistical significance (y=-
329	2.081x+273.2; $p = 0.0585$). Simple linear regression of titer values by age revealed modest statistically
330	significant declines with increasing age (Figure 3B) for study FY03-24 where there were more than twice
331	as many subjects enrolled but not FY07-15.
332	

Figure 2. Microagglutination titers over time by study. A. Mean and standard error of the mean

(SEM) bars for titer values are shown for the two studies. Titers were obtained at baseline, day 28-35,

and 6 months for study FY07-15 (green triangles). All 177 subjects vaccinated (100%) in FY07-15 had a

- positive 'take reaction' within 14 days. Titers for subjects from FY03-24 are shown at baseline, and days
 28-35 after first vaccination, and 12 months (blue circles). Mean and standard error bars are also shown
- for the 21 subjects receiving a 1^{st} revaccination (light blue squares), and 2 receiving a 2^{nd} revaccination
- (pink triangles). In FY03-24, 95.5% of subjects had a positive take reaction at first vaccination. 89.5% of
- those receiving a first revaccination, and 100% receiving 2^{nd} revaccination had a positive 'take reaction'.
- 342 **B.** Geometric mean titers with 95% confidence intervals for each time point are shown with green squares
- representing FY07-15 titers following initial vaccinations only, and blue circles representing FY03-24.
- 344 A.



347

345

Figure 3. Microagglutination Titer Values by Age and Sex at day 28-35. A. Geometric mean 348 349 microagglutination titer values are shown for male (red circle) and female (blue squares) subjects from 350 Study FY07-15 and FY03-24 as well as for the two studies combined following first vaccination. There were no significant differences in either study by sex. Geometric mean titers (with 95% confidence 351 352 intervals) in FY03-24 were 186.9 (160.2–218.1) for males and 171.2 (141.6 – 207.1) for females 353 (unpaired t-test p = 0.488). Geometric mean FY07-15 titers were 277.6 (218.4–352.7) for males and 257.6 354 (190.5-348.5) for females (unpaired t-test p = 0.699). Overall geometric mean titers were 207.6 (182.2-355 236.5) for males and 193.6 (164.7 – 227.5) for females (t-test p=0.5110). **B.** Simple linear regression of 356 log-transformed titer values by age is shown for FY03-24 (blue lines/dots), FY07-15 (green lines/dots), and the two studies combined (orange lines). While there was a statistically significant decline by age in 357 FY 03-24 (y=-0.00857x+2.510; p = 0.0016) and overall (Y = -0.00799 + 2.550; p = 0.0008), decline was 358

359 not significant in FY07-15 alone (Y = -0.00392 + 2.571; p = 0.4088).





361

362





364 365	Adverse events are shown in Table 2 . In study FY03-24, 401 of 462 vaccinated subjects (86.6%)
366	had at least one adverse event during the course of the study. In FY07-15, 170 of 177 (96.1%) reported at
367	least one AE. Local AEs were most common, reported in 84.1% in FY03-24, and 81.4% in FY07-15 with
368	only 1 local event graded as severe in the former study. Scarification site lesions and pain were the most
369	prominent overall, accounting for nearly 2/3 of local reactions. Systemic adverse events occurred in
370	fewer than 17% of those vaccinated with leading causes including fatigue (4.8%), headache (3.9%),
371	myalgia (2.9%) or fever/chills (1.5%). Pharyngitis, often unilateral and with a tonsillar exudate was seen
372	in less than 1% of subjects. Most AE rates were consistent across the two studies, with the exception of
373	lymphadenopathy which was noticeably higher in FY03-24 (18.2% vs 2.8%). Anatomic sites of observed
374	lymphadenopathy in study FY03-24 included 65 axillary, 15 epitrochlear, 2 cervical, and 143 unspecified
375	with 17 reported as epitrochlear in FY07-15 (and the remainder unspecified). Scarification site pain was
376	more commonly reported in FY07-15 (43.5% vs 16.6%).
377	

All adverse events, including serious adverse events, had onset dates up to 37 days postvaccination. Duration of adverse events, including serious adverse events, ranged from 1 to 367 days. Two serious adverse events (SAEs) were reported. Both required hospitalization. One - a case of acute appendicitis 23 days after vaccination - resolved within 2 days. The second was a coronary artery disease event occurring 24 days after vaccine administration, which resolved in 21 days. Neither was determined to be related to the vaccine, nor deemed to be life threatening. **Figure 4** shows representative take reactions in 3 individuals from the FY03-24 study to illustrate typical appearance on the volar forearm.

385

Table 2: Adverse events reported following LVS vaccination. Adverse events reported at any time

during the study period are shown. Only AEs determined by an investigator to be probably or definitelyrelated to vaccination are included.

FY03-24 FY07-15 Totals **Adverse Event** (N=462)(N=177) (N=639) n % n % % n **Total Events Reported** 1236 100 614 100 1850 100 **Participants reporting any AE** 401 170 86.8 96.1 571 89.4 Local 1040 84.1 500 81.4 1540 83.2 Mild 1013 473 81.7 77 1486 80.3 Moderate 26 2.1 27 4.4 2.9 53 Severe 1 0.1 0 0 1 0.1 **By Specific Term** Scarification site Lesions 509 41.2 212 34.5 39.0 721 Lymphadenopathy 225 18.2 17 2.8 242 13.1 Scarification site Pain/Pruritis 267 205 16.6 43.5 472 25.5 4 Injection Arm Pain 73 5.9 0.7 77 4.2 Injection Arm Edema 14 1.1 14 0.8 Shoulder / Neck Pain 14 1.1 14 0.8 196 15.9 **Systemic** 114 18.6 310 16.8 Mild 162 13.1 96 15.6 258 13.9 2.5 Moderate 31 16 2.6 47 2.5 Severe 3 0.2 2 0.3 5 0.3 **By Specific Term** Fatigue / Malaise 50 4 38 6.2 88 4.8 Headache 45 28 3.6 4.6 73 3.9 Generalized musculoskeletal pain/stiffness 40 3.2 14 2.3 54 2.9 Fever / Chills / Night Sweats 15 1.2 13 2.1 28 1.5 Pharyngitis 13 1.1 2 0.3 15 0.8 Rhinitis 13 1.1 4 0.7 17 0.9

Figure 4. LVS live, attenuated tularemia vaccine "take reactions" in three representative individuals. A single dose of 0.06 ml of LVS vaccine at a concentration of 1.0 x 10⁹ organisms/mL was inoculated into the volar forearm of each volunteer using the scarification method. Although the three individuals depicted were immunized using the same technique, these pictures show a range of possible reactions. The three individuals had day 28-35 MA titers of 160, 80, and 640 respectively. As shown in the photographs, in all three cases there is appreciable healing

of the site by day 14 following vaccination. By day 28 only a small hyper-pigmented macule remained at each vaccination site (not shown).

395



397 **Discussion**

398

399 The results seen from the most recent LVS protocols at USAMRIID parallel those from a large 400 body of clinical trials conducted from the mid-1950s to the present in late 2017. The data presented here 401 from 2004 - 2017 may represent the final LVS doses provided to volunteers under an IND clinical study. 402 The clinical experience with the F. tularensis Vaccine, Live, NDBR 101 and related LVS vaccine lots is 403 summarized in Table 4 below. Lot 4, NDBR 101 manufactured in 1962 has been in at least 1,998 404 volunteers under IND 157. Combined with literature reports using other vaccine lots, LVS has been 405 administered to roughly 4,279 volunteers. Overall, the vaccine has been shown to be safe. Common side 406 effects include local lymphadenitis and scarification site pain in up to 80% within a few days of 407 inoculation. Short-lived mild to moderate systemic symptoms (fever, malaise, myalgia) are also common 408 in 15-20% within a few days to one week of inoculation. There have been only a handful of serious 409 adverse events reported over this long period of use, none of which have so far been attributed to the 410 vaccine. Particularly remarkable is that vaccine lots used in the present were up to 55 years old, retaining 411 remarkable potency under controlled storage conditions. Immunogenicity as measured by the 'take 412 reaction' has been consistently high with 95-100% of volunteers reacting after the first vaccination. 413 Nearly all respond after a booster, even many years after lot manufacture. Likewise, immune reactions as 414 measured by micro-agglutination titers greater than 1:20 are typically seen in 90% of recipients by 4 415 weeks and approaching 100% by 8 weeks. These simple, well-established findings should serve as 416 benchmarks for future tularemia vaccine candidates.

417

As a result of years of diligent effort, a tremendous amount is known about the clinical characteristics of live, attenuated self-replicating tularemia vaccines. While there has not been an opportunity to demonstrate vaccine efficacy against a deliberate biological attack, carefully conducted human challenge studies under Operation White Coat using the SCHU-S4 strain reveal important insights into vaccine performance parameters (10). Antibody levels \geq 1:20 by microagglutination assay (thought

423 to be protective) were reached in the vast majority of volunteers following a single LVS dose (Table 3). 424 **Table 4** summarizes published challenge study reports. LVS was protective in most cases against low-425 concentration SCHU-S4 challenge (2,500 organisms), though vaccine efficacy could be overcome at 426 higher challenge concentrations (25,000 organisms) - 100-1,000-fold times greater than the minimum 427 human infectious doses (3, 20, 21). Protection was afforded against both aerosol and intradermal 428 challenge, though greater against the latter; see Table 4. While it is unlikely such studies could be 429 approved today on ethical grounds, it should be noted that it was rare even for unvaccinated subjects 430 challenged with low concentrations of tularemia to require antibiotic therapy. Many vaccinated subjects 431 did not require antibiotic therapy at higher challenge concentrations, though unvaccinated subjects did so 432 universally (22). In addition to direct evidence from challenge, indirect evidence comes from 433 demonstrated reductions in occupational exposure infections among at-risk laboratory workers after 434 introduction of LVS (23). The role of vaccination in an individual with an active infection or after 435 virulent tularemia exposure is unclear, and should be evaluated in the future.

436

437 Microagglutination titers remained remarkably stable in the present study spanning 13 years of vaccination with the same product lot manufactured in 1962. The resiliency of present vaccine lot 438 439 immunogenicity observed is consistent with a recent active comparator study. No differences were found 440 in take reaction or seroconversion by microagglutination between the USAMRIID LVS vaccine and a 441 newer vaccine lot manufactured for which NDBR 101, lot 4 served as seed material (24). Surprisingly, 442 mean titers were modestly higher among subjects in the later study (FY07-15) despite the continued aging 443 of lot 4. While there is no immediate explanation for this, titers were only modestly elevated (535) 444 compared to averages in FY03-24 (mean=380). Despite this long term stability and the aforementioned protective efficacy, specific immune correlates of protection remain elusive. The role of humoral 445 446 immunity in clinical protection from tularemia remains controversial and poorly understood. 447 Conventional wisdom would indicate that an intracellular bacterium might require a cellular immune 448 response (25), though an extracellular form of the organism has been identified (26). In humans,

449 circulating antibodies to F. tularensis were initially measured with agglutination assays and enzymelinked immunosorbent assays (ELISA) (27-29). In clinical research, a >1:20 microagglutination titer has 450 451 been used to indicate an adequate vaccine response. LVS administered to subjects by scarification has 452 reliably exceeded this benchmark over more than 6 decades (see Table 3). Bacterial agglutinins have 453 been shown to increase and persist for at least 3 years (12). Limited evidence in mice indicates that 454 antibody response is targeted to the lipopolysaccharide (Ft LPS) in both mice and humans. At least 455 partial immunity is provided in passive antibody transfer studies from both murine and human donors 456 with prior LVS vaccination (30, 31) as well as levofloxacin-treated mice who survived SCHU-S4 457 challenge (32). This appears to be mediated by the Fc- γ receptor (Fc γ R) (33). Currently available 458 serologic markers of infection are not helpful for real-time diagnosis given a typical delayed rise in IgM, 459 concurrent with IgG 2-3 weeks after symptom onset. Nor do they indicate successful treatment as IgG can 460 remain elevated for several years (34). Recently, an outbred rabbit (Rb) model, coupled with a series of 461 live attenuated S4-based vaccines (S4 Δ aroD, S4 Δ guaBA, and S4 Δ clpB) and wild type Schu S4 aerosol 462 challenge (~2,000 CFU) were used to identify clinically measurable correlates of protection (COP). 463 Analysis of individual rabbits (Rb) enabled retrospective identification of Rb COP that predicted S4 464 challenge outcome. In pilot studies, the group found several "Antigenic" COP in plasma of 80% of LVSvaccinated humans (35). 465

466

467 It is thought that cellular immunity may play a dominant role in protection from tularemia given 468 intracellular replication, predominantly in macrophages (36). The 'take reaction' following LVS 469 vaccination is the most reliable indicator of cellular immunity, occurring in 90% or more of vaccinations 470 (Table 4). However, take reaction assessment has been implicated in divergence between take and MA 471 titer results, highlighting the importance of experienced readers. Immunogenicity in the present study 472 differed from a recent study comparing USAMRIID LVS to a more recently manufactured batch by 473 Dynport Vaccine Company (DVC-LVS) where there was greater discordance between MA and take 474 reaction results (24). Following immunization or exposure to disease, a rarely used skin test (the Foshay

475 test) has been shown to remain positive for up to 10 years (15, 37). Cellular immunity in humans is also 476 measurable by a lymphocyte transformation test (38). While CD4 and CD8+ T-cells have been thought to 477 be predominantly responsible, roles of dendritic cells, macrophages, neutrophils and natural killer cells 478 have also been described (36). Cellular responses appear 2 weeks after vaccination as well as tularemia 479 disease (38, 39), in comparison to serology which typically becomes positive in 2-4 weeks (40). 480 However, evidence for the precise immune components involved in cell-mediated immunity remains 481 incomplete. It appears likely both humoral and cellular immunity play a role. Passive transfer of spleen 482 cells from vaccinated mice were protective against challenge with doses of LVS normally lethal to mice 483 (but not humans) (41). Transfer of thoracic duct lymphocytes from immunized rats reduced the burden of 484 infection following a low dose challenge with Ft LVS organisms in naïve rats, while rats given serum 485 from immunized rats were not protected against Ft challenge (42). Rats vaccinated with aerosolized LVS 486 survived subsequent lethal aerosol challenge with SCHU S4 without systemic infection. Tularemia 487 replication in the lungs and characteristic pulmonary granulomatous lesions were reduced substantially 488 though not eliminated (43), suggesting cellular protection. However, the translation of animal model 489 findings to humans has remained elusive. At least some recent progress has been made at elucidating 490 correlates in a rat co-culture model (44). In the model, T-cells from vaccinated rats are incubated ex vivo 491 with tularemia-infected rat macrophages. It is thought that the same approach might be applied to human 492 vaccine studies better elucidate cellular correlates of protection. A human model has been developed but 493 has yet to be validated or submitted to a stringent regulatory authority for approval as a surrogate 494 endpoint (45).

495

There may also be a role for mucosal immunity, given that both aerosolized LVS and aerosolized tularemia itself lead to development of immunity, the former more rapidly though of the same peak magnitude by 4 weeks as the intradermal route (22). When comparing cutaneous to aerosol vaccination in non-human primates, vaccine organisms were recoverable from the site of inoculation initially. Within 28 days they could be isolated from lymph nodes, liver and spleen but were cleared from the body by 90

501 days (12). IgA deficient mice were not protected against aerosol challenge following vaccination (46, 502 47). Immunity following aerosol challenge has been demonstrated in non-human primates (Macaca 503 *mulatta*) with a clear dose-response enhancing survival in animals given higher LVS doses (10^7) 504 organisms) (22). In addition to dermal inoculation, LVS has proven to be protective as an aerosolized 505 vaccine in humans, though side effects following higher doses required for protection may limit the 506 practicality of this approach. In comparison, one study indicates that side effects at higher doses of inhaled SCHU S4 strain organisms $(10^6 - 10^8)$ included fever and flu-like symptoms lasting 2-3 days (6). 507 508 Syriala et al. demonstrated that all of the 6 of 16 individuals protected against challenge with the virulent 509 SCHU S4 Ft. strain by previous aerosol exposure to LVS had measurable circulating antibody while only 510 one the 10 individuals not protected did (48). Of note, the individuals in this study had active tularemia 511 infections, confirmed with serology, rather than vaccinated individuals. Whether LVS would be effective 512 and marketable via trans-mucosal delivery route remains to be seen but may be worth investigating 513 among vaccine candidates.

514

There is no identified replacement or competitor to LVS in clinical stage development at the time 515 516 of writing. Key characteristics of an optimal tularemia vaccine could include lack of potential for 517 reversion to wildtype tularemia in the case of live vaccines, a safety profile in humans equivalent or better 518 than LVS, ease and low cost of manufacture, and efficacy against Ft-type A challenge in well-controlled 519 large animal models. Comparable human immune correlates would need to be demonstrated in healthy 520 volunteers, promising approaches demonstrated in murine (49) and human ex vivo co-culture model (45). 521 A large slate of candidates have been produced over the years, and there is an excellent review on the 522 subject published elsewhere (50). Approaches have focused on live, attenuated and inactivated tularemia 523 vaccines employing various Francisella strains, particularly F. holoarctica and F. novacida (51). 524 Inactivated vaccines may provide a safety advantage over live attenuated vaccines, but have yet to 525 demonstrate comparable protection in animal models (46). Protein subunit vaccines would have a 526 decided safety advantage, and also eliminate concerns for pathogenic strain reversion. However, this

approach has yet to yield an effective candidate in animal models. DNA and vectored vaccine approaches using attenuated virus or bacteria for the purpose of introducing tularemia antigens have similarly resulted in suboptimal levels of animal protection (50, 52). Vaccines targeting the Fc-gamma receptor (Fc γ R) have been developed, given Fc γ R's role in cellular phagocytosis and antigen presentation with mixed success (53).

532

533 In summary, the LVS vaccine was well tolerated and proved once again to deliver high levels of 534 positive take reactions and microagglutination titers in at-risk laboratory workers over a 13 year period. 535 Of particular interest is the resilience of the vaccine in long-term storage at USAMRIID. Despite 536 manufacture 42-55 years prior to the studies, sustained high response levels continued to be observed. An 537 incompletely understood mechanism of attenuation, hypothetical concerns for potential reversion to 538 wildtype and instability in culture remain challenges for licensure and (54). A successful effort to 539 remanufacture and test the vaccine in 2006 demonstrated that LVS could be manufactured using modern 540 methods (24). LVS attenuation mechanisms have also been partially elucidated with mutations in a Type 541 IV pilin gene (pilA) and an outer membrane protein (FTT0918) implicated in murine model virulence 542 (55). Despite use for more than 70 years and a large safety database, there is currently no plan to pursue 543 full licensure of LVS. As potentially the last laboratory worker was vaccinated under a clinical trial in 544 2017, the present work serves as a benchmark for safety, immunogenicity and long term potency against 545 which to compare future alternative vaccine candidates. The long term potency of LVS would lend itself 546 to a new vaccine protocol under IND for at risk personnel. These would reasonably include laboratory 547 workers, military personnel and/or limited disaster preparedness stockpiles intended to deter deliberate 548 biowarfare use. Given the US has no licensed measure for immunoprophylaxis against tularemia, a critical biodefense gap against a category A agent remains. Significant ongoing investment is needed. 549

Table 3. Summary of LVS vaccine studies conducted at USAMRIID and partnered facilities. Between the mid-1950s and 2017, the LVS tularemia vaccine was tested in numerous clinical trials to include 1) Healthy volunteer studies for safety and immunogenicity 2) Human challenge studies with tuleramia via the cuteneous and aerosol routes with and 3) without vaccination, in the latter case to better understand the natural history of human challenge with the Schu-S4 tularemia strain 4) studies in otherwise healthy laboratory workers potentially exposed to tularemia. Data is included from both the published literature and that collected in studies conducted under IND #157 for *Tularemia Vaccine, Live, Attenuated*.

Years	Study Title	Ν	Immunogenicity	Safety		
1) Safety and Immunogenicity Studies; N = 181 from IND; N = 2009 from literature						
1991- 1993	Evaluation of the Safety and Immunogenicity of a Live Bacterial Tularemia Vaccine in Normal Adult Subjects (Protocol 91-9, Johns Hopkins University)	94	# (%) MA titer ≥1:20 / Take reaction Lot 2R-85: 43 (91.5) / 47 (100) Lot 3-85: 46 (97.9) / 44 (93.6)	SAEs: none AEs: 273 total AE reported (Lot 2R-85 – 144; Lot 3-85 - 129		
1987- 1991	Evaluation of New Lots of a Tularemia Vaccine, Protocol A: Initial Assessment of the Safety of <i>F</i> . <i>tularensis</i> Vaccine, Live, TSI-GSD-213, Lot 1R-85 (Protocol 87-4, Log A-4706) ^a	69 ^a	% take reaction: not reported # (%) MA titer >1:20: Vaccine 33 (97) Placebo 3 (9)	SAEs: 1 (Hodgkin's lymphoma, preexisting); 7 graded severe (4 vaccine / 3 placebo) # (%) AEs: 34 (100) treated 32 (91.4) untreated		
1975	Evaluation in Volunteers of the Active-Rosette-Forming Lymphocyte Test as an Assay for Previous Immunization to Tularemia (Protocol 75-2)	11	Test of Foshay skin test – 6/6 with prior vaccination positive; 5/5 vaccine naïve negative	SAEs: none % AEs: none		
1965	Metzger et al,1965 (20); Bartelloni-1969 (3) ^b	185	# (%) take reaction: 181 (98)Partial protection from aerosol challenge; greater at lower dose	SAEs: none AEs: 30% lymphadenitis; systemic AEs not reported		
1964	Evaluation of Attenuated Tularemia Vaccine (LVS) from National Drug Company (Protocol 65-4)	7	% take reaction: 100 % MA titer >1:20: 100	SAEs: none % AEs: 5/7 lymphadenopathy		
1958	Hornick et al, 1958 (22) ^c	24	% take reaction: 100 (24/24)	% AEs: not reported		
1958	Hornick et al, 1958 (6) ^c	~1800	% take reaction: not reported % MA titer >1:20: not reported	data in 308 subjects indicated local reaction; 25% axillary adenitis; fever <10%; headache 6.5%; myalgia 5%; flu-like symptoms 14%		
Challeng	e Studies; N = 130 from IND; 282 from literature					
1967	Evaluation of Storage Stability of Tularemia Vaccine, Live, Attenuated NDBR 101, Lot 4 (Protocol 68-4/68-	20	% take reaction: 100 # (%) MA titer ≥1:20: 20 (100)	SAE: none post-vaccine Systemic AE: 13 post-vaccine		

	4A) [Inpatient 5yr storage stability human challenge study] ^e			
1966	Aerosolized LVS vaccine followed by challenge;	253	# (%) MA titer >1:20: 97% by	AEs: At low dose $(10^4 \text{ org}) 30\%$
	Hornick and Eigelsbach, 1966 $(22)^d$		3 weeks; cutaneous inoculation	had mild systemic AEs; High
			same rate but slower	dose (10^8) - 90% systemic AEs
1964 -	Evaluation of Attenuated Tularemia Vaccine (LVS)	20	% take reaction: 100	SAEs: none after vaccination
1965	from National Drug Company (Protocol 65-8)		% MA titer > 1:20: 100% by	(65-8) or challenge
			week 4 for both lots	% AEs post-vaccine:
	Evaluation of Storage Stability of Living Vaccine Strain			70% lymphadenopathy, no
	(LVS) of Pasteurella tularensis (Protocol 65-13) and		Subject requiring antibiotics	other conditions mentioned
	Evaluation of Metabolic Changes in Immunized		low-dose (2.5k cfu) - 1 of 4	
	Subjects Exposed to Infectious Doses of P tularensis		high dose $(25k \text{ cfu}) - 4 \text{ of } 4$	AEs more common in high-dose
	(65-13A)		unvaccinated controls – 6 of 6	challenge group
1964	Evaluation of Attenuated Tularemia Vaccine (LVS)	12	% take reaction: 100	SAEs: none
	from National Drug [Biologic Research] Company		% MA titer > 1:20: 83%	% AEs: 8% fever; 75%
	(Protocol 65-7)		(10/12) by week 4	lymphadenopathy
1962	NDBR 101 (from Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, or 6) using the	78	# (%) take reaction: 77 (99)	% AEs: 36% (28/78)
	scarification technique ¹		% MA titer >1:20: 68/71 (96)	lymphadenitis; no systemic AEs
1961	Saslaw et al-1961 (56) ^g	29	MA titers peaked at 4-8 weeks	% AEs: 50% lymphadenopathy
	Saslaw and Carhart-1961 (57) ^g			
3) Chall	enge Only Studies; N = 10	1		1
1966	Respiratory Pasteurella (Francisella) tularensis in Man	10	% take reaction: N/A	SAEs: none recorded
	(Protocol 67-1)		% MA titer > 1:20: 100% by	% AEs: 100% fever, HA,
			week 4	malaise; 9 AEs graded severe
4) Clinic	cal Studies (Single Arm Phase 2 in Laboratory Workers)	; N= 1,6	67	1
2009-	A Longitudinal Phase 2 Study for the Continued	177	# (%) take reaction: 177 (100)	$# (\%) SAE^{h}: 2$
2017	Evaluation of the Safety and Immunogenicity of a Live			# (%) local AE: 173 (97.7)
	Francisella tularensis Vaccine, NDBR 101, Lot 4 in		# (%) MA >1:20: 165 (93.2) by	# (%) systemic AE:
	Healthy Adults At-Risk for Exposure to Francisella		d28; 171 (97.1) by d84	Transaminase elevations:
	tularensis (Protocol FY07-15)			
2004-	A Longitudinal Phase 2 Study for the Continued	484	# (%) take reaction: 441/462	SAEs: none
2009	Evaluation of the Safety and Immunogenicity of a Live		(95.5) after primary dose	
	Francisella tularensis Vaccine, NDBR 101, Lot 4		# (%) MA titer > 1:20:	# (%) related AE: 399 (86.4)
	(Protocol FY03-24) ¹		Primary - 442/454 (97.4)	# (%) systemic AE: 264 (57.1)
			Boost – 14/19 (73.7)	
	No protocols conducted between 1999-2004			

1987-	Evaluation of New Lots of Tularemia Vaccine, Protocol	284	Take reaction: not reported	SAEs: none, 2 graded severe
1999	B: Comparative Assessment of F tularensis Vaccine,			
	Live, TSI-GSD-213 Lot 1R, and F tularensis Vaccine,		#(%) MA >1:20: 152/224	AE data not recorded for 128 of
	Live, NDBR 101 Lot 11 (Protocol 87-9, conducted at		(68.3) at 1 month; 208/224	297 doses administered
	USAMRIID and 18 extramural sites) ^j		(92.9) by 12 months	
1965-	Evaluation of Stability and Protective Efficacy of	722	% take reaction: 100	SAEs: none
1988	Tularemia Vaccine, Live, Attenuated, among At-Risk		# (%) MA titer ≥1:20: 298 of	% AEs: 87% had at least 1 AE;
	Personnel (Protocol AB-104) ^k		312 negative at baseline (99%)	90 AEs out of 722 subjects were
			seroconverted	considered related to vaccine

Footnotes:

- a. Protocol 87-4 Double-blind Phase 1 study at USAMRIID from 1987-1991; screened 100; randomized 69 to vaccine (N = 34) or placebo (N = 35). Null hypothesis was a rate of SAEs for vaccinated subjects \leq 5% with an 80% confidence interval.
- b. Metzger J. Tularemia vaccine, live, attenuated. Att. IND 157. Folder 2, Medicine Division Archives, USAMRIID. File. 1965. 70IN.; Bartelloni PJ. Clinical studies of attenuated tularemia vaccine. Commission on Epidemiological Survey. Annual Report to the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board. Fiscal Year 1969:179-185.
- c. Hornick RB et al. Studies on Pasteurella tularensis: Evaluation of a living vaccine for tularemia. The United States Army Medical unit. Fort Detrick, MD. 1958 Annual Report. Section II: 1-5.
- d. Aerogenic Immunization of Man with Live Tularemia Vaccine; Hornick and Eigelsbach-1966; Aerosol dose ranged from 10⁴-10⁸ organisms in 253 healthy subjects in 5 treatment groups.
- e. Each study group in Part II of the study low-dose challenge (1,950 3,252 organisms) and high-dose challenge (21,751 35,100 organisms) included 8 vaccinated and 2 unvaccinated control subjects. Vaccination was protective in both groups though a significantly greater number in the high-dose challenge developed clinical illness in the high dose group, only 1 of 8 needed antibiotics post challenge in the high dose challenge group, and none in the low-dose challenge group compared to 4 of 4 unvaccinated individuals.
- f. In this trial of subjects vaccinated with LVS, 11/ 68 serological responders were aerosol challenged with the SCHU S4 strain *Ft* 14 days post vaccination. 3/5 undergoing low dose challenge (2,200 organisms) were protected with 1/2 of those ill requiring antibiotics. Only 1/6 were protected following high dose challenge (24,250 organisms or 1,000x human infectious dose) though 3/5 who developed symptoms did not require antibiotics. All unvaccinated subjects challenged at low (4 subjects) and high (2 subjects) doses became ill and required antibiotics.
- g. Saslaw S, Carhart S. Studies with tularemia vaccines in subjects. III. Serologic aspects following intra-cutaneous or respiratory challenge in both vaccinated and unvaccinated subjects. Am J Med Sci 1961;241:689-99; Saslaw S, Eigelsbach HT, Wilson HE, et al. Tularemia vaccine study. I. Intra-cutaneous challenge. Arch Intern Med. 1961;107:689.
- h. Two serious adverse events (SAEs) were reported, both requiring hospitalization. 1st was acute appendicitis 23 days after vaccination resolving in 2 days. 2nd was an acute coronary artery disease event occurring 24 days after vaccine administration, and resolving in 21 days. Neither related to vaccine, nor life threatening.
- i. Protocol allowed for a primary vaccination (442/454 97.4% response) and a booster dose (14/19 73.7% response). Response was defined as in other protocols to be microagglutination titer > 1:20. After primary immunization, 441 of 462 subjects (95.5%) had a measurable take reaction, 17 of 19 subjects (89.5%) after the first boost, and 2 of 2 (100%) after the second boost.
- j. Phase 2 study conducted at USAMRIID and 18 extramural sites. Due to perceived safety concerns with TSI GSD 213 Lot 1R, the original protocol was amended to evaluate titer response and collect AE data from approximately 250 male and female subjects vaccinated with NDBR 101 Lot 11 only.
- k. Subjects enrolling in Protocol AB-104 may have received prior tularemia vaccination, including the Foshay inactivated vaccine. In study immune status was assessed in 95% of subjects (692/722); 45% of assessed subjects (312/692) had negative (< 1:20) and 33% (235/692) had positive (≥ 1:20) titers in the 4 months prior to vaccination while 145 subjects (21%) had no baseline titer recorded and were classified as "unknown".

Table 4. Protective effects of live attenuated tularemia vaccine (LVS) or prior tularemia exposure against subsequent tularemia challenge. Summary of historical literature where subjects underwent tularemia challenge after prior exposure or being randomized to vaccination with LVS or unvaccinated control groups. In A. subjects were vaccinated with LVS and then challenged by aerosol, while in B. they had been challenged previously without intervention, thus developing immunity to the disease. Subjects in C. were vaccinated with LVS, then challenged intradermally. In each experiment, subjects underwent subsequent challenge with the virulent SCHU-S4 strain at the doses and route indicated.

A. LVS with aerosol challenge	# Ill vs. # (Challenged	# Ill Requiring Treatment		Reference
Challenge Dose (No. of Organisms)	Vaccinated	Control	Vaccinated	Control	
10 - 50	3/18	8/10			Van Metre-1959
250	1/6	2/2	0	2	Falbich-1946
2,500	2/5	2/2	0	2	Falbich-1946
25,000	28/31	12/14	18	12	Falbich-1946
Total	34/60	24/28	18	16	<u>Paviovskiy-</u> 1953
B. Prior challenge with aerosol challenge	# Ill vs. # Cha	allenged	# Ill Requiring Treatment		
Challenge Dose (No. of Organisms)	Infected	Control	Infected	Control	
2,500	3/8	2/2	2/3	2/2	McCrumb-1962
25,000	6/10	2/2	4/6	2/2	
Total	9/18	4/4	6/9	4/4	
C. LVS with intra- dermal challenge	# Ill vs. # Challenged		# Ill Requiring Treatment		
Challenge Dose (No. of Organisms)	Vaccinated	Control			
2,500	1/10	11/11	Not reported		<u>Sawyer -1962</u>
8,200	1/8	-			
100,000	1/3	-			
Total	3/21	11/11			

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of all of the members of the investigative and regulatory teams who supported tularemia protocols over the years at USAMRIID, particularly Mark Goldberg, Robert Rivard, Craig Koca, Jason Regules, Mark Paxton, Dixion Rwakasyaguri, Sandi Parriott, Lisa Borek, Paileen Mongeli, Latricia Dye, Cynthia Donovan, Denise Clizbe, Kimberly Pozzouli, Arthur Freedlander, Lawrence Korman, Vincent Fulton, Joel Bozue, and Beverly Foghtman. Most importantly we would like to acknowledge the volunteers who did the hard work to advance knowledge on countering tularemia and other biothreats by virtue of their professions and their selfless service.

References

Francis E. Deer-fly fever, or Pahvant Valley Plague. A disease of man of hitherto unknown 1. etiology. Public Health Reports. 1919;34:2061-2.

2. Sanders C, Haun R. Analysis of 106 cases of tularemia. J Louisiana State Med Soc. 1968;120:391-3.

3. Bartelloni PJ. Clinical studies of attenuated tularemia vaccine. Commission on Epidemiological Survey. Annual Report to the Armed Forces Epidemiological Board Fiscal Year 1969.; 1969.

Jacobs RF. Tularemia. In: Fauci AS BE, Isselbacher KJ et al., editor. Harrison's Principles of 4. Internal Medicine. 1. 14th ed1998. p. 971.

5. Dennis DT, Inglesby TV, Henderson DA, Bartlett JG, Ascher MS, Eitzen E, et al. Tularemia as a biological weapon: medical and public health management. JAMA. 2001;285(21):2763-73.

Hornick R. Studies on Pasteurella tularensis: Evaluation of a living vaccine for tularemia. 1958 6. Annual Report. Section II. Fort Detrick, MD: The United States Army Medical Unit.

Control) CUCfD. Key Facts About Tularemia. Can Tularemia Be Used As a Weapon? 2020 [7.

Van Metre TE, Jr., Kadull PJ. Laboratory-acquired tularemia in vaccinated individuals: a report of 8. 62 cases. Ann Intern Med. 1959;50(3):621-32.

Overholt EL, Tigertt WD, Kadull PJ, Ward MK, Charkes ND, Rene RM, et al. An analysis of forty-9. two cases of laboratory-acquired tularemia. Treatment with broad spectrum antibiotics. Am J Med. 1961;30:785-806.

10. Williams MS, Baker MR, Guina T, Hewitt JA, Lanning L, Hill H, et al. Retrospective Analysis of Pneumonic Tularemia in Operation Whitecoat Human Subjects: Disease Progression and Tetracycline Efficacy. Front Med (Lausanne). 2019;6:229.

11. Yeni DK, Buyuk F, Ashraf A, Shah M. Tularemia: a re-emerging tick-borne infectious disease. Folia Microbiol (Praha). 2021;66(1):1-14.

12. Eigelsbach HT, Tulis JJ, McGavran MH, White JD. LIVE TULAREMIA VACCINE I. : Host-Parasite Relationship in Monkeys Vaccinated Intracutaneously or Aerogenically. J Bacteriol. 1962;84(5):1020-7.

13. Falbich MM. Dry living vaccine of NIIEG of the Red Army. Report I. ZhMEI (USSR) 1946;7:59-63.

14. Eigelsbach HT, Downs CM. Prophylactic effectiveness of live and killed tularemia vaccines. I. Production of vaccine and evaluation in the white mouse and guinea pig. J Immunol. 1961;87:415-25.

15. Koskela P, Herva E. Cell-mediated and humoral immunity induced by a live Francisella tularensis vaccine. Infect Immun. 1982;36(3):983-9.

16. Pittman PR, Plotkin S. Biodefense and special pathogen vaccines. In: Plotkin S, editor. Plotkin's Vaccines2018. p. 149.

17. Sato T, Fujita H, Ohara Y, Homma M. Microagglutination test for early and specific serodiagnosis of tularemia. J Clin Microbiol. 1990;28(10):2372-4.

18. Massey ED, Mangiafico JA. Microagglutination test for detecting and measuring serum agglutinins of Francisella tularensis. Appl Microbiol. 1974;27(1):25-7.

19. Lam ST, Sammons-Jackson W, Sherwood J, Ressner R. Laboratory-acquired tularemia successfully treated with ciprofloxacin: a case report. Infectious Diseases in Clinical Practice. 2012;20(3):204-7.

20. Metzger J. Tularemia vaccine, live, attenuated. Att. IND 157. Folder 2, Med Div Archives, USAMRIID. File 70IN. 1965.

21. Sawyer W, Tigertt W, Crozier D. Annual Progress Report – United States Army Medical Unit FY1962:153.

22. Hornick RB, Eigelsbach HT. Aerogenic immunization of man with live tularemia vaccine. Bacteriological reviews. 1966;30(3):532-8.

23. Burke DS. Immunization against tularemia: analysis of the effectiveness of live Francisella tularensis vaccine in prevention of laboratory-acquired tularemia. Journal of Infectious Diseases. 1977;135(1):55-60.

24. Mulligan MJ, Stapleton JT, Keitel WA, Frey SE, Chen WH, Rouphael N, et al. Tularemia vaccine: Safety, reactogenicity, "Take" skin reactions, and antibody responses following vaccination with a new lot of the Francisella tularensis live vaccine strain–A phase 2 randomized clinical Trial. Vaccine. 2017;35(36):4730-7.

25. Kirimanjeswara GS, Olmos S, Bakshi CS, Metzger DW. Humoral and cell-mediated immunity to the intracellular pathogen Francisella tularensis. Immunol Rev. 2008;225:244-55.

26. Forestal CA, Malik M, Catlett SV, Savitt AG, Benach JL, Sellati TJ, et al. Francisella tularensis has a significant extracellular phase in infected mice. J Infect Dis. 2007;196(1):134-7.

27. Rusnak JM, Kortepeter MG, Hawley RJ, Anderson AO, Boudreau E, Eitzen E. Risk of occupationally acquired illnesses from biological threat agents in unvaccinated laboratory workers. Biosecurity and bioterrorism: biodefense strategy, practice, and science. 2004;2(4):281-93.

28. Viljanen MK, Nurmi T, Salminen A. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) with bacterial sonicate antigen for IgM, IgA, and IgG antibodies to Francisella tularensis: comparison with bacterial agglutination test and ELISA with lipopolysaccharide antigen. Journal of infectious diseases. 1983;148(4):715-20.

29. Carlsson HE, Lindberg AA, Lindberg G, Hederstedt B, Karlsson K-A, Agell BO. Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay for immunological diagnosis of human tularemia. Journal of clinical microbiology. 1979;10(5):615-21.

30. Rhinehart-Jones TR, Fortier AH, Elkins KL. Transfer of immunity against lethal murine Francisella infection by specific antibody depends on host gamma interferon and T cells. Infect Immun. 1994;62(8):3129-37.

31. Drabick JJ, Narayanan RB, Williams JC, Leduc JW, Nacy CA. Passive protection of mice against lethal Francisella tularensis (live tularemia vaccine strain) infection by the sera of human recipients of the live tularemia vaccine. Am J Med Sci. 1994;308(2):83-7.

32. Klimpel GR, Eaves-Pyles T, Moen ST, Taormina J, Peterson JW, Chopra AK, et al. Levofloxacin rescues mice from lethal intra-nasal infections with virulent Francisella tularensis and induces immunity and production of protective antibody. Vaccine. 2008;26(52):6874-82.

33. Kirimanjeswara GS, Golden JM, Bakshi CS, Metzger DW. Prophylactic and therapeutic use of antibodies for protection against respiratory infection with Francisella tularensis. J Immunol. 2007;179(1):532-9.

34. Tularemia. In: Stanek SM, Saunders DL, editors. USAMRIID's medical management of biological casualties handbook, 9th Edition: US Government Printing Office; 2020.

35. Shoudy LE, Namjoshi P, Giordano G, Kumar S, Bowling JD, Gelhaus C, et al. The O-Ag Antibody Response to Francisella Is Distinct in Rodents and Higher Animals and Can Serve as a Correlate of Protection. Pathogens. 2021;10(12):1646.

36. Steiner DJ, Furuya Y, Metzger DW. Host–pathogen interactions and immune evasion strategies in Francisella tularensis pathogenicity. Infection and drug resistance. 2014;7:239.

37. Foshay L. Tularemia: Accurate and earlier diagnosis by means of the intradermal reaction. The Journal of Infectious Diseases. 1932:286-91.

38. Tärnvik A, Löfgren M, Löfgren S, Sandström G, Wolf-Watz H. Long-lasting cell-mediated immunity induced by a live Francisella tularensis vaccine. Journal of Clinical Microbiology. 1985;22(4):527-30.

39. Syrjälä H, Herva E, Ilonen J, Saukkonen K, Salminen A. A whole-blood lymphocyte stimulation test for the diagnosis of human tularemia. Journal of Infectious Diseases. 1984;150(6):912-5.

40. Chernecky CC BB. Tularemia agglutinins - serum. In: Chernecky CC BB, editor. Laboratory Tests and Diagnostic Procedures. 6th ed. Saint Louis, MO: Elsevier Saunders; 2013. p. 1052-135.

41. Fortier AH, Slayter M, Ziemba R, Meltzer M, Nacy C. Live vaccine strain of Francisella tularensis: infection and immunity in mice. Infection and immunity. 1991;59(9):2922-8.

42. Kostiala A, McGregor D, Logie PS. Tularaemia in the rat. I. The cellular basis on host resistance to infection. Immunology. 1975;28(5):855.

43. Jemski JV. Respiratory tularemia: comparison of selected routes of vaccination in Fischer 344 rats. Infection and Immunity. 1981;34(3):766-72.

44. Lindgren H, Eneslätt K, Golovliov I, Gelhaus C, Rydén P, Wu T, et al. Vaccine-mediated mechanisms controlling Francisella tularensis SCHU S4 growth in a rat co-culture system. Pathogens. 2020;9(5):338.

45. Eneslätt K, Golovliov I, Rydén P, Sjöstedt A. Vaccine-mediated mechanisms controlling replication of Francisella tularensis in human peripheral blood mononuclear cells using a co-culture system. Frontiers in cellular and infection microbiology. 2018;8:27.

46. Baron SD, Singh R, Metzger DW. Inactivated Francisella tularensis live vaccine strain protects against respiratory tularemia by intranasal vaccination in an immunoglobulin A-dependent fashion. Infect Immun. 2007;75(5):2152-62.

47. Rawool DB, Bitsaktsis C, Li Y, Gosselin DR, Lin Y, Kurkure NV, et al. Utilization of Fc receptors as a mucosal vaccine strategy against an intracellular bacterium, Francisella tularensis. J Immunol. 2008;180(8):5548-57.

48. Syrjälä H, Koskela P, Ripatti T, Salminen A, Herva E. Agglutination and ELISA methods in the diagnosis of tularemia in different clinical forms and severities of the disease. The Journal of infectious diseases. 1986;153(1):142-5.

49. De Pascalis R, Chou AY, Bosio CM, Huang C-Y, Follmann DA, Elkins KL. Development of functional and molecular correlates of vaccine-induced protection for a model intracellular pathogen, F. tularensis LVS. PLoS pathogens. 2012;8(1):e1002494.

50. Sunagar R, Kumar S, Franz BJ, Gosselin EJ. Tularemia vaccine development: paralysis or progress? Vaccine: development and therapy. 2016;6:9.

51. Golovliov I, Twine SM, Shen H, Sjostedt A, Conlan W. A Δ clpB mutant of Francisella tularensis subspecies holarctica strain, FSC200, is a more effective live vaccine than F. tularensis LVS in a mouse respiratory challenge model of tularemia. PLoS One. 2013;8(11):e78671.

52. Rotem S, Cohen O, Bar-Haim E, Bar-On L, Ehrlich S, Shafferman A. Protective immunity against lethal F. tularensis holarctica LVS provided by vaccination with selected novel CD8+ T cell epitopes. PLoS One. 2014;9(1):e85215.

53. Franz BJ, Li Y, Bitsaktsis C, Iglesias BV, Pham G, Sunagar R, et al. Downmodulation of vaccineinduced immunity and protection against the intracellular bacterium Francisella tularensis by the inhibitory receptor FcgammaRIIB. J Immunol Res. 2015;2015:840842.

54. Hartley G, Taylor R, Prior J, Newstead S, Hitchen PG, Morris HR, et al. Grey variants of the live vaccine strain of Francisella tularensis lack lipopolysaccharide O-antigen, show reduced ability to survive in macrophages and do not induce protective immunity in mice. Vaccine. 2006;24(7):989-96.

55. Salomonsson E, Kuoppa K, Forslund A-L, Zingmark C, Golovliov I, Sjöstedt A, et al. Reintroduction of two deleted virulence loci restores full virulence to the live vaccine strain of Francisella tularensis. Infection and immunity. 2009;77(8):3424-31.

56. SASLAW S, EIGELSBACH HT, PRIOR JA, WILSON HE, CARHART S. Tularemia vaccine study: II. Respiratory challenge. Archives of internal medicine. 1961;107(5):702-14.

57. Saslaw S, Carhart S. Studies with tularemia vaccines in volunteers. III. Serologic aspects following intracutaneous or respiratory challenge in both vaccinated and nonvaccinated volunteers. The American journal of the medical sciences. 1961;241:689-99.