1 Health and economic effects of introducing single-dose human papillomavirus

2 vaccination in India.

- 3 de Carvalho TM (PhD)^{1,4,#}, Man I (PhD)², Georges D (MSc)², Saraswati LR (MPhil)³,
- 4 Bhandari P (MSc)³, Kataria I (PhD)³, Siddiqui M (MPH)³, Muwonge R (PhD)², Lucas E
- 5 (MSc)², Sankaranarayanan R (MD)³, Basu P (MD)², Berkhof J (Prof)^{1,4}, Bogaards JA (PhD)^{1,4},
- 6 [§], Baussano I (MD)^{2, §}
- 7 § Authors share co-senior authorship
- 8 # Author to whom correspondence should be addressed
- 9

10 Affiliations:

- 11 1 Amsterdam UMC location Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Epidemiology and Data Science,
- 12 De Boelelaan 1117, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- 13 2 Early Detection, Prevention and Infections Branch, International Agency for Research on
- 14 Cancer (IARC/WHO), Lyon, France
- 15 3 Research Triangle Institute (RTI) International India, New Delhi, India
- 16 4 Amsterdam Public Health, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

17

- 18 Correspondence to: Dr Tiago M de Carvalho, Department of Epidemiology and Data Science,
- 19 Amsterdam UMC, The Netherlands, tm.decarvalho@amsterdamumc.nl
- 20 Running title: Health economics of HPV vaccination in India
- 21 Main text word count: 3112
- 22 Abstract word count: 248
- 23 Number of references: 31

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 ABSTRACT

25 Background

26 Cervical cancer is a major public health problem in India, where access to prevention

27 programmes is low. The World Health Organization-Strategic Advisory Group of Experts

recently updated their recommendation for human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination to

29 include a single-dose option in addition to the two-dose option, which could make HPV

30 vaccination programmes easier to implement and more affordable.

31 Methods

We combined projections from a type-specific HPV transmission model and a cancer progression model to assess the health and economic effects of HPV vaccination at national and state-level in India. The models used national and state-specific Indian demographic, epidemiological and cost data, and single-dose vaccine efficacy and immunogenicity data from the IARC India vaccine trial with 10-year follow-up. We compared single- and twodose HPV vaccination for a range of plausible scenarios regarding single-dose vaccine protection, coverage and catch-up.

39 **Results**

Under the base-case scenario of life-long protection of single-dose vaccination in 10-year-old
girls with 90% coverage, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of nationwide
vaccination relative to no vaccination was \$405 per DALY averted and lay below an
opportunity-cost based threshold of 30% Indian GDP per capita in each state (state-specific
ICER range: \$67 to \$593 per DALY averted). The ICER of two-dose vaccination versus no
vaccination and versus single-dose vaccination was \$1403 and minimum \$2279 per DALY
averted, respectively.

47 Conclusions

| 48 | Nationwide introduction of single-dose HPV | / vaccination in India is highly likely to be cost- |
|----|--|---|
|----|--|---|

- 49 effective whereas extending the number of doses from one to two would have a less
- 50 favourable profile.

51 Funding

52 Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

53 Keywords

- 54 Cervical cancer, human papillomavirus, single-dose vaccination, cost-effectiveness

74 *What is already known in this topic*

In 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) launched a global call for elimination of
cervical cancer as a public health problem, of which HPV vaccination is a key pillar. However,
access to HPV vaccination in India is still very low.

In April 2022, the WHO Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) issued a
recommendation for countries to update their dosing schedules to include a single-dose option.
Single-dose HPV vaccination is likely to be more affordable and would greatly facilitate the
implementation of HPV vaccination.

The key questions for India are whether, with a realistic cost-effectiveness threshold (30% GDP per capita), single-dose HPV vaccination would be a cost-effective intervention; and whether two-dose vaccination could still be affordable and worthwhile compared to a single-dose schedule, given the uncertainty in its initial efficacy and long-term protection.

86 <u>What this study adds</u>

We used state-specific cancer incidence and locally collected cost data and built plausible
vaccination efficacy scenarios based on the IARC India trial to inform the cost-effectiveness
estimates.

Single-dose vaccination in India would be cost-effective under a cost-effectiveness threshold
of 30% of the Indian GDP per capita and the annual budget impact would be less than 10% of
the cost of the current Indian universal childhood vaccination programme.

93 Even though there was substantial heterogeneity, we confirmed that single-dose vaccination94 would be cost-effective across all Indian states.

95 Catch-up single-dose vaccination to age 15 or 20 is a cost-effective strategy. However, the96 decision to implement catch-up will depend on the willingness of the health authorities to

97 support a higher initial investment. We found two-dose vaccination to have a less favourable

98 cost-effectiveness profile.

How this study might affect research practice and policy

- 100 Single-dose vaccination achieved a better balance between health benefits and financial
- 101 burden than two-dose vaccination, even after taking into account uncertainty in the level of
- 102 protection provided by single-dose HPV vaccination.
- 103 Our results could be used by Indian health authorities at the national and state-level to inform
- their decision and planning of the implementation of HPV vaccination in India and could
- 105 convey several lessons for other low and middle income countries.

124 INTRODUCTION

Cervical cancer is a major public health problem. Globally, an estimated 604,000 women 125 were diagnosed with cervical cancer, and 342,000 died from cervical cancer in 2020.¹ Most 126 of the cancer burden is located in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), and in 127 particular, one sixth of the future cervical cancer cases will be diagnosed in India.² HPV 128 vaccination has a high efficacy for preventing cervical cancer,^{3,4} and is a key component of 129 the World Health Organization (WHO) strategy for worldwide elimination of cervical cancer 130 as a public health problem.⁵ The prospect of introducing HPV vaccination into the Indian 131 national immunisation programme (NIP) has improved following the recent marketing 132 authorisation granted to a nationally produced vaccine.⁶ However, at its current cost, 133 implementing two-dose HPV vaccination still requires a large investment, while the health 134 benefits could take decades to accrue.⁷ 135 136

In April 2022, the WHO Strategic Advisory Group of Experts (SAGE) recommended 137 countries to update their dosing schedules to include a single-dose option.⁸ This 138 recommendation was based on data from the IARC India vaccine trial,⁹ the randomised 139 controlled trial in Kenya,¹⁰ and other evidence demonstrating high efficacy of single-dose 140 protection against persistent HPV 16/18 infection, comparable to two doses. Single-dose 141 142 vaccination could make HPV vaccination more affordable. However, there is uncertainty regarding the protection afforded by single-dose vaccination beyond 10 years,¹¹ since 143 antibody levels induced by single-dose vaccination appear to be lower than by multiple-dose 144 vaccination. 145

146

In this study, we derived a comprehensive projection of the health and economic effects of
vaccinating girls against HPV in India. As decisions on introducing HPV vaccination and on

| ers in |
|----------|
| ss of |
| |
| erature. |
| erive |
| |
| specific |
| |
| e e |

159 METHODS

160 *Patient Involvement*

161 No patients were involved in the design and conduct of this research.

162 <u>Modelling Approach</u>

163 We combined an HPV transmission model and a cervical cancer progression model to

164 estimate the health and economic effects of HPV vaccination. The first model, EpiMetHeos,

165 extends an open source framework (EpiModel) for the simulation of dynamic contact

166 networks,¹⁵ and describes transmission of 13 type-specific HPV infection types in India. This

167 model is extensively described in Man et al.¹⁶ Using HPV incidence estimated from

168 EpiMetHeos, the second model simulates the progression from HPV infection to cervical

169 intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN), cervical cancer and death, and is described in the

170 supplementary appendix.

171 We assumed that while HPV infection incidence can be country- or state-specific, the natural

172 history of HPV infection to cervical cancer does not vary across countries. This is a

biologically plausible assumption for women who are not immunocompromised and is

174 commonly adopted in multi-country modelling studies.^{17,18} Natural history parameters were

175 estimated in previous publications based on longitudinal follow-up in the POBASCAM

study,^{19,20} and by statistically linking the age distributions of CIN2/3 and cervical cancer,

177 based on data from the Dutch National Pathology Databank (PALGA) and the Dutch Cancer

178 Registry (IKNL).²¹ Further details are provided in Online Supplement Table A.1 and Online

179 Supplement Figure A.1.

180 <u>Model adaptation to India</u>

181 We calibrated the model to Indian national and subnational data to derive nationwide and state-specific impact projections of HPV vaccination. Since not all Indian states had high-182 quality data on cervical cancer incidence, we derived state-level projections in three steps: 1) 183 we identified clusters of states with high or low cancer incidence; 2) we calibrated 184 EpiMetHeos to type-specific HPV prevalence and sexual behaviour data from a 185 representative high (Tamil Nadu) and low (West Bengal) cancer incidence state (Online 186 187 Supplement Figure A.2); 3) we used the resulting projections to extrapolate cancer incidence to other states within the same cluster. Details about the calibration and clustering are 188 provided elsewhere.^{22,23} 189 190 Furthermore, we adjusted the cancer detection rates to match the observed cervical cancer stage distribution in India, and we used key Indian demographic and epidemiological data, 191 192 including background mortality rate, age distribution and hysterectomy rate. Finally, we extracted 5-year Indian cancer survival based on a literature review (Online Supplement 193 Tables A.2-A.4). Throughout this study, we assumed that no screening took place in India, 194 which is justified by the current very low uptake of opportunistic screening.²⁴ 195

196 <u>Cost Data Collection</u>

We collected Indian data on cervical cancer treatment costs from four hospitals and from the 197 literature (Online Supplement Tables A.5-A.8).²⁵ Cost of the HPV vaccine was set at the 198 GAVI price (\$USD 4.5 per dose). Costs of vaccination programme implementation and 199 delivery were collected for the state of Sikkim, where a pilot HPV programme was 200 implemented. In order to extrapolate these costs to the rest of India, we used state-level 201 delivery cost estimates of the childhood vaccination programme,²⁶ and assumed that the 202 relative differences in delivery costs between states were the same for these programmes 203 (Online Supplement Tables A.9-A.12). 204

205 <u>Vaccination Scenarios</u>

In the base-case scenario, we set vaccination age at 10 years and coverage at 90% as per 206 WHO recommendations. We evaluated both a single-dose and a two-dose schedule. For the 207 two-dose schedule we assumed no drop-out between the first and second dose. We derived 208 four assumptions of vaccine efficacy, based on the lower bound of the vaccine efficacy 209 estimate of the IARC India vaccine trial⁹, and duration of single-dose protection, informed 210 by trial immunogenicity data, based on the time until antibody levels of HPV 16/18 have 211 decreased below different detection thresholds. We refer to Man et al.¹⁶ for details on the 212 construction of these assumptions. In assumption A (used in the base-case scenario) vaccine 213 efficacies under single-dose schedule were assumed to be 95% for HPV 16/18, 9% for HPV 214 31/33/45, and 0% for the remaining oncogenic HPV types, with lifetime duration of vaccine 215 216 protection. Assumptions B, C, and D corresponded to a remaining efficacy 20 years after vaccination of approximately 80%, 75% and 65% for HPV 16/18, respectively. Additionally, 217 assumptions C and D had a lower initial efficacy equal to 90% and 85% for HPV16 and 85% 218 and 55% for HPV18, respectively (Online Supplement Table A.13). 219 In combination with vaccine efficacy and waning assumptions A–D, we evaluated multiple 220 221 levels of vaccination coverage (60%-100%). Finally, we also considered scenarios with

catch-up (CU) vaccination to age 15 or 20 when vaccination was introduced. An overview of

vaccination scenarios is shown in Online Supplement Table A.14.

224 <u>Model Outcomes</u>

225 We provide model-based projections of cervical cancer incidence reductions (Online

226 Supplement Table A.15) and disability adjusted life years (DALYs) averted compared to no

vaccination, as well as the costs of vaccination and savings from cancer treatment costs. We

used these outcomes to compute the incremental costs and health effects relative to no

vaccination and return on investment (ROI) of single-dose vaccination. ROI was calculated
as the ratio between saved cancer treatment costs and vaccination costs and converted to a
percentage. We estimated the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) of single-dose
versus no vaccination, and of two-dose versus single-dose and no vaccination, using a
healthcare payer perspective. ICER was estimated for the whole country and for each Indian
state separately.

Model outcomes are presented by year since the start of vaccination. Time horizon of the 235 analysis is 100 years starting at the year in which vaccination was introduced. Costs are 236 shown in \$USD (and as a sensitivity analysis in \$IUSD, for international comparisons), using 237 2020 prices and 2020 INR/USD and purchasing power parity (PPP) conversion rates. We 238 used a discount rate of 3% for DALYs and costs as recommended by WHO and also show 239 240 undiscounted results. Disability weights and durations associated with each cervical cancer health state were based on the Global Burden of Disease 2017 version (Online Supplement 241 Table A.16). We considered two cost-effectiveness thresholds for the ICER, a) 100% of 242 Indian GDP per capita, as per WHO recommendation (\$1995), and b) 30% of Indian GDP 243 per capita (\$598), based on previous estimates of actual cost-effectiveness thresholds for 244 LMICs.12-14 245

This study adheres to HPV-FRAME, a quality framework for mathematical modelling
 evaluations of HPV-related cancer control.²⁷ The checklist is reported in Online Supplement

 248
 Tables A.17-A.20.

249 <u>Univariate Sensitivity Analyses and Probabilistic Analysis</u>

We varied several economic parameters used for the base-case vaccination scenario. We considered an increase from 3% to 6% in discount rate, a change in cancer treatment costs of $\pm 50\%$, a change of $\pm 50\%$ in the costs of implementation and delivery of vaccination, and 2%

yearly reduction in vaccine price, informed by longitudinal GAVI data on pneumococcal
vaccine prices (S Appendix).

- 255 In the probabilistic analysis, we included uncertainty distributions for the type-specific
- duration from CIN2/3 to cancer, 5-year stage-specific cancer survival probabilities, costs of
- 257 cancer treatment, vaccination implementation and delivery costs. We also included variation
- in type-specific HPV incidence, based on the 100 best-fitting parameter sets of the
- transmission model. We ran 100 Monte Carlo simulations of the no vaccination and base-case
- scenarios, with sampled parameter values based on the distributions shown in Online
- 261 Supplement Table A.21. Results are shown in a scatterplot and as a cost-acceptability curve.
- For the base case scenario, we also report an uncertainty interval (UI) based on the 10th and
- 263 90th percentiles of the model outcomes.

264 **RESULTS**

265 <u>Base Case Scenario</u>

The base-case scenario consisted of single-dose HPV vaccination of girls aged 10 with 90% 266 coverage and lifetime protection (Assumption A). Thirty years after the start of vaccination, 267 annual cancer incidence was projected to decrease by 10% (UI: 4%, 14%). After 50, 75 and 268 100 years since start of vaccination, annual cancer incidence was projected to decrease by 269 45% (UI: 39%, 55%), 68% (UI: 63%, 76%) and 72% (UI: 65%, 79%), respectively (Figure 1, 270 271 Online Supplement Figures B.1-B.6). The total cost of introducing single-dose HPV vaccination was estimated at about \$USD 106 272 million (UI: \$100 million, \$112 million) in the first year. This is comparable with 9% of the 273 274 annual cost of the Indian universal childhood vaccination programme. With no discounting, the intervention would be cost-saving with incremental costs of -\$388 thousand per 100,000 275 women (UI: -\$1,607 thousand, -\$34 thousand) and a ROI of 32% (UI: 3%, 133%) (Online 276 Supplement Figure B.7). However, when discounting costs and DALYs averted at 3% per 277 year, the costs of vaccination outweighed the costs saved from cancer treatment, resulting in 278 279 an incremental cost of \$167 thousand per 100,000 women and a negative ROI of -42% (UI: -57%, 10%) (Figure 2). The ICER in the base-case scenario relative to no vaccination was 280

\$405 per DALY averted (UI:-\$41, \$771), which is below the threshold of 30% of the Indian
GDP per capita (Figure 2).

State-level ICERs are shown in Figure 3 and appendix p. 38. These ranged from \$67 to \$593
per DALY averted and therefore all states had an ICER below the 30% of GDP per capita
threshold. For states classified as high cancer incidence, the ICERs ranged between \$67 to
\$336, while for states classified as low cancer incidence, the ICERs ranged between \$220 to
\$593 per DALY averted.

288 Scenarios of single-dose vaccine protection and vaccination coverage

| 289 | For the worst-case assumption D with 90% coverage, annual cancer incidence decreased by |
|-----|---|
| 290 | 51% after 100 years since start of vaccination, compared to 72% in the base case. ICERs |
| 291 | under 90% coverage (relative to no vaccination) of assumptions B, C, and D were equal to |
| 292 | \$472, \$580 and \$728 per DALY averted, respectively, compared to \$405 per DALY averted |
| 293 | in the base-case. For 60% coverage, the ICER was \$310 for assumption A and \$701 for |
| 294 | assumption D (Figure 2). All scenarios had an ICER below the WHO threshold and all |
| 295 | scenarios except D had an ICER below 30% of the Indian GDP per capita (Figure 2). |
| 296 | Two-dose Vaccination |
| 297 | We assumed that the health effects of two-dose vaccination were the same as for single-dose |
| 298 | vaccination in the base case (Assumption A). The total costs of two-dose vaccination in the |
| 299 | first year were \$200 million. Relative to no vaccination, the incremental costs were \$578 |
| 300 | thousand per 100,000 women, compared to \$167 thousand for single-dose vaccination, and |
| 301 | the resulting ICER was \$1403 per DALY averted (Figure 2 and Online Supplement Figure |
| 302 | B.8). This is about 70% of the Indian GDP per capita. The ICER of two-dose vaccination |
| 303 | compared to single-dose vaccination for scenarios under assumptions B, C and D was |
| 304 | between \$2279 and \$19504 per DALY averted (Figure 4), above the WHO threshold |
| 305 | (\$1995). |

306 Catch-Up Vaccination

With catch-up to ages 15 and 20, we predicted a faster decline in annual cervical cancer 307 308 incidence, for instance, of 16% and 21% after 30 years, instead of 10% without catch-up. Over time, however, annual cervical cancer incidence will become similar to the scenarios 309 without catch-up. The total cost in the first year for catch-up to age 15 was \$475 million, 310 311 which corresponds to 40% of the annual cost of the Indian universal childhood vaccination

| 312 | programme. With catch-up to ages 15 and 20, the ICER ranged between \$378 and \$405 per |
|-----|---|
| 313 | DALY averted (Figure 4, Online Supplement Figure B.9). |

314

315 <u>Sensitivity Analyses</u>

- 316 Valuing costs in \$IUSD instead of \$USD resulted in ICERs more favourable towards
- vaccination (Online Supplement Figures B.10-B14). In the cost sensitivity analyses, we found
- that a 6% discount rate would substantially increase the ICER from \$405 in the base-case
- scenario to \$2513 per DALY averted (Figure 5). Decreasing the treatment costs by 50%, or
- increasing implementation or delivery costs by 50%, resulted in an increase in the ICER to
- 321 \$684 or 596 per DALY averted, respectively. When we assumed that vaccine price would
- drop at a rate of 2% per year, the ICER would decrease to \$127 per DALY averted.
- 323 Taking uncertainty in model parameters and cost variables into account via probabilistic
- analysis, we estimated that single-dose HPV vaccination had approximately 77% probability
- of being cost-effective at a threshold of 30% of the Indian GDP per capita. Only 1% of the
- sampled ICERs were above the WHO threshold. By contrast, in 13% of the draws, single-

327 dose vaccination was cost-saving (Figure 6).

329 **DISCUSSION**

HPV vaccination is a key component of the WHO strategy towards elimination of cervical 330 cancer as a public health problem globally. In Man et al. ¹⁶, we showed that a national 331 immunisation programme relying on single-dose vaccination for 10-year-old girls would be 332 sufficient to meet the WHO-defined elimination target across India. Here, we show that such 333 334 a programme would have an ICER of \$405 per DALY averted, far below the WHOrecommended threshold for cost-effective interventions of 100% GDP per capita (\$1995) and 335 a high probability of achieving an ICER below the more realistic willingness-to-pay threshold 336 of 30% GDP per capita, suggested in previous studies.¹²⁻¹⁴ This corresponds to a total first-337 year budget impact equivalent to 9% of the annual budget of the Indian universal childhood 338 immunisation programme.²⁶ We also show that catch-up single-dose vaccination up to ages 339 340 15 or 20 is a cost-effective strategy. Furthermore, while we found substantial state-level heterogeneity in the ICERs, depending 341 on the projected level of cervical cancer incidence and delivery costs, the 30% threshold was 342 met in every state without exception. On the other hand, we found two-dose HPV vaccination 343 to have a much less favourable cost-effectiveness profile, with an ICER against no 344 vaccination of about 70% of Indian GDP per capita at the current GAVI supported price, and, 345 even for the worst case scenario of single dose protection, an ICER against single-dose 346 vaccination of \$2279 per DALY averted, which is well above the WHO threshold (\$1995). 347 The health and economic effects of introducing HPV vaccination in India have been 348 investigated before. Two previous studies have assessed the cost-effectiveness of two-dose 349 vaccination in India,^{28,29} and two studies assessed the cost-effectiveness of single-dose 350 vaccination.^{30,31} All studies valued costs in IUSD and found that HPV vaccination would be 351 cost-effective at a threshold of 100% GDP per capita. While there is no official cost-352

effectiveness threshold for India, and current willingness-to-pay estimates are uncertain, there is an agreement that a threshold well below 100% of national GDP better reflects opportunity costs for LMICs than the WHO recommendation.¹²⁻¹⁴ Compared to previous studies, our projections are therefore more conservative.

Another strength of our approach, relative to previous studies, is our reliance on context-357 specific data. Assumptions concerning efficacy and long-term protection given by single-358 dose HPV vaccination were based on efficacy and immunogenicity data from the IARC India 359 vaccine trial.9 We used state-specific data on cervical cancer incidence and sexual behaviour 360 to project the state-specific impact of HPV vaccination. Treatment costs were collected from 361 Indian hospitals and from the literature. Implementation and delivery costs of HPV 362 vaccination were collected from Sikkim state government. Extrapolation to obtain national 363 364 cost data was informed by a recent district level cost analysis of routine childhood immunisation in India.²⁶ This also enabled us to quantify the budgetary requirement for HPV 365 vaccine introduction in India in terms of the Indian universal childhood immunisation 366 programme. Estimates of budget impact and return on investment are often lacking in cost-367 effectiveness studies of HPV vaccine introduction in LMICs, and have not been previously 368 available for India. 369

Our study also has limitations. Some of these relate to uncertainty around sexual behaviour and cancer incidence trends in India and are discussed in Man et al.¹⁶ There are also limitations concerning the economic input. While our treatment costs are based on Indian data, it was difficult to obtain a representative sample of costs for the whole country. Our implementation and delivery costs were extrapolated from Sikkim government data, however this state has a relatively small population. Furthermore, we used a payer perspective and therefore we did not take into account costs related to productivity losses.

377 Implementing cervical cancer screening along with nationwide introduction of HPV vaccination could further speed up reduction in cervical cancer incidence. However, currently 378 in India, there are multiple cultural, financial and logistical barriers restricting access to 379 screening, with only 2% of women screened in the age group 35–50 years.²⁴ If single-dose 380 HPV vaccination is implemented, a screening programme could still be worthwhile to align 381 382 with the WHO strategic targets for cervical cancer elimination in the near future. In this mathematical modelling study, we have shown that single-dose HPV vaccine 383 introduction in India is likely to be cost-effective under a stringent willingness-to-pay 384 385 threshold of 30% of the GDP per capita. Two-dose vaccination would have a less favourable cost-effectiveness profile. These results could be used by Indian government health officials 386 in their decision-making on the introduction of HPV vaccination and could convey several 387 388 lessons for implementation in other LMICs.

390 CONTRIBUTORS

- IB, PBa, and RS contributed to funding acquisition of study. The project was supervised by
- 392 IB. TMdC, JB, JAB, and IB co-designed and co-led the formal analysis, investigation,
- validation and visualisation of the study findings. IM and DG contributed to the investigation
- and visualisation of the analyses and study findings. TMdC, JAB, and JB led the
- development of modelling software. TMdC, IM, DG, PB, LRS, RM, EL, KI, and SM were
- responsible for data curation. TMdC and JAB accessed and verified all reported data.
- 397 All authors had full access to all of the data reported in the study. TMdC, JB, and JAB
- drafted the original draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to reviewing, editing, and
- approved the final manuscript. All authors had final responsibility to submit for publication.

400 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

- JB has received support to his institution from the International Agency for Research on
 Cancer (IARC/WHO) outside the submitted work. All other authors have no conflicts of
- 403 interests to declare.

404

405 DATA SHARING

406

External researchers can make written requests to the IARC for sharing of data regarding the 407 408 IARC India vaccine trial. Requests will be assessed on a case-by-case basis in consultation with lead and co-investigators. A brief analysis plan and data request will be required and 409 410 reviewed by the investigators for approval of data sharing. When requests are approved, anonymized data will be sent electronically in password protected files. All data sharing will 411 412 abide by rules and policies defined by the involved parties. Data sharing mechanisms will 413 ensure that the rights and privacy of individuals participating in research will be protected at all times. Data from public sources are listed in the appendix (pp 7-16). The model code is 414 415 available from the authors on request.

| 416 417 | ACKNOWLEDGMENTS |
|------------|--|
| 418 419 | This study was funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (grant numbers: OPP48979; |
| 420 | INV-039876). For the authors identified as personnel of the International Agency for |
| 421 | Research on Cancer or World Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the |
| 422 | views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policies or |
| 423 | views of the International Agency for Research on Cancer or World Health Organization. The |
| 424 | designations used and the presentation of the material in this Article do not imply the |
| 425 | expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WHO and the IARC about the legal |
| 426 | status of any country, territory, city, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the |
| 427 | delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. |
| 428 | |
| 429 | |
| 430 | |
| 431 | |
| 432 | |
| 433 | |
| 434 | |
| 435 | |
| 436 | |
| 437 | |
| 438 | |

439 **References**

440 1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of 441 Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021; 71(3): 442 209-49. 443 Bonjour M, Charvat H, Franco EL, et al. Global estimates of expected and preventable 2. 444 cervical cancers among girls born between 2005 and 2014: a birth cohort analysis. The Lancet Public 445 Health 2021; 6(7): e510-e21. 446 Falcaro M, Castañon A, Ndlela B, et al. The effects of the national HPV vaccination 3. 447 programme in England, UK, on cervical cancer and grade 3 cervical intraepithelial neoplasia 448 incidence: a register-based observational study. The Lancet 2021; 398(10316): 2084-92. 449 4. Lei J, Ploner A, Elfstrom KM, et al. HPV Vaccination and the Risk of Invasive Cervical Cancer. 450 N Engl J Med 2020; 383(14): 1340-8. 451 5. Das M. WHO launches strategy to accelerate elimination of cervical cancer. The Lancet 452 Oncology 2021; 22(1): 20-1. 453 The Lancet O. HPV vaccination in south Asia: new progress, old challenges. Lancet Oncol 6. 454 2022; 23(10): 1233. 455 7. Sankaranarayanan, Rengaswamy, Basu P, et al. Current status of human papillomavirus 456 vaccination in India's cervical cancer prevention efforts. Lancet Oncol 2019; 20(11): e637-e44. 457 8. World Health Organization. One-dose Human Papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine offers solid 458 protection against cervical cancer. 2022. https://www.who.int/news/item/11-04-2022-one-dose-459 human-papillomavirus-(hpv)-vaccine-offers-solid-protection-against-cervical-cancer (accessed April 460 2022. 461 9. Basu P, Malvi SG, Joshi S, et al. Vaccine efficacy against persistent human papillomavirus 462 (HPV) 16/18 infection at 10 years after one, two, and three doses of quadrivalent HPV vaccine in girls 463 in India: a multicentre, prospective, cohort study. The Lancet Oncology 2021; 22(11): 1518-29. 464 Barnabas RV, Brown ER, Onono MA, et al. Efficacy of Single-Dose Human Papillomavirus 10. 465 Vaccination among Young African Women. NEJM Evidence 2022; 1(5): EVIDoa2100056. 466 Sankaranarayanan R, Prabhu PR, Pawlita M, et al. Immunogenicity and HPV infection after 11. 467 one, two, and three doses of quadrivalent HPV vaccine in girls in India: a multicentre prospective 468 cohort study. The Lancet Oncology 2016; 17(1): 67-77. 469 Jit M. Informing Global Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds Using Country Investment Decisions: 12. 470 Human Papillomavirus Vaccine Introductions in 2006-2018. Value Health 2021; 24(1): 61-6. 471 Ochalek J, Lomas J, Claxton K. Estimating health opportunity costs in low-income and middle-13. 472 income countries: a novel approach and evidence from cross-country data. BMJ Glob Health 2018; 473 **3**(6): e000964. 474 Woods B, Revill P, Sculpher M, Claxton K. Country-Level Cost-Effectiveness Thresholds: Initial 14. 475 Estimates and the Need for Further Research. Value Health 2016; 19(8): 929-35. 476 Jenness SM, Goodreau SM, Morris M. EpiModel: An R Package for Mathematical Modeling of 15. 477 Infectious Disease over Networks. J Stat Softw 2018; 84. 478 16. Man I, Georges D, de Carvalho TM, et al. Evidence-based impact projections of single-dose 479 human papillomavirus vaccination in India: a modelling study. The Lancet Oncology 2022. 480 17. Qendri V, Bogaards JA, Baussano I, Lazzarato F, Vänskä S, Berkhof J. The cost-effectiveness 481 profile of sex-neutral HPV immunisation in European tender-based settings: a model-based assessment. The Lancet Public Health 2020; 5(11): e592-e603. 482 483 Berkhof J, Bogaards JA, Demirel E, Diaz M, Sharma M, Kim JJ. Cost-effectiveness of cervical 18. 484 cancer prevention in Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Vaccine 2013; 31 Suppl 7: H71-9. 485 Bogaards JA, Xiridou M, Coupe VM, Meijer CJ, Wallinga J, Berkhof J. Model-based estimation 19. 486 of viral transmissibility and infection-induced resistance from the age-dependent prevalence of 487 infection for 14 high-risk types of human papillomavirus. Am J Epidemiol 2010; 171(7): 817-25.

Rijkaart DC, Berkhof J, Rozendaal L, et al. Human papillomavirus testing for the detection of
high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and cancer: final results of the POBASCAM randomised
controlled trial. *The Lancet Oncology* 2012; **13**(1): 78-88.

Vink MA, Bogaards JA, van Kemenade FJ, de Melker HE, Meijer CJ, Berkhof J. Clinical
progression of high-grade cervical intraepithelial neoplasia: estimating the time to preclinical cervical
cancer from doubly censored national registry data. *Am J Epidemiol* 2013; **178**(7): 1161-9.

494 22. Man I, Georges D, de Carvalho T, et al. Evidence-based impact projections of single-dose 495 human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccination in India. *Lancet Oncol* 2022; **Accepted**.

496 23. Man I, Georges D, Bonjour M, Baussano I. "Footprinting" missing epidemiological data for 497 cervical cancer: a case study in India. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.06.28.22276994.

498 24. Bruni L, Serrano B, Roura E, et al. Cervical cancer screening programmes and age-specific
499 coverage estimates for 202 countries and territories worldwide: a review and synthetic analysis. *The*500 *Lancet Global Health* 2022; **10**(8): e1115-e27.

501 25. Singh MP, Chauhan AS, Rai B, Ghoshal S, Prinja S. Cost of Treatment for Cervical Cancer in
502 India. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2020; 21(9): 2639-46.

503 26. Schueller E, Nandi A, Summan A, et al. Public Finance of Universal Routine Childhood
504 Immunization in India: District Level Cost Estimates. *Health Policy Plan* 2021.

27. Canfell K, Kim JJ, Kulasingam S, et al. HPV-FRAME: A consensus statement and quality
framework for modelled evaluations of HPV-related cancer control. *Papillomavirus Res* 2019; 8:
100184.

508 28. Diaz M, Kim JJ, Albero G, et al. Health and economic impact of HPV 16 and 18 vaccination 509 and cervical cancer screening in India. *Br J Cancer* 2008; **99**(2): 230-8.

510 29. Jit M, Brisson M, Portnoy A, Hutubessy R. Cost-effectiveness of female human papillomavirus
511 vaccination in 179 countries: a PRIME modelling study. *The Lancet Global Health* 2014; **2**(7): e406512 e14.

513 30. Drolet M, Laprise J-F, Martin D, et al. Optimal human papillomavirus vaccination strategies to 514 prevent cervical cancer in low-income and middle-income countries in the context of limited

515 resources: a mathematical modelling analysis. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2021; **21**(11): 1598-

516 610.

517 31. Portnoy A, Abbas K, Sweet S, Kim JJ, Jit M. Projections of human papillomavirus (HPV)

vaccination impact in Ethiopia, India, Nigeria and Pakistan: a comparative modelling study. *BMJ Glob Health* 2021; 6(11).

520

522 Figures/Tables

523 Figure 1: Projected reduction in cervical cancer incidence after introduction of single-

524 dose HPV vaccination in India by scenario.^a

- 525
- 526





^a Vaccine protection assumption A denotes a vaccine efficacy of 95% for HPV 16/18, 9% for HPV 31/33/45,
and 0% for the remaining oncogenic HPV types, with lifetime protection. Vaccine protection assumption D
denotes 85% vaccine efficacy against HPV16, 55% vaccine efficacy against HPV18, with exponentially
decreasing efficacy during the entire lifetime and remaining efficacy 20 years post-vaccination of 65%. Crossprotection for types HPV 31/33/45 starts at 9% with efficacy waning at the same rate as for HPV18. Catch-up
vaccination until age 15 or 20 is shown for 90% coverage in the catch-up cohorts, with vaccine protection
assumption A as in the base-case. HPV=human papillomavirus.

Figure 2: Incremental costs and health effects of single- and two-dose vaccination versus no vaccination.^a

- 538
- 539



540

^a Costs are given in \$USD at 2020 prices. Costs and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted are

542 discounted at 3%. ICER denotes incremental cost-effectiveness ratio per DALY averted relative to no
 543 vaccination. Darker colours denote lower values.

545 Figure 3: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (in \$USD) by Indian state for the base

546 **case scenario.**^a

547



- ^a Base-case scenario denotes single-dose vaccination with 90% uptake among 10-year-old girls, a 95% vaccine
- efficacy against HPV16/18 with no waning, and 9% cross-protection for types HPV 31/33/45. Costs are given in
- thousands of \$USD at 2020 prices. Costs and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted are discounted at
- 552 3%. ICER denotes incremental cost-effectiveness ratio per DALY averted relative to no vaccination.

553 Figure 4: Incremental cost-effectiveness ratio for two-dose versus single-dose

vaccination (assuming lifetime protection for two-dose) and for single-dose vaccination with catch-up. ^a

556



557

^a Costs and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted are discounted at 3%. Costs are given in \$USD at

2020 prices. ICER denotes incremental cost-effectiveness ratio per DALY averted of two-dose vs single-dose(top panel) and relative to no vaccination (bottom panel). In the top panel, Scenario A is not applicable since

561 incremental DALYs of two-dose vaccination is equal to zero. Darker colours denote lower values.



563 Figure 5: Univariate sensitivity analysis on cost variables.

564

^a Costs are given in \$USD at 2020 prices. Costs and disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) averted are

discounted at 3% per year in the base case. ICER denotes incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. The dashed lines
denote the range for cost-effectiveness thresholds, 30% of Indian GDP per capita in \$USD (orange) and 100%
of Indian GDP per capita in USD (red). GDP=gross domestic product.

570 Figure 6: Probabilistic analysis for the base-case scenario of 90% coverage and lifetime

571 **protection.** ^a

- 572
- 573



^a The green dashed line in the left panel denotes the range below which single-dose vaccination is cost-saving.
The dashed lines in the right panel denote the range for cost-effectiveness thresholds, 30% of Indian GDP per capita in \$USD (orange) and 100% of Indian GDP per capita in \$USD (red). GDP=gross domestic product.