Supplementary information Post-exposure vaccination

The first section of this document profiles the individual studies, and the second summarizes the efficacy of post-exposure vaccination by disease.

Additional discussion of individual studies

Notes

Studies in grey have insufficient data for inclusion in the distilled tables/calculating efficacy, but still have useful information regarding post-exposure treatment.

For rabies, only studies with confirmed cases and clear record of timing were included, since exposure can be confirmed and vaccination is typically administered post-exposure.

Inclusion criteria

- Must not be an animal study, serologic study, or systematic review (sometimes used for bibliography mining)
- No experimental/unlicensed vaccines
- Articles in English
- Must include results <1 incubation period post-vaccination, or otherwise imply that postexposure (not preventative) effects are being measured

Variables across studies cited

- Experimental design (randomization, control, sample population)
- Vaccine type and dosage
- Timescale and how closely it was followed
- Definition of exposure

Exposure rating system

1. Exposure is uncertain or ongoing without a close record of timing or timing is followed without a control group

2. Study indicates a known point of exposure but offers no explanation for their approach

3. Point of exposure can be extrapolated because timing has been followed closely and/or it is likely but not explicitly stated that index patients were isolated

4. There is a clear point where exposure occurs, falling before vaccination

Search method

PubMed search terms:

[disease] postexposure vaccine

[disease] postexposure vaccination

[disease] post-exposure vaccine

[disease] post-exposure vaccination

[disease] vaccine after exposure

[disease] vaccination after exposure

Chickenpox/varicella

Study	Sample popu- lation	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of ex- posure	Results	Weaknesses
(Asano, Nakayama H, Yazaki , R, & Hirose , 1977)	Children; household contacts	26 vac- cinated, 19 unvaccinated	Controlled, not random- ized	Healthy, sero- negative	Began with onset in index cases; may be ongoing (1)	Varicella mani- fested in all un- vaccinated con- tacts and no vac- cinated contacts	Couldn't actually ac- cess this paper but used abstract/ took numbers from Mac- artney review – might be discrepancy be- tween the two sources (the abstract is a little confusing about the sample size))
(Asano, Hirose, Iwayama, Miyata, Yazaki, & Takahashi, 1982)	Children; household contacts	30 vaccinated within 3 days, 45 total con- tacts located	May be un- controlled	Healthy, sero- negative	Began with onset in index cases; may be ongoing, but notes when symptoms appear after vaccination (1)	All vaccinated within 3 days were protected from clinical vari- cella while 6-10 contacts showed mild symptoms; if vaccinated 5 days post-exposure, normal varicella developed	Limited quantitative data available; may not have control (couldn't access this paper either, but cited in Plotkin's Vac- cines)
(Arbeter, Starr, & Plotkin, 1986)	Children aged 18 months – 16 years; household contacts	13 vaccine, 13 placebo	Random- ized, dou- ble-blind, placebo-con- trolled	Healthy; vac- cination history undefined	Began with onset of lesions in index case; vaccines ad- ministered within five days (1)	12 severe second- ary cases in the placebo group; 4 mild secondary cases in vaccine group	Timing not thor- oughly explained; no discussion of when exposure ends
(Salzman & Garcia, 1998)	Children; Household contacts	10 vaccine (7 index)	Prospective, observa- tional	No prior history of varicella	Appearance of rash in the index case; vaccines ad- ministered within 3 days (1)	5/10 did not de- velop lesions; the other 5 developed between 5 and 83 lesions all 12-13	No unvaccinated con- trol; ongoing expo- sure but exposure for secondary cases

						days after vac- cination	seems to have oc- curred before vac- cination
(Watson, et al., 2000)	Children <13; shelter con- tacts	42 vac- cinated, 10 not vac- cinated be- cause they were <12 months of age or incorrectly classified as immune	Prospective, observa- tional	Negative re- ported history of varicella and/or no rec- ord of varicella vaccine (no se- rologic confir- mation)	Sharing common eating and recrea- tion room; begins with rash onset in index case; fol- lowing diagnosis, index cases con- fined to their rooms (3)	1 secondary case in the single non- immune unvac- cinated child; 2 in the vaccine group arising 12 days af- ter vaccination	Two groups not com- parable because of differing immuniza- tion history
(Mor, Harel, Kahan, & Amir, 2004)	Children 12 months – 13 years; house- hold contact	22 vac- cinated, 20 placebo	Random- ized, dou- ble-blind, placebo-con- trolled	Negative his- tory of varicella (vaccine was not licensed in Israel at that time), no evi- dence of vari- cella in primary pediatric medi- cal records	Point of exposure defined as begin- ning with first le- sion on index case; vaccines ad- ministered within 72 hours, but ex- posure does not appear to have an endpoint (1)	9 developed vari- cella in both groups (1 case was moderate/se- vere in vaccine group, versus 8 in the placebo)	Ongoing exposure; small sample
(Brotons, et al., 2010)	Individuals presenting at the Preventa- tive Medicine and Epidemi- ology Depart- ment of Vall d'Hebron Hos- pital after household ex- posure	67 patients	Prospective, observa- tional	Negative his- tory of the dis- ease, no evi- dence of previ- ous vaccination	Point of exposure defined as begin- ning with rash on- set in index case; vaccines adminis- tered within 5 days of contact, but exposure does not appear to have an endpoint (1)	45 contacts re- mained well, 10 developed mild chickenpox, 12 developed moder- ate chickenpox	Ongoing exposure; no control group

(Gétaz, et al., 2010)	Inmates in an over-crowded Swiss prison	14 suscepti- ble contacts	Prospective, observa- tional	Serologically proven and HIV-negative	Contact of more than 15 min in the same room or 5 min face-to-face conversation dur- ing contagious pe- riod; all contacts quarantined be- tween days 8-21 after exposure (4)	No post-vaccina- tion rashes or sec- ondary cases doc- umented	No control group be- cause all prisoners with significant expo- sure agreed to partici- pate; small sample of susceptible contacts
(Wu, et al., 2018)	Grade 8 stu- dents; school contact	Previously unvaccinated participants: 27 no PEP, 10 1 st dose as PEP; previ- ously vac- cinated par- ticipants: 88 no PEP, 55 2 nd dose as PEP	Prospective, observa- tional	Offered PEP dose to all stu- dents, but rec- orded immunity status	Began with symp- tom onset in index case; 12 more cases developed over the next 19 days before the PEP campaign, so exposure was on- going (1)	4, 9, 0, and 3 peo- ple developed var- icella after PEP, respective to the groups in the sam- ple size box	Vaccines adminis- tered 19 days after symptom onset in in- dex case; nearly im- possible to isolate a time of exposure

Hepatitis A

Study	Sample population	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of expo- sure	Results	Weaknesses
(Werzberge r, et al., 1992)	Children aged 2-16; community contacts dur- ing ongoing outbreak	519 vaccine, 518 placebo	Randomized, double-blind, placebo-con- trolled	Healthy, sero- negative, had not previously received vac- cine or IG	Not explicitly dis- cussed – tracked days between injection to disease (3)	7 secondary cases arose in the vaccine group and 12 in the placebo during the first 46 days fol- lowing injection	Not a large number of sec- ondary cases; exposure was ongoing and timing only recorded in groups of five days
(Sagliocca, et al., 1999)	Individuals 1-40 years; household contacts of HAV index cases	110 suscep- tible vac- cinated (197 total) and 102 suscep-	Randomized, controlled	Negative for IgG and IgM anti-HAV	Index cases were ad- mitted to hospital; contacts vaccinated within 8 days of symptom onset in in- dex cases (3)	2 secondary cases in vaccinated group (both symptom- less), 12 in unvac- cinated (showed	Unclear when secondary cases occurred (could be incorporating preventative vaccine effects); no mask- ing during randomization

		tible unvac- cinated (207 total) (Fig. 1)				symptoms or al- tered alanine ami- notransferase val- ues)	
(Victor, et al., 2007)	2-40 years; household and day-care laboratory confirmed contacts	568 vaccine, 522 IG	Randomized, double-blind, controlled with IG	Seronegative and between ages 2-40 years; no more than 14 days had passed symptom onset in index pa- tient	Point of exposure counted as day of first symptoms in the lab-confirmed index patient; >97% of in- dex patients were hospitalized and therefore ended expo- sure for contacts (4)	Secondary cases (occurring 15-56 days after expo- sure) occurred in 26 vaccinated con- tacts and 18 IG contacts	No unvaccinated control group; timing not available for individual contacts to the day
(Whelan, Sonder, Bovée, Speksnijder , & van den Hoek, 2013)	Any type of contact; household, sexual part- ner, cared for an in- fected child	Followed Dutch proto- col: 167 vaccinated (<30 years of age or 30- 50 with in- terval <8 days), 24 IG (30-50 with interval longer than 8 days, or >50 years)	Prospective observational	Total anti- HAV negative at baseline; of- fered vaccine if present <8 days after ex- posure and IG <14	Defined as sharing toilet facilities, sexual contact, or taking care of a child with HAV; considered to begin with onset symptoms for family and first contact with case for others, but no clear end (2)	8 secondary cases (occurring 15-50 days after expo- sure) in vaccinated group; none among IG recipients	No unvaccinated control group
(Parrón , et al., 2017)	Exposed people dur- ing out- breaks in Catalonia from 2012- 2016; com- munity, household,	2381 vac- cinated, 190 IG, 611 un- vaccinated	Retrospective cohort	Had to trust previous data; mentions that some suscepti- ble people may have been vac- cinated already	Had to trust previous data; no explicit dis- cussion (1)	17 secondary cases (.71%) among HepA vaccine re- cipients and 184 (30.11%) among unvaccinated par- ticipants	Timing not discussed at all, so results could reflect pre- exposure vaccine effects

day- care/school			
contacts			

Hepatitis B

Study	Sample pop- ulation	Sample size	Design	Definition of sus- ceptible	Definition of expo- sure	Results	Weaknesses
(Szmuness, Stevens, Harley, Zang, & Oleszko, 1980)	HBV-nega- tive homosex- ual men	549 vac- cine, 534 placebo	Double- blind, ran- domized, placebo- controlled	"Exclusive or pre- dominant homosexu- ality; no recent symptoms of hepati- tis; blood specimen (drawn within two weeks of recruit- ment) negative for HbsAG, anti-HBs, and anti-HBc"	No measure of expo- sure; just comparison between incidence in placebo and vaccine recipients; did record some timing of events (1)	Within 45 days (6 weeks is the lower incubation limit) of first injection, 1 hepatitis case arose among vaccine re- cipients while pla- cebo recipients saw 6	Study not specifi- cally aimed at prob- ing post-exposure efficacy; timing in- tervals are large (0- 45 days is one inter- val)
(Beasley, et al., 1983)	Infants of e- antigen-posi- tive/HbsAg carrier moth- ers	159 HBIG + vaccine, 84 controls	Random- ized, blind, controlled	Assumed – they note 80-90% of infants of HbeAg-posi- tive/HbsAg carrier mothers become car- riers before they are 3 months old	Born to an infected mother (4)	5.7% of treated in- fants became chronic HbsAg car- riers compared to 88.1% of controls	Only investigated vaccine + HBIG (neither alone)
(Roumeliotou- Karayannis, Papaevangelou, Tassapoulos, Richardson, & Krugman, 1985)	Spouses of acute hepati- tis B	75 vaccine, 71 placebo	Double- blind, ran- domized, placebo- controlled	Heterosexual cou- ples, had not previ- ously received IG, not pregnant	Sexual contact with an infected person (ad- vised to refrain once receiving treatment); vaccination timing af- ter jaundice recorded (Table 2); timing of subsequent HBV events recorded to the month (3)	Vaccine group saw 11 (14.7%) HBV events in months 1-3 (2 clinical cases, 2.7%); control group had 12 (16.9%) (5 clinical cases, 7.0%) (Fig. 1)	Small number of secondary cases; not enough data to indi- cate an efficacy in- terval for vaccina- tion

(Ip , Leli, Wong, Kuhns, & Reesink, 1989)	Infants born to mothers positive for HbsAg and HbeAg	64 vaccine (Group III), 47 pla- cebo (Group IV)	Random- ized, pla- cebo-con- trolled	Assumed	Born to an infected mother (4)	33 HBV infections in placebo group 0-3 months after birth (70.2%), 11 in vac- cinated group (17.2%) (Fig. 1)	None obvious
(Xu, et al., 1995)	Infants born to mothers positive for HbsAg and HbeAg	29 placebo, 27 and 28 NIAID and BIVS vac- cine (Table 2)	Random- ized, pla- cebo-con- trolled	Assumed – they note >70% risk for mother-to-child transmission during perinatal period	Born to an infected mother (4)	83% of infants re- ceiving placebo are infected by 1 year; 11% and 39% for NIAID and BIVS vaccine recipients	None obvious

Measles

Study	Sample popu- lation	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of ex- posure	Results	Weaknesses
(Berkovich & Starr, 1963)	Children with tuberculosis; hospital con- tacts	9 received PEP vaccine and IG, 6 received PEP vaccine only; also vaccinated a similar group of pa- tients who were not ex- posed to the index case.	Prospective observa- tional	No history of measles	Sharing a ward for 3 days during pro- dromal period in the index case; contact ended 2 days prior to vac- cination (Fig. 1) and timing of post-vaccination symptom onset recorded (3)	For vaccine + IG re- cipients, rash arose in 54% and Koplik spots in 22%; for vaccine alone, 50% and 17% respectively	No control; researchers claim it is likely that the observed illnesses were due to vaccine rather than wild virus
(Watson G. I., 1963)	Household contacts	One family: 3 vaccinated (2 children and mother), 2 unvac- cinated (2 children)	Prospective observa- tional	No history of measles	Proximity to in- fected individuals at school and then at home; claims to have vaccinated on the third day of exposure (2)	No vaccinated con- tacts contracted mea- sles; both unvac- cinated contacts did	Small sample size that precludes drawing any conclusions about tim- ing; unclear when and how contacts were ex- posed

(Ruuskanen, Salmi, & Halonen, 1978)	Children aged 1-5 years; Daycare con- tacts	74 post-ex- posure vac- cine, 442 pre-expo- sure vaccine	Prospective observa- tional, using retrospective control	Negative his- tory of measles collected using questionnaires	>5 children in- fected in a class of 30-40 (2)	5/74 children vac- cinated post-exposure contracted measles (with fever onset an average of 8.1 days following vaccina- tion), no information about other group dur- ing current outbreak	Aimed to compare reac- tions of pre- versus post- exposure vaccination, so omitted information rele- vant to present outbreak (i.e. attack rate among those who did not re- ceive PEP)
(Sheppeard, et al., 2009)	Contacts who shared the same room as a confirmed case during the infectious period; house- hold, social, hospital, school con- tacts	82 MMR, 288 unvac- cinated (93 refused, 195 exposed for >3 days)	Retrospec- tive cohort	Infants from 6- 12 months, chil- dren aged 1-4 without MMR, any individual who had not re- ceived two doses of MMR	2 hours or more in proximity to con- tact; MMR of- fered within 3 days of exposure (or IG within 7) (2)	0/82 MMR recipients contracted measles compared to 13/288 unvaccinated patients	Secondary case not de- fined (i.e. timing of on- set); susceptibility not confirmed serologically; duration and intensity of exposure unclear; some secondary cases may not have been reported
(Barrabeig, et al., 2011)	Children aged 6-47 months; daycare con- tacts	54 vaccine, 21 unvac- cinated (contacts of 10 index cases)	Retrospec- tive cohort	Previously un- vaccinated and had never con- tracted measles	Shared a class- room with index case for at least 1 day during infec- tious period (me- dian time: 2 days). Exposure began 72 hours before the onset of rash in the index case (2)	SAR was 61.9% among unvaccinated contacts and 22.2% for vaccinated (5.9%, 28.6%, 35.7%, 12.5% and 100% for <3, 4- 5,6-7,8-9, and 10-12 days post-exposure re- spectively)	Exposure was continu- ous so difficult to isolate; only 17 children were vaccinated within 72 hours
(Arciuolo, Jablonski, Zucker, & Rosen, 2017)	Contacts of confirmed cases in household, community, and healthcare settings	44 vaccine, 77 IG, 164 no PEP	Prospective, observa- tional	Previously un- vaccinated ac- cording to im- munization rec- ords (all con- tacts >19 ex- cluded for lack of adequate rec- ord)	2 hours or more in proximity to con- tact; must receive MMR within 72 hours of initial ex- posure or IG within 6 days (2)	2/44 developed mea- sles in the vaccine group; 45/164 in the control (Table 2)s	Unclear whether con- firmed cases were iso- lated; exposure duration and intensity remains un- clear; assignment con- founded since control also includes contacts vaccinated postexposure outside ACIP guidelines;

			did not thoroughly inves-
			tigate timing within or
			beyond recommended
			interval

Mumps

Study	Sample popula- tion	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of ex- posure	Results	Weaknesses
(Wharton , Cochi, Hutcheson , Bistowish, & Schaffner, 1988)	School contacts during county- wide outbreak	53 vaccinated with first dose of MMR as PEP, 125 un- vaccinated	Prospective observa- tional	Negative his- tory of mumps dis- ease or vac- cination	Ongoing exposure at school, but cases recorded to the day (3)	15 vaccinated (28.3%) and 51 un- vaccinated (40.8%) of students developed mumps between days 1-21 after the clinic	No mention of dis- ease modification
(Fiebelkorn, Lawler, Curns, Braneburg, & Wallace, 2013)	Orthodox Jewish families in Or- ange County, New York, gen- erally with high contacts rates (average of six members; shared bedrooms)	44 vaccinated as PEP (history: 28 had two doses, 2 had one, 8 unknown status), 195 not vaccinated as PEP (history: 77 had two doses, 40 had one, 78 had un- known status)	Prospective observa- tional	Recorded his- tory of mumps; only included con- tacts where <5 days had elapsed since parotitis onset in index case	Sharing a house- hold with a diag- nosed case; expo- sure likely ongo- ing, but secondary cases occurring be- fore the first incu- bation period were included (3)	9 secondary cases oc- curred during the first incubation period af- ter mumps onset in the index: 1 in a pa- tient with unknown history and PEP; 8 in patients who did not receive PEP	Small sample size; low attack rates. Could be due to im- plementing the study late in the out- break

Rabies

Study	Sample popu- lation	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of exposure	Results	Weaknesses
(Bahmanyar, Fayaz, Nour-Salehi, Mohammadi,	Individuals presenting	45 patients	Prospec- tive obser- vational	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Bitten by dogs and wolves	All individuals protected against rabies	Without knowledge of the risk of contracting rabies without treatment, diffi- cult to quantify results.

& Koprowski, 1976)	with con- firmed rabies exposure				proven to be rabid (4)		All but one received ra- bies immune serum.
(Anderson, et al., 1980)	Individuals presenting with potential rabies expo- sure	90 individuals treated with HDCV, 21 of whom were bit- ten by proven rabid animals	Prospec- tive obser- vational	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Animal bite or scratch wound (4)	All treatment was success- ful (beginning within two days of exposure for 47.2%, within four days for 73.5%, and between nine and 18 days for 8.8%)	Without knowledge of the risk of contracting rabies without treatment, diffi- cult to quantify results. All received Ig on Day 0.
(Helmick, 1983)	Patients re- ceiving PEP from 1980-81 according to CDC surveil- lance data	5654 people re- ceived rabies PEP; 374 were bitten by con- firmed rabid an- imals	Prospec- tive obser- vational	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Bitten by a proven rabid ani- mal; median delay to ex- posure was 5 days (4)	0 patients with confirmed exposure to rabies con- tracted the disease	Delay pertains to all pa- tients receiving PEP, and is not specific to con- firmed exposed group
(Wilde, et al., 1995)	Patients with WHO cate- gory III rabies exposures	100 patients	Prospec- tive obser- vational	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Animals found posi- tive for ra- bies anti- gen; trans- dermal bleeding wounds within 3 days of treatment (4)	All patients survived after conventional 5-dose sched- ule (0, 3, 7, 14, 28 days) plus HRIG on day 0	Without knowledge of the risk of contracting rabies without treatment, diffi- cult to quantify results. All participants received rabies immune globulin
(Wilde, et al., 1996)	Children who received un- successful PEP	5 children	Retro- spective case study	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Severe in- jury after being at- tacked by a rabid dog (4)	These failures likely re- sulted from incomplete/de- layed schedules	Difficult to determine causation of failure since each case varies. All par- ticipants received rabies immune globulin
(Quiambao, et al., 2000)	Patients with confirmed ra- bies exposure	57 patients	Prospec- tive trial	No definition; considered all individuals susceptible	Bitten by animal with positive FA test; pre- sented	0 patients with confirmed exposure to rabies con- tracted the disease	Without knowledge of the risk of contracting rabies without treatment, diffi- cult to quantify results. All participants received rabies immune globulin

					within 5 days (4)		
(Conroy, Vlack, Williams, Patten, Horvath, & Lambert, 2013)	Individuals with PEP ei- ther delayed or deviating from WHO standards	3 men (+1 with potential ABLV exposure)	Retro- spective case study	No definition; no individuals had received a pre-exposure vaccine	Dog bite (rabies sta- tus un- known) (1)	Each case failed to adhere to treatment guidelines and saw delays between expo- sure and seroconversion	Small sample; no proof of exposure

Smallpox

Study	Sample popula- tion	Sample size	Design	Definition of susceptible	Definition of expo- sure	Results	Weaknesses
(Henderson, Inglesby, O'Toole, & Mortimer, 2003)	Secondary cases listed among anonymous medical records from 1882 (only considering data from Fig. 1)	26 patients vaccinated during incuba- tion; 8 with "good" or "fair" previous vaccinations, 5 "poor" previ- ous vaccina- tions, 11 with- out previous vaccinations, and 2 un- known	Likely prospec- tive obser- vational, but unclear	Vaccination history rec- orded; method unclear	All included cases are infected and timing of vaccina- tion to symptom on- set has been rec- orded (3)	5 deaths: 4 among previously unvac- cinated people, all among those vac- cinated 5 or more days after exposure	No discussion of pa- tients in which postex- posure vaccination prevented disease; rec- orded cases likely come from hospitals, which would not fac- tor in undiagnosed or mild cases
(McVail, 1902)	Secondary cases known to have been vaccinated within 2 weeks after exposure	126 patients (101 with vac- cination tim- ing recorded)	Prospec- tive, ob- servational	History of dis- ease not rec- orded	All included con- tacts had already contracted small- pox; interval be- tween vaccination and symptom onset recorded (3)	7 cases among pa- tients vaccinated on days 0-3 post-expo- sure, 47 cases for days 4-7, 41 cases for days 8-11 (assum- ing 12 day incubation period)	Unclear how many to- tal received post-expo- sure vaccination (400,000 individuals vaccinated in total); no discussion about the effects of vaccina- tion history

(Hanna & Baxby, 2002)	Patients in Liv- erpool who re- ceived post-ex- posure vaccina- tion	25 previously vaccinated re- ceived vaccine during incuba- tion period (out of 45 to- tal), 18 previ- ously unvac- cinated (30 to- tal) (Charts B and C)	Prospec- tive, ob- servational	History of vaccination included	All included con- tacts are infected; timing, vaccine suc- cess, and disease se- verity recorded (3)	All vaccination and re-vaccination during the incubation period was successful, usu- ally modifying dis- ease and never result- ing in death (60/220 fatality rate for un- vaccinated cases, Ta- ble I)	No discussion about patients protected by post-exposure vac- cination
(Sutherland, 1943)	Secondary cases in Glasgow, Fife, and Edin- burgh who were vaccinated 3-14 days before symptom onset	26 patients: vaccination to rash interval of 3-8 days for 12 patients and 9-14 for 14 pa- tients (Table VIII) **What is the "expected" value?	Retrospec- tive cohort	Vaccination history ("in- fantile vac- cination") not explicitly stated for post-exposure data	All included con- tacts have smallpox; timing from vac- cination to rash on- set recorded (3)	6 fatalities; 5 corre- sponding to vaccina- tion-rash intervals of 3-8 days (5/12=41.7%) and 1 for an interval of 9- 14 days (1/14=7.1%); 7/16 fatal for totally unvaccinated individ- uals	Small sample; no re- ported vaccination his- tory; no discussion of successful postexpo- sure vaccination
(Dixon, 1948)	Immediate fam- ily contacts who were admitted to a hospital for observation, ex- cluding adult males who had been recently vaccinated	56 vaccinated after contact, 123 before contact, 167 vaccinated un- successfully (defined as an absence of ve- siculation), 132 never vac- cinated (Table 6)	Retrospec- tive cohort	Vaccination history in- cluded	Household contact in "the cramped confines of Tripoli"; some cases and con- tacts were isolated throughout the epi- demic, but not con- sistently and some- times together (3)	Mortality was 0%, 19.3%, and 25% for those vaccinated 1-5, 6-10, and 10+ days after contact; 0% for those vaccinated be- fore contact; 28.7% for those vaccinated unsuccessfully; 25.7% for those never vaccinated	Much fewer patients vaccinated post-expo- sure compared to other categories; un- clear how many peo- ple did not contract smallpox after contact and vaccination
(Smith C. S., 1948)	Contacts of four suspected cases kept under sur- veillance for 21 days	No quantita- tive data throughout; all contacts of- fered vaccina-	Retrospec- tive cohort	Vaccination history not ex- plicitly stated; indicates that many were	Suggests that index cases were not fully isolated; exposure was likely ongoing (1)	"Confluent cases oc- curred where suc- cessful vaccination had been carried out nine and eight days	No quantitative data; no discussion of suc- cessful postexposure vaccination

		tion, all re- ceived three incisions		vaccinated during WWII		before the appear- ance of the true smallpox rash"; "modified cases oc- curred where vac- cination had been carried out -2 days before the rash ap- peared"	
(Rao, 1972)	Cases of small- pox admitted to the Infectious Diseases Hospi- tal in Madras (around 7,000 in total)	1453 unvac- cinated, 502 vaccinated af- ter exposure	Retrospec- tive cohort	Vaccination included; in- ferred from presence of a scar	All included con- tacts have a second- ary case; exposure timing is not dis- cussed (1)	Fatality rates of 42.7% and 23.5% among those unvac- cinated and primarily vaccinated after ex- posure (Table 5.1)	No discussion about when post-exposure vaccination occurred
(Douglas & Edgar, 1962)	Hospital con- tacts of a single smallpox case	All hospital contacts vac- cinated within 6 days of ex- posure; no to- tal number provided	Case stud- ies	No satisfac- tory evidence of vaccination history	Index cases quaran- tined; 14 secondary cases, 6 of them fa- tal (4)	Notes that vaccina- tion 11 days post-ex- posure was ineffec- tive and vaccination within 24 hours re- sulted in mild disease	Only case studies and not a large sample; no discussion of pro- tected populations
(Heiner, Fatima, & McCrumb, 1971)	Household and compound con- tacts, visited less than 100 days after onset in index case	Of previously unvaccinated people: 2 vac- cinated within one week of exposure, 92 not vaccinated within one week of expo- sure (Table 8)	Prospec- tive, ob- servational	Vaccination history in- cluded, deter- mined by physical ex- amination of scars and questionnaire	Classified as con- stant, daily, or inter- mittent, and begins with rash onset in the index case; iso- lation not customary (1)	For the previously unvaccinated, SAR was 0/2=0% for those vaccinated within 7 days of exposure and 73/92=78.5% for those not vaccinated post-exposure (for previously vaccinated people, those rates were 1/46=2.2% and 15/285=5.3% respec- tively)	Small sample vac- cinated within one week; timing of sec- ondary case onset not explained
(Mack, Thomas, Asghar, &	Contacts in 31 households of index cases	Of previously unvaccinated people: 16 vaccinated	Retrospec- tive cohort	History of vaccination and disease, obtained	Living in a house with an infected	75% of those vac- cinated within 10 days developed smallpox compared	No discussion of mor- tality

Khan, 1972)		within 10 days of exposure, 27 not vac- cinated within 10 days of ex- posure (180 previously vaccinated)		through physi- cal examina- tions and in- terviews with patients or im- mediate fam- ily members	person; isolation fa- cilities not available (1)	to 96% of those who were not (Table 2)	
(Mack, Smallpox in Europe, 1950-1971, 1972)	Secondary vari- ola major cases among hospital staff, hospital clientele, and general public in Europe from 1950-1971	70 vaccinated after contact, 412 before contact, 79 never vac- cinated, 119 unknown	Retrospec- tive cohort	Vaccination history in- cluded; how- ever, it is of note that many index cases showed record of suc- cessful child- hood vaccina- tion	All included con- tacts have a second- ary case, and 78% of index cases were isolated (3)	Fatality rate of 29% among those vac- cinated only after ex- posure; 52% for those never vac- cinated	No discussion of post- exposure timing; no discussion about suc- cessful post-exposure vaccination. Condi- tioning on a secondary case may bias the esti- mation of effective- ness.
(Sommer, 1974)	Secondary cases (occurring >1 week of rash on- set in index case) among household con- tacts	277 unvac- cinated, 1772 vaccinated (Table 4)	Prospec- tive, ob- servational	Vaccination history in- ferred from presence of a scar or given by a relative	Sharing a household with at least one case of active small- pox; index cases were identified through the Infec- tious Disease Hospi- tal, so it is likely hospital admission ended further con- tact (3)	SAR given postexpo- sure vaccination be- tween days 0-9 was 14/1772; 4/277 in un- vaccinated people	Post-exposure timing not always explained; assumes all partici- pants exposed at the same time
(Mazumder, De, Mitra, & Mukherjee, 1975)	Patients admit- ted to the Infec- tious Diseases Hospital, Cal- cutta	901 total un- vaccinated pa- tients; 34 vac- cinated during incubation pe- riod (Tables 6- 7)	Prospec- tive, ob- servational	History of vaccination and disease, collected for 1218 patients; methods un- clear, and his- tory not in- cluded for	Nature of exposure unknown; time be- tween vaccination and fever onset rec- orded (3)	Susceptible patients vaccinated anytime during incubation had a fatality rate of 14/34=41.2% (40% within 7 days of ex- posure; 53.4% over- all fatality for suscep- tible secondary cases)	No mention of effect on morbidity or pro- tected populations

				post-exposure data			
(Massoudi, Barker, & Schwarz, 2003)	Veterans of smallpox eradi- cation	9 experts (for consultation, not vaccina- tion)	Delphi technique (expert panel to systemati- cally build consensus)	Estimates in- cluded for previously un- vaccinated people and vaccinated >30 years prior	n/a (not included in exposure rating)	Vaccination prevents disease with a 93%, 90%, and 80% effi- cacy if administered 0-6 hours, 6-24 hours, or 1-3 days post-exposure and 80%, 80% and 75% effective in modify- ing disease among those who contract the disease	Panelists only worked in countries with en- demic smallpox where partial immunity was likely

More sources cited in Nishura review that aren't in English: data from Germany, Yugoslavia, and Japan.

Tetanus

Study	Sample pop- ulation	Sample size	Design	Defini- tion of suscepti- ble	Definition of exposure	Results	Weaknesses
(Collins, White, Ramsay, & Amirthalingam, 2015)	Cases of fatal tetanus	2 patients	Retrospec- tive case studies	n/a	Serologically confirmed in- fection (4)	Delays in treatment after exposure to treatment will likely result in death	Small sample; no pro- tected group for compari- son

Additional discussion of individual diseases

Discussed	Not discussed
Vaccines with studies included	Cholera
Chickenbox/varicella	Dengue
Hepatitis A	Hepatitis E
Hepatitis B	Hib
Measles	HPV (see full text)
Mumps	Influenza
Rabies	Japanese encephalitis
Smallpox	Malaria
Vaccines without studies included	Meningococcal meningitis
Anthrax	Pertussis
Diphtheria	Pneumococcal disease
Plague	Poliomyelitis
Tetanus	Rotavirus
Typhoid	Rubella
	Tick-borne encephalitis
	Tuberculosis (see full text)
	Yellow fever

Vaccines with studies included

Chickenpox/Varicella Incubation period: 14-16 days (range: 10-21) Vaccination timing: very successful within 3 days, with positive effects through a week

The live-attenuated varicella vaccine has demonstrated post-exposure effects in various randomized control trials (RCTs) and routine immunization programs. In 1977, Asano et. al. hypothesized that the vaccine virus may prompt humoral and cellular immunity in less time than its wild form,¹ an effect which was confirmed by a series of clinical trials in Japan and the U.S. over the next few decades. In general, the vaccine prevented 90% of clinical illness if administered within three days of exposure and 67% within five days.^{2 3} It was also 100% effective at curbing moderate to severe illness within the first week.² In the early 2000s, one similar RCT⁴ refuted these statistics and found no significant effect of vaccination on secondary attack rate (SAR). However, post-exposure treatment still reduced disease severity 86% of the time, and many other studies have corroborated the initial results: including one following a grade 8 outbreak in Shanghai, China and another at a women and children's shelter in Philadelphia.^{5 6} Since 1999, the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) has recommended the varicella vaccine for post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP),⁷ and Canada has similar guidelines.⁸ It is worth noting, though, that most existing literature focuses on children and has limited evidence for adolescents and adults.

Hepatitis A Incubation period: 28 days (range: 15-50) Vaccination timing: successful within two weeks for those aged 12 months through 40 years; efficacy is lower for individuals outside this range

Routine childhood vaccination began for hepatitis A in 1996, but until recently, the ACIP recommended immune globulin (IG) for treatment after exposure.⁹ Soon after its licensure, researchers recognized the advantages of the vaccine over IG – enduring protection, widespread availability, and ease of administration – and soon began looking into using it as an alternative form of PEP. Reactive vaccination RCTs had already exhibited evidence of a post-exposure effect and indicated that immunization offer have benefits up to one week after exposure.^{10 11} Later studies extended this interval to two weeks, while also observing no significant difference in efficacy between the vaccine and standard IG.^{12 13} In 2007, the ACIP updated their recommendations to include the hepatitis A vaccine for PEP among healthy individuals aged 12 months through 40 years.⁹

However, evidence of post-exposure efficacy is compromised due to the logistics of conducting trials in low-endemic countries, and the fact that the clinical course of hepatitis A differs significantly with age: more than 80% of childhood cases are asymptomatic and result in lifelong immunity,¹⁴ while adults are more likely to develop a severe infection.¹³ In recent years, disease incidence has increased among susceptible adults because of routine vaccination programs and improved living conditions.¹⁰ Studies indicate that post-exposure vaccination may not be as effective for these older populations (>40 years old), since they exhibit lower antibody titers and a longer time to seroconversion after vaccination; one review estimated a >70% efficacy for adults aged 40-49 and >50% for all adults >40.⁹ Because of limited data, the ACIP has maintained IG as preferential for those under 12 months or over 40 years, or with pre-existing medical conditions; but in light of rising costs of IG and the possibility of an adequate response, they recently added that the vaccine should be used if IG is unavailable.⁹

Hepatitis B

Incubation period: 90 days (range: 60-150)

Vaccination timing: vaccination beginning within 24 hours of birth prevents HBV among infants born to HBeAg-positive mothers; vaccination + HBIG within one week of exposure is believed to be effective for other modes of transmission

It has been widely demonstrated that the hepatitis B vaccine is an effective form of protection after exposure to HBV, either alone or in conjunction with HBIG. Up to 50% of hepatitis B carriers received the disease from mothers, so significant research has been put toward evaluating perinatal vaccination effectiveness.¹⁵ If mothers are HBeAg-positive, randomized, controlled trials have proven that vaccinating their infants at birth without HBIG prevents about 75% of HBV infections^{16 17}. A 2015 study found that perinatal HBV infections occurred in just 1.1% of 9252 infants born to HBsAg-positive women who received the ACIP-recommended immunoprophylaxis: HepB vaccine and HBIG within 12 hours of birth, followed by completing the full 3-dose vaccine series.¹⁸ Few conclusions have been drawn in regard to optimal dosage and scheduling (0, 1, and 6 months versus 0, 1, 2, and 6 or 12 months), and there is no apparent difference in post-exposure efficacy between recombinant and plasma-derived vaccines.¹⁵ Initial studies recommended combining vaccination with HBIG for optimal PEP, but newer research indicates that HBIG can actually weaken long-term protection (12-60 months).¹⁹

Sexual and percutaneous transmission are other ways to contract the disease, and due to its long incubation period, the ACIP recommends a combination of active and passive immunization within one week of exposure.¹⁷ However, the efficacy of this treatment has not been thoroughly evaluated for these settings,²⁰ and no comparisons have been drawn between vaccination and HBIG.

Measles

Incubation period: 10-12 days Vaccination timing: >90% effective within 72 hours

Vaccination with MMR can prevent measles over 90% of the time if administered within three days after exposure.^{21 22 23 24} PEP effects begin to diminish past that time, with one study finding that vaccine effectiveness drops from 90.5% to 53.8% if 4-5 days pass, then 42.3% for 6-7 days.²² This treatment has even proven successful among a group of children with tuberculosis,²⁵ although research is lacking for post-exposure efficacy in adults. Most individuals born in the United States before 1957 are believed to be immune,¹⁷ but because age increases the risk of complication, this might be an area meriting further exploration.

In addition, despite the proven success of post-exposure vaccination, its brief three-day window complicates disseminating the vaccine in practice. Measles is most contagious during the symptomless prodrome, which causes delays in identifying exposed individuals. As a result, patients are often treated with IgIM and IgIV instead, which is effective for twice as long after exposure.¹⁷

Mumps

Incubation period: 16-18 days (range: 12-25) Vaccination timing: Absent/unclear effect

There is currently no data indicating that the MMR vaccine has a significant post-exposure effect on mumps.²¹ During an outbreak in one Tennessee high school in 1986, 28.3% of previously-unvaccinated students receiving MMR as PEP developed mumps compared to 40.8% of students who were not receiving treatment.²⁶ Another study offered a third dose of MMR to household contacts in New York, but that population saw no significant statistical difference in SAR compared to those who did not receive PEP (0% versus 5.2%).²⁷

Rabies

Incubation period: 1-3 months, ranges several days to years

Vaccination timing: effective with IG following Essen schedule (vaccinating days 0, 3, 7, and 14); no robust data on the effect of timing

The rabies vaccine has a well-known post-exposure effect. While a rabies infection generally results in death if left untreated, the current PEP recommendations are almost always successful: thorough wound cleansing and HRIG followed by a cell culture rabies vaccination (human diploid cell vaccine or purified chick embryo cell vaccine) on days 0, 3, 7, and 14 after presentation (a fifth dose was recently removed).^{17 28} No time interval after exposure should preclude beginning PEP, and lapses of a few days from the schedule are thought to be inconsequential.¹⁷ In the

U.S., treatment is initiated an average of 5 days after bite exposure, and there have been no reported failures.²⁹ Larger deviations, however, have not been studied rigorously, and the effect of longer scheduling delays remains unclear.³⁰ Of the PEP case studies available, most failures are attributed to insufficient wound infiltration or RIG dosage, not vaccine schedule.³¹

Smallpox

Incubation period: 7-17 days, average of 12.5

Vaccination timing: highly effective within 3 days post-exposure, partial protection up to 7 days

Although vaccination eradicated smallpox over 40 years ago, orthopoxvirus outbreaks and the use of variola major for bioterrorism remain public health concerns.^{32 33 34 35} Routine vaccination ended in 1980, and in the absence of mass-immunity, post-exposure vaccination could be a critical countermeasure. However, limited data exists about optimal timing and overall efficacy of the vaccine for PEP, despite its widespread historical use and inclusion as part of the World Health Organization eradication strategy.³⁵ As early as 1904, reactive vaccination within three days of exposure helped curb outbreaks and was believed to reduce symptom intensity if administered at any point before symptom onset.³⁴ In 1972, a study in Bangladesh found that vaccination within a week yielded a SAR of 1.2% compared to a control of 22.2%.³⁶ However, these historical findings cannot necessarily be generalized to current populations: most studies only considered first generation vaccines, and prior immunity in historical populations was likely underestimated.³⁴ In addition, reports often lack information about patients who were ultimately protected by post-exposure vaccination, and therefore can only compare morbidity and mortality between vaccinated and unvaccinated patients but not speak to protective efficacy.³³ One exception was a later report out of West Pakistan, which indicated an efficacy of 91.3% - but their findings are compromised by a sample population which included both unvaccinated and previously vaccinated individuals.³⁵ Instead of working with problematic data, one group of researchers turned to an expert panel in an approach called the Delphi technique. Their report collates opinions from nine smallpox veterans and estimated that vaccination is 93%, 90%, and 80% effective at preventing disease within 0-6 hours, 6-24 hours, and 1-3 days of exposure respectively, and 80%, 80%, and 75% effective at modifying disease among those who develop illness.³⁵

Others have examined the vaccine for post-exposure prophylaxis from a biological perspective and found that timescales align with historical observation. The virus usually begins by infecting mucosal cells in the respiratory tracts, where it replicates and spreads to regional lymph nodes and lymphoid organs after about 3 days. Around day 8, intense secondary viremia occurs and stimulates prodromal symptoms.³⁵ The characteristic rash follows 2-3 days later, resulting in a total incubation period averaging 12.5 days. However, the vaccinia virus is able to bypass the respiratory tract stages and induce antibody response 4 to 8 days earlier than a naturally-acquired smallpox infection.³⁷ This suggests that vaccination would provide considerable protection if administered within 3 days post-exposure, and at least partial protection up to a week after.¹⁷

Vaccines without studies included

Anthrax

Incubation period: 1 day (cutaneous), 1-7 days (pulmonary) Vaccination timing: Absent/unclear effect At present, no controlled human trials have explored the efficacy of the currently licensed anthrax vaccine, let alone its post-exposure effects.¹⁷ Animal models have shown that adding vaccination to post-exposure antibiotic treatment increases survival rates, but they have not looked into vaccine efficacy without antibiotics, and optimal timing remains unclear.³⁸ Some researchers posit that a supplementary vaccination could help counteract anthrax spores that survive antibiotic prophylaxis, which they have been shown to do for up to 100 days after inhalation in primates.^{17 39} However, due to the short incubation period and rapid onset of an anthrax infection, the vaccine is not believed to mount a fast enough response on its own.¹⁷ Until further data is available, the FDA recommends antimicrobial treatment for 60 days along with three doses of the vaccine.⁴⁰

Diphtheria Incubation period: 2-5 days (range: 1-10) Vaccination timing:

Diphtheria is typically treated with an equine antitoxin injection (DAT) in conjunction with antibiotic therapy.⁴¹ An alternative – and according to some studies, preferred⁴² – treatment is the diphtheria toxoid, which eliminates the risk of adverse effects that often result from antitoxin.¹⁷ Although the toxoid has proven effective in several outbreak settings,^{43 44 45} no studies have rigorously explored its efficacy after exposure.

Plague Incubation period: 1-3 days (pneumonic), 3-6 days (bubonic) Vaccination timing: Absent/unclear effect

No plague vaccines are currently licensed for use in the U.S., although several have been developed.¹⁷ The previously-available killed-whole-cell (KWC) vaccines required several months to induce immunity, which would likely prevent an adequate post-exposure response. A newer subunit vaccine, rF1/V, stimulates a faster response but is not believed to to provide post-exposure protection in a previously unvaccinated individual.¹⁷

Tetanus

Incubation period: 10 days (range 3-21, depends on location and severity of wound) Vaccination timing:

Due to widespread vaccine uptake, the incidence of tetanus in the U.S. has decreased by more than 98% since the 1940s to only .01 cases per 100,0000 people in 2016. However, because immunity requires routine booster doses and is never acquired naturally, post-exposure tetanus prophylaxis remains an important topic.¹⁷ For clean, minor wounds, a booster dose of the tetanus toxoid is recommended for patients who have not received a complete three-dose schedule, or if ten or more years have passed since their last immunization. This threshold is reduced to five years for more severe lesions:^{17 46} those that are deep or punctured; contaminated with dirt, feces, or saliva; and have devitalized tissue like burns, gangrene, and frostbite. Unless the wound falls under this category and the patient has not received a full primary schedule, the vaccine generally provides adequate protection without TIG.¹⁷ For patients who do not have detectable antitoxin but have previously received the full series, vaccination can bring those levels back up

within 4 to 7 days after a booster dose.¹⁷ The timescale of post-exposure treatment has not been investigated systematically, but delays would allow additional tetanus neurotoxin to bind to the peripheral and central nervous system. As a result, post-exposure vaccination should be administered as quickly as possible.⁴⁷

Typhoid

Incubation period: 8-14 days (range: 3 days – 1 month) Vaccination timing: Absent/unclear effect

Typhoid bacilli find an intracellular habitat within 24 hours, while incubation after ingesting a large inoculum may be less than a week.¹⁷ As a result, the oral vaccines that are currently available would not have time to mount an adequate response post-exposure

³ Asano Y, Hirose S, Iwayama S, et al. Protective effect of immediate inoculation of a live varicella vaccine in household contacts in relation to the viral dose and interval between exposure and vaccination [abstract]. *Biken J.* 1982;25(1):43-45.

⁴ Mor M, Harel L, Kahan E, et al. Efficacy of postexposure immunization with live attenuated varicella vaccine in the household setting—a pilot study. *Vaccine*. 2004;23(3):325-328.

⁵ Watson B, Seward J, Yang A, et al. Postexposure effectiveness of varicella vaccine. *Pediatrics*. 2000;105(1):84-88.

⁶ Wu QS., Liu JY, Wang X, et al. Effectiveness of varicella vaccine as post-exposure prophylaxis during a varicella outbreak in Shanghai, China. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2018;66:51-55.

⁷ Marin M, Güris D, Chaves S, et al. Prevention of Varicella: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practice (ACIP). *MMWR Recomm Rep.* 2007;56:1-40.

⁸ McDonald J. Evidence for Clinicians - Vaccines for postexposure prophylaxis against varicella (chickenpox) in children and adults. *Paediatr Child Health.* 2016;21(2):91-92.

⁹ Link-Gelles R, Hofmeister M, Nelson N. Use of hepatitis A vaccine for post-exposure prophylaxis in individuals over 40 years of age: A systematic review of published studies and recommendations for vaccine use. *Vaccine*. 2018;36(20):2745-2750.

¹⁰ Werzberger A, Mensch B, Kuter B, et al. A Controlled Trial of a Formalin-Inactivated Hepatitis A Vaccine in Healthy Children. *N Engl J Med.* 1992;327(7):453-457.

¹¹ Sagliocca L, Amoroso P, Stroffolini T, et al. Efficacy of hepatitis A vaccine in prevention of secondary hepatitis A infection: a randomised trial. *Lancet*. 1999;353(9159):1136-1139.

¹² Victor J, Monto A, Surdina T, et al. Hepatitis A Vaccine versus Immune Globulin for Postexposure Prophylaxis. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(17):1685-1694.

¹³ Whelan J, Sonder G, Bovée L, et al. Evaluation of Hepatitis A Vaccine in Post-Exposure Prophylaxis, The Netherlands, 2004-2012. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(10):e78914.

¹⁴ Parrón I, Planas C, Godoy P, et al. Effectiveness of hepatitis A vaccination as post-exposure prophylaxis. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2017;13(2):423-427.

¹⁵ Lee C, Gong Y, Brok J, et al. Effect of hepatitis B immunisation in newborn infants of mothers positive for hepatitis B surface antigen: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2006;332(7537):328-336.

¹⁶ Beasley RP, Lee GY, Roan CH et al. Prevention of perinatally transmitted hepatitis B virus infections with hepatitis B immune globulin and hepatitis B vaccine. *Lancet*. 1983;322 (8359):1099-1102.

¹⁷ Plotkin, S, Orenstein W, Offit P et al. *Plotkin's Vaccines*. 7the ed. Philadelphia, PA: Elsevier; 2017.

¹⁸ Schillie S, Walker T, Vesely S, et al. Outcomes of Infants Born to Women Infected With Heptatitis B. *Pediatrics*. 2015;135(5):1141-1147.

¹⁹ Roumeliotou-Karayannis A, Papaevangelou G, Tassapoulos N, et al. Post-exposure active immunoprophylaxis of spouses of acute viral hepatitis B patients. *Vaccine*. 1985;3(1):31-4.

²⁰ Updated U.S. Public Health Service Guidelines for the Management of Occupational Exposures to HBV, HCV, and HIV and Recommendations for Postexposure Prophylaxis. *MMWR*

¹ Asano Y, Nakayama H, Yazaki T, et al. Protection against varicella in family contacts by immediate inoculation with live varicella vaccine [abstract]. *Pediatrics*. 1977;59(1):3-7. ² Arbeter, A, Starr S, Plotkin S. Varicella Vaccine Studies in Healthy Children and Adults. *Pediatrics*. 1986;78(4):742-747.

Recomm Rep. 2001;50:1-52. https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5011a1.htm Accessed July 1, 2018.

²¹ Kowalzik F, Faber J, Knuf M. MMR and MMRV vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2018;36(36):5402-5407.

²² Barrabeig I, Rovira A, Rius C, et al. Effectiveness of measles vaccination for control of exposed children. Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2011;30(1):78-80.

²³ Arciuolo, R, Jablonski, R, Zucker, et al. Effectiveness of Measles Vaccination and Immune Globulin Post-Exposure Prophylaxis in an Outbreak Setting—New York City, 2013. Clin Infect Dis. 2017;65(11):1843-1847.

²⁴ Ruuskanen O, Salmi T, Halonen P. Measles vaccination after exposure to natural measles. J Pediatr. 1978;93(1):43-46.

²⁵ Berkovich S, Starr S. Use of Live-Measles-Virus Vaccine to Abort an Expected Outbreak of Measles within a Closed Population. N Engl J Med. 1963;269:75-77.

²⁶ Wharton M, Cochi S, Hutcheson R, et al. A large outbreak of mumps in the postvaccine era. J Infect Dis. 1988;158(6):1253-1260.

²⁷ Fiebelkorn A, Lawler J, Curns A, et al. Mumps Postexposure Prophylaxis with a Third Dose of Measles-Mumps-Rubella Vaccine, Orange County, New York, USA. Emerg Infect Dis. 2013;19(9):1411-1417.

²⁸ Manning SE, Rupprecht CE, Fishbein D, et al. Human rabies prevention—United States, 2008: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2008;57:1-3.

²⁹ Pandey P, Shlim D, Cave W, et al. Risk of possible exposure to rabies among tourists and foreign residents in Nepal. J Travel Med. 2002;9(3):127-131.

³⁰ Rupprecht C, Gibbons R. Prophylaxis against Rabies. N Engl J Med. 2004;351:2626-2635. ³¹ Wilde H, Sirikawin S, Sabcharoen A, et al. Failure of Postexposure Treatment of Rabies in Children. Clin Infect Dis. 1996;22(2):228-232.

³² Henderson D, Inglesby T, O'Toole T, et al. Can Postexposure Vaccination against Smallpox Succeed? Clin Infect Dis. 2003;36(5):622-629.

³³ Nishiura H, Eichner M. Interpreting the epidemiology of postexposure vaccination against smallpox. Int J Environ Health. 2008;211(1-2):219-226.

³⁴ Keckler M, Reynolds M, Damon I, et al. The effects of post-exposure smallpox vaccination on clinical disease presentation: Addressing the data gaps between historical epidemiology and modern surrogate model data. Vaccine. 2013;31(45):5192-5201.

³⁵ Massoudi M, Barker L, Schwarz B. Effectiveness of Postexposure Vaccination for the Prevention of Smallpox: Results of a Delphi Analysis. J Infect Dis. 2003;188(7):973-976.

³⁶ Sommer A. The 1972 Smallpox Outbreak in Kuhlna Municipality, Bangladesh: II. Effectiveness of Surveillance and Containment in Urban Epidemic Control. Am J Epidemiol. 1974;99(4):303-313.

³⁷ Downie A, McCarthy K. The antibody response in man following infection with viruses of the

pox group. III. Antibody response in smallpox. *J Hyg (Lond)*. 1958;56(4):479-487. ³⁸ Ionin B, Hopkins R, Pleune B, et al. Evaluation of Immunogenicity and Efficacy of Anthrax Vaccine Adsorbed for Postexposure Prophylaxis. Clin Vaccine Immunol. 2013;20(7):1016-1026.

³⁹ Wright JG, Quinn CP, Shadomy S, et al. Use of anthrax vaccine in the United States: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2009. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2010;59:1-30.

⁴⁰ U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Anthrax: Developing Drugs for Prophylaxis of Inhalation Anthrax, Guidance for Industry*. <u>https://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/Guid-ances/ucm070986.pdf</u> Accessed July 1, 2018

ances/ucm070986.pdf. Accessed July 1, 2018. ⁴¹ Both L, White J, Mandal S, et al. Access to diphtheria antitoxin for therapy and diagnostics. *Euro Surveill. 2014, 19* (24).

⁴² Farizo KM, Strebel PM, Chen RT, et al. Fatal respiratory disease due to Corynebacterium diphtheriae: case report and review of guidelines for management, investigation, and control. *Clin Infect Dis.* 1993;16(1):59-68.

⁴³ Jones EE, Kim-Farley RJ, Algunaid M, et al. (1985). Diphtheria: a possible foodborne outbreak in Hodeida, Yemen Arab Republic. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1985;63(2):287-293.

⁴⁴ Marcuse EK, Grand MG. Epidemiology of Diphtheria in San Antonio, Tex, 1970. *JAMA*. 1973;224(3):305-310.

⁴⁵ Wheeler SM, Morton, AR. Epidemiological Observations in the Halifax Epidemic. *Am J Public Health Nations Health*. 1942;32(9):947-956.

⁴⁶ Chapman LE, Sullivent EE, Grohskopf LA, et al. Recommendations for postexposure interventions to prevent infection with hepatitis B virus, hepatitis C virus, or human immunodeficiency virus, and tetanus in persons wounded during bombings and other mass-casualty events--United States, 2008: recommendations of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *MMWR Recomm Rep.* 2008;57:1-21.

⁴⁷ Collins S, White J, Ramsay M, Amirthalingam G. The importance of tetanus risk assessment during wound management. *IDCases*. 2015;2(1):3-5.