## **Supplementary Material**

Brisson M, Laprise JF, Chesson HW, et al. Health and economic impact of switching from a 4-valent to a 9-valent HPV vaccination program in the United States

Supplementary Table 1. Economic parameters
 Supplementary Table 2. Description of calibration data
 Supplementary Table 3. Vaccine efficacy parameters
 Supplementary Table 4. Percentage point reduction in incidence 70 years post-vaccination

Supplementary Figure 1. Vaccination scenarios examined

Supplementary Figure 2. Vaccination coverage 13-17 year-olds

**Supplementary Figure 3.** Natural history flow diagrams of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC), other HPV-attributable cancers (adenocarcinomas, cancers of the vulva, vagina, penis, anus and oropharynx), and anogenital warts (AGW) **Supplementary Figure 4.** Estimated percentage change following vaccination in the incidence of anogenital warts consultations among women and men; and other HPV-attributable cancers **References** 

This supplementary material has been provided by the authors to give readers additional information about their work.

# Supplementary Table 1. Economic parameters

	<b>Basa</b> assa*	Sensitivit	Deferences		
Parameters	Dase-case	Minimum	Maximum	- References	
Case-fatality⁺					
Cervical cancer (stage 1; 2-3; 4)	9%; 42%; 82%				
Vulvar/vaginal	33%	31%	39%	(16)	
Anal	31%	30%	32%	(16)	
Oropharyngeal	39%	39%	40%	(16)	
Penile	32%	29%	35%	(16)	
% AGW attributed to HPV-6/11 <sup>‡</sup>	90%	66%	100%	(17-20)	
AGW consultations per episode					
Women	1.15	1.12	1.23	(21)	
Men	1.21	1.15	1.33	(21)	
QALYs-lost					
QALYs-lost per episode					
AGW	0.02	0.01	0.04	(22,23)	
CIN1 or LSIL	0.006	0.006	0.008	(24)	
CIN2/3 or HSIL	0.01	0.009	0.012	(24)	
Disutility					
Cervical cancer (stage 1; 2-3; 4)	28%;39%;45%	19%;29%;29%	51%;58%;64%	(25-27)	
Vulvar/vaginal	32%				
Anal	51%				
Oropharyngeal	25%				
Penile	29%				
Costs (\$US)					
AGW episode					
Women	605	496	661	(5,28,29)	
Men	791	496	933	(5,28,29)	
Normal cytology	103	68	131	(30-32)	
Colposcopy/biopsy	467	287	690	(31,33)	
CIN2/3 treatment <sup>§</sup>	2,478	1,502	3,901	(33-35)	
Cervical cancer (stage 1; 2-3; 4)	31,368; 33,586; 53,796	14,058; 17,476; 18,871	32,687; 43,325; 121,460	(31,33)	
Relative costs vs.					
Cervical cancer (stage 1)					
Vulvar/vaginal	81%	67%	95%	(30)	
Anal	115%	96%	135%	(30)	
Oropharyngeal	138%	114%	161%	(30)	
Penile	63%	52%	74%	(30)	

 remite
 03%
 52%
 74%
 (30)

 \* Base-case values are the median from the literature. Abbreviations: AGW: Anogenital warts; CIN: Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia; LSIL: Low-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion; QALY: Quality-adjusted life-years
 \* (Case fatality) = 100% – (5-year survival [%])
 \* Proportion of HPV-6 and 11 among HPV positive anogenital warts

 § Treatment costs excluding the initial Pap and colposcopy/biopsy All costs are \$US 2010.
 \* High-grade squamous intraepithelial lesion; QALY: Quality-adjusted life-years

# Supplementary Table 2. Description of calibration data

Outcomes	Stratification	Reference	Targets Points	
Sexual Behavior			-	
Percent that ever had sexual intercourse	Age (15, 24, [25-29],, [40-44]yrs); Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ )	(1-3)	56	
Distribution of the number of partners in past 12 months	Age ([15-19],, [30-34], [35-44]yrs); Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ ) <sup>†</sup> Number of partners (0, 1, 2, 3, ≥4)	(1,2)	98	
Average number of partners in past 12 months by level of sexual activity	Age ([15-19],, [30-34], [35-44]yrs); Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ ); Sexual Activity Level ( $l \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ )	(1,2)	78	
Natural history				
Prevalence of HPV-16*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	
Prevalence of HPV-18*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Level (l = 2)	(3)	2	
Prevalence of HPV-16/18*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	
Prevalence of HPV-6*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	
Prevalence of HPV-11*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Level (l = 2)	(3)	2	
Prevalence of HPV-6/11*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	
Prevalence of HPV-HR*	Age ([15-19],, [45-49]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3,4)	42	
Prevalence of HPV-HRC*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	
Prevalence of HPV-HRNC*	Age ([20-24] & [25-29]yrs); Sexual Activity Levels $(l \in \{0, 1, 2\}, l \neq 3)$	(3)	12	

Outcomes	omes Stratification		Targets Points	
Rate of genital warts consultations	Age ([15-19],[65+]yrs); Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ )	(5)	24	
Positivity of HPV types in CIN2/3	HPV-16,18,6,11,HRC,HRNC	(6,7)	12	
Positivity of HPV types in SCC	HPV-16,18,HRC,HRNC	(8-11)	8	
Incidence of SCC	Age ([20-24],, [50-54]yrs)	(12)	14	
Proportion of cervical adenocarcinoma	Age ([20-24], [25-29],, [60-64]yrs) HPV-16, 18, 31, 33, 45 ,52, 58	(13)	63	
Incidence of anal cancer	Age ([25-29], [30-34],, [60-64]yrs) Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ ) HPV-16, 18, 31, 33	(12)	64	
Incidence of oropharyngeal cancer	Age ([20-24], [25-29],, [60-64]yrs) Gender ( $g \in \{1, 2\}$ ) HPV-16, 18, 33	(12)	54	
Incidence of vulvar cancer	Age ([20-24], [25-29], …, [60-64]yrs) HPV-16, 18, 31, 33, 45	(12)	45	
Incidence of vaginal cancer	Age ([30-34], [35-39], …, [60-64]yrs) HPV-16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, 58	(12)	49	
Incidence of penile cancer	Age ([20-24], [25-29], [60-64]yrs) HPV-16, 18, 31, 33, 45	(12)	45	
Screening				
Proportion of women ever screened	Age ([15-19], [20-24], [25-29], [30-34]yrs)	(14)	8	
Incidence of ASC-US/LSIL	Age ([20-24],, [60-64], [65+]yrs)	(15)	20	
Incidence of HSIL	Age ([20-24],, [60-64], [65+]yrs)	(15)	20	
Total number of data points			776	

\* Among sexually active individuals. Prevalence estimates were adjusted to take into account misclassification in number of lifetime partners and false positives due to test specificity. Abbreviations: HR=High oncogenic risk types; HRC=HR cross-protective types: 31, 33, 45, 52, 58; HRNC= HR non cross-protective types: 35, 39, 51, 56, 59, 66, 68, 73, 82
 <sup>†</sup> We were unable to fit the % of boys with less than 1 partner in the last year in the 15-19 age group (mainly because of age-specific mixing where females are more likely to choose male partners older than them).

	Base case					
	VE persistent infection (%)					
HPV-type	4-valent (No cross-protection)	4-valent (With cross-protection)	9-valent			
16/18	95.0	95.0	95.0			
6/11	95.0	95.0	95.0			
31	0.0	46.2	95.0			
33	0.0	28.7	95.0			
45	0.0	7.8	95.0			
52	0.0	18.4	95.0			
58	0.0	5.5	95.0			
Other HR-types	0.0	0.0	0.0			

# Supplementary Table 3. Vaccine efficacy parameters\*

\*Abbreviations: VE: Vaccine Efficacy; HR: High risk

		Mean change in percentage points (80% UI)							
Vaccination Scenarios	Comparison Scenarios	Anogeni	tal warts	CIN	12/3	Cervica	l cancer	Other HF can	PV-related
No Cross-protection for 4- valent									
(1) 4-valent gender-neutral	1 vs. No Vaccination	80	(75, 87)	61	(57, 66)	65	(60, 69)	76	(74, 76)
(2) 9-valent Girls 4-valent Boys	2 vs. 1	0	(-2, 1)	17	(12, 21)	13	(9, 18)	6	(5, 6)
(3) 9-valent gender-neutral	3 vs. 2	0	(-1, 2)	2	(0, 3)	1	(-2, 5)	1	(0, 1)
	3 vs.1	0	(-2, 2)	18	(14, 22)	14	(9, 19)	7	(6, 7)
With Cross-protection for 4-valent									
(1) 4-valent gender-neutral	1 vs. No Vaccination	80	(74, 88)	68	(62, 72)	69	(65, 73)	79	(78, 81)
(2) 9-valent Girls 4-valent Boys	2 vs. 1	0	(-2,2)	11	(8, 13)	9	(4, 13)	3	(2, 3)
(3) 9-valent gender-neutral	3 vs. 2	0	(-2, 2)	1	(0, 2)	1	(-2, 5)	0	(0, 1)
	3 vs.1	0	(-2, 1)	12	(10, 14)	10	(6, 13)	3	(3, 4)

#### Supplementary Table 4. Percentage point reduction in incidence 70 years post-vaccination\*

\*BASE-CASE: Vaccine-type efficacy=95%, cross-protective vaccine efficacy presented in Supplementary Table 3, duration=Lifelong.

PREDICTIONS: Mean estimate generated by the 50 best fitting parameter sets. Each parameter set run 20 times. Uncertainty intervals: 10th and 90th percentiles of model results based on the 50 best fitting parameter sets, reflects uncertainty in the natural history parameters. Abbreviations: CIN: Cervical Intraepithelial Neoplasia; UI: Uncertainty intervals Mean pre-vaccination incidence rate of diagnosed CIN2/3 and Cervical cancers are 123 and 8 per 100,000 women-years, respectively. Mean pre-vaccination incidence rate of anogenital warts consultations and Other HPV-attributable cancers are 153 and 7 per 100,000 person-years, respectively.



## Supplementary Figure 1. Vaccination scenarios examined

Four vaccination scenarios were examined: 0) no vaccination, 1) the current 4-valent gender-neutral (females/males) HPV vaccination program, 2) switching to a 9-valent for females but maintaining the 4-valent for males, or 3) switching to a 9-valent gender-neutral program. For scenarios 1 to 3, we modeled the changes in HPV vaccination in the United States from 2007 up to 2014 (i.e., introduction of gender-neutral vaccination in 2011). All changes to the current HPV vaccination strategy (scenarios 2 and 3) were modeled to occur at the beginning of 2015.

### Supplementary Figure 2. Vaccination coverage 13-17 year-olds

A) Vaccination coverage of females 13-17 years old B) Vaccination coverage of males 13-17 years old



**A-B)** Overall vaccination coverage in 13-17 year-olds. The blue lines represent the model predictions and the red dots and bars the United States (U.S.) data with 95% CI (National Immunization Survey). BASE-CASE: Vaccine uptake rates were modeled by age and derived from the observed vaccination coverage by age in the U.S. (National Immunization Survey) for years 2007 to 2013; we assume constant vaccine uptake rates at 2013 levels from 2014 onward. The overall vaccination coverage increases until 2017, the time it takes for the 2013 cohort of 13-year-olds to reach 17 years of age. HIGH VACCINATION COVERAGE SCENARIO: We use 1-dose U.S. estimates and assume vaccine protection after 1 dose. LOW VACCINATION COVERAGE SCENARIO: We assume that the 3-dose coverage remains constant at 2012 levels from 2013 onwards (2012 was the lowest estimated uptake rate between 2010-2013). **C-D)** Base-case vaccination coverage by age (thin blue lines) and overall vaccination coverage in 13-17 year-olds (thick blue line). **Definitions:** CI: Confidence Interval. VACCINE UPTAKE RATE: Probability for unvaccinated females or males to be vaccinated in a given year. VACCINATION COVERAGE: Percentage of females or males that are vaccinated.

### Supplementary Figure 3. Natural history flow diagrams

A) Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN) and squamous cell carcinoma (SCC) in the absence of screening



B) Other HPV-attributable cancers (cervical adenocarcinomas, cancers of the vulva, vagina, penis, anus and oropharynx)



C) Anogenital warts (AGW)



The mutually exclusive compartments represent the different HPV epidemiological states. Arrows represent the possible HPV-type specific transitions between these states for each individual. Arrows represent the possible HPV-type, age, and gender specific transitions between these states for each individual. **A) SCC:** Our model reproduces progression/clearance through different clinical cytological classifications (e.g., CIN1 to CIN3), and the course of underlying HPV infection progression/clearance to CIN3 based on duration of infection and HPV-type. The infection status (susceptible, infected, and immune) of each individual is type-specific and, therefore, an individual can be infected with multiple genotypes at the same time. Infected women can either clear the infection and return to immune/susceptible status or remain infected (Infected 1-4) and progress in the model to more severe stages of cervical intraepithelial lesions of grade 1 (CIN1), 2 (CIN2) or 3 (CIN3), and invasive squamous cervical cancer (SCC) of stage 1 (localized), stage 2 (regional) or stage 3 (distant). Women with CIN may also regress to a less severe stage or clear the infection and directly return to susceptible/immune status. **B) Other HPV-attributable cancers**: Simulated individuals have a gender- and type-specific time of progression from persistent infection to cancer. **C) AGW**: Simulated individuals have a joint probability of developing and being diagnosed with anogenital warts (AGW) or clearing their infection. Individuals can experience multiple episodes of AGW through recurrence of a persistent infection, re-infection with a previously cleared HPV-type or infection with a new HPV-type.

Supplementary Figure 4. Estimated percentage change following vaccination

A) Incidence of anogenital warts (AGW) consultations among women and men\*



B) Incidence of other HPV-attributable cancerst



BASE-CASE: Vaccine-type efficacy=95%, cross-protective vaccine efficacy presented in Supplementary Table 3, duration of protection=Lifelong.

PREDICTIONS: Mean estimate generated by the 50 best fitting parameter sets. Each parameter set run 20 times.

\* Mean pre-vaccination incidence rate of anogenital warts consultations=153 per 100,000 person-years,

† Mean pre-vaccination incidence of other HPV-attributable cancers=7 per 100,000 women-years.

## References

- 1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG 2006-2010). Available at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nsfg.htm</u>. Accessed November 2013.
- 2. Haderxhanaj LT, Leichliter JS, Aral SO, *et al*. Sex in a lifetime: Sexual behaviors in the United States by lifetime number of sex partners, 2006-2010. Sex Transm Dis 2014;41(6):345-52.
- 3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). Available at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes.htm</u>. Accessed November 2013.
- 4. Wheeler CM, Hunt WC, Cuzick J, *et al.* A population-based study of human papillomavirus genotype prevalence in the United States: baseline measures prior to mass human papillomavirus vaccination. Int J Cancer 2013;132(1):198-207.
- 5. Hoy T, Singhal PK, Willey VJ, *et al.* Assessing incidence and economic burden of genital warts with data from a US commercially insured population. Curr Med Res Opin 2009;25(10):2343-51.
- 6. Hariri S, Unger ER, Schafer S, *et al*. HPV type attribution in high grade cervical lesions: assessing the potential benefits of vaccines in a population-based evaluation in the United States. Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev 2015;24(2):393-9.
- 7. Coutlee F, Ratnam S, Ramanakumar AV, *et al.* Distribution of human papillomavirus genotypes in cervical intraepithelial neoplasia and invasive cervical cancer in Canada. J Med Virol 2011;83(6):1034-41.
- 8. Saraiya M, Unger E, Thompson T, et al. US assessment of HPV types in cancers: implications for current and 9-valent HPV vaccines. J Natl Cancer Inst 2015;107(6):djv086.
- 9. Serrano B, Alemany L, Tous S, *et al.* Potential impact of a nine-valent vaccine in human papillomavirus related cervical disease. Infect Agent Cancer 2012;7(1):38.
- 10. Clifford GM, Smith JS, Aguado T, *et al*. Comparison of HPV type distribution in high-grade cervical lesions and cervical cancer: a meta-analysis. Br J Cancer 2003;89(1):101-105.
- 11. Munoz N, Bosch FX, Castellsague X, *et al*. Against which human papillomavirus types shall we vaccinate and screen? The international perspective. Int J Cancer 2004;111(2):278-85.
- 12. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Cancer Institute. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's National Program of Cancer Registries and National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program.
- 13. Watson M, Saraiya M, Benard V, *et al.* Burden of cervical cancer in the United States, 1998-2003. Cancer 2008;113(10 Suppl):2855-64.
- 14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Cervical Cancer Screening Among Women Aged 18-30 Years — United States, 2000-2010.* Available at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6151a2.htm</u>. Accessed November 2013.

- 15. Insinga RP, Glass AG, Rush BB. Diagnoses and outcomes in cervical cancer screening: a population-based study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2004;191(1):105-13.
- 16. National Cancer Institute. National Cancer Institute's Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program.
- 17. Garland SM, Steben M, Sings HL, *et al*. Natural history of genital warts: analysis of the placebo arm of 2 randomized phase III trials of a quadrivalent human papillomavirus (types 6, 11, 16, and 18) vaccine. J Infect Dis 2009;199(6):805-14.
- 18. Giuliano AR, Tortolero-Luna G, Ferrer E, *et al*. Epidemiology of human papillomavirus infection in men, cancers other than cervical and benign conditions. Vaccine 2008;26 Suppl 10:K17-28.
- 19. Brown DR, Schroeder JM, Bryan JT, *et al.* Detection of multiple human papillomavirus types in Condylomata acuminata lesions from otherwise healthy and immunosuppressed patients. J Clin Microbiol 1999;37(10):3316-22.
- 20. Aubin F, Pretet JL, Jacquard AC, *et al*. Human papillomavirus genotype distribution in external acuminata condylomata: a Large French National Study (EDiTH IV). Clin Infect Dis 2008;47(5):610-5.
- 21. Camenga DR, Dunne EF, Desai MM, *et al.* Incidence of genital warts in adolescents and young adults in an integrated health care delivery system in the United States before human papillomavirus vaccine recommendations. Sex Transm Dis 2013;40(7):534-8.
- 22. Drolet M, Brisson M, Maunsell E, *et al*. The impact of anogenital warts on health-related quality of life: a 6-month prospective study. Sex Transm Dis 2011;38(10):949-56.
- 23. Woodhall S, Ramsey T, Cai C, *et al*. Estimation of the impact of genital warts on healthrelated quality of life. Sex Transm Infect 2008;84(3):161-6.
- 24. Drolet M, Brisson M, Maunsell E, *et al*. The psychosocial impact of an abnormal cervical smear result. Psychooncology 2012;21(10):1071-81.
- 25. Brisson M, Van de Velde N, De Wals P, *et al*. The potential cost-effectiveness of prophylactic human papillomavirus vaccines in Canada. Vaccine 2007;25(29):5399-408.
- 26. Jit M, Chapman R, Hughes O, *et al*. Comparing bivalent and quadrivalent human papillomavirus vaccines: economic evaluation based on transmission model. BMJ 2011;343:d5775.
- 27. Brisson M, Laprise JF, Drolet M, *et al.* Comparative cost-effectiveness of the quadrivalent and bivalent human papillomavirus vaccines: a transmission-dynamic modeling study. Vaccine 2013;31(37):3863-71.
- 28. Insinga RP, Dasbach EJ, Myers ER. The health and economic burden of genital warts in a set of private health plans in the United States. Clin Infect Dis 2003;36(11):1397-1403.
- 29. Hu D, Goldie S. The economic burden of noncervical human papillomavirus disease in the United States. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2008;198(5):500 e1-7.

- 30. Chesson HW, Ekwueme DU, Saraiya M, *et al.* Estimates of the annual direct medical costs of the prevention and treatment of disease associated with human papillomavirus in the United States. Vaccine 2012;30(42):6016-9.
- 31. Kim JJ, Goldie SJ. Health and economic implications of HPV vaccination in the United States. N Engl J Med 2008;359(8):821-32.
- 32. Schabert VF, Ye X, Insinga RP, *et al*. Five-year routine cervical cancer screening rates and intervals in a US health plan. Curr Med Res Opin 2008;24(9):2429-35.
- 33. Elbasha EH, Dasbach EJ, Insinga RP. Model for assessing human papillomavirus vaccination strategies. Emerg Infect Dis 2007;13(1):28-41.
- 34. Henk HJ, Insinga RP, Singhal PK, *et al.* Incidence and costs of cervical intraepithelial neoplasia in a US commercially insured population. J Low Genit Tract Dis 2010;14(1):29-36.
- 35. Insinga RP, Glass AG, Rush BB. The health care costs of cervical human papillomavirus-related disease. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2004;191(1):114-20.