



Safety Platform for Emergency vACCines

D2.3 Priority List of Adverse events of special interest: Nipah Virus

Work Package: WP2 Standards and tools

V1.0: 31 March 2020

Authors: Barbara Law, Miriam Sturkenboom

Nature: Report | Diss. level: Confidential

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Background.....	1
Adverse events of special interest	1
2. Objective of this deliverable	2
3. Methods.....	2
Methods to obtain AESI	2
Evaluation of literature and Decision-Making Process to Finalize List of AESI.....	3
4. Results	4
Adverse events of special interest applicable to Nipah virus vaccines	4
AESIs Related to Specific Target Disease of Nipah Virus Infection	4
5. Recommendations & discussion.....	5
6. References	6
DOCUMENT INFORMATION.....	8
SIMPLIFIED DOCUMENT HISTORY	9

1. Background

To maximize the value of vaccine safety data in clinical trials given their relatively limited sample size, it is essential to standardize their collection, presentation and analysis when possible.

Given serious adverse events following immunization (AEFIs) are fortuitously rare, this need for globally accepted standard case definitions that allow for valid comparisons extend to individual case reports, surveillance systems, and retrospective epidemiologic studies.

This need for standardization was recognized by Dr. Robert Chen at a vaccine conference in Brighton, England in 1999. Harald Heijbel, Ulrich Heining, Tom Jefferson, and Elisabeth Loupi joined his call one year later to launch the Brighton Collaboration as an international voluntary organization, now with more than 750 scientific experts. It aims to facilitate the development, evaluation and dissemination of high-quality information about the safety of human vaccines.¹

The goals of the Brighton Collaboration in the domain of case definitions has been to:

1. Develop standardized case definitions for specific AEFI's.
2. Prepare guidelines for their data collection, analysis and presentation for global use.
3. Develop and implement study protocols for evaluation of case definitions and guidelines in clinical trials and surveillance systems.
4. Raise global awareness of their availability and to educate about their benefit, monitor their global use, and facilitate access.

Safety monitoring during clinical trials is a crucial component for vaccine development. Before a vaccine can receive regulatory approval for marketing, rigorous safety monitoring and reporting is required. In the CEPI funded vaccine development programs, the CEPI funded developers are the sponsors and responsible for safety monitoring of their products and have the responsibility to comply with regulatory requirements. Since CEPI funds several developers that develop vaccines for the same target, using different vaccines and platforms, harmonization of safety monitoring is essential to allow for meaningful analysis and interpretation of the safety profiles of CEPI funded vaccines.

CEPI has contracted with the Brighton Collaboration, through the Task Force for Global Health, to harmonize the safety assessment of CEPI-funded vaccines via its Safety Platform for Emergency vACcines(SPEAC) Project. As part of its landscape analysis of Nipah Virus (NiV) infection, this document describes the methods and results SPEAC used to arrive at the list of adverse events of special interest (AESI).

Adverse events of special interest

An adverse event following immunization (AEFI) is defined as 'any untoward medical occurrence which follows immunization, and which does not necessarily have a causal relationship with the usage of the vaccine. The adverse event may be any unfavorable or unintended sign, abnormal laboratory finding, symptom or disease.'²

'Adverse Event of Special Interest' (AESI) is further defined in Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS) VII³ as:

“An adverse event of special interest (serious or non-serious) is one of scientific and medical concern specific to the sponsor’s product or program, for which ongoing monitoring and rapid communication by the investigator to the sponsor could be appropriate. Such an event might require further investigation in order to characterize and understand it. Depending on the nature of the event, rapid communication by the trial sponsor to other parties (e.g., regulators) might also be warranted.”

AESI can be specified in the Program Safety Analysis plan (PSAP) early in product development for safety planning, data collection, analysis and reporting on AESI data, and eventually form the base of AESI analysis in Reporting and Analysis Plan.

While the current CEPI vaccine development focus is primarily on phase 1 and 2 clinical trials, which will have very small total sample sizes (likely $N < 1000$), the ultimate goal is to have vaccines ready for use against emerging, epidemic diseases. Vaccine safety assessment needs therefore to be conducted 1) across the entire life cycle of vaccine development, approval and use, and 2) in a harmonized and standardized manner so that data are comparable across different trials and populations. Many if not most of the AESI identified as relevant to CEPI vaccine programs are likely to be rare events and may never occur in the context of a given trial. Nevertheless, we have to be prepared to maximize the utility of vaccine safety data in case they do occur.

To this end SPEAC has chosen to identify AESI that have been previously identified with immunization in general (e.g. anaphylaxis, Guillain-Barré Syndrome) or vaccine platforms in particular (e.g., arthritis following recombinant vesicular stomatitis virus vectored vaccine). In addition, it is important to consider events that may occur during the clinical course or as a complication of the chosen target pathogen. Depending on the platform, a vaccine targeting that pathogen may induce an adverse event with a similar immunopathogenic mechanism; whether this occurs or not can only be assessed by studying this specific AESI (e.g., sensorineural hearing loss after Lassa Fever).

2. Objective of this deliverable

The primary term objective is to create and provide lists of potential AESI relevant to development of Nipah Virus (NiV) vaccines.

The secondary objective is to harmonize their safety assessment (monitoring, investigation and analysis) by having standard case definitions, tools and informational aides, developing them as needed.

3. Methods

Methods to obtain AESI

Initially, SPEAC vaccine safety experts used their expertise and experience to identify which existing Brighton Collaboration defined adverse events were most likely to be of relevance to CEPI vaccine candidates.

Subsequently, we developed the following scoring system to characterize the nature of evidence linking a given AESI to immunization:

1. Proven association with immunization.
2. Proven association with a vaccine platform and/or adjuvant relevant to CEPI vaccine development.
3. Theoretical concern based on immunopathogenesis.
4. Theoretical concern related to viral replication during wild type disease.
5. Theoretical concern because it has been demonstrated in an animal model with one or more candidate vaccine platforms.

A given AESI could have more than one rationale. For example, convulsion could be associated with 1, 2 and 4.

It was decided for clarity to present the AESI in 3 separate tables:

1. AESI relevant to a broad range of vaccines.
2. AESI relevant to one or more specific vaccine platforms.
3. AESI relevant to a specific target disease.

One or more of these tables may be amended once the vaccine safety templates are developed for each of the CEPI vaccine platforms or should new evidence for a possible or proven vaccine safety signal be published.

To identify AESI related to events known to be associated with wild type disease, either as a result of viral replication or immunologic mechanisms, a non-systematic PubMed search was conducted in April 2019 to identify recently published review articles for Nipah virus infection. Search terms included the target disease (Nipah Virus, Nipah Virus infection), complications and clinical course, focusing on review articles or textbooks.

Evaluation of literature and Decision-Making Process to Finalize List of AESI

All retrieved review/summary articles were independently reviewed by two medical experts (B Law and Wan-Ting Huang). Each expert made summary notes on the target disease history, virology, epidemiology, clinical course, complications, pathogenesis, risk factors, therapy and prevention. The main focus of the review was to have a clear and thorough picture of the clinical course and complications of the target disease. To this end additional references were identified by each expert from the citation lists of the primary review publications. The added references were retrieved and reviewed by at least one expert and additional notes made. Each expert then independently drafted a list of AESI for consideration. The two experts reviewed and discussed to merge the preliminary lists. Tabular summaries in Word and/or Excel and a PowerPoint slide set were developed to present to the SPEAC Executive Board for their discussion and approval.

This preliminary list of AESI was next shared with a) CEPI, b) the Nipah virus vaccine developers, and c) the disease clinical experts for their review and feedback.

4. Results

Table 1 lists AESIs considered potentially applicable to Nipah virus vaccines based on known association with vaccination in general. The rationale for including the AESI is further delineated in the last column of table 1.

Adverse events of special interest applicable to Nipah virus vaccines

TABLE 1. AESI RELEVANT TO VACCINATION IN GENERAL (EVENTS LISTED IN RED HAVE EXISTING BC CASE DEFINITIONS) IN THE TOOLBOX.)

BODY SYSTEM	AESI TYPE	RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION AS AN AESI (SEE FOOTNOTE)
Neurologic	Generalized convulsion	1, 2, 4
	Guillain-Barré Syndrome (GBS)	2
	Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis (ADEM)	3
Hematologic	Thrombocytopenia	1, 2
Immunologic	Anaphylaxis	1, 2
	Vasculitides	3, 4
Other	Serious local/systemic AEFI	1, 2

1. Proven association with immunization encompassing several different vaccines
2. Proven association with vaccine that could theoretically be true for CEPI vaccines under development
3. Theoretical concern based on immunopathogenesis.
4. Theoretical concern related to viral replication during wild type disease.
5. Theoretical concern because it has been demonstrated in an animal model with one or more candidate vaccine platforms.

Table 2 focuses on AESIs relevant to particular vaccine platforms that are being considered in the Nipah virus vaccine development programs.

TABLE 2. AESI RELEVANT TO SPECIFIC VACCINE PLATFORMS FOR Nipah Virus VACCINES

BODY SYSTEM	VACCINE PLATFORM SPECIFIC AESIS	KNOWN/POSSIBLE ASSOCIATION WITH
Neurologic	Aseptic meningitis Encephalitis / Encephalomyelitis	Live viral vaccines including measles
Immunologic	Arthritis	r-VSV platform
Other	Myocarditis	MVA platform

AESIs Related to Specific Target Disease of Nipah Virus Infection

Eight primary review/summary articles⁵⁻¹² were retrieved and reviewed independently by each medical expert. Drawing from cited references in the primary review articles, WT Huang and B Law, respectively, identified three¹³⁻¹⁵ and eleven¹⁶⁻²⁶ articles for inclusion in the secondary reference set. Each of these were reviewed by one or both experts and used to add further detail to the Nipah landscape analysis.

The AESI identified for Nipah Virus infection are shown in Table 3 along with the respective specific rationales for their inclusion.

TABLE 3. AESI RELEVANT TO NIPAH VIRUS INFECTION. AESI WITH AN EXISTING BRIGHTON CASE DEFINITION ARE SHOWN IN RED.

BODY SYSTEM	NIPAH VIRUS INFECTION	RATIONALE FOR INCLUSION AS AN AESI (SEE FOOTNOTE)
Neurologic	Encephalitis / Encephalomyelitis	3, 4
	Aseptic meningitis	4
	Convulsion(s)	3
Hematologic	Acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS)	3, 4
	Pneumonitis	3, 4

3. Theoretical concern based on immunopathogenesis.
4. Theoretical concern based on viral replication during wild type disease.

While the tables above are the main output for this deliverable, all papers used for each Landscape Analysis will be available in the SPEAC toolbox along with a tabular summary and teaching PowerPoint slide set for each target disease.

5. Recommendations & discussion

SPEAC recommends that the listed AESI be adopted by CEPI and the Nipah virus vaccine developers. SPEAC recommends that the developers be prepared to take a uniform approach to the identification, assessment, investigation, analysis and reporting of any AESI should it occur during a clinical trial.

Most (11 out of 15) of the AESI for Nipah virus vaccines have published BC case definitions available.

BC case definitions are not yet developed for acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), pneumonitis nor arthritis and myocarditis.

SPEAC will develop an action plan for each prioritized AESI, in concert with CEPI & vaccine developers to identify specific approaches vis-a-vis planned clinical trials. These could include one or more of:

1. Prioritize development of new Brighton Case Definitions for those AESI that do not yet have one.
2. Prepare tools (tabular checklists and decision trees) that will facilitate standard, harmonized application of Brighton CDs
3. Conduct systematic literature reviews to describe background rates within the target populations.
4. Work with developers to modify or map existing Case Report Forms (CRF)/outcome definitions or draft new ones if desired to achieve, to the extent possible, harmonized and standardized approaches to each AESI.

6. References

1. Bonhoeffer J, Kohl K, Chen R et al. The Brighton Collaboration – enhancing vaccine safety. *Vaccine* 2004; 22: 2046.
2. Definition and Application of Terms for Vaccine Pharmacovigilance. Report of CIOMS/WHO Working Group on Vaccine Pharmacovigilance, 2012, Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences.
3. The Development Safety Update Report (DSUR): Harmonizing the Format and Content for Periodic Safety Reporting During Clinical Trials: Report of CIOMS Working Group VII, Geneva 2007. <https://cioms.ch/shop/product/development-safety-update-report-dsur-harmonizing-format-content-periodic-safety-report-clinical-trials-report-cioms-working-group-vii/> (accessed January 14, 2020)
4. ICH Topic E2F Development Safety Update Report, EMEA/CHMP/ICH/309348/2008, June 2008 https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/scientific-guideline/ich-e-2-f-development-safety-update-report-step-3_en.pdf
5. Banerjee S, Gupta N, Kodan P et al. Nipah virus disease: A rare and intractable disease. *Intractable & Rare Diseases Research* 2019; 8(1): 1-8.
6. Ramphul K, Mejias SG, Agumadu VC et al. The killer virus called Nipah: a review. *Cureus* 2018; 10(8): e3168.
7. Ang BSP, Lim TCC, Wang L. Nipah virus infection. *J Clin micro* 2018; 56:e01875-17;
8. Sun B, Jia L, Liang B et al. Phylogeography, transmission and viral proteins of Nipah virus. *Virologica Sinica* 2018; 33:385-393.
9. Clayton BA. Nipah virus: transmission of a zoonotic paramyxovirus. *Current Opinion in Virology* 2017; 22:97-104.
10. Chua KB, Tan CT, Wong KT. Nipah virus infections in humans in *Human Emerging and Re-emerging Infections: Viral & Parasitic Infections, Volume 1, 1st Edition 2016*; John Wiley & Sons, inc. Editor Sunit K Singh. Chapter 10, pp 189-205.
11. Kulkarni DD, Tosh C, Venkatesh G, Kumar DS. *Indian J Virol* 2013; 24(3): 398-408. Doi 10.1007/s13337-013-0171-y
12. Nipah Virus (NiV) Factsheet. <https://www.cdc.gov/vhf/nipah/pdf/factsheet.pdf>
13. WHO Target Product Profile for Nipah virus Vaccine (June 2017).
14. Looi LM, Chua KB. Lessons from the Nipah virus outbreak in Malaysia. *Malaysian J Pathol* 2007; 29(2): 63-67.
15. Ching PKG, de los Reyes VC, Sucaldito MN et al. Outbreak of henipavirus infection, Philippines, 2014. *Emerging Infectious Diseases* 2015; 21(9): 328-331.
16. Sejvar JJ et al. Long-term neurological and functional outcome in Nipah virus infection. 2007; *Ann Neurol* 62:235-242; <https://doi.org/10.1002/1n1.21178>
17. Tan CT et al. Relapsed and late-onset Nipah encephalitis. *Ann Neurol* 2002; 51:703-8
18. Chong HT, Tan CT. Relapsed and late-onset Nipah encephalitis, a report of 3 cases. *Neurol J SE Asia* 2003; 8:109-112.
19. Lim CC et al 2002 Nipah virus encephalitis: serial MR study of an emerging disease. *Radiology* 222:219-226
20. Lim CC et al. 2003; J Late clinical and MRI follow up of Nipah virus infection. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 74:131-3.
21. Lim CCT, Sitoh YY, Hui F et al. Nipah viral encephalitis or Japanese encephalitis? MR findings in a new zoonotic disease. *Am J Neuroradiol* 2000; 21:455-61.
22. Ng BY, et al 2004; Neuropsychiatric sequelae of Nipah virus encephalitis. *J Neuropsychiatry Clin Neurosci* 16: 500-4.
23. Wong KT, Shieh WJ, Kumar S et al. Nipah virus infection. Pathology and pathogenesis of an emerging paramyxoviral zoonosis. *Am J Path* 2002; 161(6): 2153-67

24. Satterfield BA, Dawes BE, Milligan GN. Status of vaccine research and development of vaccines for Nipah virus. *Vaccine* 2016; 34:2971-5.
25. Aditi, Shariff. Nipah virus infection: a review. *Epidemiology and Infection* 2019; 147, 395:1-6.
26. Mazzola LT, Kelly-Cirino C. Diagnostics for Nipah virus: a zoonotic pathogen endemic to Southeast Asia. *BMJ Global health* 2019; 4:3001118. (NOTE: copious information on laboratory testing; not abstracted but there if needed)

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Master Service Agreement		Service order		1
Project acronym	SPEAC	Full project title	Safety Platform for Emergency Vaccines	
CEPI Project Lead		Nadia Torniepoth / Jakob Cramer		
CEPI Project Manager		Brett Barnett		
CEPI Contract Manager		Nishat Miah		

Deliverable number	D2.3	Title	Priority List of Adverse events of special interest-Nipah
Work package number	WP2	Title	Standards and tools

Delivery date	31/03/2020	Actual date	31/03/2020
Status	Draft <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Version	1.0
Nature	Report <input type="checkbox"/> Toolbox <input type="checkbox"/> List <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Template <input type="checkbox"/> Guidance <input type="checkbox"/> Handbook <input type="checkbox"/> Questionnaire <input type="checkbox"/>		
Dissemination Level	Public <input type="checkbox"/> Confidential <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

SPEAC Project Lead	Robert Chen	E-mail: robert.chen@cepi.net
Scientific Coordinator	Miriam Sturkenboom	E-mail: miriam.sturkenboom@cepi.net

Author 1	Barbara Law	E-mail: barbara.law@cepi.net
Author 2	Miriam Sturkenboom	E-mail: miriam.sturkenboom@cepi.net
WP Leader	Barbara Law	E-mail: barbara.law@cepi.net

Reviewer 1	Executive Board	E-mail: eb@speac.cepi.net
Reviewer 2	Robert Chen	E-mail: robert.chen@cepi.net

Description of the deliverable	This deliverable provides the methods and results of the creation of the Priority List of potential Adverse events of special interest relevant to Nipah virus vaccine trials
Key words	Toolbox, case definitions, guidance documents

SIMPLIFIED DOCUMENT HISTORY

NAME	DATE	VERSION	DESCRIPTION
Matthew Dudley	30/Apr/2019	NA	Retrieval of 8 review articles for Nipah virus disease.
Barbara Law, Wan-Ting Huang	27/Nov/2019	NiV V0.1	Creation of AESI list for review
EB review and input	02/Dec/2019	NiV V0.2	Revision of AESI list following EB review
Wan-Ting Huang, Bob Chen		NiV V0.2	Presentation of AESI V1.1 to NiV vaccine developers at Singapore meeting.
EB review of AESI tables	17/Feb/2020	NiV V0.3	Updated to reflect modified rationale list
Barbara Law, Jakob Cramer	06/Mar/2020	NiV V0.3	Sent to CEPI, with plans to forward on to four clinical experts to review AESI list
Barbara Law	26/Mar/2020	D2.3 V0.1	Draft deliverable report for Nipah based on previous version developed for LF/MERS
Miriam Sturkenboom, Bob Chen	30/Mar/2020		Review
Mark McKinlay	01/Apr/2020		Review