Improving the family doctor's roles in influenza vaccination in primary care; Review

Naseem Saleem Altowairqi, Abdullatif Obaid Altowairqi, Abdulrahman Ahmed Alwagdani, Abdullah Shref Faisal Alwthainani, Abdullah Hallal A Alziyadi

Abstract:

Vaccination is the best method for the prevention and control of influenza. Vaccination can reduce illness and lessen severity of infection. This review focuses on how currently licensed influenza vaccines work, why the biology of influenza poses vaccine challenges, and vaccine approaches. A comprehensive search was performed to identify studies published in PubMed and the Cochrane database up to December 2017, in English language and involving human subject only and recently published abstracts were also reviewed our search was for detection of studies that discussing the roles in influenza vaccination in primary care. Licensed seasonal TIV and LAIV displayed a mean efficiency of 60% in healthy adults and 83% in children, respectively in recent meta-analyses. However, when the match between the vaccine strain and circulating epidemic strain is poor, or when a new pandemic virus emerges, these vaccines fail to give optimal security. The IIV does not cause robust resistance in the senior and LAIV is just licensed for people as much as the age of 49 years, leaving the most vulnerable section of the population poorly protected. Influenza vaccines must protect any age groups, particularly those most vulnerable to complications of severe influenza. Ideally, new vaccines should enhance the breadth of the immune reaction to include antigenically unique viruses within the same subtype and viruses of other subtypes, should not be produced in eggs, and should require much less time to manufacture than presently licensed technologies. The ultimate goal of an universal influenza vaccine is to safeguard versus all influenza A viruses, preventing the requirement for yearly

revaccination. Several promising techniques are under advancement to improve or overcome the drawbacks of the currently licensed vaccines and to induce broad immunity against various other subtypes of influenza with pandemic potential.

Introduction:

Influenza is a highly-contagious disease that causes a substantial condition worry [1] and is estimated to affect 5-15% of the globe population yearly [2]. Healthcare employees (HCW) could be exposed to the influenza virus in the workplace and could additionally function as a source of infection of patients and health authorities consequently recommend yearly vaccination [3]. However, although there is proof on the effectiveness of influenza vaccination, some Spanish [4] and international [5] research studies reveal that coverages do not usually exceed 40%.

Influenza vaccination has been shown to be efficient in protecting the senior and reducing morbidity and mortality in both institutionalized and area dwellers [6]. For that reason, vaccination is typically advised in this population group [1].

Studies have revealed the significance of doctors suggesting vaccination to their community-dwelling patients [7]. Similarly, an association has been shown between reliable vaccination of physicians and the efficiency of their referrals to their patients: medical professionals that are vaccinated have a higher capability to effectively advise their patients [8].

A weaker and more debatable association between vaccination of primary care physicians and real vaccination of their patients has additionally been recommended [9].

Primary care physicians are in direct contact with the population and therefore their views on influenza vaccine and the decision to vaccinate might be identifying factors in the vaccination of their patients [8]. In Spain, influenza vaccination is offered absolutely free to groups in which it is suggested, consisting of healthcare employees and persons aged ≥ 65 years, in primary medical care facilities after prescription by the patient's physician. Vaccination is provided in October and November, in a comparable style to most European countries [10].

Vaccination is the best method for the prevention and control of influenza. Vaccination can reduce illness and lessen severity of infection. This review focuses on how currently licensed influenza vaccines work, why the biology of influenza poses vaccine challenges, and vaccine approaches.

Methodology:

A comprehensive search was performed to identify studies published in PubMed and the Cochrane database up to December 2017, in English language and involving human subject only and recently published abstracts were also reviewed our search was for detection of studies that discussing the roles in influenza vaccination in primary care. We used following Mesh terms in searching relevant articles; “influenza vaccine”, and “family physicians”, “improvement”, And “strategies”.

Discussion:

- **Currently Licensed Seasonal Influenza Vaccines**

Currently certified influenza vaccines concentrate on the production of antibodies against the viral HA protein, which binds host receptors to moderate viral entry. Strain-specific antibodies produced versus the HA neutralize the virus and avoid infection. The current seasonal vaccines need annual examination and reformulation to equal the antigenic drift of flowing pressures. This process is finished two times a year, as soon as each for the northern and southern hemispheres [11]. Antigenic drift arises from mutations that take place due to the fact that the error-prone viral RNA-dependent RNA polymerase lacks proofreading function, causing mutations in the HA and other viral healthy proteins. Additionally, the HA is under favorable selection for antigenic escape from neutralization by pre-existing antibodies. Choice of the vaccine make-up for the upcoming season's vaccine have to happen 7 to 8 months ahead of "influenza season" to fit the actions of vaccine manufacturing [11].

There are three classes of certified seasonal vaccines including suspended, live attenuated, and recombinant HA vaccines [12]. All three vaccines are multivalent, with parts standing for influenza A and B viruses expected to flow in the next influenza season. The inactivated influenza vaccine (IIV) is a split virion or subunit vaccine which contains 15μg of each detoxified HA protein administered intramuscularly, or 9μg of each detoxified HA protein provided intradermally [12]. There is likewise a higher dose of antigen offered for the elderly population aged 65 years and older, in which 60 μg of each HA is carried out in order to raise the immunogenicity of the vaccine. The trivalent inactivated vaccine (TIV) includes H1N1 and H3N2 subtypes of influenza A together with the predicted leading lineage of influenza B. A recently accredited quadrivalent flu vaccine (QIV) consists of 2 lineages of flu B together with the H1N1 and H3N2 subtypes of influenza A. The IIV induce a strain-specific serum IgG antibody action and are licensed for individuals matured 6 months and older.

The second licensed vaccine product is the real-time attenuated influenza vaccine (LAIV). This vaccine likewise contains a mix of the very same four influenza stress as the QIV, yet is provided intranasally as a spray. The LAIV contains live viruses with temperature-sensitive and attenuating mutations [13].As a result of these anomalies, the vaccine virus is limited in replication at the temperature level of the reduced respiratory tract, yet could replicate at the cooler temperature of the nasal cavity. Vaccination with LAIV results in the production of strain-specific serum IgG in addition to mucosal IgA and T cell responses [13].LAIV is additionally efficient against some antigenically drifted strains of influenza [13].The LAIV is certified for healthy individuals between the ages of 2 and 49 years and the CDC advises that youngsters in between the ages of two and eight years obtain the LAIV over IIV if readily available [12].

The 3rd accredited product is FluBlok, which is a recombinant HA vaccine with HA healthy proteins that are expressed in insect cells from baculovirus vectors. FluBlok is presently certified for adults matured 18 to 49 years and can be utilized in people that are allergic to eggs [12].The manufacturing process for this vaccine has a much shorter timeframe, which would certainly be useful throughout a pandemic response.

The safety of seasonal influenza vaccines is well accepted. One of the most common damaging occasions reported for IIV involve reactions at the website of shot, including pain, inflammation, and swelling [12].For the LAIV the most usual occasions include a runny nose and nasal congestion, although high temperature and sore throat have additionally been reported in certain age groups [12].Current suggestions in the U.S. are for annual vaccination in people 6 months and older, with a focus on youngsters, persons over 65 years of age, expecting women, people with chronic health and wellness conditions, and healthcare workers [12], [13].

- **Challenges in Optimizing Influenza Vaccines**

Although the currently licensed influenza vaccines work in healthy young adults, (Table 1) summarizes numerous difficulties that continue to be. They include the reliance on embryonated eggs for vaccine production, the lengthy timeline for vaccine manufacturing, the need for yearly vaccination, the development of antigenically novel viruses, the demand for boosted immunogenicity in the senior, and the demand for an improved correlate of protection. Numerous approaches have been established to conquer these challenges and improve the immunogenicity and efficiency of influenza vaccines.

Table 1.Summary of current vaccine approaches against influenza viruses

Vaccine Format	**Viral Targets**	**Mode of Action**	**Advantages**	**Solution to Vaccine Challenge**
		Current Licensed		
IIV	HA	Neutralizing serum antibodies	Inactivated vaccine Low reactivity	
LAIV	HA NA	Serum antibodies Mucosal antibodies CTL activity	Mucosal administration Higher response in children More cross-reactive	
		Emerging Approaches		
Recombinant DNA	Various viral epitopes	Antibodies CTL activity	Non-replicating No egg requirement	Dependence on eggs for production Lengthy production time
COBRA	HA	Neutralizing antibodies	Increases cross-reactivity	Need for annual vaccination Broader immune response
Stem HA Antibodies	HA stem	locks viral fusion Blocks HA maturation Increases ADCC	Broad protection Works at multiple steps in life cycle	Need for annual vaccination Broader immune response

Viral Vectors	Various viral epitopes	Increases ADCC CTL activity	Non-replicating Multiple delivery methods	Lengthy production time

- **Dependence on embryonated eggs**

One negative aspect that is shared by IIV and LAIV is the need for embryonated eggs for production. A pandemic will likely cause a higher demand for vaccine and embryonated eggs may be in short supply if the pandemic infection is pathogenic for poultry [14]. Numerous new influenza vaccines have been licensed within recent years that do not depend on manufacturing in eggs. Flucelvax is a freshly certified vaccine that is produced in a mammalian cell line and subsequent manufacturing steps resemble egg-based IIV [12].As discussed previously, the lately licensed recombinant HA vaccine FluBlok is revealed in insect cells. Likewise, DNA vaccines and virus-like bits (VLPs) are vaccine techniques that are in clinical development and are not manufactured in eggs.

- **Lengthy timeline for vaccine production**

The selection of strains to include in yearly influenza vaccines is based upon global surveillance of circulating influenza viruses. Forecasts are made months ahead of the arrival of "influenza season" in order to fit all the actions of vaccine production; including the generation of three or four vaccine seed viruses, amplification, inactivation, purification and dispensing into vials for IIV and blending and filling of sprayers for LAIV.

Antigenic characterization of circulating viruses is one of the most important criterion for the option of vaccine strains. The antigenic relationship in between flowing infections is identified by hemagglutination inhibition (HAI) assays, where their sensitivity is examined against a panel of

antisera produced against referral strains consisting of the previous year's vaccine virus. Antigenic change among influenza viruses can be visualized by antigenic cartography [15], which is a computational tool for the analysis of HAI assay information that supplies a mathematical structure for quantitative analysis of antigenic data [16].Antigenic cartography is currently applied to the choice of strains for influenza vaccines.

The 2009 pandemic exposed the problem in producing and distributing a vaccine versus a recently emerged virus within a brief timeframe [17].The 2009 H1N1pdm IIV was not available in time to prevent the 2nd wave of the pandemic [18].One approach to avoid this predicament in the future would certainly be to stockpile vaccine seed viruses versus various subtypes that have pandemic potential. This procedure entails the option of representative viruses from each subtype focused on based on epidemiological data, and testing of the candidate vaccines in preclinical researches and clinical trials [19].

- **Need for annual vaccination**

The decrease in vaccine-specific antibodies and the antigenic drift of influenza viruses over time demands annual revaccination. Numerous techniques are being discovered to enhance the breadth of security, or cross-reactivity, of influenza vaccines to avoid the requirement for annual revaccination. These include using a computationally developed HA series, induction of antibodies guided at the preserved HA stem, immunization with conserved influenza proteins that target T cell reactions, consolidation of an adjuvant, and approaches that integrate various vaccine platforms in "prime-boost" layouts.

One strategy aimed to boost the breadth of the antibody response against the HA protein includes a computationally optimized broadly responsive antigen, or COBRA HA presented in a VLP vaccine [21].The sequence of the COBRA HA stands for a consensus sequence from a vast collection of influenza viruses that incorporates the most common amino acid at each setting. This retention of conserved areas within the HA results in the generation of cross-reactive antibodies. An H5N1 COBRA vaccine has been shown to generate extensively reactive antibodies versus numerous clades of H5N1 viruses and cause much less pathology adhering to obstacle compared to a non-consensus VLP vaccine in nonhuman primates [20].

- **Emergence of novel viruses**

Although currently readily available vaccines are effective versus seasonal influenza viruses, strain-specific resistance fails to secure versus wandered seasonal influenza viruses or from antigenically novel pandemic viruses. Within the last century there have been 4 influenza pandemics connected with high infection and mortality rates- in 1918, 1957, 1968, and most lately in 2009 [22] triggered by infections that were antigenically distinct from the circulating seasonal strains of the period. Antigenic shift can lead to a pandemic when unique influenza A viruses contaminate the human population and have the capability for human-to-human transmission. Pigs and domestic poultry have functioned as zoonotic sources for influenza viruses of novel antigenicity becoming part of the human populace [22].A number of various other subtypes of flu An infection (including H5N1, H7N9, H9N2 among others) have likewise caused occasional human infections, however have lacked the capacity for sustained human-to-human transmission, and as a result have not brought about a pandemic.

Both the IIV and LAIV systems have been used in the advancement of pandemic (p) influenza vaccines for usage in the event of emergence of novel subtypes from zoonotic resources. The pIIV injections have commonly presented reduced immunogenicity and required high antigen doses, numerous inoculations, or the incorporation of adjuvants to achieve product antibody reactions that are predicted to be protective [24] On first analysis, pLAIV were located to be variably immunogenic in stage I clinical trials [13] However, current information show that H5N1 and H7N7 pLAIV established a robust long-lasting B cell memory [23].Nonetheless, pLAIV can not be made use of up until a pandemic looms in order to avoid reassortment of the vaccine infection with distributing influenza viruses [25].

Our lack of ability to forecast the subtype that will certainly create the following influenza pandemic and the delay in delivery of the 2009 pandemic vaccine has boosted interest in a "global vaccine" that will generate extra broadly cross-reactive resistance and will not require yearly updates [19].The two leading prospects for universal vaccines consist of the very preserved stem of the HA and the M2 healthy protein. The HA stem strategy was gone over earlier [26].The M2 protein is shown externally of the virion, and acts as an ion channel that is essential for uncoating of the infection after access. Throughout natural infection, antibodies are evoked against all of the surface viral proteins, including HA, NA, and M2 [27].Antibodies routed against M2 do not counteract virus infectivity, but could minimize the seriousness of infection by getting rid of contaminated cells via antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity (ADCC). Although M2 antibodies caused by all-natural infection are uncommon and brief, they have been shown to provide broad protection against a range of influenza A viruses in animal models, and were immunogenic in phase I clinical tests [17].Vaccines focusing on M2 protein typically include the protein right into a VLP or express the protein in a recombinant vaccine by fusing the gene

inscribing M2 or tandem repeats of the ectodomain of M2 (M2e) to a service provider protein or molecule [17].

Conclusion:

Licensed seasonal TIV and LAIV displayed a mean efficiency of 60% in healthy adults and 83% in children, respectively in recent meta-analyses. However, when the match between the vaccine strain and circulating epidemic strain is poor, or when a new pandemic virus emerges, these vaccines fail to give optimal security. The IIV does not cause robust resistance in the senior and LAIV is just licensed for people as much as the age of 49 years, leaving the most vulnerable section of the population poorly protected. Influenza vaccines must protect any age groups, particularly those most vulnerable to complications of severe influenza. Ideally, new vaccines should enhance the breadth of the immune reaction to include antigenically unique viruses within the same subtype and viruses of other subtypes, should not be produced in eggs, and should require much less time to manufacture than presently licensed technologies. The ultimate goal of an universal influenza vaccine is to safeguard versus all influenza A viruses, preventing the requirement for yearly revaccination. Several promising techniques are under advancement to improve or overcome the drawbacks of the currently licensed vaccines and to induce broad immunity against various other subtypes of influenza with pandemic potential.

Reference:

1. Fiore AE, Uyeki TM, Broder K, Finelli L, Euler GL, Singleton JA, et al. Prevention and control of influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP), 2010. MMWR Recomm Rep. 2010;59(RR-8):1–62.
2. World Health Organization Influenza fact sheet. WER. 2003;78(11):77–80.
3. Picazo J, Suárez A, Fernández A, Rodríguez B, Villorejo S, del Amo MP, et al. Consenso sobre la vacunación frente a la gripe en el personal sanitario. Rev Esp Quimioter. 2012;25:226–39.
4. Bautista D, Vila B, Usó R, Téllez M, Zanón V. Predisposing, reinforcing, and enabling factors influencing influenza vaccination acceptance among healthcare workers. Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol. 2006;27(1):73–7. doi: 10.1086/499148.
5. Vaux S, Van Cauteren D, Guthmann J, Le Strat Y, Vaillant V, de Valk H, et al. Influenza vaccination coverage against seasonal and pandemic influenza and their determinants in France: a cross-sectional survey. BMC Pub Health. 2011;11(1):30. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-11-30.
6. Govaert TM, Thijs C, Masurel N, Sprenger M, Dinant G, Knottnerus J. The efficacy of influenza vaccination in elderly individuals. JAMA. 1994;272(21):1661–5. doi:10.1001/jama.1994. 03520210045030.
7. Abramson Z, Cohen-Naor V. Factors associated with performance of influenza immunization among the elderly. Isr Med Assoc J. 2000;2(12):902–7.
8. Abramson ZH, Levi O. Influenza vaccination among primary healthcare workers. Vaccine. 2008;26(20):2482–9. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2008.03.011.
9. Abramson ZH, Avni O, Levi O, Miskin IN. Is the influenza vaccination rate of elderly patients affected by raising the vaccination rate of the staff at their primary health care clinics? Isr Med Assoc J. 2011;13(6):325–8.
10. Mereckiene J, Cotter S, Nicoll A, Lopalco P, Noori T, Weber JT, et al. Seasonal influenza immunisation in Europe. Overview of recommendations and vaccination coverage for three. Euro Surveill. 2014;19(16):20780.
11. WHO. Influenza (Seasonal) 2014.
12. Grohskopf LA, Olsen SJ, Sokolow LZ, Bresee JS, Cox NJ, Broder KR, Karron RA, Walter EB Centers for Disease C and Prevention. Prevention and control of seasonal influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) -- United States, 2014–15 influenza season. MMWR Morbidity and mortality weekly report. 2014;63:691–697.
13. Coelingh KL, Luke CJ, Jin H, Talaat KR. Development of live attenuated influenza vaccines against pandemic influenza strains. Expert review of vaccines. 2014;13:855–871.
14. Hannoun C. The evolving history of influenza viruses and influenza vaccines. Expert review of vaccines. 2013;12:1085–1094.
15. Smith DJ, Lapedes AS, de Jong JC, Bestebroer TM, Rimmelzwaan GF, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. Mapping the antigenic and genetic evolution of influenza virus. Science. 2004;305:371–376.
16. University of Cambridge, W.C.C. Mapping the Evolution of Pathogens. 2014.

17. Lee YT, Kim KH, Ko EJ, Lee YN, Kim MC, Kwon YM, Tang Y, Cho MK, Lee YJ, Kang SM. New vaccines against influenza virus. Clin Exp Vaccine Res. 2014;3:12–28.
18. Smith DJ, Lapedes AS, de Jong JC, Bestebroer TM, Rimmelzwaan GF, Osterhaus AD, Fouchier RA. Mapping the antigenic and genetic evolution of influenza virus. Science. 2004;305:371–376.
19. Subbarao K, Joseph T. Scientific barriers to developing vaccines against avian influenza viruses. Nature reviews Immunology. 2007;7:267–278.
20. Giles BM, Crevar CJ, Carter DM, Bissel SJ, Schultz-Cherry S, Wiley CA, Ross TM. A computationally optimized hemagglutinin virus-like particle vaccine elicits broadly reactive antibodies that protect nonhuman primates from H5N1 infection. J Infect Dis. 2012b;205:1562–1570.
21. Giles BM, Ross TM. A computationally optimized broadly reactive antigen (COBRA) based H5N1 VLP vaccine elicits broadly reactive antibodies in mice and ferrets. Vaccine. 2011;29:3043–3054.
22. Taubenberger JK, Kash JC. Influenza virus evolution, host adaptation, and pandemic formation. Cell host & microbe. 2010;7:440–451.
23. Babu TM, LM, Fitzgerald T, Luke C, Sangster MY, Jin H, Topham D, Katz J, Treanor J, Subbarao K. Live attenuated H7N7 influenza vaccine primes for a vigorous antibody response to inactivated H7N7 influenza vaccine. Vaccine. 2014 In Press.
24. Baz M, Luke CJ, Cheng X, Jin H, Subbarao K. H5N1 vaccines in humans. Virus Res. 2013;178:78–98.
25. Jin H, Subbarao K. Live attenuated influenza vaccine. Current topics in microbiology and immunology. 2015;386:181–204.
26. Krammer F, Palese P. Influenza virus hemagglutinin stalk-based antibodies and vaccines. Curr Opin Virol. 2013;3:521–530.
27. Li CK, Rappuoli R, Xu XN. Correlates of protection against influenza infection in humans--on the path to a universal vaccine? Current opinion in immunology. 2013;25:470–476.