

Influenza immunization strategies by family doctors to improve primary care

Abdulrahman Ahmed M Asiri, Saad Falah Saeed Alshahrani, Mohammed Moslah M Alsodan,
Abdullah Ali Abdullah Alqahtani, Abdulrahman Abdullah M Alghanem

Abstract:

The main public health strategy for containing influenza-related disease is annual vaccination, which is recommended for the elderly and others belonging to risk-factor categories, who present the highest morbidity and mortality. In this review we discuss history of immunization and improvement strategies of influence immunization in primary care. A computerized search was performed using following databases (Embase, Medline, Web-of- Cochrane, CINAHL) on November, 2017. Searching evidence discussing the Influenza immunization strategies by family doctors. Vaccination of HCW is a key part of a strategy to prevent influenza in groups who are most at risk of complications. The evaluated literature suggests that while no single component is capable of raising influenza vaccination rates in HCW rapidly and to a relevant degree, except perhaps necessary vaccination, a comprehensive, well-supported, well-staffed and well-planned, multifaceted vaccination intervention program by family physicians can raise uptake rates significantly and sustainably. Indeed, it seems likely that in such a multifaceted program, the individual elements defined in this review would sustain each other and perhaps have a synergistic effect.

Introduction:

The major public health approach for having influenza is yearly vaccination, which is suggested for the elderly and others belonging to risk-factor groups, which offer the highest morbidity and death, as reported by the World Health Organization (WHO) Recommendations [1].

Influenza viruses are frequently transforming, primarily as an outcome of so-called "antigenic drift", which includes the constant, spontaneous alteration of viral surface composition, and regards hemagglutinin (HA) and neuraminidase (NA) proteins. Because of this, the vaccine composition has to be adjusted annually to integrate viral stress as comparable as feasible to the epidemic strains.

The degree of similarity or difference in between the circulating viruses and the viruses included in the injections is often described as "vaccine match" or "vaccine mismatch". Vaccine performance, i.e. the ability to prevent influenza instances, is determined both by the degree of vaccine matching and by the qualities of the topics immunized, such as their age and health condition.

The level of antigenic drift and the frequency of drifted infections in circulation can transform from one season to one more, in comparison with each of the strains consisted of in the seasonal influenza vaccine. Since 1973, security systems have enabled the WHO to provide suggestions for the structure of influenza vaccines. Careful evaluation of epidemiological information based upon the antigenic identification of pressures, pathogenic possibility and transmissibility is a beneficial ways of evaluate valuating the persistence and dissemination of new influenza strains [2], [3], [4].

Considering that 1999, the WHO has issued 2 various sets of suggestions each year: one for the northern and one for the southern hemisphere; these recommendations are issued numerous

months prior to the influenza season starts, in order to enable timely production of the upcoming seasonal influenza vaccine in conformity with the suppliers' recommendations. Even when circulating influenza viruses are mildly or moderately drifted in contrast with the vaccine, available evidence recommends that people may still get some safety benefit from vaccination [5].

The main public health strategy for containing influenza-related disease is annual vaccination, which is recommended for the elderly and others belonging to risk-factor categories, who present the highest morbidity and mortality. In this review we discuss history of immunization and improvement strategies of influence immunization in primary care.

Methodology:

A computerized search was performed using following databases (Embase, Medline, Web-of-Cochrane, CINAHL) on November, 2017. Searching evidence discussing the Influenza immunization strategies by family doctors, we consider only English language articles, with human subjects on our review. Furthermore, we reviewed the references list of each identified article for more evidence to be included in present review.

Discussion:

- **Historical evolution of influenza vaccines**

Two main kinds of influenza vaccine are presently readily available: inactivated vaccine and live attenuated vaccine. The first suspended influenza vaccine (IIV) was monovalent and was protective against the A (H1N1) pressure. In 1940, nonetheless, a different influenza virus was separated (influenza B) and the initial bivalent vaccine was consequently tested in healthy adults [2].

Current inactivated vaccines are mostly generated by ways of propagation in embryonated hens' eggs. Nonetheless, the schedule of embryonated hens' eggs is a limiting consider vaccine production, and global production is not anticipated to be able to meet the raised need for doses in the pandemic period [6].

At the end of the 1970s, a new strain of influenza A with various HA and NA was recognized. Since then, 2 influenza A strains (H1N1 and H3N2 subtypes) and one influenza B (Victoria or Yamagata family trees) strain have been included in the majority of influenza injections, called trivalent influenza vaccines (TIV) [7]

The initial trivalent live undermined influenza vaccine (LAIV) was licensed in Russia in the late 1970s and in North America in 2003. Europe lately advised its use in kids aged 2 years. The objective of vaccination with an online attenuated virus is to generate a secretory and systemic immune response that a lot more closely looks like the immune reaction discovered after natural infection [8]. However, the immunological devices of action and correlates of defense continue to be greatly vague [9].

In more current years, enhancements were made, mostly in production modern technologies and use of adjuvants, while cutting-edge solutions were based upon two concepts: the manufacturing

of reassortant strains between wildtype viruses (for their antigenic homes) and cultureadapted pressures (for their replication buildings).

Alternative paths of delivery have been likewise checked out, particularly intradermal (ID) management. An ID TIV obtained marketing permission in the EU in February 2009, and was certified by the European Medicines Agency (EMA) for grownups older than 60 years in the 2010/11 season in Europe, and in Canada in September 2010. In the US, the exact same vaccine was authorized by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on 10th May 2011 and has been readily available in the US given that the 2011/2012 influenza period for topics older compared to 64 years.

In 2013, the WHO recommendations included a 2nd influenza B strain in the vaccine composition, permitting participant countries making their very own choice on the opportunity to suggest a TIV or a quadrivalent (QIV) influenza vaccine in their immunization programs.

- **Influenza vaccination recommendations**

WHO recommendations define the criteria for determining risk teams and other groups targeted for vaccination. Age is taken into consideration a threat factor for influenza infection, as the elderly are at high danger of complications such as morbidity, hospitalization and mortality. Vaccination is suggested for the elderly globally, though age requirements differ from one country to another.

In the last years, research has concentrated on increasing the defense of elderly topics and improving their immune reaction, which has been revealed to be below that of more youthful adults [1].A variety of researches have shown that MF59-adjuvanted vaccine and ID influenza vaccine give higher immunogenicity compared to non-adjuvanted vaccines in the elderly [10-

14].Consequently, it is advisable to immunize these vulnerable topics with non-conventional vaccinations. Other classifications of at-risk subjects have been identified, and, on the basis of the most recent clinical evidence and guidelines from clinical societies, it is advised that they ought to be vaccinated versus influenza every year. Hereof, it has been demonstrated that influenza-vaccinated patients with rheumatoid arthritis or systemic lupus erythematosus are less most likely to contract pneumonia, acute bronchitis or viral infections compared to unvaccinated patients [15].

In a lot of research studies, neither DMARDs neither TNF inhibitors have hampered humoral immune actions to influenza vaccination, while rituximab has been seen to do so significantly [16].Additionally, a large meta-analysis revealed that the incident of adverse events adhering to influenza vaccination was comparable in patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic conditions (AIIRD) and in healthy and balanced controls [17].On the basis of this proof and expert point of views, in 2011 the Evidence-based European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) formulated suggestions for annual influenza vaccination in patients with AIIRD.

It is well established that the immunological response to the seasonal TIV influenza vaccine is additionally undermined in cancer patients. Rates of seroprotection and seroconversion vary by malignancy kind and are greater in patients with strong tumors, unlike in those with hematologic malignancies or in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell recipients. Recent literature has reported that using myeloablative radiation treatment programs and biologics is associated with lowered immunogenicity to influenza vaccines. Moreover, in cancer patients, influenza infections not only result in acute illness however could also result in postpone in vital therapies for the malignancy, such as subsequent dosing of chemotherapy or biologics. In order to avoid these complications,

vaccination stays the primary way to increase immunity against seasonal influenza, and for that reason stop infection [18].

The use of organized influenza vaccination in patients with coronary cardiovascular disease prevents cardiovascular morbidity and all-cause mortality, as reported in various meta research studies and randomized clinical trials [19]. On the basis of this proof, because 2006 the American Heart Association and American College of Cardiology has recommended influenza immunization with inactivated vaccine as component of extensive secondary avoidance personallies with coronary and various other atherosclerotic vascular conditions [20].

- **Improving strategies of immunization in primary care**

Couple of methodologically extensive research studies have been published on how to successfully and sustainably raise influenza vaccine uptake rates amongst HCW; nevertheless, numerous insights arised from our review of the available literature. We located in our restricted analysis that programs utilizing a larger number of treatment parts attained higher vaccine coverage. Amongst specific approaches reported to have high success rates, the arrangement of free vaccine seems to be crucial. The most effective treatment, nonetheless, appears to be a mandatory vaccination policy for health care workers. The 3 programmes that utilized this approach accomplished nearly universal protection. While the majority of researches evaluated were executed during a single season, we located proof that sustained efforts cause high and sustained vaccination uptake rates.

Provision of free vaccine was used in nearly all programmes at standard, however was officially assessed in one research study where it appeared to be the critical part to considerably boost vaccine uptake after other approaches before showed either absolutely no or a minimal success

[21]. This result is constant with outcomes of a meta-analysis of researches that have investigated self-reported factors for non-receipt of the vaccine where inconvenient gain access to has been determined as one of the major obstacles, especially for doctors [22].

Other useful treatment elements consisted of flexible and worksite vaccine shipment, the assignment of staff committed to take responsibility for the programme, and provision of educational materials. Concerning the latter, an essential aspect of creating instructional product is that nurses and doctors will likely have to be targeted in different methods [25]. This is sustained by numerous research studies that discovered that the vaccination rate of registered nurses was dramatically reduced than that of physicians, [24] and research study showing big differences in attitudes and expertise worrying influenza vaccination between nurses and physicians [25]. Educational messages will likely need to be communicated in several methods to increase the possibility and frequency of experiences. A current meta-analysis on treatments for grown-up immunization programmes supports the notion of the potential positive results rewards might have. ⁵⁶ Understanding knowledge and attitudes prior to the treatment has been utilized to tailor intervention programmes and shape the components of academic tasks to neighborhood demands and was likewise assessed by several researches. Although several of these customized research studies reported a significant increase in uptake, their success might not be connected directly to the carried out study [21], [23]. Due to the fact that neighborhood problems, peer opinion, cultural, institutional and logistical elements will all lead to distinctions in understanding and behavior and since reasons for rejection of the vaccine cover a vast and varied spectrum, making use of a pre-intervention survey makes intuitive feeling.

Making vaccination a mandatory condition of first and proceeded HCW employment is likely to be the most questionable, yet additionally successful approach for boosting uptake [30]. A recent

study amongst US HCW that reported working at a facility where vaccination was needed by their company, 98 - 1% were immunized [26]. Insufficient vaccine uptake degrees have prompted countless medical care centers in the USA to institute required programmes for their HCW to secure patients [31]. Additionally, several US professional societies suggested that influenza vaccination of HCW be made necessary, [27] and a number of studies showed assistance for this plan among HCW in the USA and medical trainees in Germany [28]. Nonetheless, the vaccination mandate in the USA has fulfilled substantial resistance. HCW opposed against the execution of a vaccination demand and made a successful lawful obstacle on the basis that the hospital had actually broken the regards to their contracts [30]. Opponents claim that a mandate breaches HCW personal autonomy and right to make clinical choices concerning their body themselves and that it could 'alienate staff and damages spirits', undermine depend on and negatively affect staff member- employer relationship [31]. Analysts that sustain necessary vaccination assume the failure of voluntary vaccination approaches and suggest that the advantages for patients exceed worries and threats of vaccination on behalf of the HCW and that the constraints of HCW autonomy and freedom of selection are for that reason fairly warranted, unless a legitimate clinical contraindication exists [29]. From their point of view, obligatory programs meet the specialist values and codes of ethics taken on by HCW, that is, to do no injury and to act in patients' benefits. However, while the avoidance of harm to others is a potential reason for the constraint of freedom, obligatory procedures are just justified under specific problems [31]. Effective programs presented in this testimonial have made substantial business and instructional initiatives before the begin of the compulsory plan recommending that an obligatory programme should not be used as the easy, management magic bullet, yet needs a minimum of simultaneous or perhaps much better antecedent implementation of a multifaceted programme using various

other components described in this testimonial to maximize opportunities for a 'friendly function' of the plan by staff.

Box 1. Elements suggested for a successful HCW vaccination program

1. Commitment of and strong support by the hospital's top management;
2. Pre-intervention information collection to identify important barriers to vaccination with a consequent adjustment (tailoring) of the intervention programme to the gained experience from the pre-intervention investigations (e.g. profession, gender, race sensitive);
3. Provision of free vaccine;
4. Organization of easily accessible vaccine, for example, through flexible and worksite delivery;
5. Organization of several activities belonging to the components educational material, education session, reminders, incentives;
6. Management optimization, such as (i) assignment of (one or more) dedicated staff to organize and actively promote the measure, and/or (ii) giving feedback of vaccination uptake rates during the preparation phase for the influenza season;
7. In a well-prepared setting: requirement of all HCW to become vaccinated against influenza with the possibility to opt-out by signing a declination statement;
8. Continuation of the assessment – planning – intervention cycle for several years.

 **Conclusion:**

Vaccination of HCW is a key part of a strategy to prevent influenza in groups who are most at risk of complications. The evaluated literature suggests that while no single component is capable of raising influenza vaccination rates in HCW rapidly and to a relevant degree, except perhaps necessary vaccination, a comprehensive, well-supported, well-staffed and well-planned, multifaceted vaccination intervention program by family physicians can raise uptake rates significantly and sustainably. Indeed, it seems likely that in such a multifaceted program, the individual elements defined in this review would sustain each other and perhaps have a synergistic effect. A successful program would consist of as numerous elements as possible (Box1) nevertheless, in resource-limited setups, hospital managers might intend to focus on two components that seem to be most efficient in quickly increasing vaccination rates. Initially, flexible access to free vaccination is essential to get over time- and access-related barriers to

vaccine uptake. Second, the method for a successful HCW vaccination program needs culturally sensitive education on the risk of influenza and the overall benefits of vaccination, tailored to specific professional features.

Reference:

1. Parodi V, Florentiis D, Martini M, Ansaldi F. Inactivated influenza vaccines: recent progress and implication for the elderly. *Drugs Aging*. 2011 Jan;28:93–106.
2. Hannoun C. The evolving history of influenza viruses and influenza vaccines. *Expert Rev Vaccines*. 2013;12:1085–1094.
3. Wood JM, Williams MS. History of Inactivated Influenza vaccines. In: *Textbook of Influenza*. Oxford: Blackwell Science. 1998;pp.:317–323.
4. Florentiis D, Parodi V, Orsi , Rossi A, Altomonte F, Canepa P, Ceravolo A, Valle L, Zancolli M, Piccotti E, et al. Impact of influenza during the post-pandemic season: epidemiological picture from syndromic and virological surveillance . *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2011;52:134–136.
5. Crovari P, Alberti M, Alicino C. History and evolution of influenza vaccines. *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2011;52:91–94.
6. Haaheim LR, Madhun AS, Cox R. Pandemic influenza vaccines – the challenges. *Viruses*. 2009;1:1089–1109.
7. Treanor JJ. Prospects for broadly protective influenza vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2015;33(Suppl 4):D39–D45.
8. Gasparini R, Amicizia D, Lai PL, Panatto D, et al. Live attenuated influenza vaccine. *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2011;52:95–101.

9. Sridhar S, Brokstad KA, Cox RJ, et al. Influenza vaccination strategies: comparing inactivated and live attenuated influenza vaccines. *Vaccines*. 2015;3:373–389.
10. Ansaldo F, Bacilieri S, Durando P, Sticchi L, Valle L, Montomoli E, Icardi G, Gasparini R, Crovari P. Cross-protection by MF59-adjuvanted influenza vaccine: neutralizing and haemagglutination- inhibiting antibody activity against A(H3N2) drifted influenza viruses . *Vaccine*. 2008;26:1525–1529.
11. Minutello M, Senatore F, Cecchinelli G, Bianchi M, Andreani T, Podda A, Crovari P. Safety and immunogenicity of an inactivated subunit influenza virus vaccine combined with MF59 adjuvant emulsion in helderly subjects, immunized for three consecutive influenza Seasons. *Vaccine*. 1999;17:99–104.
12. Giudice G, Hilbert AK, Bugarini R, Minutello A, Popova O, Toneatto D, Schoendorf I, Borkowski A, Rappuoli R, Podda A. An MF59-adjuvanted inactivated vaccine containing A/ Panama/1999 (H3N2) induced broader serological protection against heterovariant influenza strain A/Fujian/2002 than a subunit and a split influenza vaccine . *Vaccine*. 2006;24:3063–3065.
13. Gasparini R, Pozzi T, Montomoli E, Fragapane E, Senatore F, Minutello M, Podda A. Increased immunogenicity of the MF59- adjuvanted vaccine compared to a conventional vaccine in elderly subjects . *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2001;17:135–140.
14. Arakane R, Annaka R, Takahama A, Ishida K, Yoshiike M, Nakayama T, Takeshita F. Superior immunogenicity profile of the new intradermal influenza vaccine compared to the standard subcutaneous vaccine in subjects 65 years and older: a randomized controlled phase III study . *Vaccine*. 2015;33:6650–6658.
15. Assen Assen, Agmon-Levin N, Elkayam O, Cervera R, Doran MF, Dougados M, Emery P, Geborek P, Ioannidis JP, Jayne DR, et al. EULAR recommendations for vaccination in adult patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic diseases . *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2011;70:414–422.
16. Davis MM, Taubert K, Benin AL, Brown DW, Mensah GA, Baddour LM, Dunbar S, Krumholz HM American Heart Association, author; American College of Cardiology, author; American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation, author; American Association of Critical Care Nurses, author; American Association of Heart Failure Nurses, author; American Diabetes Association, author; Association of Black Cardiologists, Inc, author; Heart Failure Society of America, author; Preventive Cardiovascular Nurses Association, author; American Academy of Nurse Practitioners, author; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Advisory Committee on Immunization, author. Influenza vaccination as secondary prevention for cardiovascular disease: a science advisory from the American Heart Association/American College of Cardiology. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2006;48:1498–1502. Erratum in: *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2006 Dec.
17. Kobashigawa T, Inoue E, Tanaka E, Momohara S, Yamanaka H. Vaccination against seasonal influenza is effective in Japanese patients with rheumatoid arthritis enrolled in a large observational cohort . *Scand J Rheumatol*. 2013;42:445–450.

18. Westra J, Rondaan C, Assen S, Bijl M. Vaccination of patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic diseases . *Nat Rev Rheumatol*. 2015;11:135–145.
19. Baluch A, Pasikhova Y. Influenza vaccination in oncology patients. *Curr Infect Dis Rep*. 2013;15:486–490.
20. Caldeira D, Costa J, Vaz-Carneiro A. Analysis of the Cochrane review: influenza Vaccines for preventing cardiovascular disease. *Acta Med Port*. 2015;28:424–426. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;5:CD00505.
21. Song JY, Park CW, Jeong HW, Cheong HJ, Kim WJ, Kim SR. Effect of a hospital campaign for influenza vaccination of healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*2006; 27:612–617.
22. Hollmeyer HG, Hayden F, Poland G, Buchholz U. Influenza vaccination of health care workers in hospitals--a review of studies on attitudes and predictors. *Vaccine*2009; 27:3935–3944.
23. Begue RE, Gee SQ. Improving influenza immunization among healthcare workers. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*1998; 19:518–520.
24. de Juanes JR, Garcia dC, Arrazola MP, Jaen F, Sanz MI, Gonzalez A. Influenza vaccination coverage among hospital personnel over three consecutive vaccination campaigns (2001–2002 to 2003–2004). *Vaccine*2007; 25:201–204.
25. Leitmeyer K, Buchholz U, Kramer M *et al*. Influenza vaccination in German health care workers: effects and findings after two rounds of a nationwide awareness campaign. *Vaccine*2006;24:7003–7008.
26. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Influenza vaccination coverage among health-care personnel – United States, 2010–11 influenza season. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*2011; 60:1073–1077.
27. Poland GA. Mandating influenza vaccination for health care workers: putting patients and professional ethics over personal preference. *Vaccine*2010; 28:5757–5759.
28. deSante JE, Caplan A, Shofer F, Behrman AJ. Physician attitudes towards influenza immunization and vaccine mandates. *Vaccine*2010; 28:2517–2521.
29. Douville LE, Myers A, Jackson MA, Lantos JD. Health care worker knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs regarding mandatory influenza vaccination. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*2010; 164:33–37.
30. Finch M. Point: mandatory influenza vaccination for all health care workers? Seven reasons to say “no”*Clin Infect Dis*2006; 42:1141–1143.
31. Sullivan PL. Influenza vaccination in healthcare workers: should it be mandatory? *Online J Issues Nurs*2010; 15:6. (Generic).