



# Burden of HPV-Related Diseases in the Czech Republic: Model-Based Study

## Vojtech Kamenský<sup>1</sup>, Juliana Müllerová<sup>1,2</sup>, Aleš Tichopád<sup>1</sup> and Ivana Šarkanová<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Biomedical Technology, Faculty of Biomedical Engineering, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czechia <sup>2</sup> CEEOR s.r.o., Prague, Czechia,

#### Introduction

Human papillomavirus (HPV) infections are among the most prevalent sexually transmitted infections worldwide and are associated with various cancers. This

lable 1: Economic	outcomes from simu	llation of 11-years-c	olds cohorts.	
Discount rate	No vaccination		Vaccination	
Discount rate	0%	3%	0%	3%
	Female	e cohort (69.2% vaccinated g	girls)	

model-based study assessed the burden of HPV-related diseases in the Czech Republic and evaluated the cost-effectiveness of a potential 9vHPV catch-up vaccination program.

# Methods

- A Markov multistate model was developed to calculate the lifetime health and economic outcomes of HPV infections and vaccination (Fig.1) [1].
- The model was simulated for 94 cycles (up to the age of 105), separately for 11-years old males and females The simulation comprised 58,368 females and 60,994 males.
- Additionally, cohorts of ages 15-21 were simulated to assess the impact of catch-up vaccination outside the 11-year-old age group. Four possible scenarios were considered: one where none of the unvaccinated receive the vaccine, and three others where 10%, 20%, and 30% of the remaining individuals are vaccinated with the 9vHPV vaccine.



IOLAI QALIS	5,055,555	1,554,500	5,021,702	1,041,108		
Total costs [CZK]	3,121,654,628	1,164,470,603	1,268,140,794	649,587,351		
Cost per patient [CZK]	53,482	19,950	21,727	11,129		
Indirect costs [CZK]	39,863,033		12,886,959			
Male cohort (42.5% vaccinated boys)						
Total QALYs	3,248,566	1,497,037	3,449,418	1,573,312		
Total costs [CZK]	1,229,962,168	370,703,660	886,453,336	390,646,360		
Cost per patient [CZK]	20,165	6,078	14,533	6,405		
Indirect costs [CZK]	22,281,130		12,879,109			

#### 2. Probabilistic sensitivity analysis

In the probabilistic sensitivity analysis of model with female population, vaccination was the dominant strategy in 99.3% of the iteration, and in only 0.7% of the iterations was vaccination the more costly strategy with higher benefits (the average ICER value in this case was 796 CZK per QALY). In the male population, vaccination was the dominant strategy in 80.3% of iterations, and in 19.7% of iterations, vaccination was the more costly strategy with higher benefits (the average ICER value in this case was 452 CZK per QALY)(Fig.3).



**Fig 1** The simplified structure of the Markov model. Intraepithelial neoplasia (3 degrees of severity) is referred as -IN, which can progress to cancer. Cervical (CIN), vulvar (VIN), vaginal (VaIN), anal (AIN), penile (PeIN) and oropharyngeal (OIN) areas.

### Results

#### 1. 11-year-olds group

Considering the outcomes evaluated, the vaccination scenario produced significant benefits for both sex cohorts (Fig. 2; Table 1).



**Fig 3** Incremental costs vs. incremental QALYs from 1,000 probabilistic sensitivity analysis simulations. A - female cohort; B- male cohort

#### 3. Catch-up vaccination

The three-dose catch-up vaccination strategy for the 15-21 age group was found to be more effective and cost-efficient, similar to the strategy for the 11-year-old group, making it the dominant intervention compared to the no-vaccination scenario. (Table 2).

**Table 2:** Total (discounted) QALYs, costs, and the ICER associated with catch-up vaccination strategy in female and male cohort.

Female cohort	No vaccination	10%	20%	30%
		0% discount rate		
Total QALYs	6,471,884	6,500,298	6,528,712	6,557,126
Total costs [CZK]	6,080,615,328	5,787,944,250	5,495,273,171	5,202,602,093
Indirect costs [CZK]	77,898,321	73,510,487	68,614,245	63,718,003
ICER [CZK per QALY]	dominated	dominant	dominant	dominant
		3% discount rate		
Total QALYs	2,790,094	2,791,389	2,803,590	2,815,792
Total costs [CZK]	2,268,251,502	2,246,910,071	2,197,233,155	2,147,556,239
Indirect costs [CZK]	77,898,321	73,510,487	68,614,245	63,718,003
ICER [CZK per QALY]	dominated	dominant	dominant	dominant
Male cohort	No vaccination	10%	20%	30%
Male cohort	No vaccination	10% 0% discount rate	20%	30%
Male cohort Total QALYs	<b>No vaccination</b> 13,173,861	<b>10%</b> <b>0% discount rate</b> 13,358,031	<b>20%</b> 13,542,202	<b>30%</b> 13,726,372
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119	10%         0% discount rate         13,358,031         5,565,285,753	<b>20%</b> 13,542,202 5,479,398,719	<b>30%</b> 13,726,372 5,360,055,519
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242	10%         0% discount rate         13,358,031         5,565,285,753         95,867,064	<b>20%</b> 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886	<b>30%</b> 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK] ICER [CZK per QALY]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242           dominated	10%         0% discount rate         13,358,031         5,565,285,753         95,867,064         dominant	<b>20%</b> 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886 dominant	<b>30%</b> 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708 dominant
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK] ICER [CZK per QALY]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242           dominated	10%         0% discount rate         13,358,031         5,565,285,753         95,867,064         dominant         3% discount rate	20% 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886 dominant	<b>30%</b> 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708 dominant
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK] ICER [CZK per QALY] Total QALYs	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242           dominated           5,679,384	10%         0% discount rate         13,358,031         5,565,285,753         95,867,064         dominant         3% discount rate         5,736,269	20% 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886 dominant 5,815,357	30% 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708 dominant 5,894,444
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK] ICER [CZK per QALY] Total QALYs Total Costs [CZK]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242           dominated           5,679,384           2,268,251,502	10%0% discount rate13,358,0315,565,285,75395,867,064dominant3% discount rate5,736,2692,367,946,175	20% 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886 dominant 5,815,357 2,439,305,362	30% 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708 dominant 5,894,444 2,510,664,550
Male cohort Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK] ICER [CZK per QALY] Total QALYs Total costs [CZK] Indirect costs [CZK]	No vaccination           13,173,861           5,718,085,119           103,778,242           dominated           5,679,384           2,268,251,502           77,898,321	10%0% discount rate13,358,0315,565,285,75395,867,064dominant3% discount rate5,736,2692,367,946,17573,510,487	20% 13,542,202 5,479,398,719 87,955,886 dominant 5,815,357 2,439,305,362 68,614,245	30% 13,726,372 5,360,055,519 80,044,708 dominant 5,894,444 2,510,664,550 63,718,003

**Fig 2** Graphical representations of QALY outcomes in both 11-years-olds cohorts as a function of vaccination rates, comparing scenarios without vs. with vaccination.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The results emphasised the extensive benefits of the HPV vaccination. The results strongly encourage the implementation of the 9vHPV catch-up vaccination program in the Czech Republic to address the current immunisation gap and extend the benefits of the HPV vaccination to older age groups who missed the initial vaccinations.

References: [1] Simons JJM, Vida N, Westra TA, Postma MJ. Cost-effectiveness analysis of a gender-neutral human papillomavirus vaccination program in the Netherlands. Vaccine. 2020 Jun; 38(30): 4687–94.