



London, 16 March 2009

EMEA/CVMP/IWP/439467/2007-CONSULTATION

**COMMITTEE FOR MEDICINAL PRODUCTS FOR VETERINARY USE  
(CVMP)**

**REFLECTION PAPER ON THE DEMONSTRATION OF A POSSIBLE IMPACT OF  
MATERNALLY DERIVED ANTIBODIES ON VACCINE EFFICACY IN YOUNG ANIMALS**

<b>DRAFT AGREED BY IMMUNOLOGICALS WORKING PARTY</b>	28 January 2009
<b>ADOPTION BY CVMP FOR RELEASE FOR CONSULTATION</b>	12 March 2009
<b>END OF CONSULTATION (DEADLINE FOR COMMENTS)</b>	30 September 2009

Comments should be provided using this [template](#) to [Vet-guidelines@emea.europa.eu](mailto:Vet-guidelines@emea.europa.eu)  
Fax +44 20 7418 8447

<b>Key words:</b>	Maternally acquired immunity, maternally derived antibodies (MDAs), young animals, vaccine interference, vaccine efficacy
-------------------	---

16 **REFLECTION PAPER ON THE DEMONSTRATION OF A POSSIBLE IMPACT OF**  
17 **MATERNALLY DERIVED ANTIBODIES ON VACCINE EFFICACY IN YOUNG ANIMALS**  
18

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**1 INTRODUCTION..... 3**  
**2 SCOPE..... 3**  
**3 LEGAL BASIS ..... 3**  
**4 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS ..... 3**  
**5. POSSIBLE IMPACT OF MDAS ON VACCINE EFFICACY ..... 4**

29 **1 INTRODUCTION**

30

31 Protection against infectious diseases is normally provided in neonatal and young animals by passive  
32 maternally acquired immunity and/or by active immunity induced by early vaccination. In mammals,  
33 early protection results from uptake of circulating maternal antibodies via the colostrum shortly after  
34 birth but can also continue via the milk during the period of lactation (the so-called lactogenic  
35 immunity). In some mammalian species, a smaller or larger portion of maternal antibodies is  
36 transferred to the fetus via the placenta. In avian species, maternal antibodies are transferred via the  
37 egg yolk towards the progeny. In general, the extent and duration of the protection of the offspring or  
38 progeny offered by maternally acquired immunity, in which maternally derived antibodies (MDAs)  
39 play a major role, are proportional to the amounts received from the mother.

40

41 Active immunization of embryos, neonates and young animals can be obtained with vaccines which  
42 can be safely administered *in ovo*, soon or shortly after birth and can provide satisfactory levels of  
43 efficacy after one or more administrations, depending on the level of MDAs and the potential of a  
44 vaccine to break through the MDA barrier. This is a particularly challenging task as the relative  
45 immaturity of the immune system in early life of animals and the potential interference of passively  
46 acquired MDAs may hamper the formation of active immunity, thus leading to failure of response to  
47 vaccination. The age, at which the young animal can be optimally vaccinated without experiencing  
48 any negative impact on vaccine efficacy is difficult to estimate. Determining the optimal age and  
49 schedule of vaccination is, therefore, of crucial importance in order to balance benefits and risks  
50 inherent with the use of vaccines in young animals.

51

52 The aim of the present reflection paper is to give guidance on how to demonstrate to which extent  
53 MDAs may have an impact on the efficacy of vaccines when administered to animals at an age at  
54 which maternally acquired immunity is still present.

55

56

57 **2 SCOPE**

58

59 This reflection paper applies to all veterinary vaccines submitted for authorisation via centralised,  
60 decentralised, mutual recognition and national procedures, unless justified. This reflection paper  
61 presents data that should be provided when a vaccine is intended to be used in young animals which  
62 potentially have MDAs. If the applicant can demonstrate that the interference of MDAs is not a  
63 problem with regard to the efficacy of the vaccination (e.g animals to be vaccinated have reached an  
64 age at which MDAs are no longer present), this reflection paper is not relevant.

65

66

67 **3 LEGAL BASIS**

68

69 This reflection paper has to be read in conjunction with the relevant part 8 - efficacy of Title II of the  
70 Annex I to Directive 2001/82/EC as amended. In particular, general provisions of part 8 clearly  
71 require that the influence of passively acquired and maternally derived antibodies on the efficacy of a  
72 vaccine shall be adequately evaluated.

73

74

75 **4 GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

76

77 If vaccination is recommended in animals at an age at which maternally acquired immunity may still  
78 be present and may interfere with active immunity development, studies to determine whether or not  
79 such interference occurs should be performed.

80

81 The degree, persistence, and natural decay of MDAs may vary considerably depending on factors such  
82 as animal species, immune status of the mother, quantity and time of colostrum uptake by the neonate,  
83 rate of catabolisation etc. The level of antibodies in the dams in the general population may be highly  
84 variable, resulting in variable, low or high levels of MDA in the progeny. The antibody levels could be  
85 variable, for example, when the dams may be vaccinated at a time before they are pregnant and when

86 there is a relatively low incidence of the relevant disease in the environment. The levels may be low,  
87 for example, when there is only a low or short-lived level of antibodies induced by a vaccine or  
88 disease agent. High levels could be expected, for example, when there is routine vaccination of dams  
89 in pregnancy with a highly immunogenic vaccine. Consequently, the age at which MDAs no longer  
90 interfere with efficient activation of the young animal's immune system upon vaccination will vary  
91 considerably. Factors including the type of vaccine and the route of administration also have to be  
92 considered when evaluating the impact of passive MDAs on the development of an active immune  
93 response in the vaccinated animals.

## 94 95 96 **5. POSSIBLE IMPACT OF MDAS ON VACCINE EFFICACY**

97  
98 Depending on the nature and the properties of the vaccine (e.g. dose and strain of live vaccines) and/or  
99 on specific circumstances related e.g. to the vaccination programme or method of administration (such  
100 as: *in ovo* vaccination, vaccination against ubiquitous pathogens, etc.), laboratory and/or field studies  
101 are necessary to demonstrate the efficacy of a vaccine administered in the presence of passive MDAs.  
102

103 As a matter of principle, the extent and duration of passively acquired immunity should be determined  
104 but such data can generally be gathered from scientific publications, from field trials or from the  
105 populations on the premises where animals are selected for performing MDA interference studies.  
106

107 To verify the presence or absence of interference by MDAs on the vaccine take and thus with the  
108 efficacy of the vaccination, the following study could be performed, but it can be modified as  
109 necessary to take account of the particular circumstances.  
110

111 Three groups of animals at the minimum age recommended for vaccination are used. One group  
112 (group 1) contains animals without MDAs. The two other groups (groups 2 and 3) consist of animals  
113 having MDAs. The level of MDAs is measured in each animal by using a validated laboratory test  
114 relevant for detecting such antibodies. The MDA titre found should be representative of the titre of  
115 animals of the same age to be vaccinated under field circumstances. Possible reference made to  
116 varying degrees (low, medium, high) of MDAs should be justified.  
117

118 The recommended vaccination schedule, using a vaccine with minimum titre or potency, should be  
119 applied to two groups of animals, one with representative MDA titres (group 2) and one without  
120 MDAs (group 1). The third group of animals (group 3) with MDAs should not be vaccinated and  
121 should be followed for decay of MDAs.  
122

123 The follow up of the study depends then on the relation between the antibodies and the protection (see  
124 also table below):  
125

- 126 a) If the applicant has previously demonstrated that there is a direct correlation between the  
127 antibody titre and the protection against the disease, a serological follow up will be adequate  
128 and group 1 is not needed.

129 At the age when, in the group of animals with MDAs and not vaccinated (group 3), MDAs  
130 have become low to undetectable, the vaccination in the group vaccinated in the presence of  
131 MDAs should have induced an antibody titre which is protective. It may be possible, if  
132 justified, to investigate the effect of MDA on serological responses under field conditions, in  
133 which case the non vaccinated group (group 3), intended to follow the decay of MDAs, would  
134 also serve to exclude that field infections have occurred.  
135

- 136 b) If there is no direct correlation between antibody titre and protection, then a challenge  
137 experiment is needed.

138 Challenge should be performed at the age when MDAs have disappeared or have reached low  
139 levels in group 3 that has not been vaccinated. One or more parameters to demonstrate  
140 protection from challenge should be evaluated (e.g. clinical, pathological, virological,  
141 bacteriological criteria) and it should be shown that the efficacy of the vaccine in animals

142 vaccinated in the presence of MDAs is, notwithstanding normal biological variation, similar to  
 143 that obtained in animals of the same age but vaccinated in the absence of MDAs.  
 144 If the results of the study indicate that the MDAs interfere with vaccine efficacy, this point  
 145 should be indicated in the SPC and the applicant should define the schedule of vaccination that  
 146 will ensure protection of vaccinated animals, both with and without MDAs

147  
 148 Table 1: Summary of the protocol  
 149

Group	MDA status	Age	Vaccination	Serological follow up	Challenge	Interpretation of results if MDAs do not interfere with vaccination efficacy*
1	MDA -	Minimum	yes	yes	Yes if no direct correlation between serology and protection	If correlation between serology and protection, antibody titres in group 2 should be protective.
2	MDA +	Minimum	yes	yes		If no such correlation exists, protection upon challenge in group 2 should, notwithstanding normal biological variation, be similar to that observed in group 1
3	MDA +	Minimum	no	yes		Group 3 = control group. which allows : -to define the time of endpoint for serology in group 2 or the time of challenge in all the groups, -to check the absence of intercurrent infection , -to validate the challenge.

150