

The First Oral Rotavirus Vaccine, 1998–1999: Estimates of Uptake from the National Immunization Survey

PHILIP J. SMITH, PhD^a
BEN SCHWARTZ, MD^a
ALI MOKDAD, PhD^a
ALAN B. BLOCH, MD^a
MARY MCCAULEY, MTSC^a
TRUDY V. MURPHY, MD^a

SYNOPSIS

Objective. On August 31, 1998, the rhesus-human reassortant rotavirus vaccine (RRV-TV) was licensed for use in the U.S. During the next nine months, 15 cases of intussusception were reported among infants who received the vaccine. Case-control and cohort studies showed a significantly increased risk of developing intussusception within one week of receiving the vaccine; subsequent ecologic studies did not. In this study, the authors used data on RRV-TV vaccination rates from the National Immunization Survey (NIS) to estimate state and national RRV-TV uptake rates and factors associated with receiving RRV-TV. These estimates are a key component in evaluating published ecologic studies designed to investigate the relationship between receipt of the vaccine and intussusception.

Methods. The authors analyzed NIS data for children ages 19 to 35 months who were eligible to receive RRV-TV between September 1998 and July 1999. The authors estimated vaccine coverage and the number of doses administered by state, NIS sampling quarter, and birth cohort, and analyzed demographic and socioeconomic variables to evaluate their relationship with receiving RRV-TV.

Results. It was estimated that approximately 1 million doses of RRV-TV were administered to 504,585 ($\pm 61,854$) children, 13.4% ($\pm 1.6\%$) of children who were eligible. The estimated number of doses administered and the vaccination coverage rate varied greatly from state to state. Children living in households with higher socioeconomic conditions were more likely to receive the vaccine.

Conclusion. Ecologic studies had a limited ability to detect a significant increase in the population incidence rate of intussusception that could be attributed to RRV-TV because populations in these studies consisted primarily of children who did not receive the vaccine. The example from RRV-TV demonstrates some of the challenges of assessing the magnitude of the association between a vaccine and an uncommon or rare adverse event.

^aNational Immunization Program, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

Address correspondence to: Philip J. Smith, PhD, CDC, National Immunization Program, MS E-62, 1600 Clifton Road NE, Atlanta, GA 30333; tel. 404-639-8729; e-mail <PSmith3@cdc.gov>.

Rotavirus is the most common cause of severe diarrhea among infants worldwide.¹ In the United States, approximately 2.7 million children younger than 5 years of age are infected with rotavirus diarrhea each year, resulting in 500,000 physician visits and 50,000 hospitalizations at an estimated cost of \$274 million in medical care and more than \$1 billion in societal costs.^{2,3} In developing countries, an estimated 800,000 deaths per year are caused by rotavirus.^{4,5}

An oral, live, tetravalent, rhesus-human reassortant rotavirus vaccine, RotaShield (RRV-TV), was developed and found to be effective in clinical trials among children in North America, South America, and Europe.⁶ On the basis of these studies, RRV-TV was licensed on August 31, 1998, for use among infants in the United States.⁷

In the precensure studies of candidate live attenuated rhesus-human reassortant rotavirus vaccines administered orally, intussusception occurred in five of 10,054 vaccine recipients and in one of 4,633 controls.⁸ While these data suggested a possible relationship between vaccination with the candidate vaccines and intussusception, the difference between these estimated rates was not statistically significant. As a precaution, intussusception was listed in the vaccine package insert as a possible adverse reaction, and the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommended post-licensure surveillance for intussusception.⁷

Within nine months of licensure of RRV-TV, 15 cases of intussusception among recipients of RRV-TV were reported to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS).⁹ Based on these data and data from the manufacturer's precensure studies, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended on July 16, 1999, that health-care providers and parents postpone administration of RRV-TV while further investigation was undertaken.¹⁰ Subsequently, the manufacturer ceased distribution of the vaccine.

In response to these reports, the CDC conducted case-control and cohort studies, which demonstrated that the risk of intussusception was increased significantly following administration of the first dose of RRV-TV by approximately one case in 10,000 vaccinees.^{11,12} In October 1999, the ACIP withdrew its recommendation for the administration of RRV-TV in the U.S.^{13,14}

Two ecologic studies conducted by Simonsen et al.¹⁵ and Chang et al.¹⁶ questioned whether RRV-TV was, in fact, associated with increased risk of intussusception. Estimates of vaccine coverage are a key component in ecologic analyses to detect a significant increase in the population incidence rates of intussusception after the

administration of RRV-TV over the rate of intussusception in the absence of RRV-TV. The assumption is that the increase could be attributed to RRV-TV. The conclusions of the two studies depended on state-level estimates of the number and percentage of children receiving RRV-TV. To estimate these statistics, both studies used preliminary marketing and distribution data from the manufacturer. Since doses distributed to a state may be redistributed to other states or stored for future administration, coverage estimates derived from these data may be inaccurate.

We analyzed data from the 1999–2001 National Immunization Survey (NIS), a large probability sample survey conducted by the CDC, to more accurately estimate the number of doses of RRV-TV administered, the percentage of children receiving one or more doses, and the socioeconomic and demographic factors associated with receipt of the vaccine. We used these surveillance statistics to examine the ability of the ecological analyses to detect an increased risk of intussusception following vaccination with RRV-TV, if such an increased risk existed.

METHODS

RRV-TV surveillance:

the National Immunization Survey

The NIS is conducted in 78 Immunization Action Plan (IAP) areas consisting of the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and 27 other large urban areas. During each quarter of the calendar year, the NIS obtained an independent sample of telephone numbers to identify households that had children 19 to 35 months of age in each IAP area. At the completion of the telephone interview of households with age-eligible children, consent was requested to contact the children's vaccination providers to obtain their vaccination histories. Data obtained from the vaccination providers were used to determine whether the sampled children were up-to-date with recommended vaccines. Estimates of vaccination coverage rates were obtained from each quarterly survey, and provided a measure of the extent to which children were adequately vaccinated with recommended vaccines. Descriptions of the NIS sampling design, survey weights, and statistical methods for estimating vaccination coverage rates are given by Smith et al.^{17,18}

Determination of birth cohorts eligible for the RRV-TV vaccine

RRV-TV was licensed on August 31, 1998, and became available at different times in different geographic areas in the U.S. For each IAP, we assumed that vac-

cine became available in the month of the earliest dose reported by providers of children sampled by the NIS. RRV-TV administration effectively ceased in each IAP by July 16, 1999, when the CDC recommended that health care providers and parents discontinue its use. Children who received the vaccine as recommended (no first dose after 6 months of age and no dose before 6 weeks of age) when it was available were born no earlier than seven months before the first month in which it was available in each area, and no later than May 31, 1999, in all areas.

Statistical analysis of RRV-TV uptake rates

NIS vaccination coverage rates were estimated for each quarter the survey was conducted and information was collected on children's RRV-TV vaccination histories. To accommodate the complex sampling design and sample survey weights of the NIS, we used SUDAAN Version 7.5 for all statistical analyses of RRV-TV uptake rates and all related RRV-TV surveillance statistics.¹⁹ We used bivariate logistic regression to estimate odds ratios (OR) to evaluate the association between the receipt of one or more doses of RRV-TV and children's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

RESULTS

Quarterly NIS estimates of RRV-TV uptake

Over the seven NIS quarterly surveys conducted from the third quarter of 1999 to the first quarter of 2001,

the NIS sampled 14,889 children who were age-eligible to receive RRV-TV during the time it was recommended. The estimated number of doses administered when the vaccine was available was reported in the third quarter survey of 1999 to be less than 1,000 doses, and increased to 1,037,000 doses reported in the first quarter survey of 2001 (Table 1). Because Quarter 1, 2001, NIS data include all birth cohorts eligible to receive RRV-TV, data from this quarter estimate the total number of RRV-TV doses administered in the U.S. The estimated RRV-TV coverage rate increased from 2.3% ($\pm 2.5\%$) in the fourth quarter survey of 1999 to 12.2% ($\pm 1.4\%$) in the first quarter survey of 2001. The estimated RRV-TV coverage rate peaked at 13.4% ($\pm 1.6\%$) in the fourth quarter survey of 2000. The decrease in estimated coverage from 13.4% in the fourth quarter survey of 2000 to the 12.2% in first quarter survey of 2001 was not statistically significant. This apparent decline was attributable to the cohort born during the second quarter of 1999, which was eligible to receive RRV-TV for only two and a half months before vaccine usage was suspended.

Using data from the NIS, we determined that doses had been received by sampled children in 77 of the 78 IAPs by July 16, 1999 (see Figure). No providers reported administering RRV-TV to children sampled by the NIS in New Mexico. By the end of October 1998, providers reported doses of sampled children in 34 IAPs (44%); by the end of December 1998, providers

Table 1. Quarterly estimates of RRV-TV uptake, National Immunization Survey: April 1, 1999–March 31, 2001

<i>NIS quarterly survey quarter/year</i>	<i>Sample size^a</i>	<i>Population size^b</i>	<i>Estimated number of eligible children^c</i>	<i>Estimated numbers in thousands of doses administered Number (95% CI)</i>	<i>Estimated coverage one or more RRV-TV doses Percent (95% CI)</i>
Q3/1999	12	5,493,972	8,708	<1 ($\pm <1$)	<1 ($\pm <1$)
Q4/1999	287	5,412,542	253,552	13 (± 15)	2.3 (± 2.5)
Q1/2000	1084	5,813,749	1,013,896	96 (± 43)	3.9 (± 1.6)
Q2/2000	2085	5,717,510	2,207,071	452 (± 105)	8.0 (± 1.8)
Q3/2000	3132	5,813,855	3,103,959	746 (± 124)	10.3 (± 1.6)
Q4/2000	3761	5,372,071	3,753,774	979 (± 125)	13.4 (± 1.6)
Q1/2001	4528	5,509,950	4,413,058	1,037 (± 132)	12.2 (± 1.4)


^aThe NIS quarterly sample size is the unweighted number of children 19-35 months of age at the time of the NIS interview who were determined from date of birth to have been eligible to have received RRV-TV according to ACIP recommendations during the period when RRV-TV was administered.

^bThe NIS quarterly estimate of the number of children in the U.S. 19-35 months of age.

^cThe NIS quarterly estimate of the number of children in the U.S. who were eligible to have received RRV-TV according to ACIP recommendations during the period when RRV-TV was administered.

^dCI = confidence interval

Figure. Distribution of month of earliest first RRV-TV dose among sampled children in each Immunization Action Plan (IAP) area



reported doses of sampled children in 65 IAPs (84%). In the seven NIS quarterly surveys included in the analysis, 1,562 children sampled by the NIS had been administered RRV-TV. Of these, 43 (2.8%) received doses after July 16, 1999, when the CDC recommended that administration of the vaccine be suspended.

National and state estimates of RRV-TV uptake

Data from the NIS survey conducted in the first quarter of 2001 included the most recent available information about RRV-TV vaccination histories for birth cohorts that could have been administered the vaccine. Table 2 gives the quarterly estimates of the number of doses administered and the percent of children receiving one or more doses of RRV-TV by state, using NIS data reported in this quarter. Among the 5.5 million children who were ages 19 to 35 months and were eligible to be sampled by the NIS in this quarter, approximately 4.4 million children were eligible to have received RRV-TV according to ACIP recommendations during the time it was available. Estimates of the number of doses administered and the RRV-TV coverage varied widely from state to state: the estimated number of doses administered ranged from less than 1,000 (NH, NM, ND, OR, SD, VT, WA, WY) to 105,000 (NY). The estimated coverage rate ranged from less than 1% (NM, OR, SD, WA) to 29.4% (NE). Overall, 504,585

(±61,854) children received one or more doses of RRV-TV.

RRV-TV coverage by birth cohort

Table 3 shows RRV-TV quarterly coverage estimates by birth cohort as the cohorts progressed over time. Children belonging to older birth cohorts were less likely to have received the vaccine. The oldest birth cohort eligible to receive RRV-TV was born in the second quarter of 1998. The estimated uptake in this birth cohort increased from 0% in the third NIS sampling quarter of 1999 to 2.6% in the first NIS sampling quarter of 2001. More recent birth cohorts had higher coverage rates, achieving a maximum of 22.8% for the cohort born in the first quarter of 1999 and sampled in the fourth quarter of 2000.

Factors associated with the receipt of RRV-TV

Table 4 shows the estimated percent of children receiving one or more doses of RRV-TV for 15 variables collected in the NIS. This table also shows the estimated odds ratios for the association between the receipt of one or more doses of RRV-TV and the children's demographic and socioeconomic characteristics, and their vaccination providers' characteristics. Children who received one or more doses of RRV-TV were more likely to be white; to have received vaccinations from providers in a private practice setting; to be in a household that reported an annual income exceeding \$75,000; and to have a mother who was at least 30 years old, married, and had attended college. Children who received one or more doses of RRV-TV were less likely to have participated in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) and their vaccination providers were less likely to have participated in the Vaccines for Children (VFC) program.

DISCUSSION

Data from the NIS provide the first estimates of RRV-TV uptake in the U.S. using standard sampling techniques.²⁰ NIS interviews conducted from 1999 to 2001 provide data on all cohorts that could have received the vaccine according to ACIP recommendations during the period that the vaccine was available. These data suggest that approximately one million doses of RRV-TV were administered to 504,585 (±61,854) children living in the United States. Approximately 13.4% of all children who were eligible to receive RRV-TV were administered one or more doses of the vaccine. In general, the likelihood of receiving RRV-TV was significantly greater among children living in households with higher socioeconomic status.

Table 2. RRV-TV uptake of children 19 to 35 months of age: national and state estimates, NIS-1st quarter, 2001

	Sample size	Population size	Estimated number of eligible children	Estimated numbers in thousands of doses administered Number (95% CI)	Estimated coverage one or more RRV-TV doses Percent (95% CI)
U.S. total	4,528	5,509,950	4,413,058	1,037 (±132)	12.2 (±1.4)
Alabama	126	83,373	70,578	35 (±15)	25.3 (±9.8)
Alaska	57	13,576	10,105	2 (±2)	10.6 (±8.5)
Arizona	92	114,318	74,508	3 (±4)	1.5 (±2.1)
Arkansas	75	49,563	38,291	4 (±4)	4.9 (±4.8)
California	255	779,001	640,609	103 (±58)	8.1 (±4.4)
Colorado	69	88,145	68,391	19 (±13)	11.1 (±7.7)
Connecticut	57	50,173	40,584	9 (±7)	12.9 (±8.6)
Delaware	52	13,001	10,627	3 (±2)	17.0 (±11.2)
Dist. of Columbia	62	11,930	9,341	1 (±1)	8.4 (±6.8)
Florida	147	293,893	203,006	35 (±35)	7.8 (±6.5)
Georgia	119	161,283	128,219	11 (±9)	4.1 (±3.3)
Hawaii	42	20,728	17,057	1 (±1)	5.9 (±8.0)
Idaho	68	32,266	26,605	8 (±6)	13.0 (±8.1)
Illinois	144	236,265	203,433	48 (±26)	11.9 (±5.8)
Indiana	120	118,991	101,813	34 (±21)	16.5 (±9.5)
Iowa	53	49,443	40,909	9 (±7)	14.5 (±9.3)
Kansas	52	48,501	39,531	9 (±8)	12.3 (±9.3)
Kentucky	64	68,392	58,789	9 (±7)	7.9 (±6.0)
Louisiana	115	94,581	79,996	28 (±17)	14.4 (±7.9)
Maine	64	23,656	17,575	2 (±2)	9.5 (±7.1)
Maryland	133	125,536	102,899	32 (±15)	18.6 (±8.6)
Massachusetts	101	112,434	90,459	19 (±13)	13.4 (±7.8)
Michigan	99	176,285	122,227	40 (±26)	19.9 (±11.2)
Minnesota	68	97,015	87,489	24 (±14)	18.4 (±9.5)
Mississippi	58	53,137	45,917	3 (±4)	4.5 (±4.5)
Missouri	56	104,761	87,855	42 (±23)	23.5 (±11.8)
Montana	65	14,466	13,157	4 (±2)	17.4 (±9.3)
Nebraska	63	32,328	27,933	18 (±8)	29.4 (±11.8)
Nevada	62	45,839	36,368	3 (±3)	4.3 (±4.9)
New Hampshire	50	17,122	11,563	<1 (±<1)	1.8 (±3.6)
New Jersey	125	212,528	181,835	44 (±31)	15.0 (±9.2)
New Mexico ^a	0	39,369	0	0 (±0)	0 (±0)
New York	124	340,288	282,489	105 (±51)	17.7 (±7.8)
North Carolina	55	136,342	119,447	31 (±19)	14.1 (±8.8)
North Dakota	42	9,005	5,090	<1 (±<1)	6.2 (±8.3)
Ohio	186	219,246	178,473	56 (±35)	12.1 (±6.8)
Oklahoma	69	74,037	61,938	7 (±7)	6.2 (±5.7)
Oregon	40	60,717	32,625	<1 (±<1)	<1 (±<1)
Pennsylvania	114	190,092	155,825	61 (±32)	20.5 (±9.5)
Rhode Island	60	18,269	13,195	2 (±2)	9.5 (±8.1)
South Carolina	62	82,440	63,366	22 (±13)	17.7 (±9.7)
South Dakota	49	13,011	9,913	<1 (±<1)	<1 (±<1)
Tennessee	178	97,438	80,645	12 (±7)	9.4 (±5.2)
Texas	347	444,785	384,542	53 (±34)	7.6 (±4.3)
Utah	46	58,574	34,484	7 (±6)	11.7 (±9.2)
Vermont	56	11,242	7,510	<1 (±1)	2.8 (±3.8)
Virginia	54	137,297	121,171	48 (±31)	19.3 (±11.5)
Washington	97	108,845	67,179	<1 (±1)	0.6 (±1.2)
West Virginia	52	27,626	23,806	8 (±7)	17.5 (±11.3)
Wisconsin	126	91,437	77,407	25 (±12)	17.2 (±7.8)
Wyoming	58	7,357	6,281	<1 (±1)	2.2 (±4.2)

^aNo children sampled in New Mexico received RRV-TV.

CI = confidence interval

Table 3. RRV-TV coverage by birth cohort

Birth cohort	Quarterly survey	Estimated coverage 1+ RRV-TV doses	
Quarter / year	Quarter / year	Sample size	Percent (95% CI)
Q2 / 1998	Q3 / 1999	4	0.0 (± 0.0)
	Q4 / 1999	228	2.7 (± 3.1)
	Q1 / 2000	729	2.7 (± 1.5)
	Q2 / 2000	769	2.9 (± 2.1)
	Q3 / 2000	774	3.8 (± 1.7)
	Q4 / 2000	706	3.8 (± 2.2)
	Q1 / 2001	804	2.6 (± 1.2)
	Q3 / 1998	Q4 / 1999	1
Q1 / 2000		292	7.3 (± 4.4)
Q2 / 2000		973	10.1 (± 3.0)
Q3 / 2000		1,081	7.6 (± 2.4)
Q4 / 2000		986	7.2 (± 2.1)
Q1 / 2001		972	8.2 (± 2.5)
Q4 / 1998	Q2 / 2000	310	14.6 (± 5.7)
	Q3 / 2000	991	16.6 (± 3.5)
	Q4 / 2000	982	17.6 (± 3.6)
	Q1 / 2001	1,018	17.4 (± 3.5)
Q1 / 1999	Q3 / 2000	231	19.8 (± 7.3)
	Q4 / 2000	882	22.9 (± 4.0)
	Q1 / 2001	1,023	19.2 (± 3.7)
Q2 / 1999	Q4 / 2000	166	19.8 (± 9.2)
	Q1 / 2001	665	13.7 (± 3.9)

By using the same data collection methodology and survey instruments in all areas, the NIS produces vaccination coverage levels that are comparable among areas and over time. Considerable resources are applied to eliminating the effects of data collection and field operations that could bias results. The NIS is designed to produce annual estimates of vaccination coverage levels within each of 78 areas with a coefficient of variation of no more than 5%. Previous studies²¹ have shown that vaccination coverage estimates obtained from the National Health Interview Survey²² are very similar to those obtained from the NIS, and provide a validation of the methods and results in this paper.

RRV-TV vaccination coverage estimates obtained

from the NIS are useful for evaluating the conclusions of research designed to investigate the relationship between receipt of the vaccine and intussusception. For example, Simonsen et al. investigated the risk of intussusception attributable to vaccination with RRV-TV using an ecologic study design.¹⁵ In this study, hospital discharge reports of children 6 weeks to 7 months of age with any mention of intussusception were extracted from electronic databases of 10 states. The authors estimated the attributable risk by dividing the number of excess cases of intussusception during the period of vaccination by the estimated number of vaccinated children, based on doses of vaccine distributed. Chang et al. used essentially the same method in their ecologic analyses of data from New York State.¹⁶ Unlike the case case-control study¹¹ and cohort study¹² that estimated the attributable risk of RRV-TV to intussusception to be approximately one case among 10,000 vaccinees, the ecologic studies did not detect an attributable risk of this magnitude.

To examine the discrepant findings of the ecologic studies vs. the case-control and cohort studies, we used the RRV-TV vaccination coverage rates estimated from NIS data, and looked at the ability of the ecological analyses to detect an increased risk of intussusception, if such an increased risk existed. Using NIS data, we estimated that the RRV-TV coverage rate was 12.2% ($\pm 1.4\%$) in the 10 states of Simonsen's ecological study and 17.7% ($\pm 7.8\%$) in New York State. Assuming these levels of vaccine coverage and a background intussusception rate of 34.40 cases per 100,000 derived from data reported by Simonsen et al., the chance of detecting an attributable risk of approximately one case of intussusception among 10,000 vaccinees was no more than 22% for Simonsen's ecologic study and no more than 16% for Chang's ecologic study.^{15,16} Given the NIS national estimate of 13.4% coverage ($\pm 1.6\%$), if Simonsen's ecological study was expanded to include all 50 states and the District of Columbia, the chance of detecting an attributable risk of approximately one case among 10,000 vaccinees would be no more than 46%. Even given the highest estimate of attributable risk of one case among 5,000 vaccinees,¹¹ the chance of detecting an increased risk attributable to RRV-TV was <40% in Simonsen et al.'s 10-state analysis; it was approximately 80% if the Simonsen et al. analysis were extended to all 50 states and the District of Columbia, and was only 25% in Chang et al.'s ecological study. The power of the ecologic studies to detect substantial levels of the attributable risk was low because few infants were vaccinated with RRV-TV in the study populations. As a result, although the risk of intussusception may have been substantial among children

Table 4. Analysis of factors associated with receiving one or more doses of RRV-TV

Variable	Sample size	Percent received one or more RRV-TV doses Percent (95% CI)	OR ^a	95% CI for the OR
Age of child (months)				
19–24	1517	17.0 (±2.9)	4.5	3.0, 6.8
25–29	1610	14.7 (±2.5)	3.7	2.4, 5.5
30–35 [†]	1401	4.8 (±1.6)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Number of children 18 years of age in the household				
1 child [†]	1257	14.0 (±2.9)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
2–3 children	2739	12.4 (±1.8)	0.9	0.6, 1.2
4+ children	532	7.6 (±3.0)	0.5	0.3, 0.8
Number of vaccination providers				
1 provider [†]	3120	13.3 (±1.8)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
2 providers	1153	11.1 (±2.6)	0.8	0.6, 1.2
3+ providers	255	3.6 (±2.2)	0.2	0.1, 0.5
Educational status of the mother				
<12 years	609	5.2 (±2.5)	0.3	0.2, 0.5
12 years	1383	10.0 (±2.4)	0.5	0.4, 0.7
>12, non-college graduate [†]	805	11.9 (±3.1)	0.6	0.4, 0.8
College graduate [†]	1731	18.5 (±2.8)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Economic status				
Annual household income \$75K [†]	806	18.5 (±3.8)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Above poverty, household income <\$75K	2415	13.0 (±1.9)	0.6	0.5, 0.9
Below poverty	835	5.8 (±2.4)	0.3	0.2, 0.5
Unknown	472	10.7 (±4.4)	0.6	0.3, 1.0
Age of mother				
≤19	162	7.3 (±5.5)	0.5	0.2, 1.1
20–29	1967	9.0 (±2.0)	0.6	0.4, 0.8
30+ [†]	2399	15.1 (±2.0)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Marital status of mother				
Widowed/divorced/separated	363	9.6 (±4.3)	0.7	0.4, 1.2
Never married	866	8.3 (±2.9)	0.6	0.4, 0.9
Married [†]	3297	13.5 (±1.7)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Moved to a different state since birth				
Yes [†]	403	9.0 (±5.1)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
No	4125	12.5 (±1.5)	1.4	0.7, 2.8
MSA ^b				
MSA, central city [†]	2036	11.9 (±2.4)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
MSA, non-Central City	1557	13.5 (±2.1)	1.1	0.8, 1.5
Non MSA	935	9.4 (±2.9)	0.6	0.4, 1.0

(continued on p. 141)

Table 4 (continued). Analysis of factors associated with receiving one or more doses of RRV-TV

Variable	Sample size	Percent received one or more RRV-TV doses Percent (95% CI)	OR ^a	95% CI for the OR
Facility type				
All public/non-hospital	663	3.0 (±2.0)	0.2	0.1, 0.3
All hospital	342	8.6 (±5.3)	0.4	0.2, 0.9
All private/non-hospital	2457	15.9 (±2.1)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
All military/other	72	0.6 (±1.2)	0.0	0.0, 0.2
Mixed	332	7.2 (±3.5)	0.4	0.2, 0.7
Type of provider unknown	662	11.6 (±3.4)	0.7	0.5, 1.0
Race/ethnicity of child				
Hispanic	851	7.1 (±2.6)	0.5	0.3, 0.8
White, non Hispanic [†]	2726	15.7 (±2.0)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Black, non Hispanic	716	6.0 (±2.5)	0.3	0.2, 0.5
American Indian, non-Hispanic	58	5.3 (±6.5)	0.3	0.1, 1.1
Asian, non Hispanic	176	15.1 (±7.9)	1.1	0.5, 2.1
Dose card				
Dose card [†]	2456	12.6 (±2.0)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Non dose card	2072	11.8 (±2.0)	0.8	0.6, 1.1
Gender				
Male [†]	2325	11.2 (±1.8)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Female	2203	13.3 (±2.1)	1.2	0.9, 1.6
VFC ^c participation				
All providers	3296	11.2 (±1.6)	0.7	0.5, 1.0
Some but not all providers [†]	769	15.8 (±3.8)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Ever on WIC ^d				
Received WIC [†]	2247	7.0 (±1.6)	1.0	1.0, 1.0
Never received WIC	2240	17.6 (±2.3)	2.7	2.0, 3.6

^aOdds ratio adjusted for difference in coverage rates between states.

[†]Reference cell.

^bMetropolitan statistical area.

^cThe Vaccine for Children, or VFC, program buys vaccines for children in certain groups who can't afford to buy vaccines.

^dThe Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) is a federal grant program administered by the Food and Nutrition Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

receiving RRV-TV, the risk to the entire population of predominantly unvaccinated children was quite small because relatively few children were administered the vaccine. Ecologic studies may not provide reliable evaluations of the association between vaccination with RRV-TV and intussusception.

Both ecologic studies used manufacturer distribution data as the basis for estimating RRV-TV coverage in the states investigated in their evaluations. These

estimates were substantially higher than those obtained by the NIS. Reasons for this difference may include doses that were never used rather than being administered, doses that were wasted or returned, and some doses that were distributed to one state and administered to children living in another state.

Development of rotavirus vaccines is desirable because safe and effective vaccines could save as many as 800,000 lives each year. Accurate estimates of the mag-

nitude of the association between RRV-TV and intussusception are useful for designing vaccine trials with a new generation of rotavirus vaccines, and will affect national policy for use of these vaccines

The authors thank Dr. Joanne Schulte for suggesting an analysis using data from the National Immunization Survey and Dr. Lawrence Barker and Dr. Jeanne Santoli for their helpful comments made during the course of this research.

APPENDIX

The baseline risk of intussusception in the absence of RRV-TV was derived from data published in Table 1 of the paper by Simonsen et al.¹⁵ In estimating this risk, we used data pertaining to children 45 to 210 days old because the first dose of RRV-TV was recommended no sooner than 45 days (~6 weeks) of age and no later than after 210 days (~6 months) of age. This table also indicates that 125 children in this age group had intussusception in the nine-month period before RRV-TV was available, beginning October 1, 1998, and ending June 20, 1999. The estimated annualized number of intussusceptions is $n=166.7=125/0.75$, since the nine-month period represents 3/4 of a year. Also, this table shows 1,076,715 children belonging to the 12-month 1998 birth cohort. Assuming the children are born uniformly across the year, the annualized number 167 “represents” intussusception cases from approximately $(210 - 45)/365 = 0.45$ of the entire 1998 birth cohort, i.e., $.45 \times 1,076,715 = 484,521.75$ children. Using these statistics, the estimated background rate of intussusception in the absence of RRV-TV is $167/484,521.75 = 34.40$ per 100,000. Assuming the estimate of Murphy et al.¹¹ and Kramarz et al.¹² of one case in 10,000 as the increased risk of intussusception attributable to RRV-TV, the risk of intussusception among children receiving RRV-TV that is attributable to both the background rate and the rate attributable to RRV-TV is $[34.40 + (100,000 \times 0.0001)] / 10,000 = 44.4$ per 10,000. Using the estimated national RRV-TV coverage rate of 13.4% reported in Table 1 of our paper, the population risk of intussusception assuming an attributable risk of 1 in 10,000 is $10,000 \times [(1 - 0.134) \times 0.00340 + 0.134 \times 0.000444] = 35.74$ per 10,000. If Simonsen’s ecologic study had been expanded to the *entire* U.S. annual birth cohort of 4.5 million children, its methods would have the statistical power of 45.7% to detect a difference between the population risk of intussusception and the baseline risk of intussusception, using a one-sided statistical test designed to have no more than a 5% chance of erroneously concluding that differences existed if they actually did not exist. The mathematical formulae for

these power calculations are described^{23,24} and available in the `binomial.sample.size()` function of S-Plus.²⁵ A similar approach was used to estimate the statistical power of Simonsen’s 10-state ecologic study, and Chen’s ecologic study of New York State.

REFERENCES

1. Parashar UD, Bresee JS, Gentsch JR, Glass RI. Rotavirus. *Emerg Infect Dis* 1998;4:561-70. Available from: URL: <http://www.cdc.gov/ncidod/EID/vol4no4/parashar.htm>.
2. Parashar UD, Holman RC, Clarke MJ, Bresee JS, Glass RI. Hospitalizations associated with rotavirus diarrhea in the United States, 1993 through 1995: surveillance based on the new ICD-9-CM rotavirus-specific diagnostic code. *J Infect Dis* 1998;177:13-7.
3. Tucker AW, Haddix AC, Bresee JS, Holman RC, Parashar UD, Glass RI. Cost-effectiveness analysis of a rotavirus immunization program for the United States. *JAMA* 1998;279:1371-6.
4. Institute of Medicine. The prospects of immunizing against rotavirus. In: *New vaccine development: diseases of importance in developing countries*, Volume 2. Washington: National Academy Press; 1986. p. D13-D13-2.
5. Glass RF, Barnes GL, Cipriani E, Lund JS. Clinical immunity after neonatal rotavirus infection: a prospective longitudinal study in young children. *N Engl J Med* 1983;309:72-6.
6. Clemens J, Keckich N, Naficy A, Glass R, Rao M. Public health considerations for the introduction of new rotavirus vaccines for infants: a case study of tetravalent rhesus rotavirus-based reassortant vaccine. *Epidemiol Rev* 1999;21:24-42.
7. Rotavirus vaccine for the prevention of rotavirus gastroenteritis among children. Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP). *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1999;48(RR-2):1-23.
8. Rennels MB, Parashar UD, Holman RC, Le CT, Chang HG, Glass RI. Lack of an apparent association between intussusception and wild or vaccine rotavirus infection. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 1998;17:924-5.
9. Braun MM, Ellenberg SS. Descriptive epidemiology of adverse events after immunization: reports to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS), 1991-1994. *J Pediatr* 1997;131:529-35.
10. Intussusception among recipients of rotavirus vaccine—United States, 1998–1999. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1999;48(27):577-81.
11. Murphy TV, Gargiullo PM, Massoudi MS, Nelson DB, Jumaan AO, Okoro CA, et al. Intussusception among infants given an oral rotavirus vaccine. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344:564-72.
12. Kramarz P, France EK, Destephano F, Black SB, Shinefield H, Ward JI, et al. Population-based study of rotavirus vaccination and intussusception. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2001;20:410-6.

13. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices. Volume III. The verbatim transcript of the ACIP conference convening at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, October 22, 1999, at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1600 Clifton Road, NE, Auditorium B, Atlanta, Georgia. Nancy Lee and Associates Certified Court Reporters, 1999:1-189.
14. Withdrawal of rotavirus vaccine recommendation. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1999;48(43):1007.
15. Simonsen L, Morens DM, Elixhauser M, Gerber M, Van Raden M, Blachwelder WC. Effect of rotavirus vaccination programme on trends in admission of infants to hospital for intussusception. *Lancet* 2001;358:1224-9.
16. Chang HG, Smith PF, Ackelsberg J, Morse DL, Glass RI. Intussusception, rotavirus diarrhea, and rotavirus vaccine use among children in New York state. *Pediatrics* 2001;108:54-60.
17. Smith PJ, Rao JNK, Battaglia MP, Ezzati-Rice TM, Daniels D, Khare M. Compensating for provider non-response using response propensities to form adjustment cells: the National Immunization Survey. *National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 2* (133). 2001.
18. Smith PJ, Battaglia MP, Huggins VJ, Hoaglin DC, Rodén A, Khare M, et al. Overview of the sampling design and statistical methods used in the National Immunization Survey. *Am J Prev Med* 2001;(2004 Suppl):17-24.
19. Shah BV, Barnwell BG, Bieler GS. SUDAAN user's manual, release 7.5. Research Triangle Park (NC): Research Triangle Institute; 1997.
20. Cochran WG. Sampling techniques. 3rd ed. New York: Wiley; 1977.
21. Bartlett DM, Ezzati-Rice TM, Stokley S, Zhao Z. Comparison of NIS and NHIS/NIPRCS vaccination coverage estimates. National Immunization Survey. National Health Interview Survey. National Immunization Provider Record Check Study. *Am J Prev Med* 2001;20(4 Suppl):25-7.
22. National Center for Health Statistics. National Health Interview Survey: research for the 1995–2004 redesign. *Vital Health Stat 2* 1999;(126):1-119.
23. Fleiss JL. Statistical methods for rates and proportions. New York: Wiley; 1981.
24. Rosner B. Fundamentals of biostatistics. 3rd ed. Boston: PWS-Kent; 1990.
25. S-Plus 2000 guide to statistics, volume 1. Seattle: Insightful Corporation; 2001.