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Background

The recent pandemic of 2009–10, although overall mild in impact, amply demonstrated that some individuals/groups are at increased risk of complications/death from influenza infection. Those at increased risk included pregnant women. Persuading patients to accept vaccination can be difficult, and in pregnancy there is rightly caution about providing any medical interventions unless the benefit outweighs the risk. This study was undertaken to determine if pregnant women vaccinated against A/H1N1v passed on humoral immunity to their unborn child and therefore would provide it with protection against acquiring influenza. Evidence that this was the case could be used by health policy-makers and clinicians to encourage women to accept protective vaccine in future pandemic influenza events, as well as seasonal influenza.

Methods

Across three hospital sites in the East Midlands (UK), 104 pregnant women who had [77 (74%)] or had not [27 (26%)] already been vaccinated against A/H1N1v (as part of the national immunisation programme) and were admitted for delivery (during winter 2009–10) were recruited to take part in this observational study. At parturition, venous cord blood samples were taken to determine if the baby had humoral immunity to A/H1N1v. Samples were analysed for haemagglutinin inhibition and microneutralisation titres in order to determine immune status.

The mothers were also asked to consent for long-term follow-up of the baby by means of an Office for National Statistics flag on the baby’s records (for 5 years). Additionally, the babies in the study are being followed up to determine if the acquired humoral immunity provides clinical protection against acquisition of A/H1N1v. These two components of the study are not the subject of this paper and will be reported after their completion in the future.

Results

The results from this study demonstrate evidence of background humoral immunity in babies of unvaccinated mothers of 25%–30%. Humoral immunity in babies of vaccinated mothers was present in 80% of the group. The difference in positive immunity between the babies of unvaccinated and vaccinated mothers was statistically significant (chi-squared test, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusions

This study provides evidence that maternal vaccination against monovalent A/H1N1v can provide humoral immunity to the unborn child, which may protect the baby against acquisition of the infection early in infancy when treatment options for infection are limited (because antiviral medications and immunisation are not licensed, have theoretical unwanted effects or may not be effective in this age group). The results will provide support to policy-makers and clinicians in advocating immunisation for pregnant women in future influenza epidemic and pandemic events, and will help pregnant women to make informed choices about vaccination under such circumstances.
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