Pennsylvania; <sup>8</sup>Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee; <sup>9</sup>Children's Mercy, Kansas City, Missouri, <sup>10</sup>Children's Mercy Hospital - Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri, <sup>11</sup>Seattle Children's Hospital, Seattle, Washington, <sup>12</sup>Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, University of Cincinnati College of Medicine, Cincinnati, Ohio, <sup>13</sup>Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, <sup>14</sup>Texas Children's Hospital, Houston, Texas, <sup>15</sup>University of California, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, <sup>16</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia

### Session: 278. Vaccines: Influenza Saturday, October 5, 2019: 12:15 PM

**Background:** Influenza vaccination has been shown to reduce influenza risk in pregnant women and their infants who are not yet age-eligible for vaccine. Ascertainment of vaccination history is important for vaccine safety and effectiveness evaluations. Our goals were to (a) determine coverage, location, and timing of maternal influenza vaccination and (b) compare a subset of self-reported influenza vaccinations with documented vaccine records.

*Methods:* We enrolled children < 18 years. with acute respiratory illness in 7 pediatric hospitals and emergency departments in the New Vaccine Surveillance Network from December 1, 2016 to October 31, 2018. We interviewed all mothers of enrolled infants < 1 year, and obtained mother's influenza vaccine information while pregnant. As an option, sites obtained maternal influenza vaccine records from reported sources (e.g., registries, provider records, pharmacies).

**Results:** Among 5,458 mothers, 2,944 (54%) self-reported receiving influenza vaccine during pregnancy (57% in 2016–2017; 51% in 2017–2018), varying from 49% to 74% by site. Among self-reported vaccinees, 17%, 36%, and 47% received vaccine during their first, second, and third trimester, respectively. Most women (76%) were vaccinated at their OB/GYN or midwife office, 7% at their primary care provider, 7% at their workplace, and 5% at a retail pharmacy. Among 1,338 infants < 6 months. during early influenza season (i.e., born from June to August) and thus ineligible for vaccination, only 46% of mothers reported receiving vaccine during pregnancy (42% reported not receiving it, 12% were unsure). Of 2,242 women for whom vaccine verification was attempted, 1,491 (67%) self-reported receiving influenza vaccine during pregnancy; of those, documentation of vaccine receipt was found for 901 (60%).

**Conclusion:** Influenza vaccination coverage among pregnant women was suboptimal, potentially increasing the risk of influenza in unvaccinated pregnant women. Infants born to unvaccinated women, particularly those born from June to August, may also be at higher risk since they are not age-eligible to receive vaccine before influenza season. The optimal approach to ascertainment of maternal vaccination history with accuracy and completeness merits further investigation.

Disclosures. All authors: No reported disclosures.

#### 2739. Comparison of Hemagglutination Antibody Inhibition (HAI) Titers Following Influenza Vaccination by Birth Cohort and Repeated Influenza Vaccination History

Amy C. Sherman, MD<sup>1</sup>; Lilin Lai, MD<sup>1</sup>; Mary B. Bower, BA, BSN<sup>2</sup>; Muktha S. Natrajan, PhD, MPH<sup>3</sup>; Christopher M. Huerta, BS<sup>1</sup>; Yongxian Xu, MD<sup>4</sup>; Mark Mulligan, MD, FIDSA<sup>5</sup>; Nadine Rouphael, MD<sup>6</sup>; Nadine Rouphael, MD<sup>6</sup>; <sup>1</sup>Emory University, Decatur, Georgia; <sup>2</sup>Hope Clinic, Decatur, Georgia; <sup>3</sup>Emory University Vaccine Center, Atlanta, Georgia; <sup>4</sup>Hope Clinic VTEU Lab, Decatur, Georgia; <sup>5</sup>New York, University, New York, New York; <sup>6</sup>Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia

Session: 278. Vaccines: Influenza

Saturday, October 5, 2019: 12:15 PM

**Background:** The host immune response to influenza vaccination can be affected by prior imprinting to a specific influenza strain based on birth cohort and prior influenza vaccination history. Understanding the underlying immune mechanisms is essential to development of an improved seasonal vaccine and an effective universal influenza vaccine.

**Methods:** This is a prospective pilot study, with a total of 20 subjects in either the H3N2 cohort (N = 10, born 1968–1977) or the H1N1 cohort (N = 10, born 1948–1957). Each cohort was further stratified by subjects who have received the influenza vaccine  $< 2 \text{ or } \ge 3$  of the past 5 years. The FDA-approved quadrivalent 2018–19 influenza vaccine (containing A(H1N1), an A/Michigan/45/2015-like virus; A(H3N2), an A/Singapore/INFIMH-16–0019/2016-like virus; B/Colorado/06/2017-like virus; and B/Phuket/3073/2013-like virus) was administered on Day 1. Demographic information included age, gender, ethnicity, and BMI. HAI titers for each component of the vaccine were obtained at baseline, 29 days post-vaccination, and 180 days post-vaccination. HAI fold-change and HAI geometric mean titers (GMT) were analyzed.

**Results:** There was no significant difference between H1N1 or H3N2 HAI foldchange in the H3N2 birth cohort (P = 0.7496) or in the H1N1 birth cohort (P = 0.8237), Figure A. Comparing HAI fold-change for the repeatedly vs. minimally vaccinated groups, there was a significant higher fold change in the minimally vaccinated group (H1N1 HAI (P = 0.002) and H3N2 HAI (P < 0.0001), Figure B). GMT was higher at baseline for the repeatedly vaccinated group (H1N1, 70; H3N2, 98; vs. H1N1, 30; H3N2, 21 for the minimally vaccinated group); however, the GMT for the minimally vaccinated group was higher at day 29 (H1N1, 172; H3N2, 184; vs. H1N1, 422; H3N2, 299 for the minimally vaccinated group; Figure C). HAI titers and analysis at day 180 post vaccination are in progress.

**Conclusion:** There was no evidence of an imprinting effect by birth cohort for HAI titer magnitudes, even when stratified by vaccination history. There was a significantly higher HAI fold change for individuals who had received minimal influenza

vaccinations in the past 5 years at 29 days post-vaccination. Individuals who had repeated vaccinations in the last 5 years had higher HAI GMT at baseline.

**Disclosures:** Nadine Rouphael, MD, Merck: I conduct as Emory PI the PNEUMO MERCK study at Emory, Research Grant; Pfizer: I conduct as co-PI the RSV PFIZER study at Emory, Research Grant; Sanofi-Pasteur: I conducted as Emory PI the CDIFFENSE trial at Emory, Research Grant.

# 2740. Using Machine Learning Methods to Identify Factors Associated with Pregnant Women Receiving the Influenza Vaccine during 2017-2018

Barbara Bardenheier, PhD, MPH, MA<sup>1</sup>; Vishal Nayak, Master of Science<sup>2</sup>; Fangjun Zhou, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Carla Black, PhD<sup>1</sup>; Sarah Ball, ScD, MPH4; James A. Singleton, PhD<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia; <sup>2</sup>General Dynamics Information Technology, Atlanta, Georgia; <sup>3</sup>CDC, Atlanta, Georgia; <sup>4</sup>Abt Associates, Newton, Massachusetts

### Session: 278. Vaccines: Influenza Saturday, October 5, 2019: 12:15 PM

**Background.** Pregnant women are recommended for influenza vaccination because they are at higher risk of severe illness, and to protect their babies before they are old enough to receive the vaccine. Traditional statistical methods have been used to identify factors associated with vaccination, but programmatic efforts to increase vaccination coverage may be enhanced by machine learning methods that optimize prediction.

**Methods.** Using data from an Internet panel survey of pregnant women (n = 1,771), we used a random forest classification model to identify the strongest predictors of receiving influenza vaccination using the Gini Mean Decrease Score. The higher the Score, the more important an attribute is in predicting the outcome. Forty-three attributes inputted into the model included demographic, economic, healthcare provider related, health related, and knowledge, attitudes and practices related to influenza and influenza vaccine. The majority (70%) of our data were used to train the model and the rest were used to validate how well it performed by using model performance measures (e.g., accuracy, sensitivity, specificity).

**Results.** Our model had an accuracy of 84% (95% CI: 82%, 86%), sensitivity of 89% and specificity of 79%. The most important attribute was the belief that pregnant women should get the flu shot (Gini Score: 457), the second was due date (September–Ottober 2017 and September–Ottober 2018 had low probability of vaccination, Gini Score: 275), and the third was being offered the vaccine by a healthcare provider (Gini Score: 196).

**Conclusion.** Analyzing data using machine learning techniques may bring new insights for vaccination campaigns. Our results suggest that a provider recommendation is important, but perhaps even without a recommendation, women who form their own beliefs about need for vaccination may also be more likely to get vaccinated. Also, pregnant women and women of childbearing age should be targeted for vaccination ation during each fall, and for those with due date early in the flu season, providers should stress the importance of maternal vaccination for protection of the infant since the baby will be <6 months old during peak influenza season, when they are most vulnerable but would benefit from maternal antibodies.

FIGURE A

## H1N1 cohort: HAI Fold Change

