

1 Prior infections and effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in test-negative 2 study: A systematic review and meta-analysis

3
4 Tim K. Tsang^{1,2}, Sheena G. Sullivan³, Xiaotong Huang¹, Can Wang¹, Yifan Wang¹,
5 Joshua Nealon¹, Bingyi Yang¹, Kylie E. C. Ainslie^{1,4}, Benjamin J. Cowling^{1,2}

6 7 Affiliations:

- 8 1. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and
9 Control, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The
10 University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China
- 11 2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health Limited, Hong Kong Science and
12 Technology Park, New Territories, Hong Kong Special Administrative
13 Region, China
- 14 3. WHO Collaborating Centre for Reference and Research on Influenza,
15 Royal Melbourne Hospital, and Doherty Department, University of
16 Melbourne, at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity,
17 Melbourne, Australia
- 18 4. Centre for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health
19 and Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands

20 21 Corresponding author:

22 Dr. Tim K. Tsang, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The
23 University of Hong Kong, 7 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong.
24 Tel: +852 3917 9715; Fax: +852 3520 1945; email: timtsang@connect.hku.hk

25

26 Prof. Benjamin J Cowling, School of Public Health, The University of Hong Kong,

27 21 Sassoon Road, Pokfulam, Hong Kong.

28 Tel: +852 3917 6711; Fax: +852 3520 1945; email: bcowling@hku.hk

29

30 **Word count:** (Abstract: 353)

31 (Main text: 3,360)

32

33

34

35 ABSTRACT

36 **Background:** Prior infection with SARS-CoV-2 can provide protection against
 37 infection and severe COVID-19. In settings with high pre-existing immunity,
 38 vaccine effectiveness (VE) should decrease with higher levels of immunity
 39 among unvaccinated individuals. Here, we conducted a systematic review and
 40 meta-analysis to understand the influence of prior infection on VE.

41 **Methods:** We included test-negative design (TND) studies that examined VE
 42 against infection or severe disease (hospitalization, ICU admission, or death) for
 43 primary vaccination series. To determine the impact of prior infections on VE
 44 estimates, we compared studies that excluded or included people with prior
 45 COVID-19 infection. We also compared VE estimates by the cumulative incidence
 46 of cases before the start of and incidence rates during each study in the study
 47 locations, as further measures of prior infections in the community.

48 **Findings:** We identified 67 studies that met inclusion criteria. Pooled VE among
 49 studies that included people with prior COVID-19 infection was lower against
 50 infection (pooled VE: 77%; 95% confidence interval (CI): 72%, 81%) and severe
 51 disease (pooled VE: 86%; 95% CI: 83%, 89%), compared with studies that
 52 excluded people with prior COVID-19 infection (pooled VE against infection:
 53 87%; 95% CI: 85%, 89%; pooled VE against severe disease: 93%; 95% CI: 91%,
 54 95%). There was a negative correlation between the cumulative incidence of
 55 cases before the start of the study and VE estimates against infection (spearman
 56 correlation (ρ) = -0.32; 95% CI: -0.45, -0.18) and severe disease (ρ = -0.49; 95%
 57 CI: -0.64, -0.30). There was also a negative correlation between the incidence
 58 rates of cases during the study period and VE estimates against infection (ρ = -
 59 0.48; 95% CI: -0.59, -0.34) and severe disease (ρ = -0.42; 95% CI: -0.58, -0.23).

60 **Interpretation:** Based on a review of published VE estimates we found clear
 61 empirical evidence that higher levels of pre-existing immunity in a population
 62 were associated with lower VE estimates. Excluding previously infected
 63 individuals from VE studies may result in higher VE estimates with limited
 64 generalisability to the wider population. Prior infections should be treated as
 65 confounder and effect modificatory when the policies were targeted to whole
 66 population or stratified by infection history, respectively.

67

68 INTRODUCTION

69 COVID-19 vaccines reduce the risk of infection and can also ameliorate disease
 70 severity when breakthrough infection occurs (1, 2). Ongoing evaluation of
 71 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness (VE) has largely been measured through
 72 observational studies, particularly test-negative design (TND) studies, which
 73 share some similarities with case control studies (3). However, there has been
 74 substantial variation among reported VE estimates (4-7), which may be
 75 attributable to differences in study design, the vaccines used, disease incidence
 76 and population characteristics. Importantly, pre-existing population immunity as
 77 a result of infection could explain changes in COVID-19 VE over time and among
 78 populations (8, 9).

79
 80 Infection with SARS-CoV-2 induces an immune response to protect against
 81 reinfection (10-14). However, reinfection could occur due to waning naturally-
 82 induced immunity (15, 16) or virus evolution (17, 18). Nevertheless, studies
 83 have shown that compared to persons with no prior infection, vaccination
 84 among people with prior infection enhances neutralising antibody activity as
 85 well as cell-mediated responses that can protect against (re)infection (19),
 86 suggesting prior infections may modify the protection from vaccinations. In
 87 settings where a large proportion of the population has prior exposure through
 88 infection, the unvaccinated will be more protected from infection than in a naïve
 89 population, thereby diluting the apparent effectiveness of vaccination. Under
 90 these two scenarios, prior infection modifies the effect of vaccination
 91 (Supplementary note 1).

92

93 Prior infection can also alter people's decision to be vaccinated and present for
 94 care. For example, vaccination requirements vary for people with recent prior
 95 infection in Hong Kong (20). Moreover, individuals with recent infection may
 96 choose not to be vaccinated if they believe they have sufficient pre-existing
 97 immunity to prevent re-infection and ameliorate the severity of any re-infections
 98 that do occur (21). Additionally, these individuals may also choose not to present
 99 for care believing their COVID-like symptoms are due to another illness, leading
 100 to differential under-ascertainment of previously-infected COVID-19 cases in
 101 surveillance data. Other individual-level factors may also affect the decision to
 102 vaccinate and engage in infection-risk behaviors, such as perceived risk of severe
 103 disease post-infection (22-24). Acting in this way, prior infection may create a
 104 confounding bias along of the vaccination-COVID-19 association (Supplementary
 105 note 1).

106

107 Here, we aim to review systematically and meta-analyse published data to
 108 characterize the potential impact of pre-existing population immunity on VE
 109 estimates for completed primary vaccination series of COVID-19. We also
 110 conducted meta-regression to account for the influence of key design features
 111 such as vaccine types, circulating virus strains.

112

113 **METHODS**

114 ***Search strategy and selection criteria***

115 This systematic review was conducted following the Preferred Reporting Items
 116 for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA) statement (25). A
 117 standardized search was done in PubMed, Embase and Web of Science, using the

118 search term “(“test negative” OR “effectiveness”) AND (“vaccine”) AND (“COVID-
119 19” OR “SARS-CoV-2”)”. The search was done on 11 July 2022, with no language
120 restrictions. Additional relevant articles from the reference sections of identified
121 articles were also reviewed. Two authors (XH and CW) independently screened
122 the titles and full texts, and extracted data from the included studies, with
123 disagreement resolved by consensus together with a third author (TKT). Studies
124 identified from different databases were de-duplicated.

125

126 Studies that reported using a test-negative approach in which all cases and non-
127 cases were tested were included (26, 27). We included published TND studies
128 with participants recruited from the general population, and reported estimates
129 of VE for completed primary vaccination series (two doses for most vaccines;
130 one dose for Janssen) against at least one of the following endpoints: 1) positive
131 test result, 2) symptomatic disease, 3) hospitalization, 4) ICU admission, 5)
132 severe COVID, 6) death. We excluded articles if: 1) the study participants were
133 recruited from a specific sub-population, such as healthcare professionals; 2)
134 studies that only reported VE for booster doses; 3) studies that summarised or
135 re-analysed already-published data; 4) studies that only reported pooled VE
136 estimates for different vaccines; 5) the study was a preprint; or 6) the full text
137 was not available.

138

139 Data were extracted from included studies using a standardised data collection
140 form (Table S1) that collected information about: 1) study period; 2) region(s); 3)
141 population; 4) the use of clinical criteria for enrolment; and 5) whether
142 participants with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection were included. For each study, VE

estimates with confidence intervals were extracted separately for each endpoint (e.g. infection, hospitalisation), vaccine and the circulating virus. In some studies, VEs specific to time intervals after vaccination were reported. Therefore, we extracted VE estimates for the first available time interval at least 14 days post-vaccination, because antibodies have been shown to peak by then in naïve persons (28). For studies that reported multiple estimates, such as by age group or type of vaccine, all subgroup-specific estimates were included, but the overall estimates were excluded.

151

152 ***Meta-analysis***

In all identified studies, VE was defined as $100\% \times (1 - OR)$. The extracted VE estimates were meta-analysed to estimate pooled VE. VE estimates were transformed to the odds ratios scale, meta-analysed, then back-transformed to the VE scale for interpretation. The pooled odds ratio was estimated by random effects meta-analyses using the inverse variance method and restricted maximum likelihood estimator for heterogeneity (29-32). Heterogeneity was assessed using Cochran's Q and the I^2 statistic (33). We considered an I^2 value more than 75% to be indicative of high heterogeneity (34). We also conducted a sensitivity analysis using fixed effects meta-analyses.

162

The main study feature of interest was if pooled VE against infection or severe disease varied depending on whether the studies included or excluded participants with prior infection. Severe disease was based on whether the estimate was limited to cases who required hospitalization, ICU admission and death. Otherwise the estimate was classified as VE against infection, which

168 included estimates of VE against test positive or symptomatic infection (without
169 hospitalisation).

170

171 Pooled estimates were additionally disaggregated by the probable circulating
172 virus and vaccine administered. Most studies did not report variant-specific VE
173 estimates but did report study periods and the general prevalence of variants
174 during that period. Therefore, estimates were grouped according to the
175 predominant circulating virus: 1) Omicron, 2) late-Delta, which was the period
176 with co-circulation of Delta and Omicron, 3) Delta, 4) pre-Delta, which included
177 ancestral strains and variants preceding Delta. Type of vaccine was grouped as
178 follows: 1) mRNA vaccines, including vaccines produced by Moderna and Pfizer-
179 BioNTech; 2) Adenovirus vector vaccines, including vaccine produced by
180 AstraZeneca, Janssen and Gamaleya; and 3) Inactivated virus vaccines, including
181 vaccine produced by Sinovac Biotech and Sinopharm.

182

183 ***Meta-regression***

184 To evaluate the impact of pre-existing immunity on VE estimates, we used a
185 meta-regression approach. Three proxies of prior immunity were explored: 1)
186 inclusion versus exclusion of participants with prior infection; 2) cumulative
187 incidence of COVID-19 since December 2019 in each of the study
188 countries/regions before the start of study; and 3) the incidence rate of COVID-
189 19 in the country/region during the study period. For this, we downloaded
190 population denominator data and daily COVID-19 case data from the World
191 Health Organization website (35, 36). We first used correlation analysis,
192 including Pearson (r) and Shearman (ρ) correlation coefficient, to determine the

193 association between pre-existing immunity and VE estimates. Meta-regression
194 models were adjusted for age group (age below or above 65 years), types of
195 vaccines used, predominant circulating virus, and the use of clinical criteria for
196 enrolment. A sensitivity analysis was conducted for additionally adjusting for
197 location and duration of the study.

198

199 The fitted meta-regression model estimated the ratio of ORs (ROR) for each of
200 the prior immunity proxies explored. On the OR scale, values closer to 0
201 indicated a more effective vaccine, while values closer to 1 indicated a less
202 effective vaccine. This was counter to the VE scale where values closer to 0
203 indicated an ineffective vaccine. Therefore, using inclusion versus exclusion of
204 participants with prior infection as an example, if $ROR > 1$, then the OR estimated
205 from studies including participants with prior infection was higher than that
206 from studies excluding participants with prior infection. On the VE scale, this
207 translates to lower VE for studies that included participants with prior infection
208 than studies that excluded these participants.

209

210 We plotted the expected change in VE estimate to visualize the impact of each
211 prior immunity proxy based on the ROR obtained from meta-regression. To
212 illustrate the change in VE scale, we showed the change in estimate based on the
213 ROR assuming VE for the reference group of 80% against infection and 90%
214 against severe disease. Statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.0.5
215 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

216

217 **RESULTS**

218 We identified 6904 studies, among which 2929 were duplicates. Title and
219 abstract screening of the remaining articles identified 480 for full text review, of
220 which 67 met our inclusion criteria (4-7, 37-99) (Figure 1; Table S2). Studies
221 were set in 17 countries/regions. Most were from the United States (29) and
222 United Kingdom (10). Fifty-one studies provided 173 VE estimates against
223 infection (Figure S1-2), and 41 studies provided 93 estimates against severe
224 disease (Figure S3-4). Among all 67 studies, 45 included and 24 studies excluded
225 participants with prior COVID-19 infection (including two studies which
226 provided VE estimates including and excluding participants with COVID-19
227 infection). A summary of study characteristics and the corresponding number of
228 estimates, including handling of participants with prior infections, enrolment
229 criteria, vaccine types and circulating virus are provided in Table S3-S5.

230

231 ***Vaccine effectiveness against infection and severe disease***

232 The 173 VE point estimates against infection ranged from 14% to 98%, with
233 $I^2=100\%$, indicating high heterogeneity (Figure 2-3). Among them, 95 (55%)
234 were higher than 80%. The 93 point estimates against severe disease were also
235 highly heterogeneous ($I^2=100\%$), ranging from 20% to 100% (Figure 2-3).
236 Among them, 71 (76%) were higher than 80%. For both outcomes, we observed
237 declining VE over time from early 2021 to mid 2022 (Figure S5).

238

239 ***Impact of type of vaccine and circulating viruses***

240 Our meta-analysis (Figure 3) indicated that pooled VE against infection for a
241 primary course of mRNA vaccines was 86% (95% CI: 84%, 88%), compared to

69% (95% CI: 64%, 73%) for adenovirus vector vaccines and 67% (95% CI: 34%, 84%) for inactivated virus vaccines. When we examined differences in pooled VE by the circulating virus, we found that VE against infection during the Omicron period was far lower (VE: 52%; 95% CI: 45%, 59%) than during the pre-Delta (VE: 89%; 95% CI: 87%, 91%), Delta (VE: 78%; 95% CI: 58%, 88%), and the late-Delta periods (VE: 79%; 95% CI: 74%, 92%). Similarly, VE against severe disease during the Omicron period was 64% (95% CI: 56%, 71%), which was lower than for pre-Delta (VE: 92%; 95% CI: 89%, 94%), Delta (VE: 87%; 95% CI: 76%, 93%), and late-Delta periods (VE: 91%; 95% CI: 88%, 93%). The results were similar when further disaggregated by including or excluding prior infection (Table S8), or using fixed-effects analysis (Figure S6).

Role of prior infection on VE estimates

In general, we found that VE estimates derived from study participants with lower pre-existing immunity were higher. The pooled VE against infection for studies that excluded participants with prior COVID-19 infection was higher (VE: 87%; 95% CI: 85%, 89%) than from studies that included these participants (VE: 77%; 95% CI: 72%, 81%). Similarly, pooled VE against severe disease from studies that excluded participants with prior COVID-19 infection (VE: 93%; 95% CI: 91%, 95%) was higher than from studies that included these participants (VE: 87%; 95% CI: 84%, 90%). There was high heterogeneity among the estimates ($I^2 > 99\%$). The pooled estimates from fixed-effect analysis were similar (Figure S6).

In meta-regression adjusting for vaccine type, circulating virus, and enrolment criteria (Table S6; Figure 4A-B), the OR against infection from studies that

267 included participants with prior COVID-19 infection (higher pre-existing
268 immunity) was 1.56-fold higher (95% CI: 1.29, 1.89) than the OR from studies
269 that excluded these participants (i.e. with generally lower pre-existing
270 immunity). Therefore, the VE against infection in a study that originally excluded
271 participants with prior COVID-19 infection was 80%, it would be expected to
272 yield an estimate of 69% (95% CI: 62%, 74%) had they included those
273 participants. Similarly, the OR against severe disease from studies that included
274 participants with prior COVID-19 infection was 1.73-fold higher (95% CI: 1.23,
275 2.45) than from studies that excluded these participants. Assuming a baseline VE
276 against severe disease of 90%, the corresponding VE expected when participants
277 with prior infection were included would be 83% (95% CI: 76%, 87%). The
278 results were similar with adjustment for location and duration of study (Table
279 S7).

280

281 ***Impact of cumulative incidence***

282 There was a modest, negative correlation between the cumulative incidence of
283 cases in the study locations prior to the start of the study, as a proxy of pre-
284 existing population immunity (Figure S8), and VE against infection (Pearson
285 correlation (r) = -0.42; 95% CI: -0.54, -0.30; Shearman correlation (ρ) = -0.32; 95%
286 CI: -0.45, -0.18) and severe disease (r = -0.41, 95% CI: -0.56, -0.22; ρ = -0.49; 95%
287 CI: -0.64, -0.30). In meta-regression, adjusting for vaccine type, circulating virus,
288 and enrolment criteria (Table S6; Figure 4A-B), the ROR against infection
289 associated with a doubling of the cumulative incidence of cases before the start
290 of studies was 1.10 (95% CI: 1.02, 1.20). Therefore, if the baseline VE against
291 infection from a study was 80%, then the corresponding VE for a setting with

twice the cumulative incidence of cases before the start of a study would represent a two-percentage point reduction in VE (VE=78%; 95% CI: 76%, 79.6% for a doubling). The ROR against severe disease for each doubling of the cumulative incidence of cases before the start of a study (higher pre-existing immunity) was 1.47 (95% CI: 1.26, 1.71). Therefore, assuming a baseline VE against severe diseases of 90%, the corresponding VE for a setting with twice the cumulative incidence of cases before the start of a study would represent a 5 percentage point drop in VE (VE=85%, 95% CI: 83%, 87% for the initial doubling).

Impact of incidence rate during the study period

There was a modest, negative correlation between the incidence rates of cases in the study locations prior to the start of the study, as a proxy of pre-existing population immunity (Figure S8), and VE against infection ($r = -0.38$; 95% CI: -0.50, -0.24; $\rho = -0.48$; 95% CI: -0.59, -0.34) and severe disease ($r = -0.50$, 95% CI: -0.64, -0.33; $\rho = -0.42$; 95% CI: -0.58, -0.23). After adjusting for vaccine type, circulating virus and enrolment criteria (Table S6), we estimated that the ROR against infection for each doubling of the incidence of cases during the study period was 1.16 (95% CI: 1.07, 1.25). If the baseline VE against infection from a study was 80%, then the corresponding VE from a study with twice the incidence of cases during the study period would be 77% (95% CI: 75%, 79%). We also estimated that the ROR against severe disease associated with a doubling in the incidence of cases and death during the study was 1.20 (95% CI: 1.03, 1.40). Therefore, assuming a baseline VE of 90% against severe disease, the

316 corresponding VE for a study with twice as many cases during the study period
317 would be 88% (95% CI: 86%, 89.7%).

318

319 **DISCUSSION**

320 In this study, we summarized VE estimates from TND studies to understand the
321 impact of prior infections on VE estimates. We found that higher pre-existing
322 immunity in the source population, indicated by including participants with
323 prior COVID-19 infection, higher pre-study cumulative incidence of cases, and
324 higher incidence rate of cases during study period, was associated with lower VE.

325

326 Prior infection could be a confounder, effect modifier or both. As a confounder it
327 could affect peoples' decisions to vaccinate and modify their risk behaviours as
328 well as providing protection against reinfection (12, 13, 21). Hence, the VE
329 obtained from individuals with or without prior infection would be similar, if the
330 influence of the confounding could be controlled in analysis. On the other hand, if
331 prior infection were only an effect modifier (i.e. only associated with the risk of
332 (re)infection and not the propensity to be vaccinated) vaccination in settings
333 with higher pre-existing immunity would appear to have a relatively modest
334 effect on further increasing protection at the population level because VE would
335 be lower among previously infected participants (12, 13). In reality prior
336 infection is probably both a confounder and effect modifier and therefore studies
337 should consider both appropriate confounding control, such as through
338 covariate adjustment or stratification, as well as inclusion of interaction terms to
339 explore the potential effect modification.

340

341 When VE was estimated based on studies excluding participants with prior
342 infection, these VE estimates should be interpreted as the VE for a hypothetical
343 population with no pre-existing immunity. As of late 2022, these estimates
344 would have limited practical value in most locations which have experienced
345 substantial epidemics. Epidemic forecasting models used to inform public health
346 control policies should separate individuals into different compartments based
347 on infection history to improve the precision of their forecasts. Therefore, groups
348 estimating VE estimates to inform policy should stratify by infection history so
349 that their work will be more broadly useful for policy (100, 101).

350

351 Our observation that higher incidence rates during a study period were
352 associated with lower VE estimates suggests that SARS-CoV-2 vaccines provide
353 leaky protection (102), since the VE depended on the number of exposure
354 (proxied by incidence rates during study period). It has previously been shown
355 that the ORs derived from TND studies were biased (103), so that VE estimates
356 for leaky vaccines would decrease with time since vaccination, even if the true
357 VE remained unchanged (102). For COVID vaccines, the antigenic drift observed
358 for SARS-CoV-2 viruses makes it difficult to disentangle reduced VE associated
359 with a leaky vaccine from reduced VE associated with vaccine antigenic match,
360 and a decreased proportion of susceptible in the community.

361

362 Although 55% of VE estimates against infection and 76% of estimates against
363 severe disease were higher than 80%, heterogeneity was very high, as indicated
364 by the high I^2 values observed. Consistent with previous reviews, high
365 heterogeneity could be attributed to differences in effectiveness among vaccine

types, or the predominant circulating virus in each study (8, 105). However, we continued to observe high heterogeneity when estimating pooled VE against specific vaccine types and the predominant virus. Our meta-regression identified some sources of the heterogeneity, such as pre-existing immunity. However, heterogeneity remained high and further investigation is needed to identify other causes to ensure valid VE estimates are available for ongoing optimization of vaccination strategies (106).

Our study had some limitations. First, our review focused on VE of primary vaccination series. Further analysis would be required to determine whether similar issues apply to estimation of VE for booster doses, which are complicated by dosing schedules that mix vaccine types, the number of doses received, greater antigenic differences between the vaccines received and the dominant circulating virus, changes in vaccine formulation including bivalent formulations, and the accumulation of immunity through both vaccination and infection over time. Second, most studies were conducted in adults, so that our results may not be generalizable to children. Finally, TND studies included in our review were observational in nature. Some confounders were adjusted in these studies, including age, sex, being health care workers, or pre-existing conditions. However, we did not include a bias assessment to evaluate whether studies adequately addressed confounding nor have we considered other potential sources of bias such as measurement errors.

In conclusion, we observed reduced VE associated with higher pre-existing immunity in the population. Exclusion of participants with prior infection could

391 artificially inflate VE estimates and affect their generalisability to the wider
 392 population. If the goal of a study is to inform policy that applies to the whole
 393 population, participants with prior infection should be included and their status
 394 included as a covariate for confounder control. However, if decision-makers
 395 desire different vaccination policies dependent on infection history then studies
 396 need to stratify accordingly, or including interaction term, instead of excluding
 397 participants with prior infection. Studies unable to adjust for prior infection
 398 could consider using external adjustment (107) to assess the potential effect of
 399 this confounder on their estimates. Optimal design of VE studies remains a
 400 research priority. In particular, further work is needed to understand how prior
 401 infection influences VE for booster doses and as vaccine formulations change.

402

403

404 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

405 The authors thank Hang Qi for technical assistance. This project was supported
406 by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (grant no. R01 GM139926),
407 and the Theme-based Research Scheme (Project No. T11-712/19-N) of the
408 Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong SAR Government. BJC is supported by
409 an RGC Senior Research Fellowship (grant number: HKU SRFS2021-7S03) and
410 the AIR@innoHK program of the Innovation and Technology Commission of the
411 Hong Kong SAR Government. The WHO Collaborating Centre for Reference and
412 Research on Influenza is supported by the Australian Government Department of
413 Health and Aged Care.

414

415 **COMPETING INTERESTS STATEMENT**

416 BJC reports honoraria from AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GSK, Haleon, Moderna,
417 Pfizer, Roche and Sanofi Pasteur. JN was previously employed by and owns
418 stocks in Sanofi. The authors report no other potential conflicts of interest.

419

420

421

422 REFERENCES

- 423 1. Bergwerk M, Gonen T, Lustig Y, Amit S, Lipsitch M, Cohen C, et al. Covid-19
424 Breakthrough Infections in Vaccinated Health Care Workers. N Engl J Med.
425 2021;385(16):1474-84.
- 426 2. Lipsitch M, Krammer F, Regev-Yochay G, Lustig Y, Balicer RD. SARS-CoV-2
427 breakthrough infections in vaccinated individuals: measurement, causes and
428 impact. Nat Rev Immunol. 2022;22(1):57-65.
- 429 3. Belongia EA, Simpson MD, King JP, Sundaram ME, Kelley NS, Osterholm
430 MT, et al. Variable influenza vaccine effectiveness by subtype: a systematic
431 review and meta-analysis of test-negative design studies. Lancet Infect Dis.
432 2016;16(8):942-51.
- 433 4. Bruxvoort KJ, Sy LS, Qian L, Ackerson BK, Luo Y, Lee GS, et al.
434 Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 against delta, mu, and other emerging variants of
435 SARS-CoV-2: test negative case-control study. Bmj. 2021;375:e068848.
- 436 5. Andrews¹ N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, Toffa S, Rickeard T, Gallagher E, et al.
437 Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. N Engl J
438 Med. 2022.
- 439 6. Tseng HF, Ackerson BK, Luo Y, Sy LS, Talarico CA, Tian Y, et al.
440 Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron and Delta variants.
441 Nat Med. 2022.
- 442 7. Chemaitelly² H, Yassine HM, Benslimane FM, Al Khatib HA, Tang P, Hasan
443 MR, et al. mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against the B.1.1.7 and
444 B.1.351 variants and severe COVID-19 disease in Qatar. Nat Med.
445 2021;27(9):1614-21.

- 446 8. Higdon MM, Wahl B, Jones CB, Rosen JG, Truelove SA, Baidya A, et al. A
447 Systematic Review of Coronavirus Disease 2019 Vaccine Efficacy and
448 Effectiveness Against Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2
449 Infection and Disease. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2022;9(6):ofac138.
- 450 9. Lewnard JA, Patel MM, Jewell NP, Verani JR, Kobayashi M, Tenforde MW,
451 et al. Theoretical Framework for Retrospective Studies of the Effectiveness of
452 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines. *Epidemiology.* 2021;32(4):508-17.
- 453 10. Li G, Fan Y, Lai Y, Han T, Li Z, Zhou P, et al. Coronavirus infections and
454 immune responses. *J Med Virol.* 2020;92(4):424-32.
- 455 11. Suryadevara N, Shrihari S, Gilchuk P, VanBlargan LA, Binshtein E, Zost SJ,
456 et al. Neutralizing and protective human monoclonal antibodies recognizing the
457 N-terminal domain of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein. *Cell.* 2021;184(9):2316-31
458 e15.
- 459 12. Kojima N, Shrestha NK, Klausner JD. A Systematic Review of the
460 Protective Effect of Prior SARS-CoV-2 Infection on Repeat Infection. *Eval Health*
461 *Prof.* 2021;44(4):327-32.
- 462 13. Leidi A, Koegler F, Dumont R, Dubos R, Zaballa ME, Piumatti G, et al. Risk
463 of Reinfection After Seroconversion to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome
464 Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2): A Population-based Propensity-score Matched
465 Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2022;74(4):622-9.
- 466 14. Hansen CH, Michlmayr D, Gubbels SM, Molbak K, Ethelberg S. Assessment
467 of protection against reinfection with SARS-CoV-2 among 4 million PCR-tested
468 individuals in Denmark in 2020: a population-level observational study. *Lancet.*
469 2021;397(10280):1204-12.

- 470 15. Long QX, Liu BZ, Deng HJ, Wu GC, Deng K, Chen YK, et al. Antibody
471 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nat Med.* 2020;26(6):845-8.
- 472 16. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, Hastie KM, Yu ED, Faliti CE, et al. Immunological
473 memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science.*
474 2021;371(6529).
- 475 17. Pulliam JRC, van Schalkwyk C, Govender N, von Gottberg A, Cohen C,
476 Groome MJ, et al. Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with
477 emergence of Omicron in South Africa. *Science.* 2022;376(6593):eabn4947.
- 478 18. Townsend JP, Hassler HB, Wang Z, Miura S, Singh J, Kumar S, et al. The
479 durability of immunity against reinfection by SARS-CoV-2: a comparative
480 evolutionary study. *Lancet Microbe.* 2021;2(12):e666-e75.
- 481 19. Reynolds CJ, Pade C, Gibbons JM, Butler DK, Otter AD, Menacho K, et al.
482 Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection rescues B and T cell responses to variants after first
483 vaccine dose. *Science.* 2021.
- 484 20. The Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. Vaccine
485 pass, <https://www.coronavirus.gov.hk/eng/vaccine-pass.html> (accessed Aug 26,
486 2022) [
- 487 21. Troiano G, Nardi A. Vaccine hesitancy in the era of COVID-19. *Public*
488 *Health.* 2021;194:245-51.
- 489 22. Robinson E, Jones A, Lesser I, Daly M. International estimates of intended
490 uptake and refusal of COVID-19 vaccines: A rapid systematic review and meta-
491 analysis of large nationally representative samples. *Vaccine.* 2021;39(15):2024-
492 34.
- 493 23. Parker DM, Bruckner T, Vieira VM, Medina C, Minin VN, Felgner PL, et al.
494 Predictors of Test Positivity, Mortality, and Seropositivity during the Early

495 Coronavirus Disease Epidemic, Orange County, California, USA. *Emerg Infect Dis.*
496 2021;27(10):2604-18.

497 24. Jara A, Undurraga EA, González C, Paredes F, Fontecilla T, Jara G, et al.
498 Effectiveness of an Inactivated SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Chile. *N Engl J Med.*
499 2021;385(10):875-84.

500 25. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for
501 systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.*
502 2009;6(7):e1000097.

503 26. Sullivan SG, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Cowling BJ. Theoretical Basis of the
504 Test-Negative Study Design for Assessment of Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness.
505 *Am J Epidemiol.* 2016;184(5):345-53.

506 27. Jackson ML, Nelson JC. The test-negative design for estimating influenza
507 vaccine effectiveness. *Vaccine.* 2013;31(17):2165-8.

508 28. Yang B, Huang X, Gao H, Leung NH, Tsang TK, Cowling BJ. Immunogenicity,
509 efficacy, and safety of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine dose fractionation: a systematic
510 review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med.* 2022;20(1):409.

511 29. Hedges LV, Vevea JL. Fixed- and random-effects models in meta-analysis.
512 *Psychological Methods.* 1998;3(4):486-504.

513 30. Langan D, Higgins JPT, Jackson D, Bowden J, Veroniki AA, Kontopantelis E,
514 et al. A comparison of heterogeneity variance estimators in simulated random-
515 effects meta-analyses. *Res Synth Methods.* 2019;10(1):83-98.

516 31. Thompson SG, Sharp SJ. Explaining heterogeneity in meta-analysis: a
517 comparison of methods. *Stat Med.* 1999;18(20):2693-708.

- 518 32. Veroniki AA, Jackson D, Bender R, Kuss O, Langan D, Higgins JPT, et al.
519 Methods to calculate uncertainty in the estimated overall effect size from a
520 random-effects meta-analysis. Res Synth Methods. 2019;10(1):23-43.
- 521 33. Cochran WG. The combination of estimates from different experiments.
522 Biometrics. 1954;10:101-29.
- 523 34. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in
524 meta-analyses. Bmj. 2003;327(7414):557-60.
- 525 35. World Health Organization. Daily cases and deaths by date reported to
526 WHO [Available from: <https://covid19.who.int/WHO-COVID-19-global-data.csv>.
- 527 36. World Health Organization. COVID-19 Explorer [Available from:
528 <https://worldhealthorg.shinyapps.io/covid/>.
- 529 37. Abu-Raddad1 LJ, Chemaitelly H, Ayoub HH, Yassine HM, Benslimane FM,
530 Al Khatib HA, et al. Waning of mRNA-1273 vaccine effectiveness against SARS-
531 CoV-2 infection in Qatar. N Engl J Med. 2022;16.
- 532 38. Abu-Raddad2 LJ, Chemaitelly H, Butt AA. Effectiveness of the BNT162b2
533 Covid-19 Vaccine against the B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 Variants. N Engl J Med.
534 2021;385(2):187-9.
- 535 39. Amirthalingam G, Bernal JL, Andrews NJ, Whitaker H, Gower C, Stowe J, et
536 al. Serological responses and vaccine effectiveness for extended COVID-19
537 vaccine schedules in England. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):7217.
- 538 40. Andrejko KL, Pry J, Myers JF, Jewell NP, Openshaw J, Watt J, et al.
539 Prevention of COVID-19 by mRNA-based vaccines within the general population
540 of California. Clin Infect Dis. 2021.

- 541 41. Andrews² N, Tessier E, Stowe J, Gower C, Kirsebom F, Simmons R, et al.
542 Duration of Protection against Mild and Severe Disease by Covid-19 Vaccines.
543 New England Journal of Medicine. 2022;386(4):340-50.
- 544 42. Bernal¹ JL, Andrews N, Gower C, Gallagher E, Simmons R, Thelwall S, et al.
545 Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. New
546 England Journal of Medicine. 2021;385(7):585-94.
- 547 43. Bernal² JL, Andrews N, Gower C, Robertson C, Stowe J, Tessier E, et al.
548 Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccines on covid-
549 19 related symptoms, hospital admissions, and mortality in older adults in
550 England: Test negative case-control study. The BMJ. 2021;373 (no pagination).
- 551 44. Britton A, Fleming-Dutra KE, Shang N, Smith ZR, Dorji T, Derado G, et al.
552 Association of COVID-19 Vaccination With Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection by
553 Time Since Vaccination and Delta Variant Predominance. Jama.
554 2022;327(11):1032-41.
- 555 45. Butt AA, Omer SB, Yan P, Shaikh OS, Mayr FB. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine
556 Effectiveness in a High-Risk National Population in a Real-World Setting. Ann
557 Intern Med. 2021;174(10):1404-8.
- 558 46. Cerqueira-Silva T, Katikireddi SV, de Araujo Oliveira V, Flores-Ortiz R,
559 Júnior JB, Paixão ES, et al. Vaccine effectiveness of heterologous CoronaVac plus
560 BNT162b2 in Brazil. Nat Med. 2022.
- 561 47. Chemaitelly¹ H, Tang P, Hasan MR, AlMukdad S, Yassine HM, Benslimane
562 FM, et al. Waning of BNT162b2 Vaccine Protection against SARS-CoV-2 Infection
563 in Qatar. N Engl J Med. 2021;385(24):e83.
- 564 48. Chung¹ H, He S, Nasreen S, Sundaram ME, Buchan SA, Wilson SE, et al.
565 Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 covid-19 vaccines against

566 symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection and severe covid-19 outcomes in Ontario,
567 Canada: test negative design study. *Bmj*. 2021;374:n1943.

568 49. Chung2 JR, Kim SS, Belongia EA, McLean HQ, King JP, Nowalk MP, et al.
569 Vaccine Effectiveness against COVID-19 among Symptomatic Persons Aged ≥ 12
570 Years with Reported Contact with COVID-19 Cases, February - September 2021.
571 *Influenza Other Respi Viruses*. 2022;1-7.

572 50. Collie S, Champion J, Moultrie H, Bekker LG, Gray G. Effectiveness of
573 BNT162b2 Vaccine against Omicron Variant in South Africa. *N Engl J Med*.
574 2022;386(5):494-6.

575 51. Corrao G, Franchi M, Rea F, Cereda D, Barone A, Borriello CR, et al.
576 Protective action of natural and induced immunization against the occurrence of
577 delta or alpha variants of SARS-CoV-2 infection: a test-negative case-control
578 study. *BMC Med*. 2022;20(1):52.

579 52. Drawz PE, DeSilva M, Bodurtha P, Benitez GV, Murray A, Chamberlain AM,
580 et al. Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 Second Doses and Boosters for
581 SARS-CoV-2 infection and SARS-CoV-2 Related Hospitalizations: A Statewide
582 Report from the Minnesota Electronic Health Record Consortium. *Clin Infect Dis*.
583 2022.

584 53. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Naleway AL, Patel P, Gaglani M, Natarajan K, et al.
585 Effectiveness of two-dose vaccination with mRNA COVID-19 vaccines against
586 COVID-19-associated hospitalizations among immunocompromised adults Nine
587 States, January-September 2021. *American Journal of Transplantation*.
588 2022;22(1):306-14.

589 54. Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, Mitchell PK, DeSilva MB, Irving SA, et al.
590 Waning 2-Dose and 3-Dose Effectiveness of mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19-

591 Associated Emergency Department and Urgent Care Encounters and
592 Hospitalizations Among Adults During Periods of Delta and Omicron Variant
593 Predominance - VISION Network, 10 States, August 2021-January 2022. MMWR
594 Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2022;71(7):255-63.

595 55. Grannis SJ, Rowley EA, Ong TC, Stenehjem E, Klein NP, DeSilva MB, et al.
596 Interim Estimates of COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness Against COVID-19-
597 Associated Emergency Department or Urgent Care Clinic Encounters and
598 Hospitalizations Among Adults During SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant
599 Predominance - Nine States, June-August 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
600 2021;70(37):1291-3.

601 56. Hitchings MDT, Ranzani OT, Dorion M, D'Agostini TL, de Paula RC, de
602 Paula OFP, et al. Effectiveness of ChAdOx1 vaccine in older adults during SARS-
603 CoV-2 Gamma variant circulation in São Paulo. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):6220.

604 57. Kim SS, Chung JR, Belongia EA, McLean HQ, King JP, Nowalk MP, et al.
605 mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness against COVID-19 among Symptomatic Outpatients
606 Aged ≥ 16 Years in the United States, February - May 2021. J Infect Dis. 2021.

607 58. Lauring AS, Tenforde MW, Chappell JD, Gaglani M, Ginde AA, McNeal T, et
608 al. Clinical severity of, and effectiveness of mRNA vaccines against, covid-19 from
609 omicron, delta, and alpha SARS-CoV-2 variants in the United States: prospective
610 observational study. Bmj. 2022;376:e069761.

611 59. Lewis NM, Naioti EA, Self WH, Ginde AA, Douin DJ, Talbot HK, et al.
612 Effectiveness of mRNA vaccines in preventing COVID-19 hospitalization by age
613 and burden of chronic medical conditions among immunocompetent US adults,
614 March-August 2021. J Infect Dis. 2021.

- 615 60. Li XN, Huang Y, Wang W, Jing QL, Zhang CH, Qin PZ, et al. Effectiveness of
616 inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccines against the Delta variant infection in
617 Guangzhou: a test-negative case-control real-world study. *Emerg Microbes Infect.*
618 2021;10(1):1751-9.
- 619 61. Maeda H, Saito N, Igarashi A, Ishida M, Suami K, Yagiuchi A, et al.
620 Effectiveness of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2
621 infections during the Delta variant epidemic in Japan: Vaccine Effectiveness Real-
622 time Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2 (VERSUS). *Clinical Infectious Diseases.*
623 2022;23.
- 624 62. Mallow C, Ferreira T, Shukla B, Warde P, Sosa MA, Parekh DJ, et al. Real
625 world SARS-COV-2 vaccine effectiveness in a Miami academic institution. *Am J*
626 *Emerg Med.* 2022;54:97-101.
- 627 63. Nasreen S, Chung H, He S, Brown KA, Gubbay JB, Buchan SA, et al.
628 Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection
629 and severe outcomes with variants of concern in Ontario. *Nat Microbiol.*
630 2022;7(3):379-85.
- 631 64. Ngyen LBL, Bauer R, Lesieur Z, Galtier F, Duval X, Vanhems P, et al.
632 Vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19 hospitalization in adults in France: A test
633 negative case control study. *Infectious Diseases Now.* 2022;52(1):40-3.
- 634 65. Olson1 SM, Newhams MM, Halasa NB, Price AM, Boom JA, Sahni LC, et al.
635 Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA Vaccination Against COVID-19
636 Hospitalization Among Persons Aged 12-18 Years - United States, June-
637 September 2021. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2021;70(42):1483-8.

- 638 66. Olson² SM, Newhams MM, Halasa NB, Price AM, Boom JA, Sahni LC, et al.
639 Effectiveness of BNT162b2 Vaccine against Critical Covid-19 in Adolescents. N
640 Engl J Med. 2022;386(8):713-23.
- 641 67. Pardo-Seco J, Mallah N, López-Pérez LR, González-Pérez JM, Rosón B,
642 Otero-Barrós MT, et al. Evaluation of BNT162b2 Vaccine Effectiveness in Galicia,
643 Northwest Spain. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(7).
- 644 68. Price AM, Olson SM, Newhams MM, Halasa NB, Boom JA, Sahni LC, et al.
645 BNT162b2 Protection against the Omicron Variant in Children and Adolescents.
646 N Engl J Med. 2022.
- 647 69. Ranzani¹ O, Hitchings MDT, Dorion M, D'Agostini TL, de Paula RC, de
648 Paula OFP, et al. Effectiveness of the CoronaVac vaccine in older adults during a
649 gamma variant associated epidemic of covid-19 in Brazil: test negative case-
650 control study. Bmj-British Medical Journal. 2021;374.
- 651 70. Ranzani² OT, Silva AAB, Peres IT, Antunes BBP, Gonzaga-da-Silva TW,
652 Soranz DR, et al. Vaccine effectiveness of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 against COVID-19 in
653 a socially vulnerable community in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: a test-negative design
654 study. Clin Microbiol Infect. 2022.
- 655 71. Rearte A, Castelli JM, Rearte R, Fuentes N, Pennini V, Pesce M, et al.
656 Effectiveness of rAd26-rAd5, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19, and BBIBP-CorV vaccines for
657 risk of infection with SARS-CoV-2 and death due to COVID-19 in people older
658 than 60 years in Argentina: a test-negative, case-control, and retrospective
659 longitudinal study. Lancet. 2022;399(10331):1254-64.
- 660 72. Self WH, Tenforde MW, Rhoads JP, Gaglani M, Ginde AA, Douin DJ, et al.
661 Comparative Effectiveness of Moderna, Pfizer-BioNTech, and Janssen (Johnson &
662 Johnson) Vaccines in Preventing COVID-19 Hospitalizations Among Adults

663 Without Immunocompromising Conditions - United States, March-August 2021.
664 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(38):1337-43.

665 73. Sheikh A, McMenamin J, Taylor B, Robertson C. SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in
666 Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness.
667 Lancet. 2021;397(10293):2461-2.

668 74. Sritipsukho P, Khawcharoenporn T, Siribumrungwong B, Damronglerd P,
669 Suwantararat N, Satdhabudha A, et al. Comparing real-life effectiveness of various
670 COVID-19 vaccine regimens during the delta variant-dominant pandemic: a test-
671 negative case-control study. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2022;11(1):585-92.

672 75. Tabak YP, Sun X, Brennan TA, Chaguturu SK. Incidence and Estimated
673 Vaccine Effectiveness Against Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
674 Persons Tested in US Retail Locations, May 1 to August 7, 2021. JAMA Netw Open.
675 2021;4(12):e2143346.

676 76. Tang P, Hasan MR, Chemaitelly H, Yassine HM, Benslimane FM, Al Khatib
677 HA, et al. BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against the
678 SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in Qatar. Nat Med. 2021;27(12):2136-43.

679 77. Tenforde MW, Olson SM, Self WH, Talbot HK, Lindsell CJ, Steingrub JS, et al.
680 Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines Against COVID-19
681 Among Hospitalized Adults Aged ≥ 65 Years - United States, January-March 2021.
682 MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2021;70(18):674-9.

683 78. Thiruvengadam R, Awasthi A, Medigeshi G, Bhattacharya S, Mani S,
684 Sivasubbu S, et al. Effectiveness of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine against SARS-CoV-
685 2 infection during the delta (B.1.617.2) variant surge in India: a test-negative,
686 case-control study and a mechanistic study of post-vaccination immune
687 responses. Lancet Infect Dis. 2022;22(4):473-82.

- 688 79. Thompson MG, Stenehjem E, Grannis S, Ball SW, Naleway AL, Ong TC, et al.
689 Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines in Ambulatory and Inpatient Care Settings. N
690 Engl J Med. 2021;385(15):1355-71.
- 691 80. Winkelman TNA, Rai NK, Bodurtha PJ, Chamberlain AM, DeSilva M, Jeruzal
692 J, et al. Trends in COVID-19 Vaccine Administration and Effectiveness Through
693 October 2021. JAMA Netw Open. 2022;5(3):e225018.
- 694 81. Zambrano LD, Newhams MM, Olson SM, Halasa NB, Price AM, Boom JA, et
695 al. Effectiveness of BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) mRNA Vaccination Against
696 Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children Among Persons Aged 12-18
697 Years - United States, July-December 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
698 2022;71(2):52-8.
- 699 82. Altarawneh HN, Chemaitelly H, Ayoub HH, Tang P, Hasan MR, Yassine HM,
700 et al. Effects of Previous Infection and Vaccination on Symptomatic Omicron
701 Infections. N Engl J Med. 2022;387(1):21-34.
- 702 83. Andrews N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, Toffa S, Sachdeva R, Gower C, et al.
703 Effectiveness of COVID-19 booster vaccines against COVID-19-related symptoms,
704 hospitalization and death in England. Nature Medicine. 2022;28(4):831-+.
- 705 84. Chemaitelly H, Ayoub HH, AlMukdad S, Coyle P, Tang P, Yassine HM, et al.
706 Duration of mRNA vaccine protection against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and
707 BA.2 subvariants in Qatar. Nat Commun. 2022;13(1):3082.
- 708 85. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Naleway AL, Patel P, Gaglani M, Natarajan K, et al.
709 Effectiveness of 2-Dose Vaccination with mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines Against
710 COVID-19-Associated Hospitalizations Among Immunocompromised Adults -
711 Nine States, January-September 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.
712 2021;70(44):1553-9.

- 713 86. Fleming-Dutra KE, Britton A, Shang N, Derado G, Link-Gelles R, Accorsi EK,
714 et al. Association of Prior BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccination With Symptomatic
715 SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Children and Adolescents During Omicron
716 Predominance. *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association*.
717 87. Husin M, Tok PSK, Suah JL, Thevananthan T, Tng BH, Peariasamy KM, et al.
718 Real-world effectiveness of BNT162b2 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 infection
719 among adolescents (12 to 17-year-olds) in Malaysia. *Int J Infect Dis*.
720 2022;121:55-7.
721 88. Kirsebom FCM, Andrews N, Stowe J, Toffa S, Sachdeva R, Gallagher E, et al.
722 COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against the omicron (BA.2) variant in England.
723 *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022;22(7):931-3.
724 89. Lewis NM, Self WH, Gaglani M, Ginde AA, Douin DJ, Keipp Talbot H, et al.
725 Effectiveness of the Ad26.COV2.S (Johnson & Johnson) COVID-19 Vaccine for
726 Preventing COVID-19 Hospitalizations and Progression to High Disease Severity
727 in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022.
728 90. Nadeem I, ul Munamm SA, Rasool MU, Fatimah M, Abu Bakar M, Rana ZK,
729 et al. Safety and efficacy of Sinopharm vaccine (BBIBP-CorV) in elderly
730 population of Faisalabad district of Pakistan. *Postgraduate Medical Journal*.
731 91. Niessen FA, Knol MJ, Hahne SJM, Bonten MJM, Bruijning-Verhagen PCJL,
732 Peters V, et al. Vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19 related hospital admission
733 in the Netherlands: a test-negative case-control study. *Vaccine*. 2022;10.
734 92. Powell AA, Kirsebom F, Stowe J, McOwat K, Saliba V, Ramsay ME, et al.
735 Effectiveness of BNT162b2 against COVID-19 in adolescents. *Lancet Infect Dis*.
736 2022;22(5):581-3.

93. Skowronski DM, Febriani Y, Ouakki M, Setayeshgar S, El Adam S, Zou M, et al. Two-Dose Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Vaccine Effectiveness With Mixed Schedules and Extended Dosing Intervals: Test-Negative Design Studies From British Columbia and Quebec, Canada. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*.
94. Suarez Castillo M, Khaoua H, Courtejoie N. Vaccine effectiveness and duration of protection against symptomatic infections and severe Covid-19 outcomes in adults aged 50 years and over, France, January to mid-December 2021. *Glob Epidemiol*. 2022;4:100076.
95. Suarez Castillo M, Khaoua H, Courtejoie N. Vaccine-induced and naturally-acquired protection against Omicron and Delta symptomatic infection and severe COVID-19 outcomes, France, December 2021 to January 2022. *Euro Surveill*. 2022;27(16).
96. Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Puzniak L, Hong V, Xie F, Ackerson BK, et al. Durability of BNT162b2 vaccine against hospital and emergency department admissions due to the omicron and delta variants in a large health system in the USA: a test-negative case-control study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2022;10(7):689-99.
97. Tenforde MW, Patel MM, Ginde AA, Douin DJ, Talbot HK, Casey JD, et al. Effectiveness of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Messenger RNA Vaccines for Preventing Coronavirus Disease 2019 Hospitalizations in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022;74(9):1515-24.
98. Tenforde MW, Self WH, Zhu Y, Naioti EA, Gaglani M, Ginde AA, et al. Protection of mRNA vaccines against hospitalized COVID-19 in adults over the first year following authorization in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022.

761 99. Whitaker HJ, Tsang RSM, Byford R, Andrews NJ, Sherlock J, Pillai PS, et al.
762 Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness and
763 immune response amongst individuals in clinical risk groups. *Journal of Infection*.
764 2022;84(5):675-83.

765 100. Bubar KM, Reinholt K, Kissler SM, Lipsitch M, Cobey S, Grad YH, et al.
766 Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and
767 serostatus. *Science*. 2021;371(6532):916-21.

768 101. Cai J, Deng X, Yang J, Sun K, Liu H, Chen Z, et al. Modeling transmission of
769 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron in China. *Nat Med*. 2022.

770 102. Lewnard JA, Tedijanto C, Cowling BJ, Lipsitch M. Measurement of Vaccine
771 Direct Effects Under the Test-Negative Design. *Am J Epidemiol*.
772 2018;187(12):2686-97.

773 103. Halloran ME, Longini IM, Jr., Struchiner CJ. Design and interpretation of
774 vaccine field studies. *Epidemiol Rev*. 1999;21(1):73-88.

775 104. Trogen B, Caplan A. Risk Compensation and COVID-19 Vaccines. *Ann*
776 *Intern Med*. 2021;174(6):858-9.

777 105. Khandker SS, Godman B, Jawad MI, Meghla BA, Tisha TA, Khondoker MU,
778 et al. A Systematic Review on COVID-19 Vaccine Strategies, Their Effectiveness,
779 and Issues. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2021;9(12).

780 106. Singh JA, Upshur REG. The granting of emergency use designation to
781 COVID-19 candidate vaccines: implications for COVID-19 vaccine trials. *Lancet*
782 *Infect Dis*. 2021;21(4):e103-e9.

783 107. Greenland S. Basic methods for sensitivity analysis of biases. *Int J*
784 *Epidemiol*. 1996;25(6):1107-16.

785 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

786 **Figure 1.** Selection of studies for the systematic review

787

788 **Figure 2.** VE point estimates from identified studies based on prior infection

789 (Panel A), predominant circulating virus (Panel B) and vaccine type (Panel C).

790 Each point represents the VE point estimate. Estimates are jittered to enable

791 visualisation. Black points represent the pooled VE estimate from meta-analysis

792 with black lines representing the 95% confidence interval around the pooled

793 estimate. Shaded area is the violin plot, showing the smoothed density of the VE

794 point estimates.

795

796 **Figure 3.** Pooled VE estimates against infection and severe disease by circulating

797 virus, vaccine types, and the inclusion or exclusion of participants with prior

798 COVID-19 infection from random-effect meta-analysis.

799

800 **Figure 4.** Predicted VE for a group of individuals based on the estimated ratio of

801 odds ratios (ROR) estimated from meta-regression, and the VE for the

802 individuals in the reference group. Panel A and B indicate predicted VE against

803 infection and severe disease, respectively. Prior COVID-19 infection, cumulative

804 incidence of cases before the study, and the incidence rate of cases during study


805 are considered. Models adjusted for age group, type of vaccine, predominant






806 circulating virus, and enrolment criteria.

807

808

809



A**B****C****D****E****F**