Direct and indirect effectiveness of mRNA vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 infection in long-term care facilities in Spain

Susana Monge[1], Carmen Olmedo[2], Belén Alejos, María Fé Lapeña[3], María José Sierra[1]*, Aurora Limia[2]* and the COVID-19 registries study group.

[1]Centre for the Coordination of Alerts and Health Emergencies, General Directorate of Public Health, Ministry of Health.

[2]Vaccines division, General Directorate of Public Health, Ministry of Health.

[3]Data analytics department, General Directorate of Digital Health and National Health Service Information Systems, Ministry of Health.

* These persons contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding author:

Susana Monge

smonge@mscbs.es

Conflicts of interest: authors declare no support from any organisation for the submitted work; no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Contributions: SM, CO, MJS and AL conceived the idea for the study. SM and CO designed the analysis which was performed by SM with help from BA, support from MFL and under the supervision of MJS and AL. All authors participated in the interpretation of results and critically reviewed the content of the manuscript.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Funding: This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Members of the COVID-19 registries study group: *David Moreno, Manuel Méndez Díaz, Ismael Huerta González, Antonia Mª Galmes Truyol, Ana Barreno Estévez, Valvanuz García Velasco, Mª Jesús Rodríguez Recio, José Sacristán, Montserrat Martínez Marcos, Eliseo Pastor Villalba , María José Macías Ortiz, Ana García Vallejo, Sara Santos Sanz, Rocío García Pina , Aurelio Barricarte Gurea, Rosa Sancho Martínez, Eva María Ochoa, Mauricio Vázquez Cantero, Atanasio Gómez Anés, María Jesús Pareja Megía, Yolanda Castán, Manuel Roberto Fonseca Álvarez, Antonia Salvà Fiol, Hilda Sánchez Janáriz, Luz López Arce, María Ángeles Cisneros Martín, José Sacristán, Frederic Jose Gibernau, Cesar Fernandez Buey, Katja Villatoro Bongiorno, Francisco Javier Rubio García, Fernando Santos Guerra, Jenaro Astray Mochales, Francisco Javier Francisco Verdu, Isabel García Romero, Rosa Oriza Bernal, Tomás Gómez Pérez, Salomé Hijano Villegas, Sergio Román Soto, Virgilio Yagüe Galaup, Mercedes Alfaro Latorre, Marta Aguilera Guzmán, Belén Crespo Sánchez-Eznarriaga, Montserrat Neira León, Noemí Cívicos Villa.*

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Abstract

Objectives To estimate indirect and total (direct plus indirect) effects of COVID-19 vaccination in residents in long-term care facilities (LTCF).

Design Registries-based cohort study including all residents in LTCF ≥65 years offered vaccination between 27 December 2020 and 10 March 2021. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection following vaccination was compared with the risk in the same individuals in a period before vaccination. Risk in non-vaccinated was also compared to a period before the vaccination programme to estimate indirect protection. Standardized cumulative risk was computed adjusted by previous documented infection (before the start of follow-up) and daily-varying SARS-CoV-2 incidence and reproductive number.

Participants 573,533 records of 299,209 individuals in the National vaccination registry were selected; 99.0% had ≥1 vaccine-dose, 99.8% was Pfizer/BioNTech (BNT162b2). Residents mean age was 85.9, 70.9% were females. A previous SARS-CoV-2 infection was found in around 25% and 13% of participants, respectively, at the time of vaccine offer and in the reference period.

Main outcome measures Documented SARS-CoV-2 infection identified in the National COVID-19 laboratory registry.

Results Total VE was 57.2% (95% Confidence Interval: 56.1%-58.3%), and was highest ≥28 days after the first vaccine-dose (*proxy* of ≥7 days after the second dose) and for individuals naïve to SARS-CoV-2 [81.8% (81.0%-82.7%)] compared to those with previous infection [56.8% (47.1%-67.7%)]. Vaccination prevented up to 9.6 (9.3-9.9) cases per 10.000 vaccinated per day; 11.6 (11.3-11.9) if naïve vs. 0.8 (0.5-1.0) if previous infection. Indirect protection in the non-vaccinated could only be estimated

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

for naïve individuals, at 81.4% (73.3%-90.3%) and up to 12.8 (9.4-16.2) infections prevented per 10.000 indirectly protected per day.

Conclusions Our results confirm the effectiveness of mRNA vaccination in institutionalized elderly population, endorse the policy of universal vaccination in this setting, including in people with previous infection, and suggest that even non-vaccinated individuals benefit from indirect protection.

Key-words: COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; vaccination; vaccine effectiveness; long-term care facilities; elderly; indirect effects.

Key messages:

- COIVD-19 vaccination reduced the risk of documented SARS-CoV-2 infection in institutionalized elderly by 57.2% (56.1% to 58.3%), which increased to 81.2% (80.2% to 82%) for the fully vaccinated.
- In individuals naïve to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination reduced the risk by up to 81.8% and averted up to 11.6 cases per 10,000 vaccinated persons per day.
- Those with previous infection also benefited from a risk reduction of 57%, which translated in less than 1 infection averted per 10,000 vaccinated persons per day.
- Non-vaccinated individuals living in facilities where the majority (residents and staff) had been vaccinated showed a risk reduction similar to those actually vaccinated.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

88 **MAIN TEXT**

89 **Introduction**

90 Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic up to March 7 2021, 18,927 residents in
91 long-term care facilities (LTCF) have died in Spain with confirmed COVID-19, and an
92 additional 10,492 have died with compatible symptoms [1]. This means a cumulative
93 mortality rate of 67 per 1,000 residents, accounting only for confirmed infections. This
94 high vulnerability is due to the higher risk of exposure in dependents living in a closed
95 institution but also to the higher severity of infection due to advanced age and
96 presence of comorbidities. Indeed, one on every 5 cases of SARS-CoV-2 infection died
97 in this setting [1].

98 COVID-19 vaccination in Spain started on December 27 with the Pfizer/BioNTech
99 (BNT162b2) vaccine, for which LTCF -both residents and workers- were the first priority
100 group [2]. The vaccination campaign coincided with the third COVID-19 epidemic wave,
101 with national 14-day cumulative incidence increasing from less than 250 cases per
102 100,000 population by the end of 2020 to more than 1,000 by the end of January 2021
103 [3]. Vaccination started in facilities considered at higher risk, such as those that had
104 never experienced a COVID-19 outbreak, had higher number of residents or more
105 difficulties for implementing prevention and control measures. Vaccination teams
106 visited the facilities and vaccination was universal, including those with previous SARS-
107 CoV-2 infection. Vaccination was only deferred in people with active infection and,
108 inconsistently, in people under quarantine. Acceptance has been very high, with 97.8%
109 of all institutionalized persons (any institution type) having received at least one
110 vaccine dose, and 88.8% two doses [4].

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

111 The Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine has shown an efficacy of 95% in preventing Covid-19 in
112 randomized clinical trials [5]. However, elderly persons in general, and those
113 institutionalized in particular, are not represented in randomized studies [6]. Therefore
114 there is great interest in estimating vaccine effectiveness (VE) in this population
115 following its widespread vaccination. Moreover, because vaccination coverage was so
116 high, it is expected that non-vaccinated persons could be indirectly protected if
117 vaccination reduces infection and transmissibility among vaccinated persons. A few
118 observational studies focusing on the elderly have been published in the last weeks
119 [7,8]; one published and two pre-print studies have specifically addressed vaccine
120 effects in LTCF residents [9,10,11], and none have tried to address the indirect
121 protection in non-vaccinated individuals in this high-coverage setting.
122 This study aims to estimate indirect and total (direct plus indirect) effects of
123 vaccination in residents in LTCF in a high incidence context.

124 **Methods**

125 *Data sources*

126 REGVACU is a nation-wide registry of all COVID-19 vaccine-doses administered and
127 vaccine rejections. Data was extracted on March 15 and the administrative censoring
128 date was March 10. Individuals ≥65 years of age by December 27, with a valid postal
129 code, and identified as "resident in elderly homes" according to REGVACU were
130 selected. SERLAB is a nation-wide registry of all SARS-CoV-2 PCR and rapid antigenic
131 tests performed. Positive tests within 60 days of a previous positive one were dropped,
132 as they were considered to belong to the same episode. In LTCF, tests were performed
133 to symptomatic persons and risk contacts. Incoming residents were also routinely
134 tested and periodical screenings have also been carried out. Therefore, documented

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

135 infections registered in SERLAB may correspond both to symptomatic and
136 asymptomatic infections, although this circumstance was not recorded in the system.
137 Residents in REGVACU were cross-matched with SERLAB by person identification
138 number, date of birth and sex.

139 *Study design*

140 To estimate the total (direct and indirect) effect of vaccination in vaccinated
141 individuals, the risk of SARS-CoV-2 documented infection in the cohort of individuals
142 with the first dose administered between December 27 and March 10 was compared to
143 the risk in the same individuals in a period before the start of the vaccination
144 programme. A before-after comparison was deemed more appropriate since, due to
145 the high vaccination coverage at LTCFs, non-vaccinated individuals after December 27
146 would probably not represent baseline infection risk had the individual not been
147 vaccinated. Baseline infection risk, on the other hand, is heavily influenced by
148 community incidence and the vaccination campaign coincided with the third epidemic
149 wave in Spain. To minimize this effect the second epidemic wave was chosen as
150 comparison period, starting the follow-up of the non-vaccinated period 87 days before
151 individual-specific first dose administration date (October 1, at the earliest), with
152 administrative censoring on December 13, 87 days before March 10 (supplementary
153 Figure S1).

154 To estimate the indirect protection of vaccination in not vaccinated individuals, the risk
155 of SARS-CoV-2 documented infection in the cohort of individuals never vaccinated
156 between December 27 and March 10 was compared to the risk in the same individuals
157 87 days before, similarly as previously explained for vaccinated individuals. The follow-
158 up period started at the earliest date when the vaccine was offered to each individual,

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

159 since all residents at the same LTCF were offered vaccination on the same day.
160 Therefore individuals were ensured to be included on the date that a first vaccine-dose
161 was administered to most of the co-residents and workers.
162 The follow-up for all individuals finished at the earliest of a SARS-CoV-2 positive test or
163 administrative censoring. Unfortunately, no information on the individuals' vital status
164 was available. Existence of any previous SARS-CoV-2 documented infection on the first
165 day of follow-up was also registered.
166 An additional analysis to investigate the possible design-associated bias is presented in
167 the supplementary material.
168 The study obtained approval from the research ethics committee at the Instituto de
169 Salud Carlos III (CEI PI 98_2020). Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or
170 conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research. Results of this study are
171 planned to be disseminated to the broad public.
172 *Data analysis*
173 The standardized cumulative risk of a documented SARS-CoV-2 infection that every
174 individual had in the sample been either vaccinated or not vaccinated was computed
175 [12]. To estimate the probability of the event on each follow-up day, conditioned to
176 remaining event-free up to that day and given the individual covariates, a pooled
177 logistic regression was fitted adjusting by follow-up day, previous SARS-CoV-2 infection
178 (before beginning of follow-up), daily-varying 7-day SARS-CoV-2 cumulative incidence
179 specific to the province, its quadratic term, and the empirical reproduction number for
180 that province on that date. An interaction between follow-up day and vaccination was
181 introduced to allow for a time-varying effect of the vaccine. Robust models were built
182 using individuals as clusters. Standardized cumulative risk curves were derived using

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

183 the Kaplan-Meier method. Risk ratios (RR), vaccine effectiveness (VE= 1-RR) and risk
184 difference (RD) were estimated for the overall period and in four sub-periods after the
185 administration of the first dose, as proxies of different vaccine protection: (1) 14 days;
186 (2) 14 to 21 days; (3) 21 to 28 days (proxy of first 7 days after the second dose) and; (4)
187 >28 days (proxy of fully vaccinated, i.e. ≥7 days after second vaccine dose). Normal
188 distribution-based confidence intervals were estimated using bootstrapping with 300
189 repetitions.

190 **Results**

191 *Description of participants*

192 Out of 5,068,733 vaccination records from 3,615,403 individuals in REGVACU, 573,533
193 records from 299,209 individuals were selected; 296,093 (99.0%) had received ≥1
194 vaccine-dose, of which 99.8% were Pfizer/BioNTech (BNT162b2) and 0.2% Moderna
195 vaccine; 92.6% of them received a second vaccine-dose in a median of 21 days
196 (interquartile range: 21-21). Time to vaccination is shown in supplementary figure S2.
197 Mean age was 85.9 years (standard deviation = 7.8) and 70.9% were females. Selected
198 individuals were cross-matched with SERLAB; 77,662 (26.0%) had at least one positive
199 test between March 1, 2020 and March 11, 2021. A SARS-CoV-2 previous infection was
200 found in 17.5% of participants on the date they started the follow-up for the total
201 effects study; 22.3% in the vaccinated group and 12.7% in the comparison group (from
202 87 days before). In the indirect effects analysis, 20.3% had previous infection; 27.7% in
203 the indirectly protected and 12.9% in the comparison group.

204 *Estimation of vaccine effectiveness in vaccinated persons*

205 This analysis included 16,277,284 and 16,142,536 person-days of follow-up among
206 vaccinated and non-vaccinated persons, respectively. There were 11,304 and 19,656

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

207 documented infections, respectively (supplementary table S1). Detailed information on
208 the crude estimates and adjusted cumulative risk in each group can be found in the
209 supplementary material (Figure S3 and Tables S2 and S3).
210 Vaccine effectiveness for the whole study period was 57.2% (95% Confidence Interval:
211 56.1% to 58.3%), but it increased after two vaccine doses, and was higher in individuals
212 without previous SARS-CoV-2 infection; VE was 81.8% (81.0% to 82.7%) for residents
213 fully vaccinated and with no previous infection, but decreased to 56.8% (47.1% to
214 67.7%) if previous infection (Table 1, Figure 1). Interestingly, in a separate analysis we
215 found that previous infection in the reference period was associated to a risk reduction
216 of 86.6% (85.2%-87.8%), higher than the estimate for complete vaccination.
217 The estimated number of SARS-CoV-2 infections averted by vaccination (risk
218 difference) was greatest in the intermediate periods, which coincided with the peak of
219 the epidemic waves, at 11.6 cases per 10,000 vaccinated persons per day in the group
220 without previous infection (Table 1). In the group with previous infection, the number
221 of infections averted was much lower, of around 0.6 – 0.7 per 10,000 vaccinated
222 persons per day.
223 *Estimation of indirect vaccine effectiveness in non-vaccinated persons*
224 This analysis included 164,520 and 161,388 person-days of follow-up, respectively,
225 among persons not vaccinated but who had been offered the vaccine at their LTCF
226 (indirectly protected) and same persons in the reference period (87 days before).
227 There were 126 and 276 events, respectively (supplementary Table S1). Detailed
228 information on the crude estimates and the adjusted cumulative risk in each group can
229 be found in the supplementary material (Figure S3 and Tables S2 and S3).

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

230 Indirect protection was estimated at 57.3% (48% to 66.3%) for the whole study-period.
231 There was no statistically significant reduction in risk in the first 14 days of follow-up
232 but it increased progressively thereafter, particularly after 28 days (as a proxy of full
233 immunization of vaccinated persons at the LTCF), when VE reached 79.5% (71.0% to
234 88.1%) overall and 81.4% (73.3% to 90.3%) for the group with no documented SARS-
235 CoV-2 infection before the beginning of follow-up (Table 1, Figure 1).
236 The estimated number of SARS-CoV-2 infections averted by vaccination was similar to
237 the one found in the vaccinated group for individuals without previous infection, of 11
238 .0 and 12.8 per 10,000 non-vaccinated persons per day in the intermediate periods
239 (Table 1).
240 It was not possible to estimate VE for indirect protection in the group with a previous
241 SARS-CoV-2 infection since there were only 14 events, confidence intervals virtually
242 tended to infinite, and the model did not result in credible risk curves.

243 **Discussion**

244 This study on the institutionalized elderly confirms the high benefit of vaccination in
245 this population, reducing the risk of infection by up to 81.2% and avoiding up to 9.6
246 cases per 10,000 population per day. The risk reduction was through direct protection
247 of those vaccinated but also through indirect protection of those who were not-
248 vaccinated. The vaccine effectiveness increased throughout the study period, likely
249 showing the progressive immunization of vaccinated persons with increasing time
250 elapsed since the first-dose and after the receipt of the second dose. While VE was
251 higher for individuals naïve to SARS-CoV-2, those with previous infection also benefited
252 from vaccination, even the absolute gain in number of infections averted was low,
253 possibly due to an already lower baseline risk in this group.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

254 Immunesenescence and factors related to chronic conditions, together with
255 malnutrition, are known to impair immunity required for an effective vaccine response
256 [13], and lower neutralizing antibodies response to Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine in people
257 ≥65 years has been reported [6,14]. However, our estimates resulted fairly similar to
258 those of observational studies in younger adult population and are consistent with
259 other studies showing high VE in the elderly from the general population. A cohort of
260 health care workers in the UK found a VE of 70% 21 days after the first dose and of
261 85% 7 days after the second dose of Pfizer/BioNTech [15]. A slightly higher estimate, of
262 94.1%, is given by a pre-print with data from Israel [16]. Other observational studies
263 have explored VE in older age groups. In a registries-based study from Israel, in
264 persons aged ≥70 years, VE was found to be 44%, 64% and 98% at 14-20 days post-
265 vaccination, 21-27 days post-vaccination and ≥7 days after the second vaccine-dose,
266 respectively, which were similar to the results for younger age groups [17]. Bernal et al
267 have reported vaccine effects to start 10-13 days after vaccination with
268 Pfizer/BioNTech and reach 61% in people aged ≥70 years and 70% in people aged ≥80
269 years ≥28 days post-vaccination, and 89% 14 days after the second vaccine-dose [8].
270 A study in LTCF in Connecticut experiencing COVID-19 outbreaks found a 63%
271 protection with partial vaccination (between 14 and 28 days of the first dose), close to
272 our estimates, with unchanged results after excluding those with previous infection
273 [9]. However, two other existing studies focusing on LTCF have reported lower VE. A
274 Danish study in pre-print [10], has found no protective effect of a first vaccine-dose, a
275 52% reduction in days 0-7 after the second dose and 64% beyond day 7. A recently
276 released pre-print manuscript from the VIVALDI study in the UK has found no
277 protection conferred by vaccination with the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine in the first 28

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

278 days after the first dose [11]. Nevertheless, VE between days 28 to 47 was between
279 56% and 62% [11], in a similar range of the effect found in this study for the period 22-
280 28 days (61.9%). Early results from British Columbia have estimated 80% reduction in
281 risk 2-3 weeks after the first vaccine-dose [18]. Of note, our work included both
282 symptomatic and asymptomatic infections, pointing that risk was probably reduced for
283 both type of endpoints to an unknown degree. As an illustration, in national COVID-19
284 surveillance, 39% of all notified infections since 10 May 2020 in people ≥65 years of
285 age were asymptomatic.
286 A considerable 22% of all participants in our study had a previous documented SARS-
287 CoV-2 infection, although there are possibly a high number of infections that were not
288 documented, especially during the first epidemic wave in March-April 2020. Several
289 studies have documented a high immune response to a first COVID-19 vaccine-dose in
290 people with previous infection [19,20,21]. The results of this study add to previously
291 existing literature that, even though the effect was greater in naïve subjects to SARS-
292 CoV-2, those with previous infection also benefited from a risk reduction of 57%,
293 although it translated in less than 1 infection averted per 10,000 population per day.
294 Results from the indirect protection analysis support the hypothesis that vaccination
295 may reduce transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 and result in herd immunity. Previous
296 studies have shown decreased viral load in vaccinated patients, including those in LTCF
297 [9, 22], and a study from Scotland found a 30% lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 in household
298 members of vaccinated health-care workers, although the reduction in SARS-CoV-2
299 transmission from vaccinated individuals could be double that estimate, since
300 household members could also have been infected in the community [23]. A recent
301 ecological study from Israel has shown that increasing vaccine coverage provides cross-

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

302 protection to unvaccinated individuals in the community [24]. In our study, non-
303 vaccinated individuals living in facilities where the majority (residents and staff) had
304 been vaccinated showed a risk reduction similar to those actually vaccinated.
305 However, the magnitude of protection may be overestimated, since non-vaccinated
306 individuals could correspond more frequently to persons with previous infection, even
307 if not documented. This could be controlled in individuals with documented infection
308 but not in an unknown number with non-documented infection or diagnosed with
309 serology. Also, indirect protection was measured in a context of very high vaccine
310 coverage, difficult to attain in a non-institutional setting; therefore our results may not
311 have generalisability to the community setting.
312 Some limitations to study results could relate to the before-after comparison. Even
313 though we tried to minimize it, residual confounding due to higher incidence during
314 the third epidemic wave and possibly, to the relaxation of the isolation of LTCF during
315 the Christmas season, with higher number of day-outs and visits, may be present and
316 could underestimate the protection of the vaccine. This underestimation of the effect
317 of the vaccine could maybe explain that the effect of natural infection in the non-
318 vaccinated group was found higher than the effect of the vaccine. The conservative
319 direction of the possible bias is shown by the bias indicator analysis (supplementary
320 material).
321 In conclusion, our results confirm the effectiveness of vaccination in institutionalized
322 elderly population, endorse the policy of universal vaccination in this setting, including
323 in people with previous infection, and suggest that even non-vaccinated individuals
324 benefit from indirect protection. Further questions include the duration of protection

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

325 in this population and according to previous infection, and the severity of infection,

326 which could not be measured in this study.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of the General Directorate of Digital Health and National Health Service Information Systems and the General Sub-Directorate for Health Information (Ministry of Health, Spain) for their work in managing the registries in which this study was based, as well as in providing all the necessary IT support. We specially thank Miguel Hernán for his methodological advice and support in the design of the analysis as well as Luis Sanguiao for his support in implementing parallel computing. We acknowledge as well all the work of the professionals involved in the vaccination program and in managing the vaccination and laboratory registries from the Autonomous Communities.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

References

[1] Instituto de Mayores y Servicios Sociales (Imserso). Actualización nº 2. Enfermedad por coronavirus (COVID-19) en Centros Residenciales. 7/3/2021. Available at: https://www.imserso.es/InterPresent2/groups/imserso/documents/binario/inf_resid_20210312.pdf (Accessed 31 March 2021)

[2] Grupo de Trabajo Técnico de Vacunación COVID-19, de la Ponencia de Programa y Registro de Vacunaciones 2 de diciembre 2020. Estrategia de vacunación frente a COVID19 en España. 2 de diciembre 2020. Available at: https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/prevPromocion/vacunaciones/covid19/docs/COVID-19_EstrategiaVacunacion.pdf (Accessed 31 March 2021)

[3] Centro de Coordinación de Alertas y Emergencias Sanitarias. Ministry of Health of Spain. Actualización nº 335. Enfermedad por el coronavirus (COVID-19). 18.03.2021. Available at: https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/Actualizacion_335_COVID-19.pdf (Accessed 31 March 2021)

[4] GIV COVID-19. Gestión Integral de la vacunación COVID. Ministry of Health of Spain. Informe de actividad 18 de marzo. Available at: https://www.mscbs.gob.es/profesionales/saludPublica/ccayes/alertasActual/nCov/documentos/Informe_GIV_comunicacion_20210318.pdf (Accessed 31 March 2021)

[5] Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2020 Dec 31;383(27):2603-2615. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

359 [6] Prendki V, Tau N, Avni T, Falcone M, Huttner A, Kaiser L, at al. A systematic review
360 assessing the under-representation of elderly adults in COVID-19 trials. BMC Geriatr.
361 2020 Dec 20;20(1):538. doi: 10.1186/s12877-020-01954-5.
362 [8] Müller L, Andrée M, Moskorz W, et al. Age-dependent immune response to the
363 Biontech / Pfizer BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccination. MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi:
364 10.1101/2021.03.03.21251066.
365 [7] Bernal JL, Andrews N, Gower C, et al. Early effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination
366 with BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine and ChAdOx1 adenovirus vector vaccine on
367 symptomatic disease, hospitalisations and mortality in older adults in the UK : a test
368 negative case control study. MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021.
369 DOI:10.1101/2021.03.01.21252652.
370 [9] Britton A, Jacobs Slifka K, Edens Ch et al. Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech
371 COVID-19 Vaccine Among Residents of Two Skilled Nursing Facilities Experiencing
372 COVID-19 Outbreaks — Connecticut, December 2020–February 2021. MMWR 2021;70:
373 Early Release March 15.
374 [10] Moustsen-Helms IR, Emborg HD, Nielsen J, Nielsen KF, Krause TG, Mølbak H, et al.
375 Vaccine effectiveness after 1st and 2nd dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine
376 in long-term care facility residents and healthcare workers – a Danish cohort study.
377 MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.08.21252200.
378 [11] Shrotri M, Krutikov M, Palmer T, Giddings R, Azmi B,Subbarao S, et al. Vaccine
379 effectiveness of the first dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 and BNT162b2 against SARS-CoV-2
380 infection in residents of Long-Term Care Facilities (VIVALDI study). MedRxiv [Preprint]
381 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.26.21254391.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

382 [12] Hernán MA, Robins JM (2020). Causal Inference: What If. Boca Raton: Chapman &
383 Hall/CRC. Available at: https://www.hsph.harvard.edu/miguel-hernan/causal-
384 inference-book/ (Accessed 31 March 2021).
385 [13] Fulop T, Pawelec G, Castle S, Loeb M. Immunosenescence and vaccination in
386 nursing home residents. Clin Infect Dis. 2009 Feb 15;48(4):443-8. doi: 10.1086/596475.
387 [14] Walsh EE, Frenck RW, Falsey AR, *Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, et al. Safety
388 and Immunogenicity of Two RNA-Based Covid-19 Vaccine Candidates. New England
389 Journal of Medicine. 2020;383(25):2439-50.
390 [15] Hall VJ, Foulkes S, Saei A, Andrews N, Oguti B, Charlett et al. Effectiveness of
391 BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccine Against Infection and COVID-19 Vaccine Coverage in
392 Healthcare Workers in England, Multicentre Prospective Cohort Study (the SIREN
393 Study). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3790399 (Accessed 31 March
394 2021)
395 [16] Haas EJ, Frederick JA, McLaughlin JM, Anis E, Singer SR, Khan F, et al. Nationwide
396 Vaccination Campaign with BNT162b2 in Israel Demonstrates High Vaccine
397 Effectiveness and Marked Declines in Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infections and COVID-
398 19 Cases, Hospitalizations, and Deaths. Available at:
399 https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3811387 (Accessed 31 March
400 2021)
401 [17] Dagan N, Barda N, Kepten E, Miron O, Perchik S, Katz MA, et al. BNT162b2 mRNA
402 Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination Setting. N Engl J Med. 2021 Feb 24.
403 doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2101765. Online ahead of print. PMID: 33626250
404 [18] Early findings show the first vaccine dose reduced the risk of COVID-19 by 80 per
405 cent or more. Press release. February 19, 2021. Available at:

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

http://www.bccdc.ca/about/news-stories/news-releases/2021/early-findings-show-the-first-vaccine-dose-reduced-the-risk-of-covid-19-by-80-per-cent-or-more (Accessed 31 March 2021)

[19] Manisty C, Otter AD, Treibel TA, McKnight Á, Altmann DM, Brooks T, et al. Antibody response to first BNT162b2 dose in previously SARS-CoV-2-infected individuals. The Lancet. 2021;397(10279):1057-8.

[20] Saadat S, Tehrani ZR, Logue J, *Newman M, Frieman MB, Harris AD, et al. Single Dose Vaccination in Healthcare Workers Previously Infected with SARS-CoV-2. medRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.01.30.21250843.

[21] Camara C Lozano-Ojalvo D, Lopez-Granados E. Differential effects of the second SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine dose on T cell immunity in naïve and COVID-19 recovered individuals. Biorxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.22.436441.

[22] Petter E, Mor O, Zuckerman N, Oz-Levi D, Younger A, Aran D, Erlich Y. Initial real world evidence for lower viral load of individuals who have been vaccinated by BNT162b2. MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.02.08.21251329 .

[23] Shah AS, Gribben C, Bishop J, Hanlon P, Caldwell D, Wood R, et al. Effect of vaccination on transmission of COVID-19: an observational study in healthcare workers and their households. MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.11.21253275.

[24] Milman O, Noga Aharony IY, Katz R, Herzel E, Ben-Tov A, Kuint J, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection risk among unvaccinated is negatively associated with community-level vaccination rates. MedRxiv [Preprint] 2021. doi: 10.1101/2021.03.26.21254394.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

428 **Table 1. Vaccine effectiveness (VE) and risk difference (RD) in residents of elderly long-term care facilities according to evidence of previous**

429 **infection and time since first vaccinated (as a proxy of number of vaccine - doses and days since last dose).**

		VACCINE EFFECTIVENES (%)			RISK DIFFERENCE (per 10,000 persons per day)		
		Overall	**No previous infection**	**Previous infection**	**Overall**	**No previous infection**	**Previous infection**
EFFECTS IN THE VACCINATED	Full period	57.2% (56.1% to 58.3%)	57.6% (56.6% to 58.6%)	36.3% (27.9% to 45.5%)	-6.26 (-6.45 to -6.06)	-7.37 (-7.58 to -7.16)	-0.64 (-0.86 to -0.44)
	Days 0-14	28.5% (26.4% to 30.7%)	28.9% (26.9% to 31%)	9.6% (-6.9% to 26.8%)	-5.06 (-5.52 to -4.57)	-6.05 (-6.56 to -5.54)	-0.25 (-0.72 to 0.23)
	Days 15-21	51.0% (49.7% to 52.3%)	51.9% (50.7% to 53.1%)	25.5% (15.1% to 36.6%)	-9.62 (-9.97 to -9.23)	-11.59 (-12.01 to -11.19)	-0.66 (-1.00 to -0.32)
	Days 22-28	61.9% (60.8% to 63%)	62.9% (61.9% to 64%)	34.6% (25.7% to 44.1%)	-9.65 (-9.92 to -9.35)	-11.59 (-11.92 to -11.28)	-0.76 (-1.03 to -0.5)
	Days ≥29	81.2% (80.2% to 82%)	81.8% (81.0% to 82.7%)	56.8% (47.1% to 67.7%)	-5.59 (-5.76 to -5.41)	-6.47 (-6.66 to -6.28)	-0.75 (-0.98 to -0.53)
INDIRECT EFFECTS	Full period	57.3% (48% to 66.3%)	58.7% (49.4% to 68.5%)	NA	-8.13 (-10.13 to -5.98)	-10.08 (-12.62 to -7.52)	NA
	Days 0-14	18.8% (-1.7% to 39.9%)	18.2% (-3.1% to 39.8%)	NA	-3.31 (-7.29 to 0.79)	-3.79 (-8.54 to 1.14)	NA
	Days 15-21	43.6% (31.3% to 55.5%)	45% (32.8% to 57.1%)	NA	-8.8 (-11.95 to -5.48)	-11.02 (-14.88 to -6.99)	NA
	Days 22-28	55.8% (45.2% to 65.9%)	57.8% (47.5% to 68.2%)	NA	-10.06 (-12.66 to -7.30)	-12.81 (-16.16 to -9.39)	NA
	Days ≥29	79.5% (71.0% to 88.1%)	81.4% (73.3% to 90.3%)	NA	-9.22 (-11.56 to -6.73)	-11.46 (-14.39 to -8.6)	NA

430 NA: The model did not result in plausible bias-free risk curves, therefore no estimations were drawn.

NOT PEER-REVIEWED

Figure 1. Cumulative incidence of documented SARS-CoV-2 infection in residents in long-term care facilities estimated from adjusted hazards models.



NOT PEER REVIEWED