medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Efficacy of vaccination against severe COVID-19 in relation to Delta variant and time since second dose: the REACT-SCOT case-control study

Paul M McKeigue [1 6 *], David A McAllister [2 6], Sharon J Hutchinson [3 6], Chris Robertson [4 6], Diane Stockton [6], Helen M Colhoun [5 6], for the PHS COVID-19 Epidemiology and Research Cell [6]

1 Usher Institute, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh EH8 9AG, Scotland.

2 Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, 1 Lilybank Gardens, Glasgow G12 8RZ.

3 School of Health and Life Sciences, Glasgow Caledonian University. SH - Professor of Epidemiology and Population Health

4 Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde, 16 Richmond Street, Glasgow G1 1XQ.

5 Institute of Genetics and Cancer, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Western General Hospital Campus, Crewe Road, Edinburgh EH4 2XUC, Scotland.

6 Public Health Scotland, Meridian Court, 5 Cadogan Street, Glasgow G2 6QE

* Corresponding author: paul.mckeigue@ed.ac.uk

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Objectives - To investigate: (1) whether vaccine efficacy against severe COVID-19 has decreased since Delta became the predominant variant; (2) whether efficacy wanes with time since second dose.

Design - Matched case-control study.

Setting - Population of Scotland from 1 December 2020 to 19 August 2021.

Main outcome measure - Severe COVID-19, defined as cases with entry to critical care or fatal outcome.

Results - Efficacy of vaccination against severe COVID-19 decreased in May 2021 coinciding with the replacement of the B.1.1.7 (Alpha) by the B.1.617.2 (Delta) variant in Scotland, but this decrease was reversed over the next month. In the most recent time window, the efficacy of two doses against severe COVID-19 was 91% (95 percent CI 86% to 95%) for the AstraZeneca product and 92% (95 percent CI 85% to 95%) for mRNA (Pfizer or Moderna) products. Against the broader category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19, efficacy in this time window was slightly lower: 88% (95 percent CI 85% to 90%) for the AstraZeneca product, 91% (95 percent CI 88% to 93%) for mRNA vaccines. Efficacy against COVID-19 declined rapidly in the first two months since second dose but more slowly thereafter. For hospitalised or fatal COVID-19 the model best supported by the data was one in which efficacy was the sum of a rapidly waning effect with half-life of 17 (95% CI 9 to 39) days and a time-invariant efficacy of 83%.

Conclusions - These results are reassuring with respect to concerns that efficacy against severe COVID-19 might have fallen since the Delta variant became predominant. Although there is considerable uncertainty attached to any extrapolation into the future, these results suggest that the rapid early waning of efficacy against hospitalised COVID-19 after the second dose tapers off within a few months. This weakens the rationale for policies based on delivering booster doses to the entire population, rather than to vulnerable individuals for focused protection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Recent reports have suggested that efficacy of vaccines against COVID-19 infection may have fallen since the B.1.617.2 (Delta) variant became predominant [1–6]. Other studies have raised concerns that efficacy may wane with time since second dose [3,7]. These concerns have led US public health agencies to recommend booster doses [8].

Studies of efficacy against infection are subject to ascertainment bias unless they are based on testing at predetermined regular intervals [3]. Studies of efficacy against severe COVID-19, defined as cases that are fatal or require critical care, are less susceptible to ascertainment bias and this is also the outcome most relevant to health-care capacity. The objectives of this study were to investigate for the two main classes of vaccine: (1) whether efficacy against severe COVID-19 has decreased since Delta became the predominant variant; (2) whether efficacy of two doses against severe COVID-19 wanes with time since second dose.

Methods

The design of the REACT-SCOT case-control study has been described in detail previously [9]. In brief, for every incident case of COVID-19 in the Scottish population ten controls matched for one-year age, sex and primary care practice and alive on the day of presentation of the case that they were matched to were selected using the Community Health Index database. COVID-19 cases were those with a positive nucleic acid test, or a hospital admission or death with COVID-19 ICD-10 codes. As previously, to minimise ascertainment bias we pre-specified the primary outcome measure as severe COVID-19, defined as diagnosed cases with entry to critical care within 28 days of presentation or fatal outcome (death within 28 days of a positive test or any death for which COVID-19 was coded as underlying cause) [9]. We also examined the broader category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19. Though the data extract included cases presenting up to 2 September 2021, the analyses reported here are restricted to cases and controls presenting from 1 December 2020 to 19 August 2021, ensuring follow-up for at least 14 days after presentation date to allow cases to be classified as severe or hospitalised.

The vaccination programme in Scotland began on 8 December 2020. By 24 March 2021 half the adult population had received a first dose, and by 7 June half the adult population had received a second dose [10]. Vaccination status was defined by the number of doses received at least 14 days before presentation date.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The incidence density sampling design controls not only for the matching factors of age, sex and primary care practice but also for calendar time. Rate ratios for severe COVID-19 were estimated from conditional logistic regression models. The efficacy of vaccination is 1 minus the rate ratio. Covariates included in each model were those previously identified as strong predictors of severe disease in this population: care home residence, risk category (no risk condition, moderate risk condition, clinically extremely vulnerable), number of non-cardiovascular drug classes dispensed in last 240 days and recent hospital stay [9,11,12].

To investigate the effect of the Delta variant we examined how efficacy varied with calendar time, and to investigate possible waning we examined how efficacy varied with time since last dose. To show these relationships without predefined categories, the initial analysis presents line plots of log rate ratios estimated within sliding 42-day time windows against calendar time and against time since last dose. For a formal comparison between time periods before and after Delta became the predominant variant, we estimated rate ratios before and after 19 May 2021: the date on which Delta became the main variant in Scotland [13].

To model waning of efficacy after the second dose of vaccine, we compared the fit of two families of model: (1) a "waning to zero efficacy" model in which the effect of vaccination on the scale of log rate ratio decays exponentially to zero with time since second dose; (2) a "waning to constant efficacy" model in which the effect of vaccination is the sum of two terms: a time-invariant effect and a waning effect that decays exponentially with time since second dose. For each of these two model families, a model was fitted for each value of the decay half-life over a sequence of values from 10 to 500 days and a profile likelihood confidence interval for the half-life was obtained as the range of half-life values over which the log-likelihood of the model was within 1.92 natural log units of its maximum value. Comparison between the best-fitting waning to zero model and the best-fitting "waning to constant efficacy" model was based on the difference in log-likelihood between these nested models.

Results

Tables S1 and S2 show the distributions of risk factors in cases and their matched controls, for the 5168 severe cases and the 17121 cases in the broader category of hospitalised or fatal. These results are provided for reference only: the reader is cautioned that unconditional odds ratios calculated from these tables cannot be used to estimate rate ratios because of the matched design [14,15]. Over all cases and matched controls, the median and interquartile range of the time since last dose was 34 (22 to 53) days

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

for those who had received a single dose and 67 (42 to 89) days for those who had received two doses. Of those who had received two doses of an mRNA vaccine by the date of the latest extract, 9% had received the Moderna product.

Vaccine efficacy before and after the Delta variant became predominant

Figure 1 (a) shows that the rate ratio for severe COVID-19 associated with a single dose of vaccine in June to July 2021, after the Alpha variant was replaced by the Delta variant, was similar to that in March to April. There is however an obvious blip, with a temporary increase in the rate ratio (corresponding to a decline in efficacy) from early May to early June. The rate ratios for severe COVID-19 associated with two doses of vaccine show a similar perturbation during May 2021, but the estimates of rate ratios for time windows before May 2021 are imprecise because at this time few individuals had received their second dose. To compare the rate ratio before and after the date that the Delta variant became predominant, a conditional logistic regression model was fitted with the effect of two doses versus none nested within each level of an indicator variable defined as presentation date on or after 19 May 2021. The rate ratio for severe disease associated with two doses of vaccine was 0.04 (95% CI 0.01 to 0.18, p=2×10^{-5}) before 19 May and 0.10 (95% CI 0.08 to 0.14, p=1×10^{-53}) from 19 May onwards. The confidence interval for the rate ratio before 19 May is wide because few individuals had received two doses before April 2021 and there were few severe cases from April to mid-May 2021. Figure 1 (b) shows that the rate ratio for the broader category of hospitalised or fatal disease associated with two doses of vaccine increased (and thus efficacy was lower) after the Delta variant became predominant. The rate ratio was estimated as 0.05 (95% CI 0.03 to 0.10, p=2×10^{-16}) before 19 May and 0.15 (95% CI 0.13 to 0.17, p=1×10^{-181}) from 19 May onwards

Figure 1 (a) shows that against severe COVID-19, the efficacy of two doses of the AstraZeneca and mRNA vaccines did not differ after May 2021, but Figure 1 (b) shows that against the broader category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19 the AstraZeneca vaccine had lower efficacy than the mRNA vaccines. In the most recent 42-day time window centred on 29 July 2021, the efficacy of two doses against severe COVID-19 was 91% (95 percent CI 86% to 95%) for the AstraZeneca product and 92% (95 percent CI 85% to 95%) for mRNA (Pfizer or Moderna) products. Against the broader category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19, efficacy in this time window was slightly lower: 88% (95 percent CI 85% to 90%) lower for the AstraZeneca product, 91% (95 percent CI 88% to 93%) for mRNA vaccines.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Vaccine efficacy by time since second dose

Figure 2 (a) shows that the log rate ratio for severe COVID-19 increases (and thus efficacy decreases) over the first two months after the second dose for both AstraZeneca and mRNA vaccines, but that with increasing time since second dose the slope of this relationship appears to flatten. Up to about 6 weeks from the second dose, the slope of the increase in log rate ratio is less steep for the AstraZeneca vaccine than for the mRNA vaccines, so that the difference in efficacy narrows with time since second dose. Figure 2 (b) shows the same analysis for the broader category of hospitalized or fatal COVID-19. The slope of the relationship of log rate ratio associated with vaccine to time since second dose appears to flatten with increasing time since second dose. As in Figure 1 (b), efficacy against hospitalisation remains higher for the mRNA than for the AstraZeneca vaccine.

Modelling of the relation of efficacy to time since second dose was based on comparison of "waning to zero efficacy" and "waning to constant efficacy" models as described above. For hospitalised or fatal COVID-19, the best-fitting "waning to constant efficacy" model with waning effect half-life of 17 (95% CI 9 to 39) days, reaching a constant efficacy of 83% was supported (p=0.001) over the best-fitting "waning to zero efficacy" model. For the narrower outcome of severe COVID-19 the parameter estimates for the best-fitting "waning to constant efficacy" model were similar to those for hospitalised or fatal COVID-19 – waning effect half-life of 27 (95% CI 14 to 143) days, constant efficacy 82% – but there was only weak evidence (p=0.05) favouring this model over the best-fitting model with waning to zero efficacy. The decay curves corresponding to the best-fitting models for each outcome are shown in Figure S1.

Conclusions

Statement of principal findings

- The efficacy of two vaccine doses against severe COVID-19 in the most recent time windows is around 92% and does not differ between AstraZeneca and mRNA products. Efficacy against the broader category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19 remains slightly lower for the AstraZeneca vaccine than for mRNA vaccines (88% versus 91%)

- Efficacy declines rapidly during the first two months after the second dose but more slowly thereafter. For the broad category of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19, the results support a model in which the efficacy is the sum of a waning effect with half-life of a few weeks and a time-invariant effect, declining towards a constant value of about 80% over the first few months.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Strengths and limitations

Strengths of this study are the focus on severe COVID-19 as main outcome measure, the elimination of confounding by calendar time in the matched case-control design, and the ability to control for multiple comorbidities through linkage to electronic health records. A limitation of the incidence density case-control design is that it excludes those who have previously tested positive for COVID-19: a separate study of reinfections is in progress. For investigating the possible effect of the Delta variant on efficacy, a limitation is that we do not have direct measurements of variant type; however in Scotland the Alpha variant was almost completely replaced by Delta over a few weeks in May 2021 [13], and the effect of this is visible in the time window plots as a temporary perturbation of efficacy. As few people had received their second dose before April 2021 and from April to May 2021 the number of severe cases was low, estimates of efficacy of two doses against severe COVID-19 are based mainly on cases occurring after May 2021. Although the effects of calendar time and time since second dose are confounded with other factors not considered in this analysis including seasonality, the build-up of natural immunity, and the changing morbidity profile of cases, the objective of this study is to establish whether efficacy is waning in the population as a whole and thus to lay an evidence base for policy.

Comparison with other studies

Several studies have suggested that vaccine efficacy against infection may have fallen since Delta became the predominant variant. A study based on regular monthly PCR tests obtained in the UK Office of National Statistics (ONS) Covid-19 Infection Survey reported that efficacy against infection had fallen from 79% to 67% for the AstraZeneca vaccine since Delta became the predominant variant, but had remained around 80% for the Pfizer vacine [3]. Two other recent studies from the UK [2,13] using test-negative controls have estimated recent efficacy against symptomatic infection to be lower for the AstraZeneca product than for the Pfizer product. However these studies were based on unscheduled tests, which may give rise to ascertainment bias if vaccination influences test-seeking behaviour.

Studies of efficacy against hospitalisation with COVID-19 are less susceptible to ascertainment bias. Of three US studies of efficacy against hospitalisation, two reported that efficacy against hospitalisation was no lower after the Delta variant became predominant than before [4,5], and one reported that efficacy of mRNA vaccines fell from 85% to 75% [6]. Our results show that against the narrower outcome of severe COVID-19 there has been in Scotland no sustained reduction in efficacy.

The ONS study also found that efficacy against infections detected at less than 30 PCR cycles

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

declined during the first three months since second dose, and that this decline was steeper for the Pfizer mRNA vaccine than for the AstraZeneca vaccine: modelled as linear effects of time since second dose on the log rate ratio associated with vaccination, the waning effects were equivalent to declines from 93% to 89% for the Pfizer vaccine and from 72% to 69% for the AstraZeneca vaccine from 15 to 45 days after second dose [3]. The authors suggested that if these linear effects were extrapolated, the two vaccines would have equal efficacy against infection after 16-20 weeks. The ONS study did not test the form of the relationship of efficacy to time since second dose: on the scale of log rate ratio, exponential decay is more realistic than a linear effect which implies that efficacy would eventually become negative. Our results show that for efficacy against severe disease also, the waning of efficacy appears to be faster for mRNA vaccines than for the AstraZeneca product, but this early waning appears to taper off.

Although a model in which efficacy against hospitalisation is the sum (on a scale of log rate ratio) of a rapidly-waning effect and a constant effect is supported by the data, the underlying mechanism of this is not clear. The measured rate of decline of neutralising antibodies induced by mRNA vaccines [16] is too slow to explain the rapid decline of efficacy in the first two months since second dose.

Policy implications

A joint CDC/FDA statement on 18 August 2021 asserted that [8]:

> *The available data make very clear that protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection begins to decrease over time following the initial doses of vaccination, and in association with the dominance of the Delta variant, we are starting to see evidence of reduced protection against mild and moderate disease.*

On this basis, the statement concluded that "a booster shot will be needed to maximize vaccine-induced protection and prolong its durability", reversing an earlier position [17]. Our results are more reassuring, in that we find that while vaccine efficay against severe COVID-19 declined when the Alpha variant was replaced by the Delta variant, this decline was only temporary. Although there is considerable uncertainty attached to any extrapolation into the future, the best estimate we can make on the basis of the data available is that the rapid waning of efficacy against COVID-19 in the first two months after the second dose tapers off thereafter and that the trajectory is consistent with a long-term efficacy of about 80% against hospitalisation. Thus at present there is no clear evidence to support a policy of delivering booster doses to the entire population, rather than to vulnerable individuals for focused protection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Declarations

Public and Patient Involvement statement:

This study was conducted under approvals from the Public Benefit and Privacy Panel for Health and Social Care which includes public and patient representatives.

Ethics approval

This study was performed within Public Health Scotland as part of its statutory duty to monitor and investigate public health problems. Under the UK Policy Framework for Health and Social Care Research set out by the NHS Health Research Authority, this does not fall within the definition of research and ethical review was therefore not required. Individual consent is not required for Public Health Scotland staff to process personal data to perform specific tasks in the public interest that fall within its statutory role. The statutory basis for this is set out in Public Health Scotland's privacy notice.

Transparency declaration

PM as the manuscript's guarantor affirms: that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as originally planned and registered have been explained. This manuscript has been generated directly from the source data by a reproducible research pipeline.

Funding

No specific funding was received for this study.

Data Availability

The component datasets used here are available via the Public Benefits and Privacy Panel for Health and Social Care at https://www.informationgovernance.scot.nhs.uk/pbpphsc/ for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data. All source code used for derivation of variables, statistical analysis and generation of this manuscript is available on https://github.com/pmckeigue/covid-scotland_public.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Competing interest

All authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest.

Acknowledgements

We thank Jen Bishop, Ciara Gribben and David Caldwell for undertaking the linkage analysis within Public Health Scotland,

References

1. Nanduri S. Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Nursing Home Residents Before and During Widespread Circulation of the SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant , March 1August 1, 2021. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7034e3

2. Lopez Bernal J, Andrews N, Gower C, Gallagher E, Simmons R, Thelwall S, et al. Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021;385: 585–594. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2108891

3. Pouwels KB. Impact of Delta on viral burden and vaccine effectiveness against new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the UK. Oxford; 2021.

4. Tenforde MW. Sustained Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines Against COVID-19 Associated Hospitalizations Among Adults , March – July 2021. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7034e2

5. Rosenberg ES. New COVID-19 Cases and Hospitalizations Among Adults, by Vaccination Status , May 3 – July 25, 2021. MMWR Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report. 2021;70. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7034e1

6. Puranik A, Lenehan PJ, Silvert E, Niesen MJM, Corchado-Garcia J, O'Horo JC, et al. Comparison of two highly-effective mRNA vaccines for COVID-19 during periods of Alpha and Delta variant prevalence. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; 2021. p. 2021.08.06.21261707. doi:10.1101/2021.08.06.21261707

7. Mizrahi B, Lotan R, Kalkstein N, Peretz A, Perez G, Ben-Tov A, et al. Correlation of SARS-CoV-2 Breakthrough Infections to Time-from-vaccine; Preliminary Study. Cold Spring Harbor

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Laboratory Press; 2021. p. 2021.07.29.21261317. doi:10.1101/2021.07.29.21261317

8. Office of the Commissioner. Joint Statement from HHS Public Health and Medical Experts on COVID-19 Booster Shots. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/joint-statement-hhs-public-health-and-medical-experts-covid-19-booster-shots; FDA; 2021.

9. McKeigue PM, Weir A, Bishop J, McGurnaghan SJ, Kennedy S, McAllister D, et al. Rapid Epidemiological Analysis of Comorbidities and Treatments as risk factors for COVID-19 in Scotland (REACT-SCOT): A population-based case-control study. PLOS Medicine. 2020;17: e1003374. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003374

10. Public Health Scotland. COVID-19 vaccination in Scotland: Daily update. COVID-19 Daily Dashboard. https://public.tableau.com/views/COVID-19DailyDashboard_15960160643010/Overview?/; 2021.

11. McKeigue PM, Kennedy S, Weir A, Bishop J, McGurnaghan SJ, McAllister D, et al. Relation of severe COVID-19 to polypharmacy and prescribing of psychotropic drugs: The REACT-SCOT case-control study. BMC medicine. 2021;19: 51. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-01907-8

12. McKeigue PM, McAllister DA, Caldwell D, Gribben C, Bishop J, McGurnaghan S, et al. Relation of severe COVID-19 in Scotland to transmission-related factors and risk conditions eligible for shielding support: REACT-SCOT case-control study. BMC medicine. 2021;19: 149. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-02021-5

13. Sheikh A, McMenamin J, Taylor B, Robertson C. SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Scotland: Demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. The Lancet. 2021;397: 2461–2462. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01358-1

14. Breslow NE, Day NE, Halvorsen KT, Prentice RL, Sabai C. Estimation of multiple relative risk functions in matched case-control studies. American Journal of Epidemiology. 1978;108: 299–307. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a112623

15. Greenland S, Thomas DC. On the need for the rare disease assumption in case-control studies. American Journal of Epidemiology. 1982;116: 547–553. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.aje.a113439

16. Doria-Rose N, Suthar MS, Makowski M, O'Connell S, McDermott AB, Flach B, et al. Antibody Persistence through 6 Months after the Second Dose of mRNA-1273 Vaccine for Covid-19. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021;384: 2259–2261. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2103916

17. Office of the Commissioner. Joint CDC and FDA Statement on Vaccine Boosters. FDA. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/joint-cdc-and-fda-statement-vaccine-boosters;

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

FDA; 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Figures



Fig 1. Relation of vaccine efficacy to calendar time: (a) severe COVID-19; (b) hospitalised or fatal COVID-19. Vaccination status is defined by number of doses received at least 14 days before. Rate ratios in conditional logistic regression model, adjusted for covariates. For each effect, line thickness is proportional to precision of estimate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Fig 2. Relation of vaccine efficacy to time since last dose: (a) severe COVID-19; (b) hospitalised or fatal COVID-19. Rate ratios in conditional logistic regression model, adjusted for covariates. For each effect, line thickness is proportional to precision of estimate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary Material



Fig S1. Best-fitting models of waning to zero efficacy and waning to constant efficacy for the narrow outcome of severe COVID-19 and the broader outcome of hospitalised or fatal COVID-19

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S1. Rate ratios for severe COVID-19

			Univariate		Multivariable	
	Controls (45767)	Cases (5168)	Rate ratio (95% CI)	*p*-value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	*p*-value
Care home	2375 (5%)	933 (18%)	5.4 (4.8, 5.9)	5×10^{-217}	5.6 (5.0, 6.4)	7×10^{-152}
No risk condition	25632 (56%)	1393 (27%)		.		.
Moderate risk condition	16512 (36%)	2703 (52%)	3.35 (3.11, 3.61)	9×10^{-225}	1.96 (1.80, 2.14)	3×10^{-52}
Eligible for shielding	3623 (8%)	1072 (21%)	6.2 (5.7, 6.8)	3×10^{-327}	2.76 (2.46, 3.11)	6×10^{-64}
Number of non-cardiovascular drug classes	3 (1 to 7)	8 (4 to 12)	1.15 (1.14, 1.15)	2×10^{-522}	1.09 (1.08, 1.09)	3×10^{-122}
Recent hospital stay	977 (2%)	1461 (28%)	19.1 (17.3, 21.1)	2×10^{-740}	13.7 (12.3, 15.2)	7×10^{-492}
Vaccination status						
Not vaccinated	37098 (81%)	4348 (84%)		.		.
1 dose mRNA vaccine	2101 (5%)	246 (5%)	0.80 (0.68, 0.94)	0.008	0.41 (0.34, 0.50)	4×10^{-20}
1 dose AZ vaccine	2647 (6%)	244 (5%)	0.40 (0.33, 0.49)	6×10^{-19}	0.37 (0.30, 0.46)	4×10^{-19}
2 doses mRNA vaccine	1221 (3%)	81 (2%)	0.18 (0.13, 0.25)	4×10^{-25}	0.09 (0.06, 0.13)	7×10^{-38}
2 doses AZ vaccine	2696 (6%)	248 (5%)	0.23 (0.18, 0.29)	3×10^{-30}	0.14 (0.11, 0.19)	1×10^{-43}

Presentation dates from 1 December 2020 to 19 August 2021.

Vaccination status defined as number of doses received at least 14 days before presentation date.

Controls matched for age, sex, and primary care practice on date of presentation of case.

Multivariable model includes all covariates in the table

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.12.21263448; this version posted September 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table S2. Rate ratios for hospitalised or fatal COVID-19

			Univariate		Multivariable	
	Controls (158666)	Cases (17121)	Rate ratio (95% CI)	*p*-value	Rate ratio (95% CI)	*p*-value
Care home	4976 (3%)	1844 (11%)	4.65 (4.34, 4.99)	7×10^{-402}	3.80 (3.48, 4.15)	2×10^{-193}
No risk condition	103921 (65%)	6909 (40%)		.		.
Moderate risk condition	44846 (28%)	7450 (44%)	2.96 (2.84, 3.08)	4×10^{-642}	1.81 (1.73, 1.89)	6×10^{-136}
Eligible for shielding	9899 (6%)	2762 (16%)	5.2 (4.9, 5.5)	1×10^{-800}	2.40 (2.24, 2.57)	1×10^{-137}
Number of non-cardiovascular drug classes	3 (0 to 6)	6 (2 to 10)	1.14 (1.14, 1.14)	9×10^{-1382}	1.09 (1.08, 1.09)	1×10^{-358}
Recent hospital stay	2543 (2%)	4442 (26%)	23.9 (22.5, 25.4)	9×10^{-2335}	16.3 (15.3, 17.4)	9×10^{-1597}
Vaccination status						
Not vaccinated	121607 (77%)	14067 (82%)		.		.
1 dose mRNA vaccine	9072 (6%)	614 (4%)	0.39 (0.36, 0.43)	3×10^{-77}	0.29 (0.27, 0.33)	9×10^{-112}
1 dose AZ vaccine	10161 (6%)	1006 (6%)	0.46 (0.41, 0.50)	9×10^{-54}	0.41 (0.37, 0.45)	6×10^{-62}
2 doses mRNA vaccine	6261 (4%)	293 (2%)	0.14 (0.12, 0.16)	7×10^{-130}	0.10 (0.08, 0.12)	1×10^{-158}
2 doses AZ vaccine	11527 (7%)	1140 (7%)	0.31 (0.27, 0.35)	1×10^{-84}	0.21 (0.18, 0.23)	7×10^{-135}

Presentation dates from 1 December 2020 to 19 August 2021.

Vaccination status defined as number of doses received at least 14 days before presentation date.

Controls matched for age, sex, and primary care practice on date of presentation of case.

Multivariable model includes all covariates in the table