

BIOLOGICAL RHYTHMS IN COVID-19 VACCINE EFFECTIVENESS

Guy Hazan, M.D., Ph.D.¹⁻³, Or A. Duek, PhD^{4,5}, Hillel Alapi, B.A.⁶, Hiram Mok, MD¹, Alex Ganninger¹, Elaine Ostendorf¹, Carrie Gierasch, B.S.¹, Gabriel Chodick, Ph.D.^{6,7}, David Greenberg, M.D.^{8,9}, and Jeffrey A. Haspel, M.D., Ph.D.^{1*}

¹Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, MO, USA.

²Department of Pediatrics, Soroka University Medical Center, Beer-Sheva, Israel.

³Research and Innovation Center, Saban Childrens Hospital, Beer-Sheva, Israel.

⁴Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT, USA.

⁵Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Community Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel

⁶Maccabitech Institute for Research and Innovation, Maccabi Healthcare Services, Tel Aviv, Israel.

⁷Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel.

⁸The Pediatric Infectious Disease Unit, Soroka University Medical Center, Beer-Sheva, Israel.

⁹Faculty of Health Sciences, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel.

*Corresponding author contact information: Jeffrey Haspel, Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Washington University School of Medicine, Campus Box 8052, 660 South Euclid Avenue, St. Louis, MO, 63110, USA. Email: jhaspel@wustl.edu

This paper has an online Supplement.

KEY POINTS

Question: Does the time of day patients receive their COVID-19 vaccinations influence their clinical benefit?

Findings: In this population-level cohort study that included 1,515,754 individuals aged 12 and over, COVID-19 vaccination during the late morning to early afternoon was associated with fewer breakthrough infections compared to other times. Vaccination timing altered breakthrough infection risk by 8.6-25%, depending on patient age and dose number.

Meaning: Prioritizing children and the elderly for late morning to early afternoon immunization could improve the effectiveness of mass vaccinations against COVID-19, and potentially other infectious diseases.

ABSTRACT

Importance Circadian rhythms affect fundamental immune processes, but how this translates to clinical outcomes like real-world vaccine effectiveness is unclear.

Objective To examine associations between Coronavirus Infectious Disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccination timing and effectiveness.

Design, Setting, and Participants Retrospective cohort study of database records from Maccabi Healthcare Services (MHS), a major Israeli Health Maintenance Organization (HMO). We included all individuals over 12 with at least one timestamped vaccine dose and no documented COVID-19 infection prior to completing the initial 2-dose immunization series (n=1,515,754, 99.2% receiving BNT162b2). Database records spanned December 19, 2020, to April 25, 2022, encompassing two spikes in COVID infection dominated by the delta (B.1.617.2) and omicron (B.1.1.529) SARS-CoV-2 variants.

Main Outcomes and Measures Outcomes included COVID-19 breakthrough infection and COVID-19 associated emergency department (ED) visits. Our main comparison was between patients vaccinated exclusively during morning hours (8:00-11:59), afternoon (12:00-15:59), or evening hours (16:00-19:59). We employed Cox multivariate regression to adjust for differences in age, sex, and co-morbidities.

Results. Breakthrough infections differed based on vaccination time, with lowest rates associated with late morning to early afternoon, and highest rates with evening vaccination. Vaccination timing remained significant after adjustment for patient age, sex, and co-morbidities (HR=0.88 afternoon vs. evening, [95% CI 0.87-0.90]). Results were consistent in patients who received the basic two-dose vaccine series and who received booster doses. The relationship between COVID-19 immunization time and breakthrough infection risk was sinusoidal, consistent with a biological rhythm in vaccine effectiveness. Vaccination timing altered breakthrough

infection risk by 8.6-25% in our cohort, depending on patient age and dose number. The benefits of daytime vaccination were concentrated in younger and elderly patients. In contrast to breakthrough infections, COVID-19 related ED visits correlated with age and medical comorbidities but not with time of vaccination.

Conclusions and Relevance We report a significant association between the time of COVID-19 vaccination and its clinical effectiveness in terms of breakthrough infection. These data have implications for mass vaccination programs.

INTRODUCTION

Circadian rhythms are daily oscillations in biological function that enable organisms to align their physiology to the day-night cycle^{1,2}. These rhythms emanate from a genetically encoded molecular clock that regulates gene expression and thereby organizes cellular functions into daily cycles^{1,2}. Among the activities organized by the circadian system are basic immune processes³⁻⁵, including the innate inflammatory response⁶⁻¹², cellular egress from the bone marrow¹³, leukocyte trafficking to organs and lymph nodes¹⁴⁻¹⁶, and T cell responses to antigen^{17,18}. Some theorize that the circadian rhythms in humans should translate, directly or indirectly, into preferable times of day to vaccinate patients^{1,2,19-21}. However, clinical studies differ on whether rhythms exist in vaccine responses, including those against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the cause of coronavirus infectious disease-19 (COVID-19)²²⁻³¹. While important, prior studies had limited sample sizes and focused on markers of immunogenicity like antibody titers rather than clinical outcomes. Here, we examine how the timing of COVID-19 vaccination relates to clinical protection using large-scale observational data.

METHODS

Study design and setting. This retrospective cohort study analyzes database records from Maccabi Healthcare Services (MHS) in Israel. MHS is the second largest state-mandated, not-for-profit, health maintenance organization (HMO) in Israel with over 2.6 million members, constituting one-quarter of the country's population. MHS maintains extensive medical, demographic, and anthropometric information linked to a nation-wide electronic medical record (EMR) servicing the entire Israeli civilian population. The MHS database captures all clinical encounters, diagnoses, medications, and laboratory data for its participants anywhere within the country regardless of setting, including all clinical activity and diagnostic testing related to COVID-19. All data were de-identified prior to analysis. Since this was a retrospective study,

patient informed consent was not required. For identities of those who analyzed the data see “Study Oversight” in the **eAppendix1** of the **Supplement**. The MHS ethical committee approved the study.

Study period. We analyzed data from December 19, 2020 (the first day of vaccine administration in the study population) to April 25, 2022 (the last day of data extraction). This timespan encompasses two spikes in COVID infection dominated by the delta (B.1.617.2) and omicron (B.1.1.529) SARS-CoV-2 variants (**eFigure 1** in the **Supplement**, black and blue bars). For background information on the COVID-19 vaccine rollout in Israel see **eAppendix2** in the **Supplement**.

Study population (Figure 1A). We extracted data from all MHS members aged 12 years and older who received at least one dose of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine, joined MHS prior to February 2020 and therefore had a complete medical history on file. For analysis of each vaccine dose, we excluded patients who had a documented SARS-CoV-2 positive test prior to the date of vaccination. We further excluded patients with missing timestamps (11.4% of individuals for dose 1, 9.6% for dose 2, 12.3% for dose 3, and 9.1% for dose 4). 81.1% of MHS members identified as Jewish, 6% identified as orthodox Jews, 5.8% as Arabs, and 6.1% as former Soviet Union residents.

Data sources and organization. We analyzed de-identified patient-level data extracted from MHS electronic records. Continuous variables included age at immunization, time and date of vaccine administration, and body mass index (BMI). Dichotomous variables included sex and comorbidities linked to COVID-19 severity^{32,33}. For variable definitions see **eTables 1 and 2** in the **Supplement**.

Study outcomes. The primary outcome was COVID-19 infection as defined by positive SARS-CoV-2 polymerase-chain-reaction (PCR) or antigen test performed at any official site. Infections

in the first 14 days following vaccination were excluded from the analysis, since patients during this interval are not considered to have a complete immunologic response to vaccination. The secondary outcome was emergency department (ED) visits associated with COVID-19 infection, defined as ED encounters in a period 7 days prior to 14 days after documented COVID-19 infection. We calculated number need to treat (NNT) as described³⁴:

$$\text{NNT}=(\text{Sc}^{\Delta\text{HR}}-\text{Sc})^{-1}$$

Where Sc is event free survival in the reference group and ΔHR is hazard ratio at the most minus the least preferable vaccination time. We estimated Sc as 0.75 at study end based on the survival curve generated for univariate analysis (**Figure 2**), and ΔHR as the peak-to-trough difference in HR for breakthrough infection across the day (**Figures 3 and 4**). We estimated the change in vaccine effectiveness based on moving vaccinations from the best to worst time-of-day as 1-HR as described³⁵.

Statistical analysis. An initial descriptive analysis included calculations of single variable distribution, central tendency, and dispersion. We stratified vaccine timing in 4-hour bins: 8:00-11:59 (morning), 12:00-15:59 (afternoon), and 16:00-19:59 (evening) comparison groups (**Figure 1B**). Day 0 in our analysis was individually defined for each patient as 7 days after the receipt of vaccine dose 2 as described³⁶. Given that the first 2 doses of BNT162b2 constitute a single intervention we combined these doses into one analytic model. Patients who received both doses 1 and 2 in the same time bin were included in this analysis, while patients vaccinated in different time bins were excluded (**Figure 1A**). For analysis of the booster doses (doses 3 and 4), only the time of booster administration was considered as boosters are regarded as separate medical interventions to augment waning COVID-19 immunity.

Since one independent variable (booster status) differed over time, univariate and multivariate survival analyses were performed with time-dependent covariates^{37,38}. Kaplan–

Meier analysis with a log-rank test was used for the univariate analysis. A Cox proportional-hazards regression model with time-dependent covariates was used to estimate the association between vaccine administration time-of-day and study endpoints. This statistical approach was previously applied to Israeli HMO data for analyzing associations between COVID-19 immunization and clinical endpoints over extended periods³⁵. Our choice of variables to include in the Cox model was based on previously published associations between age, comorbidities and COVID-19 endpoints of infection or disease severity (see **eAppendix3** in the **Supplement** for a discussion of Cox model variable selection)^{32,33,35}. To simplify the modeling of breakthrough events after the initial immunization series (doses 1 and 2), we excluded subjects who received the second booster (dose 4). For modeling events after doses 3 and 4 we included all subjects. We treated the first COVID-19 infection as a terminal event. As such, recurrent infections did not factor into our analysis. For orthogonal validation of conclusions from our Cox model and a discussion of proportional hazard assumptions and see “Model Sensitivity Analysis” in **eAppendix4** and **eTables 3-5** in the **Supplement**.

To examine how the choice of time bins affected conclusions from our Cox regression model, we generated HRs comparing the 8:00-9:59 time bin to successive 2-hour intervals across the day, incrementing by one hour with each iteration. Note, to avoid overlap with the index bin, HRs were generated from 10:00 on in this analysis. Our hypothesis was that a diurnal rhythm in vaccine effectiveness should produce a sinusoidal trend in HRs as a function of vaccination time. To statistically evaluate the trend in HRs across the day for periodicity we used METACYCLE, an algorithm commonly used for circadian rhythm detection in gene expression data³⁹. The COSOPT algorithm⁴⁰ was used to generate best-fit sinusoidal curves for data presentation. We observed very high goodness of fit with this approach (r^2 range 0.91-0.97, **Figure 3**), supporting the use of a sinusoidal model. To avoid forced fitting these data, we

programmed COSOPT and METACYCLE to select the best fitting periodic function across a range of cycle lengths (4-24 hours) as described⁴⁰.

We performed all statistical analyses using R version 3.5.0. Code for all analyses is available upon request. A p-value of less than 0.05 was used to indicate significance in all analyses.

RESULTS

To examine how the timing of COVID-19 immunization relates to clinical effectiveness we analyzed a large cohort of patients enrolled in Maccabi Healthcare Services (MHS), a major Israeli HMO. A strength of MHS data is that prior studies have used it and other similar sources to measure the real-world effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines^{35,36,41,42}. However, these studies did not consider the time-of-immunization as a factor.

Out of approximately 2.6 million MHS participants, 1,515,574 had timestamps recorded for at least 1 immunization (**Figure 1A**). Our study population almost exclusively received the Pfizer-produced BNT162b2 vaccine (99.2%, n=1,503,599), with a minority receiving the Moderna mRNA-1273 product (0.74%, n=11,220). Most patients received immunizations within a 12-hour timespan stretching from 8:00 to 20:00 (**Figure 1B**). Based on this distribution, we began by comparing COVID-19 breakthrough infections in patients receiving their first two immunizations exclusively in the morning (8:00-11:59, n=313,844), afternoon (12:00-13:59, n=292,278), or evening (16:00-19:59, n=236,348). As a group, patients vaccinated in the morning were older and had more comorbidities than at other times (**Table 1**).

Patients immunized against COVID-19 in the morning and afternoon had less frequent breakthrough infections than those vaccinated in the evening, with the groups diverging prior to the wave of infections caused by the Delta variant (**Figure 2A**). The difference remained significant after stratification by sex, age, and total number of co-morbidities (**Figure 2B-D**).

Counterintuitively, factors like older age that predict worse COVID-19 clinical outcomes were associated with fewer breakthrough infections, a finding also noted elsewhere^{35,41}. We suggest this reflects greater adherence to COVID-19 precautions in older or more vulnerable individuals (for example, mask use and social distancing), leading to less viral exposure. Even so, morning vaccination remained superior to evening vaccination in these patients (**Figures 2C, D**).

We considered whether patients receiving vaccinations at different times of day might have different baseline infectious risks due to unmeasured variables in our data, for example occupation or household size. To this end, we scrutinized COVID-19 infections in the first 14 days after the first immunization, a timeframe prior to the onset of full vaccine protection. During this period there were 7.0, 8.1, and 3.6 COVID-19 infections per 100,000 patients in the morning, afternoon, and evening groups respectively ($p=0.008$ morning vs. evening and $p=0.245$ morning vs. afternoon, permutation test). This pattern is the opposite of the effectiveness signal seen after vaccination takes effect, favoring morning or afternoon dosing (**Figure 2A**). Since patients vaccinated in the morning are older and have more comorbidities (**Table 1**), adjustment for these demographic variables would further widen the difference between morning and evening groups. Thus, baseline infection risk does not explain why morning and afternoon vaccinations were associated with fewer breakthrough infections post-immunization.

We also considered if our comparison groups might differ in their readiness to undergo COVID-19 testing, thus confounding results. However, the morning and evening vaccination groups had equivalent numbers of COVID-19 tests (2.28 vs. 2.29 tests per capita, respectively) and a similar distribution of testing times around the clock (**eFigure 2A** in the **Supplement**). We did observe reduced positivity rates in COVID-19 tests obtained in the early morning like one recent report⁴³, but this pattern was independent of vaccination timing (**eFigure 2B** in the **Supplement**). Overall, univariate analysis suggested a clinical advantage to dosing COVID-19

vaccines in the morning or afternoon in terms of fewer breakthrough infections. These results are unlikely to reflect differences in the baseline velocity of COVID-19 infection, diagnostic testing patterns, or diurnal variations in COVID-19 detection.

Using Cox multivariate regression to adjust for age, sex, comorbidities, and the protection afforded by COVID-19 boosters, we mapped the relationship between vaccination time and breakthrough infections (**Figure 3**). Across the 14-hour span when most COVID-19 vaccinations were given, the hazard ratio (HR) for breakthrough infections was lowest between late morning to early afternoon and highest risk with evening vaccination times (**Figure 3A-C**). Stratifying subjects into morning, mid-day, and evening vaccination groups produced similar conclusions (**eTables 6-8** in the Supplement), as did the use of two alternative statistical approaches: logistic regression and bootstrap analysis (**eTables 4 and 5** in the Supplement). The relationship between vaccination time and HR for breakthrough infection was sinusoidal with period durations ranging from 9.0-15.4 hours, depending on the vaccine dose (**Figure 3A-C**). We estimated a maximum peak-to-trough change in the HR for breakthrough infection as 0.12 for doses 1 and 2, 0.086 for dose 3, and 0.25 for dose 4 (**Figure 3A-C**). In our cohort, this translates to a number needed to treat (NNT) range of 18.7-54.5 by study end if patients were moved from the least favorable to most favorable COVID-19 vaccination times. It also corresponds to a relative change of vaccine effectiveness of 8.6-25%. In contrast to breakthrough infections, vaccine timing was not associated with rates of COVID-19 associated ED visits, although these encounters correlated with age and comorbidities as previously described^{32,33} (**Figure 3D and eTable 9** in the Supplement). Thus, COVID-19 vaccination timing had a significant association with effectiveness as defined by breakthrough infection, but this did not translate directly into ED visits. The sinusoidal trend suggests a biological rhythm in COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness based on time of administration.

Since age affects breakthrough COVID-19 infection rates in our data (**Figure 2C and eTables 6-8 in the Supplement**), we examined how this variable interacted with vaccine effectiveness (**Figure 4**). We found that the benefits of morning vaccination were concentrated in younger (<30 years old) and older (>60 years old) individuals (**Figure 4A**). For both the initial vaccine series and the first booster (dose 3), increasing age correlated with longer period durations and a shift in the peak HR to later hours, perhaps reflecting changes to the circadian system and immune experience with aging (**Figure 4B-D**)^{44,45}. In the oldest age stratification (**Figure 4D**), the rhythms resembled that of the second booster (dose 4, **Figure 3C**), an intervention restricted to older patients during the study period (**Table 1**). Taken together, these data suggest a strategy for leveraging diurnal rhythms to optimize COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness in a population, where younger patients and the elderly would be prioritized for immunizations in the late morning to early afternoon.

DISCUSSION

Our data indicate a significant association between the time of COVID-19 vaccination and its clinical effectiveness in terms of breakthrough infection. While the impact of vaccination timing is additive on top of an effective vaccine, it is an easily modifiable factor that when extended over millions of immunizations can amount to a large aggregate benefit. The relationship between vaccination timing and infection risk is sinusoidal, suggesting a biological rhythm in vaccine effectiveness consistent with circadian regulation of underlying immune processes. While breakthrough COVID-19 infections varied with vaccination timing, ED presentations proximate to COVID-19 detection did not. This finding may indicate that while COVID-19 vaccine immunogenicity is circadian regulated, patient factors like age and co-morbidities dominate the clinical severity of disease. Alternatively, our statistical power for detecting associations with ED presentations was lower as they were infrequent in our cohort (one ED visit to 60.8 positive COVID tests). Regardless, minimizing COVID-19 infections of any severity

is desirable. Asymptomatic patients can still infect others and even mild symptoms can complicate the management of chronic conditions. Our observation that biological rhythms map to younger patients and the elderly is important because it suggests that prioritizing these patients for mid-day immunization could improve the effectiveness of mass vaccinations against COVID-19. We suggest this idea is practical and warrants prospective study.

Human populations have less consistent behavioral patterns than other organisms, making it challenging to observe how circadian rhythms affect medical interventions in real-world settings. This is because individuals lead diverse lifestyles, are routinely exposed to light at night, and engage in activities like night shift work that alter the phase of the circadian clock^{19,46}. Our ability to detect rhythms in COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness in this study is due to the unique circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Israeli response to the pandemic. This includes a population-level sample of subjects that is two orders of magnitude larger than prior cohorts, a concerted intervention largely consisting of a single vaccine product (BNT162b2), a population highly motivated to report COVID-19 infection, substantial clinical follow-up (>1 year), and finally a high level of data integration within the Israeli healthcare system. Our data do not directly address whether rhythms in BNT162b2 effectiveness extend to other COVID-19 vaccine products or to vaccinations against other pathogens. However, it is worth noting that the plurality of studies that do report diurnal rhythms in vaccine immunogenicity found morning to afternoon dosing to be optimal^{23,27,28}. Therefore, our data may have implications for diseases beyond COVID-19.

Our analysis has limitations. As with any observational study, patients were not randomly assigned to specific vaccination times, and demographic differences between groups can bias results. We attempted to compensate for this by adjusting for variables known to affect COVID-19 infection rates and complications^{32,33,35}, assessing the role of unmeasured variables, and using independent statistical models. Nevertheless, there may be sources of bias missed

by our methods. There were also a limited number of ED events in the study population to support conclusions related to this specific outcome. Our dataset lacks comprehensive viral genotyping and so we cannot determine whether time-of-vaccination influences breakthrough infections to different extents across variants. However, given rhythms were evident with vaccine boosters given while different viral variants were dominant our findings are likely to be broadly applicable. Because vaccinations were not provided around the clock in our population, we cannot be certain whether the observed rhythms in vaccine effectiveness are diurnal (i.e., 24-hour cycles) or ultradian in nature (<24 hours cycles) as suggested by periodicity analysis (**Figures 3 and 4; eTable 13** in the **Supplement**). Regardless, both diurnal and ultradian rhythms are compatible with upstream circadian clock influence^{18,47}. Our results reflect the cumulative behavior of our cohort, and individuals with acutely disrupted circadian rhythms due to shift work, jet lag or sleep deprivation might react differently to immunization timing. Research suggests these patients are more vulnerable to COVID-19 infection and future research should focus on vaccination strategies specific to this subgroup⁴⁸. In summary, circadian rhythms represent a fundamental property of living things that regulate immune function at a basic biological level. This study provides the first estimate of how far this core process extends into an important clinical realization of immune function: vaccine effectiveness. Our data suggest a way of leveraging biological rhythms to optimize immunizations against SARS-CoV-2 variants using reformulated vaccines and potentially vaccines against other pathogens.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

R code for all analyses is available upon request. Pursuant to MHS data sharing policy, patient data will not be shared.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Steven Brody, Erik Herzog, Patrick Lyons, Edward Puro, and Robyn Haspel for their input.

FUNDING

This work was funded by NIH R01 HL135846, R01 HL152968, and internal funds from the Washington University School of Medicine, Department of Medicine.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors report no conflicts.

REFERENCES

1. Allada R, Bass J. Circadian Mechanisms in Medicine. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2021;384(6):550-561.
2. Cederroth CR, Albrecht U, Bass J, et al. Medicine in the Fourth Dimension. *Cell metabolism*. 2019;30(2):238-250.
3. Wang C, Lutes LK, Barnoud C, Scheiermann C. The circadian immune system. *Sci Immunol*. 2022;7(72):eabm2465.
4. Nosal C, Ehlers A, Haspel JA. Why Lungs Keep Time: Circadian Rhythms and Lung Immunity. *Annu Rev Physiol*. 2020;82:391-412.
5. Man K, Loudon A, Chawla A. Immunity around the clock. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2016;354(6315):999-1003.
6. Gibbs J, Ince L, Matthews L, et al. An epithelial circadian clock controls pulmonary inflammation and glucocorticoid action. *Nature medicine*. 2014;20(8):919-926.
7. Gibbs JE, Blaikley J, Beesley S, et al. The nuclear receptor REV-ERB α mediates circadian regulation of innate immunity through selective regulation of inflammatory cytokines. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2012;109(2):582-587.
8. Sengupta S, Tang SY, Devine J, et al. Circadian control of lung inflammation in influenza infection. *Nature communications*. 2019;10:4107.
9. Ehlers A, Xie W, Agapov E, et al. BMAL1 links the circadian clock to viral airway pathology and asthma phenotypes. *Mucosal immunology*. 2018;11(1):97-111.
10. Kiessling S, Dubeau-Laramee G, Ohm H, Labrecque N, Olivier M, Cermakian N. The circadian clock in immune cells controls the magnitude of Leishmania parasite infection. *Scientific reports*. 2017;7(1):10892.
11. Keller M, Mazuch J, Abraham U, et al. A circadian clock in macrophages controls inflammatory immune responses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2009;106(50):21407-21412.
12. Silver AC, Arjona A, Walker WE, Fikrig E. The circadian clock controls toll-like receptor 9-mediated innate and adaptive immunity. *Immunity*. 2012;36(2):251-261.
13. Méndez-Ferrer S, Lucas D, Battista M, Frenette PS. Haematopoietic stem cell release is regulated by circadian oscillations. *Nature*. 2008;452(7186):442-447.
14. He W, Holtkamp S, Hergenhan SM, et al. Circadian Expression of Migratory Factors Establishes Lineage-Specific Signatures that Guide the Homing of Leukocyte Subsets to Tissues. *Immunity*. 2018;49(6):1175-1190 e1177.
15. Druzd D, Matveeva O, Ince L, et al. Lymphocyte Circadian Clocks Control Lymph Node Trafficking and Adaptive Immune Responses. *Immunity*. 2017;46(1):120-132.
16. Holtkamp SJ, Ince LM, Barnoud C, et al. Circadian clocks guide dendritic cells into skin lymphatics. *Nat Immunol*. 2021.
17. Nobis CC, Dubeau Laramée G, Kervezee L, Maurice De Sousa D, Labrecque N, Cermakian N. The circadian clock of CD8 T cells modulates their early response to vaccination and the rhythmicity of related signaling pathways. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2019;116(40):20077-20086.
18. Fortier EE, Rooney J, Dardente H, Hardy MP, Labrecque N, Cermakian N. Circadian variation of the response of T cells to antigen. *Journal of immunology (Baltimore, Md : 1950)*. 2011;187(12):6291-6300.
19. Haspel JA, Anafi R, Brown MK, et al. Perfect timing: circadian rhythms, sleep, and immunity - an NIH workshop summary. *JCI Insight*. 2020;5(1).
20. Panda S. The arrival of circadian medicine. *Nat Rev Endocrinol*. 2019;15(2):67-69.

21. Otasowie CO, Tanner R, Ray DW, Austyn JM, Coventry BJ. Chronovaccination: Harnessing circadian rhythms to optimize immunisation strategies. *Frontiers in immunology*. 2022;13:977525.
22. Langlois PH, Smolensky MH, Glezen WP, Keitel WA. Diurnal variation in responses to influenza vaccine. *Chronobiology international*. 1995;12(1):28-36.
23. de Bree LCJ, Mourits VP, Koeken VACM, et al. Circadian rhythm influences induction of trained immunity by BCG vaccination. *The Journal of clinical investigation*. 2020;130(10):5603-5617.
24. Zhang H, Liu Y, Liu D, et al. Time of day influences immune response to an inactivated vaccine against SARS-CoV-2. *Cell Research*. 2021;31(11):1215-1217.
25. Matryba P, Gawalski K, Ciesielska I, et al. The Influence of Time of Day of Vaccination with BNT162b2 on the Adverse Drug Reactions and Efficacy of Humoral Response against SARS-CoV-2 in an Observational Study of Young Adults. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10(3).
26. Wang W, Balfe P, Eyre DW, et al. Time of Day of Vaccination Affects SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Responses in an Observational Study of Health Care Workers. *Journal of biological rhythms*. 2022;37(1):124-129.
27. Phillips AC, Gallagher S, Carroll D, Drayson M. Preliminary evidence that morning vaccination is associated with an enhanced antibody response in men. *Psychophysiology*. 2008;45(4):663-666.
28. Long JE, Drayson MT, Taylor AE, Toellner KM, Lord JM, Phillips AC. Morning vaccination enhances antibody response over afternoon vaccination: A cluster-randomised trial. *Vaccine*. 2016;34(24):2679-2685.
29. Yamanaka Y, Yokota I, Yasumoto A, Morishita E, Horiuchi H. Time of Day of Vaccination Does Not Associate With SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Titer Following First Dose of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine. *Journal of biological rhythms*. 2022:7487304221124661.
30. Filippatos F, Tatsi EB, Efthymiou V, Syriopoulou V, Michos A. Time of Day of BNT162b2 COVID-19 Immunization Affects Total SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Levels but Not Neutralizing Activity. *Journal of biological rhythms*. 2022;37(5):562-566.
31. Liu Y, Zhang H, Yuan G, et al. The impact of circadian rhythms on the immune response to influenza vaccination in middle-aged and older adults (IMPROVE): a randomised controlled trial. *Immun Ageing*. 2022;19(1):46.
32. Wang B, Li R, Lu Z, Huang Y. Does comorbidity increase the risk of patients with COVID-19: evidence from meta-analysis. *Ageing*. 2020;12(7):6049-6057.
33. Zheng Z, Peng F, Xu B, et al. Risk factors of critical & mortal COVID-19 cases: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *J Infect*. 2020;81(2):e16-e25.
34. Altman DG, Andersen PK. Calculating the number needed to treat for trials where the outcome is time to an event. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 1999;319(7223):1492-1495.
35. Hammerman A, Sergienko R, Friger M, et al. Effectiveness of the BNT162b2 Vaccine after Recovery from Covid-19. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2022;386(13):1221-1229.
36. Dagan N, Barda N, Kepten E, et al. BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination Setting. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2021;384(15):1412-1423.
37. Zhang Z, Reinikainen J, Adeleke KA, Pieterse ME, Groothuis-Oudshoorn CGM. Time-varying covariates and coefficients in Cox regression models. *Ann Transl Med*. 2018;6(7):121.
38. Zabor EC. Landmark Analysis and Time Dependent Covariates. https://www.emilyzabor.com/tutorials/survival_analysis_in_r_tutorial.html.

39. Wu G, Anafi RC, Hughes ME, Kornacker K, Hogenesch JB. MetaCycle: an integrated R package to evaluate periodicity in large scale data. *Bioinformatics*. 2016;32(21):3351-3353.
40. Haspel JA, Chettimada S, Shaik RS, et al. Circadian rhythm reprogramming during lung inflammation. *Nature communications*. 2014;5:4753.
41. Chodick G, Tene L, Rotem RS, et al. The Effectiveness of the Two-Dose BNT162b2 Vaccine: Analysis of Real-World Data. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2022;74(3):472-478.
42. Chodick G, Tene L, Patalon T, et al. Assessment of Effectiveness of 1 Dose of BNT162b2 Vaccine for SARS-CoV-2 Infection 13 to 24 Days After Immunization. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2021;4(6):e2115985.
43. McNaughton CD, Adams NM, Hirschie Johnson C, Ward MJ, Schmitz JE, Lasko TA. Diurnal Variation in SARS-CoV-2 PCR Test Results: Test Accuracy May Vary by Time of Day. *Journal of biological rhythms*. 2021;36(6):595-601.
44. Hood S, Amir S. The aging clock: circadian rhythms and later life. *The Journal of clinical investigation*. 2017;127(2):437-446.
45. Leng J, Goldstein DR. Impact of aging on viral infections. *Microbes Infect*. 2010;12(14-15):1120-1124.
46. Resuehr D, Wu G, Johnson RL, Jr., Young ME, Hogenesch JB, Gamble KL. Shift Work Disrupts Circadian Regulation of the Transcriptome in Hospital Nurses. *Journal of biological rhythms*. 2019;34(2):167-177.
47. Ramsey KM, Yoshino J, Brace CS, et al. Circadian clock feedback cycle through NAMPT-mediated NAD⁺ biosynthesis. *Science (New York, NY)*. 2009;324(5927):651-654.
48. Fatima Y, Bucks RS, Mamun AA, et al. Shift work is associated with increased risk of COVID-19: Findings from the UK Biobank cohort. *J Sleep Res*. 2021;30(5):e13326.

Table 1: patient demographics based on time of COVID-19 vaccinations.^a

Variable	Doses 1&2 ^b			Dose 3			Dose 4		
	Evening, N = 236,348	Mid, N = 292,278	Morning, N = 313,844	Evening, N = 320,960	Mid, N = 351,857	Morning, N = 391,135	Evening, N = 66,346	Mid, N = 74,835	Morning, N = 65,726
Age, Median (SD)	40 (19)	42 (20)	47 (20)	44 (19)	47 (19)	46 (18)	66 (12)	69 (11)	69 (11)
Sex, n (%)									
F	121,439 (51)	155,133 (53)	162,701 (52)	165,086 (51)	183,797 (52)	205,816 (53)	31,213 (47)	37,990 (51)	32,458 (49)
M	114,909 (49)	137,145 (47)	151,143 (48)	155,874 (49)	168,060 (48)	185,319 (47)	35,133 (53)	36,845 (49)	33,268 (51)
Comorbidities, n (%)									
0	132,716 (56)	162,156 (55)	169,925 (54)	175,356 (55)	189,793 (54)	211,664 (54)	26,010 (39)	29,877 (40)	26,338 (40)
1-4	100,865 (43)	125,236 (43)	137,278 (44)	140,977 (44)	155,506 (44)	172,352 (44)	36,989 (56)	40,388 (54)	35,402 (54)
4+	2,767 (1.2)	4,886 (1.7)	6,641 (2.1)	4,627 (1.4)	6,558 (1.9)	7,119 (1.8)	3,347 (5.0)	4,570 (6.1)	3,986 (6.1)
Diabetic, n (%)	17,576 (7.4)	26,354 (9.0)	33,157 (11)	28,209 (8.8)	34,693 (9.9)	37,803 (9.7)	16,252 (24)	19,474 (26)	17,313 (26)
Blood Pressure, n (%)	38,122 (16)	55,715 (19)	72,071 (23)	61,127 (19)	75,120 (21)	82,732 (21)	33,129 (50)	41,472 (55)	35,964 (55)
Neurological Disease, n (%)	20,415 (8.6)	31,125 (11)	36,610 (12)	31,197 (9.7)	39,046 (11)	42,172 (11)	13,422 (20)	17,983 (24)	15,757 (24)
Chronic Kidney Disease, n (%)	8,828 (3.7)	15,127 (5.2)	20,011 (6.4)	14,491 (4.5)	20,074 (5.7)	21,967 (5.6)	9,736 (15)	14,203 (19)	11,994 (18)
Immuno-suppression, n (%)	4,223 (1.8)	6,191 (2.1)	7,758 (2.5)	6,640 (2.1)	8,587 (2.4)	9,169 (2.3)	3,208 (4.8)	3,855 (5.2)	3,467 (5.3)
Dialysis, n (%)	90 (<0.1)	176 (<0.1)	236 (<0.1)	177 (<0.1)	249 (<0.1)	283 (<0.1)	118 (0.2)	144 (0.2)	118 (0.2)
Asthma, n (%)	43,420 (18)	52,849 (18)	52,543 (17)	55,883 (17)	61,236 (17)	65,317 (17)	10,146 (15)	11,400 (15)	10,199 (16)
Cancer last 5yrs, n (%)	10,189 (4.3)	16,340 (5.6)	20,885 (6.7)	16,497 (5.1)	22,127 (6.3)	23,681 (6.1)	9,395 (14)	12,403 (17)	10,877 (17)
Obesity, n (%)	43,167 (18)	56,137 (19)	64,610 (21)	63,978 (20)	70,721 (20)	80,405 (21)	19,427 (29)	20,592 (28)	18,279 (28)
Heart Disease, n (%)	16,524 (7.0)	25,474 (8.7)	32,705 (10)	25,691 (8.0)	33,114 (9.4)	36,730 (9.4)	15,461 (23)	19,800 (26)	17,348 (26)
Days between vaccinations 2-3, Median (SD)	197 (28)	197(28)	196 (27)						

^aWith the exception of sex, all differences between groups achieved statistical significance ($p < 0.001$, Wilcoxon rank sum test/Pearson's Chi-square test). This is a function of the large sample sizes in our cohort.

^bBoth vaccine doses administered within the indicated timeframe.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. SARS-CoV2 vaccine timing across the day. Panel A shows the patient inclusion flowchart. Panel B shows the distribution of COVID-19 vaccine administration times, binned by hour of the day. Red circle, dose 1. Blue square, dose 2. Green triangle, dose 3 (the first booster dose). Black inverted triangle, dose 4 (second booster dose). Time intervals used to compare the effects of morning (AM), afternoon (Mid), and evening (PM) vaccine dosing on effectiveness are denoted by horizontal bars.

Figure 2. Morning COVID-19 vaccination is associated with fewer breakthrough infections. Panel A shows infection-free survival in patients receiving the first two COVID-19 vaccine inoculations between 8:00-11:59 hours (morning or AM), 12:00-15:59 hours (afternoon or Mid), and 16:00-19:59 hours (evening or PM). Panels B-D show COVID-19-free survival in patients stratified by sex (B), age (C), and number of medical co-morbidities (D). Shading around the lines represent 95% confidence intervals (CI). Waves of COVID-19 infection caused by the delta (Δ) and omicron (O) SARS-CoV-2 variants based on Israeli Ministry of Health (MOH) data are indicated by black and grey horizontal bars, respectively. For clarity, panels B-D display only the AM and PM groups.

Figure 3. Biological rhythms in SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness. Data points represent adjusted hazard ratios (HR) \pm 95% CI relative to dosing between 8:00-9:59 AM, which serves a non-overlapping index bin for this analysis. Best-fit sinusoidal trend lines (black lines), amplitudes (Amp), period duration (Per), goodness of fit (r^2), and METACYCLE generated p-values for periodicity are depicted within each graph where appropriate. Panels A-C show HRs for breakthrough infections based on the timing of vaccine doses 1 and 2 (A), dose 3 (B), and dose 4 (C). Panel D shows HRs for COVID-19-associated ED visits, defined as occurring within -7 to +14 days of a COVID-19 positive test (see Methods). For patient demographic

breakdown, sample sizes, and a tabular presentation of these data see **eTables 10-12** in the **Supplement**. For the complete METACYCLE output see **eTable 13** in the **Supplement**.

Figure 4. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine diurnal rhythms depend on patient age. Panel A shows HRs \pm 95% CI for breakthrough COVID-19 infection based on time of vaccination (AM versus PM) and age range. Values to the right of the dotted line favor morning vaccination (8:00-11:59), and values to the left favor evening vaccination (16:00-19:59). Black, timing of doses 1 and 2 are considered. Red, timing of dose 3 is considered. **Panels B-D** show comparative vaccine effectiveness around the clock relative to dosing between 8:00-9:59 (HR \pm 95% CI). Best-fit sinusoidal trend lines (black lines), period duration (Per), amplitudes (Amp), goodness of fit (r^2), and METACYCLE generated p-values for periodicity are depicted within each graph. Black, timing of doses 1 and 2 are considered. Red, timing of dose 3 is considered. **(B)** Ages 12-30 years old. **(C)** Ages 30-60 years old. **(D)** Over 60 years old. For sample sizes and tabular presentation of these data see **eTables 14-17** in the **Supplement**. For the complete METACYCLE output see **eTable 13** in the **Supplement**.

Figure 1





Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4

