medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Title: Information bias of vaccine effectiveness estimation due to informed consent for national registration of COVID-19 vaccination: estimation and correction using a data augmentation model

Authors and affiliations:

C.H. (Henri) van Werkhoven,[1,2] Brechje de Gier,[1] Scott McDonald,[1] Hester E. de Melker,[1] Susan J.M. Hahné,[1] Susan van den Hof,[1] Mirjam J. Knol[1]

[1.] Center for Infectious Disease Control, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM), Bilthoven, the Netherlands.

[2.] Julius Center for Health Sciences and Primary Care, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Word count: 3142

Tables 1, figures: 4 (max 8 tables and figures)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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

Background:

Registration in the Dutch national COVID-19 vaccination register requires consent from the vaccinee. This causes misclassification of non-consenting vaccinated persons as being unvaccinated. We quantified and corrected the resulting information bias in the estimation of vaccine effectiveness (VE).

Methods:

National data were used for the period dominated by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant (11 July to 15 November 2021). VE ((1-relative risk)*100%) against COVID-19 hospitalization and ICU admission was estimated for individuals 12-49, 50-69, and ≥70 years of age using negative binomial regression. Anonymous data on vaccinations administered by the Municipal Health Services were used to determine informed consent percentages and estimate corrected VEs by iterative data augmentation. Absolute bias was calculated as the absolute change in VE; relative bias as uncorrected / corrected relative risk.

Results:

A total of 8,804 COVID-19 hospitalizations and 1,692 COVID-19 ICU admissions were observed. The bias was largest in the 70+ age group where the non-consent proportion was 7.0% and observed vaccination coverage was 87%: VE of primary vaccination against hospitalization changed from 75.5% (95% CI 73.5-77.4) before to 85.9% (95% CI 84.7-87.1) after correction (absolute bias -10.4 percentage point, relative bias 1.74). VE against ICU admission in this group was 88.7% (95% CI 86.2-90.8) before and 93.7% (95% CI 92.2-94.9) after correction (absolute bias -5.0 percentage point, relative bias 1.79).

Conclusions:

VE estimates can be substantially biased with modest non-consent percentages for registration of vaccination. Data on covariate specific non-consent percentages should be available to correct this bias.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

KEY MESSAGES (3-5 bullet points, each a complete sentence)

- A relatively small degree of misclassification in the determinant (e.g. modest non-consent for registration of vaccination records) can result in substantial bias in effect estimates (e.g. vaccine effectiveness [VE]) in particular when the exposed group is large (high vaccination uptake).
- In this study, a non-consent percentage of 7.0% for registration of vaccination records in the 70+ years group, in which the observed vaccination uptake was 87%, resulted in an absolute bias of the VE against COVID-19 hospitalization of -10.4 percentage point and a relative bias of the relative risk (true/observed relative risk) of 1.74.
- Changes over time in vaccination uptake in the context of modest non-consent percentages may result in incorrect conclusions regarding waning of the VE.
- Similarly, differences in vaccination uptake or non-consent percentages between age groups may result in incorrect conclusions regarding effect modification of the VE by age.
- Covariate-specific data on non-consent percentages should be available to assess the bias and generate corrected VE estimates under certain assumptions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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

Monitoring vaccine coverage and vaccine effectiveness (VE) is important to support infectious disease control and vaccine policy making.(1) Analyzing data from nationwide COVID-19 vaccination registries linked to outcome data such as hospitalizations is essential to provide rapid evidence on VE to inform timely public health decisions to optimally control the COVID-19 pandemic.

In the Netherlands, individual informed consent has to be obtained to share vaccination status in national vaccination register at the National Institute of Public Health, while vaccination information is available in the medical records that are stored at the vaccination provider (e.g. the municipal health service, general practitioner or nursing home). This is operationalized in the Dutch national COVID-vaccination Information and Monitoring System (CIMS), which includes only those vaccination records of individuals who provided consent for registration in CIMS. As a result, vaccine coverage data based on CIMS are incomplete and linkage of this database to other data sources such as hospitalization records inevitably results in misclassification of their vaccination status. Vaccinated individuals without consent will be erroneously classified as unvaccinated due to the absence of a vaccination record in CIMS. In addition to CIMS, anonymous informed consent data is available from all individuals vaccinated by the Municipal Health Services (GGDs). Since the GGDs administered 86% of COVID-19 primary series vaccinations in the Netherlands,(2) this data source can provide a good indication of the amount of misclassification in the population over time. Although these data cannot be linked to individual hospitalization records, the availability of this dataset provides a unique opportunity to quantify the information bias resulting from the informed consent requirement.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Since the summer of 2021, we have monitored the VE against hospitalization utilizing linkage of hospitalization to CIMS data.(3) In this study we analyzed to what extent non-consent may have biased the estimated VE against COVID-19 hospitalization and ICU admission in adults.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Methods

Bias estimation by formula

To get insight in the relative importance of different parameters, prior to modelling VE information bias present in real data, we calculated the bias in the absence of confounding factors and assuming a constant vaccination uptake and non-consent percentage. This was based on a formula with three parameters: the true percentage vaccinated in the population (v), the percentage of vaccinated persons not providing informed consent (nc), and the true relative risk (RR) of the outcome from which VE is calculated as (1-RR) * 100%. We used the following formula for the observed relative risk:

$$RR' = \frac{RR * (1 - v + v * nc)}{1 - v + RR * v * nc}$$

(see derivation in supplementary appendix). We visualized the relation between these parameters and the resulting relative bias (calculated as observed RR divided by true RR) and absolute bias (calculated as true VE minus observed VE in percentage points).

Data sources

To quantify the information bias for the VE against COVID-19 hospitalization and ICU admission in the Netherlands we used three data sources, all stratified by year of birth, sex, region and calendar date, for the period 11 July to 15 November 2021. This period was dominated by the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant.

1. Original population dataset: Dutch Personal Records Database for the total population size on January 1st, 2021, enriched with CIMS for daily vaccination uptake.
2. Non-consent percentages for COVID-19 vaccination based on anonymous data from the Municipal Health Services (GGDs).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

3. Hospital admissions, from the Dutch National Intensive Care Evaluation (NICE) COVID-19 registry, which consists of all hospitalized persons with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test or Computed Tomography confirmed COVID-19.

For a full description of the data sources and justification of data selection and preparation, please refer to the supplementary methods.

Vaccination status

Four COVID-19 vaccines were used in the Netherlands within the study period: Comirnaty (BNT162b2; BioNTech/Pfizer, Mainz, Germany/New York, United States (US)), Spikevax (mRNA-1273, Moderna, Cambridge, US), Vaxzevria (ChAdOx1-S; AstraZeneca, Cambridge, United Kingdom), and Jcovden (Ad26.COV2-S (recombinant), Janssen-Cilag International NV, Beerse, Belgium). The *primary series vaccination* included either one dose of Jcovden or two doses of any of the other vaccines. Vaccination status was categorized as unvaccinated (up to 14 days after receipt of the first vaccination dose), partly vaccinated (from 14 days after the first dose, up to either 28 days after the first dose in case of the Jcovden vaccine or 14 days after receipt of a second dose), or fully vaccinated (having received the Jcovden vaccine ≥ 28 days ago or a second dose of one of the other vaccines ≥ 14 days ago) in line with the analyses used in the Dutch national COVID-19 surveillance reports up to November 2021.(3) We did not take the vaccine type or time since vaccination into account in our analyses.

Data analysis

After determining the VE using the original events and population datasets, we performed two different imputation approaches to correct the VE. In the first, 'Partially corrected analysis', we assumed that individuals vaccinated by providers other than the GGD (e.g. general practitioners) had

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

all provided informed consent. In the second, 'Fully corrected analysis', we analyzed non-consent percentages by birth year, sex, region and calendar time, and generalized these to individuals vaccinated by providers other than the GGD, thus assuming that non-consent percentages were similar conditional on these covariates. We then used a negative binomial regression model to estimate the RR for partly and fully vaccinated individuals as compared to unvaccinated. VE was calculated as (1-RR) * 100%. Analyses were stratified for age groups 12-49 years, 50-69 years, and 70+ years old. Please refer to the supplementary methods for a full description of the statistical methods.

Analyses were performed in R version 4.1.2.(4) For regressions we used the mgcv package version 1.8-38.(5)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Results

Bias estimation by formula

Using the information bias formula, the relative bias of the true RR increased with increasing true VE, vaccination coverage, and non-consent percentage, whereas the absolute bias of the VE increased with increasing vaccination coverage and non-consent percentage, and was maximal at a true VE of around 50-60% (Figure 2A, 2B). Keeping vaccination coverage and non-consent percentage constant, a decline in VE (e.g. due to waning of the VE over time) led to a slight increase in the bias over time (Figure 2C). Holding the true VE and non-consent percentage constant, an increase in vaccination coverage (e.g. at the start of the vaccination campaign) led to a substantial bias, which would erroneously suggest waning of the VE (Figure 2D).

Description of vaccination records and consent percentages in the dataset

Covariate date was missing in 0.1% of the records from the Dutch Personal Records Database, 0.7% of the CIMS records, 0.5% of the anonymous GGD dataset, and 4.1% of records in the NICE dataset. Missing records from NICE related mostly to the inability to link to the CIMS registry due to a missing or incorrect national identification number (3.9%).

At the end of the follow-up period, of those with complete population data, 5,453,019 (67.0%), 3,999,842 (84.3%), and 2,270,686 (86.9%) individuals in the age groups 12-49, 50-69, and 70+ years, respectively, had a linked vaccination record in CIMS (Table 1). The number of persons who had been vaccinated but did not consent for registration in CIMS, based on the GGD data only (partially-corrected dataset), was 429,177 (7.3%), 210,338 (5.0%), and 151,909 (6.3%) for these same age groups. Regression model predictions of consent percentage by age, sex, region, and calendar time are visualized in Supplementary Figure S1 and S2. After correction using the second imputation approach (fully-corrected dataset), the non-consent percentages increased to 461,064 (7.8%),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

302,377 (7.0%), and 169,882 (7.0%), respectively (Table 1). The vaccination uptake and estimated proportion misclassified over time is depicted in Figure 3. Misclassification, expressed as the proportion of persons originally classified as non-vaccinated, was highest in the 70+ age group.

Data augmentation models – corrected VEs

All data augmentation models converged after fewer than 5 iterations (Supplementary Figure S3). Both the estimated absolute bias of the VE (Figure 4, supplementary table S1) and the estimated relative bias of the RR (Supplementary Figure S4 and Table S1) were largest for the 70+ years age group. In the sensitivity analysis, assuming a lower risk of COVID-19 hospital or ICU admission for the non-consenting vaccinated individuals, relative to the consenting vaccinated individuals, yielded a larger bias in vaccine-effectiveness estimates; conversely, a higher risk of the endpoint for non-consenting individuals yielded a smaller bias (Supplementary Figure S4 and Table S1). The estimated fraction of information missing for the log(RR) (γ_{mis}), i.e. the relative loss of efficiency of the data augmentation method as compared to the hypothetical scenario in which there is no misclassification of vaccination status, was between 0.05 and 0.17, which corresponds to a statistical efficiency between 83% and 95%, depending on the age group and imputation approach (Supplementary Table S2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Discussion

It is known that non-differential (i.e. random) misclassification of exposure status generally causes a bias towards zero (i.e. towards no effect) although some conditions such as a polytomous exposure variable can lead to a bias away from zero.(6) In our setting, in which misclassification is always to the non-vaccinated reference group, a bias towards zero can be expected. Yet, the results of the current study caution to not ignore relatively small fractions of misclassification of exposure. For the 70+ years population, in which 7.0% of vaccinated individuals were estimated to be misclassified as non-vaccinated due to non-consent, the bias was -10 percentage points for the VE against hospitalization and -5 percentage points for the VE against ICU admission. For monitoring of vaccine effectiveness, time trends and between-group differences are highly important as they can signal (age-specific) waning immunity, or a lower VE against emerging virus variants. Accurate estimation of the VE is therefore important to support policy decisions, for example about the need of booster vaccinations.

Over the past decades different statistical approaches have been published to estimate or correct bias due to misclassification in exposure status. Probabilistic sensitivity analyses can be used to present (a range of) bias-corrected effect estimates based on (a range of) assumptions about the risk of misclassification of the exposure variable.(7) With this method, exposure status of individual records is reclassified stochastically based on the assumed parameters which may be based on data or best educated guess. Multiple imputation, regression calibration, and maximum likelihood estimation are validated methods for the correction of misclassification of exposure; these models require that exposure is measured without error in a subset of the population.(8, 9) The misclassification simulation extrapolation (MC-SIMEX) method can be used to reduce bias due to misclassification if the misclassification matrix is known or estimated externally.(10) Bayesian correction models for misclassification have also been proposed.(11) More recent developments

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

include the use of generalized linear finite mixture models, reparameterized imputation for measurement error, and sensitivity-specificity imputation to handle misclassification of exposure status.(12, 13, 14) These models are applicable to individual level data? and utilize a pattern of exposure misclassification related to exposure and outcome status based on either a subset, external data, or assumptions. They are not directly applicable to our study in which separate data streams generated aggregated numerator (admissions) and denominator (population) data, while information about non-consent was available for almost the entire denominator but not for the numerator. Therefore, we had to develop a customized model, which is based on assumptions similar to existing models.

The corrected VE estimates that we obtained in our study are in line with VE estimates against COVID-19 hospitalization observed in other studies conducted during the Alpha and Delta dominant periods.(15) The extent to which these studies suffer from similar and/or other forms of bias is difficult to assess. The large heterogeneity in vaccine effectiveness observed between studies, giving I^2 values >90% in most of the pooled analyses in a meta-analysis of observational studies, suggests that methodological heterogeneity is present.(15) Clinical heterogeneity may also play a role but is expected to be limited when comparing the same age group between comparable countries.

We demonstrated that as vaccination uptake increased, assuming that a relatively constant proportion of vaccinated individuals decline to give consent for registration of their vaccination, the misclassification bias also increased. As a result, time trends are more difficult to interpret. In fact, trends of decreasing VE over time may be interpreted as vaccine waning and lead to recommendations for earlier booster vaccination. In the Netherlands this was presumably not the case as vaccination uptake was relatively stable over the period in which a decreasing VE was observed. However, this may not be the same elsewhere or in the future. We also demonstrated

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

that the magnitude of bias differed markedly between young people and older adult populations, which can lead to incorrect conclusions about age-differences in VE, especially because such differences are biologically plausible. The larger bias in the 70+ years population is mostly due to a high vaccination uptake in this age group; as a result, a larger proportion of those classified as being unvaccinated are in reality vaccinated. Clearly, it cannot simply be assumed that bias due to misclassification will be the same over time or between subgroups. Our results demonstrate the importance of complete vaccination data for monitoring of effectiveness of vaccination programs. In addition, for epidemiological studies and surveillance where this may not always be possible, they call for a discussion on how to routinely collect anonymous data of non-consenting individuals and implement misclassification correction models.

The availability of anonymous COVID-19 vaccination data by calendar date, birth year, sex and region from the GGD, which administered the vast majority of COVID vaccinations in the Netherlands, was essential to quantify the information bias resulting from the informed consent procedure. The estimated statistical efficiency of the data augmentation model, compared to having 100% consent, was reasonably high. Therefore, if the model assumptions - in particular non-differential misclassification - are correct, and non-consent percentages are reasonably low, the bias can be relatively well corrected.

Recent implementation of informed consent in the Dutch childhood vaccination program resulted in a high non-consent percentage of 12%.(16) Combined with the high vaccination uptake this will result in relatively large bias in VE estimates. The use of biased VE estimates may have undesirable consequences for vaccination policy. Although the data augmentation model, developed as part of this study, could be available to correct the information bias also for other vaccination programs, there are some limitations. First, the model relies on the assumption of non-differential

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

misclassification, i.e. that vaccinated persons with and without providing consent have a similar incidence of the disease of interest conditional on their covariates. This is difficult to verify within our study and only sensitivity analyses could shed light on the importance of this assumption. In case of differential misclassification, higher non-consent percentage will result in a higher impact of misspecification of this assumption. When deemed important, the presence, direction and magnitude of differential misclassification and other important parameters of the misclassification correction model could be estimated using a survey. For example, a survey of 1209 parents in the US to compare parent-reported childhood vaccination status to EHR data found 94% agreement for receiving no vaccination and 87% for receiving all vaccinations with no delay.(17) However, this approach may not be unbiased in the case of misclassifications due to non-consent. Second, higher non-consent percentages such as those currently observed in the Dutch childhood vaccination program will also increase the statistical uncertainty of the model, reflected in wider confidence intervals. Finally, in the current study we were able to carry out imputations based on covariate-specific non-consent percentages that covered 86% of vaccinations. Critical information for non-consenting individuals is the (approximate) vaccination date, number of previous vaccinations, and covariates relevant to the disease under study. Unfortunately, no covariate-specific consent data are available for the Dutch childhood vaccination program. Although a global non-consent percentage could also be used, such an approach will result in less reliable imputations.

Several other limitations of the study need to be addressed. First, an anonymous dataset with informed consent status was only available for the GGD and not for other health care providers administering COVID-19 vaccines, such as general practitioners and hospitals. In the partially-corrected analysis we conservatively assumed that other providers had consent percentages of 100%, thereby underestimating the bias. The fully-corrected analysis assumed that consent percentages were similar between GGD and other providers conditional on birth year, sex, region,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

and calendar date. Individuals aged 50-69 years were relatively more often vaccinated by other providers. Within this age group, people born in 1956-1960 were initially invited to be vaccinated by their general practitioner. This can be appreciated from a larger difference between the corrected estimates from the fully-corrected compared to the partially-corrected analyses.

Second, the current analysis only corrects VE for misclassification of vaccination status. Other biases may be present including unmeasured confounding, as the surveillance data does not include data on comorbidities, socio-economic status, behavior or previous infections. For example, if individuals at increased risk of COVID-19 hospitalization because of comorbidity are vaccinated more often, this will result in confounding bias towards zero.(18) Determinants of healthy vaccinee bias are much more difficult to observe and may result in confounding in the opposite direction as they often related to behavioral aspects. Another form of information bias that may have occurred as part of the COVID-19 hospitalizations concern admissions for a reason not related to COVID-19 where SARS-CoV-2 infection was a secondary diagnosis. Such misclassification of the outcome most likely causes a bias towards a lower VE. To the best of our knowledge, secondary SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnoses were less of an issue during the Delta period than after the emergence of Omicron so it may not affect our analysis that much. As different biases may be in different directions, the current study serves mostly to quantify the amount of bias from one source, rather than claiming to provide an unbiased estimate of the true VE.

A third limitation is that we have not analyzed the VE by time since vaccination in our data-augmentation model and did not include periods where booster vaccinations were available. The data augmentation model presumably is less stable when time since vaccination and other vaccination statuses are incorporated, as this would result in more uncertainty about the correct

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

classification of hospitalized individuals with no linked vaccination records and hence in lower precision of the corrected VE estimates.

In conclusion, relatively small proportions of misclassified vaccination status due to the informed consent procedure implemented in the Netherlands resulted in a substantial downward bias of the VE estimates for COVID-19 hospitalization and ICU admission and potentially in incorrect conclusions about changes in the VE over time or difference in the VE between subgroups. Covariate-specific consent data should be available such that a model that takes into account misclassification can be used to correct for this form of bias, but these rely on a constant risk assumption which may not hold true. Future facilitation of the use of routinely collected health data, while protecting privacy rights and personal autonomy, is crucial to increase its value in surveillance and research for public health.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

References

1. Hahné S, Bollaerts K, Farrington P. Vaccination Programmes: Epidemiology, Monitoring, Evaluation: Taylor & Francis; 2021.
2. Archive COVID-19 vaccination figures 2022 Bilthoven: RIVM; [updated report date 28 June 2022. Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/en/covid-19-vaccination/archive-covid-19-vaccination-figures-2022.
3. [Vaccine effectiveness in preventing hospital and ICU admission in the Netherlands] Bilthoven: RIVM; [updated 18 Nov 2021. Available from: https://www.rivm.nl/sites/default/files/2021-11/Analyse%20VE_Update%20-%20versie%2018%20nov%202021-FINAL-2.docx.
4. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021.
5. Wood SN. Fast Stable Restricted Maximum Likelihood and Marginal Likelihood Estimation of Semiparametric Generalized Linear Models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology. 2010;73(1):3-36.
6. Jurek AM, Greenland S, Maldonado G, Church TR. Proper interpretation of non-differential misclassification effects: expectations vs observations. Int J Epidemiol. 2005;34(3):680-7.
7. Fox MP, Lash TL, Greenland S. A method to automate probabilistic sensitivity analyses of misclassified binary variables. Int J Epidemiol. 2005;34(6):1370-6.
8. Cole SR, Chu H, Greenland S. Multiple-imputation for measurement-error correction. Int J Epidemiol. 2006;35(4):1074-81.
9. Messer K, Natarajan L. Maximum likelihood, multiple imputation and regression calibration for measurement error adjustment. Stat Med. 2008;27(30):6332-50.
10. Küchenhoff H, Mwalili SM, Lesaffre E. A general method for dealing with misclassification in regression: the misclassification SIMEX. Biometrics. 2006;62(1):85-96.
11. MacLehose RF, Olshan AF, Herring AH, Honein MA, Shaw GM, Romitti PA. Bayesian methods for correcting misclassification: an example from birth defects epidemiology. Epidemiology. 2009;20(1):27-35.
12. Hubbard RA, Johnson E, Chubak J, Wernli KJ, Kamineni A, Bogart A, et al. Accounting for misclassification in electronic health records-derived exposures using generalized linear finite mixture models. Health Serv Outcomes Res Methodol. 2017;17(2):101-12.
13. Corbin M, Haslett S, Pearce N, Maule M, Greenland S. A comparison of sensitivity-specificity imputation, direct imputation and fully Bayesian analysis to adjust for exposure misclassification when validation data are unavailable. Int J Epidemiol. 2017;46(3):1063-72.
14. Edwards JK, Cole SR, Fox MP. Flexibly Accounting for Exposure Misclassification With External Validation Data. Am J Epidemiol. 2020;189(8):850-60.
15. Rahmani K, Shavaleh R, Forouhi M, Disfani HF, Kamandi M, Oskooi RK, et al. The effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines in reducing the incidence, hospitalization, and mortality from COVID-19: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Public Health. 2022;10:873596.
16. Van Lier EAO, P.J.; Giesbers, H.; Hament, J-M; Van Vliet, J.A.; Drijfhout, I.H.; Hirschberg, H.; De Melker, H.E. Vaccinatiegraad en jaarverslag Rijksvaccinatieprogramma Nederland 2021. RIVM; 2022.
17. Daley MF, Shoup JA, Newcomer SR, Jackson ML, Groom HC, Jacobsen SJ, et al. Assessing Potential Confounding and Misclassification Bias When Studying the Safety of the Childhood Immunization Schedule. Acad Pediatr. 2018;18(7):754-62.
18. de Gier BvA, L.; Boere, T.; van Roon, A.; van Roekel, C.; Pijpers, J.; van Werkhoven, H.; van den Ende, C.; Hahné, S.; de Melker, H.; Knol, M.; van den Hof, S. COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against mortality and risk of death from other causes after COVID-19 vaccination, the Netherlands, January 2021-January 2022. medRxiv. 2023.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Acknowledgements

Conflicts of interests

None to report.

Author statement

Conceptualization: CHvW, MJK, BdG. Data analysis: CHvW. Data analysis verification: SM. Supervision: MJK. Writing original draft manuscript: CHvW. Critical review of the manuscript: all authors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 1: Vaccination status at the end of the study period and estimated non-consent percentage by dataset and age group.

Dataset	Vaccinated	Non-consent[1]
Age 12-49 | 15-Nov-2021 (N=8,143,074)		
Original	5,453,019 (67.0%)	-
Partially-corrected[2]	5,882,196 (72.2%)	429,177 (7.3%)
Fully-corrected[3]	5,914,083 (72.6%)	461,064 (7.8%)
Age 50-69 | 15-Nov-2021 (N=4,747,165)		
Original	3,999,842 (84.3%)	-
Partially-corrected[2]	4,210,180 (88.7%)	210,338 (5.0%)
Fully-corrected[3]	4,302,219 (90.6%)	302,377 (7.0%)
Age 70+ | 15-Nov-2021 (N=2,613,867)		
Original	2,270,686 (86.9%)	-
Partially-corrected[2]	2,422,595 (92.7%)	151,909 (6.3%)
Fully-corrected[3]	2,440,568 (93.4%)	169,882 (7.0%)

[1]Non-consent percentage calculated as proportion of those vaccinated.
[2]Correction using an anonymous dataset from the Municipal Health Services (GGD), based on vaccination dates, year of birth and consent status.
[3]Correction using the anonymous GGD dataset supplemented with an extrapolation model for other providers.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Figure 1: Data augmentation model. Fixed imputation of vaccination status in the population dataset followed by stochastic imputation of vaccination status for hospitalized patients without a linked CIMS vaccination record. Abbreviations: CIMS: Corona Information and Monitoring System. GGD: Municipal Health Services. RR: relative risk. N/A: not applicable.

Step 1: Fixed imputation of vaccination status in the partially corrected dataset stratified by birth year, sex, region, and calendar date (fictional numbers for a single stratum)

Source 1: linked CIMS-records and population size; Original population dataset

Result: imputed vaccination status; Partially-corrected population dataset – subset that was originally classified as unvaccinated

Source 2: GGD-vaccinated persons who did not consent for data registration *



* For the fully-corrected method, consent percentages observed in source 2 are extrapolated to providers other than the GGD; other steps are the same.

Step 2: Stochastic imputation of vaccination status to hospital or ICU admissions without a linked CIMS vaccination record - iterative until RR estimates converge (same fictional stratum)

RR from previous iteration:	*RR-adjusted weight:*	*Probability of new status:*
Primary: 0.2 (VE=80%)	550 * 0.2 = 110	110 / 1030 = 0.11
Partly: 0.4 (VE=60%)	50 * 0.4 = 20	20 / 1030 = 0.02
Unvaccinated: N/A	900 * 1 = 900	900 / 1030 = 0.87
	Sum 1030	

Stochastic assignment of vaccination status → Refit regression and update RR estimates

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Figure 2: Illustration of theoretical bias by true vaccine effectiveness, vaccination uptake and non-consent percentage. A: Relative bias of the relative risk; B: Absolute bias of the vaccine effectiveness; C: Small overestimation of VE waning in case of constant vaccination coverage and true waning over time; D: Suggestion of VE waning due to increasing vaccination coverage over time when true VE is constant. VE: vaccine effectiveness. Gray areas in panel C and D indicate the true vaccination uptake in the population.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Figure 3: Misclassification of vaccination status over time by age group. A: Vaccination status in the original dataset; B: Vaccination status in the partially-corrected dataset; C: Vaccination status in the partially-corrected dataset among persons originally classified as unvaccinated; D: Vaccination status in the fully -corrected dataset; E: Vaccination status in the fully-corrected dataset among persons originally classified as unvaccinated.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.05.23.23290384; this version posted May 24, 2023. 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 .

Figure 4: Original and corrected VE estimates assuming the risk of acquiring the endpoint is independent of providing consent. Abbreviations: hosp: hospitalization; ICU: intensive care unit admission.