Risk-based prediction for optimal timing of booster vaccination for COVID-19 to prevent severe disease

Hailey J. Park[1,2], Gregg S. Gonsalves[3], Sophia T. Tan[1,2], J. Daniel Kelly[4,5,6], George W. Rutherford[4,5], Robert M. Wachter[7], Robert Schechter[8], A. David Paltiel[9], and Nathan C. Lo[1,2*]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of HIV, Infectious Diseases, and Global Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

[2]Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

[3]Department of Epidemiology of Microbial Diseases and Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

[4]Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

[5]Institute for Global Health Sciences, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

[6]F.I. Proctor Foundation, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

[7]Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

[8]California Department of Public Health, Richmond, CA, USA

[9]Department of Health Policy and Management and Public Health Modeling Unit, Yale School of Public Health, New Haven, CT, USA

*Corresponding author:
Nathan C. Lo, MD PhD
Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine
Department of Medicine
Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA 94305
Nathan.Lo@stanford.edu

Abstract Word Count: 227

Main Text Word Count: 3380

Figures: 1

Tables: 2

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Omicron, vaccination, bivalent boosters, vaccine effectiveness, epidemiology

Abstract

While waning protection from vaccination and natural infection against SARS-CoV-2 infection is well-documented, recent analyses have also found waning of protection against severe COVID-19. This highlights a broader need to understand the optimal timing of COVID-19 booster vaccines specific to an individual to mitigate the risk of severe COVID-19, while accounting for waning of protection and differential risk by age group and immune status. Here we show that more frequent COVID-19 booster vaccination (every 6-12 months) in older age groups and the immunocompromised population would effectively mitigate the burden of severe COVID-19, while frequent boosters in the younger population may only provide modest benefit. Analyzing United States COVID-19 surveillance and seroprevalence data in a microsimulation model, we estimated that in persons 75+ years, annual and semiannual bivalent boosters would reduce annual absolute risk of severe COVID-19 by 311 (277-369) and 578 (494-671) cases, respectively, compared to a one-time bivalent booster dose. In contrast, for persons 18-49 years, the model estimated that annual and semiannual bivalent boosters would reduce annual absolute risk of severe COVID-19 by 20 (13-26) and 37 (24-50) cases per 100,000 persons, respectively, compared to a one-time bivalent booster dose. Persons with prior infection had a much lower benefit of more frequent boosting, while immunocompromised persons had larger benefit. This study underscores the benefit of customizing timing of COVID-19 booster vaccines based on individual risk.

Introduction

Both COVID-19 vaccination and natural infection from SARS-CoV-2 generate protection against future risk of COVID-19; however, this protection wanes over time, in part due to new variants[1-6]. While waning immunity from vaccination and natural infection against SARS-CoV-2 infection is well-documented[6], recent analyses have also found waning of protection against severe COVID-19 (defined as hospitalization or death)[1,2,7]. These studies further suggest that additional booster vaccine doses or natural infection can restore the level of protection despite this prior decline[1,4,8]. A key clinical question remains: what is the optimal frequency of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination to offset waning of protection against severe disease, and how can this be customized to person-specific risk?

There is limited evidence to guide decisions on the timing of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination to prevent severe COVID-19. Considerations for an individual include: i) baseline risk for severe COVID-19, correlated with increased age and presence of immunocompromising conditions; ii) vaccination history, including number of doses and time since last vaccination; iii) previous SARS-CoV-2 infection(s), including time since last infection and variant; and iv) overall risk of infection driven by levels of SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the community. Given heterogeneity in risk of severe COVID-19 within the population, the optimal frequency of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination may be different based on risk factors.

While limiting SARS-CoV-2 community transmission and providing early access to antiviral treatment (e.g., nirmatrelvir-ritonavir) for COVID-19 is important from a public health perspective, here we focus on the impact of the timing of booster vaccination in different age

groups and the immunocompromised population to prevent severe disease. Using a microsimulation model of severe COVID-19 to compare the individual- and population-level impact of various timings of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination in different risk groups, we aim to inform guidance for the frequency of COVID-19 booster vaccination in the United States.

Results

Primary results

We analyzed detailed COVID-19 surveillance data and seroprevalence estimates from US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention over the 6 months prior to bivalent booster roll out in the United States. We developed and calibrated a microsimulation model of severe COVID-19 to a simulated population composed of vaccinated persons (with at least a primary series with BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273, plus one monovalent mRNA booster) in four age groups: 18-49 years, 50-64 years, 65-74 years, and 75+ years, and an immunocompromised population. Model inputs included person-level, age-specific vaccination history and probability of prior infection, which informed the waning of protection since last vaccine dose or natural infection.

The model estimated that more frequent bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination in older age groups would have larger absolute reductions in severe COVID-19 risk (Table 1 and Figure S1). In a hypothetical cohort of persons 18-49 years old who received a one-time bivalent booster vaccination, the model estimated 2,158 severe COVID-19 cases over a 2-year period in a population of 1 million people with annual risk of 108 severe cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 105-108). The model estimated annual bivalent booster vaccination would reduce relative annual risk of severe COVID-19 by 19% and absolute risk by 20 cases per 100,000 persons

(95% UI: 13-26; NNT 2,458), compared to a base case of one-time bivalent booster. The model estimated that semiannual (every 6 months) bivalent booster vaccination would reduce relative annual risk by 34% and absolute risk by 37 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 24-50; NNT 1,350), compared to one-time bivalent booster. In the annual and semiannual vaccine strategy, we estimated that 36% and 40% of the averted severe COVID-19 cases occurred in persons without prior documented COVID-19 infection, respectively.

In contrast, in a hypothetical cohort of persons 75+ years old who received a one-time bivalent booster vaccination, the model estimated 30,861 severe COVID-19 cases over a 2-year period in a population of 1 million people with annual risk of 1,543 severe cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 1,529-1,553). The model estimated annual bivalent booster vaccination would reduce relative annual risk of severe COVID-19 by 20% and absolute risk by 311 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 277-369; NNT 161), compared to a base care of one-time bivalent booster. The model estimated that semiannual bivalent booster vaccination would reduce relative annual risk by 37% and absolute risk by 578 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 494-671; NNT 87), compared to one-time bivalent booster. In the annual and semiannual vaccine strategies, we estimated that 77% and 77% of the averted severe COVID-19 cases occurred in persons without prior documented COVID-19 infection.

In a hypothetical cohort of immunocompromised persons who received a one-time bivalent booster vaccination, the model estimated 24,194 severe COVID-19 cases over a 2-year period in a population of 1 million people with annual risk of 1,210 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 1,202-1,218). Annual bivalent booster vaccination reduced relative annual risk of severe

COVID-19 by 10% and absolute risk by 118 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 104-118; NNT 425), compared to a base case of one-time bivalent booster. Semiannual bivalent booster vaccination reduced relative annual risk by 18% and absolute risk by 220 cases per 100,000 persons (95% UI: 198-240; NNT 227), compared to one-time bivalent booster.

Full reporting of results, including for persons 50-64 years and persons 65-74 years, are shown in Table 1. Model validation results demonstrated that model predictions for severe COVID-19 incidence were similar to observed values (Table A3). Model predictions on risk of severe COVID-19 without any bivalent booster are available in the Appendix (Table S2).

Sensitivity analysis

In sensitivity analysis, we found that higher incidence of severe COVID-19 was associated with the largest increase in gains associated with more frequent bivalent boosting. For example, in persons 65-74 years old, semiannual bivalent booster averted 374 cases per 100,000 persons in the high incidence scenario compared to 223 cases per 100,000 persons in the primary analysis. Additionally, more rapid waning of vaccine-induced protection (pessimistic waning) and higher vaccine effectiveness had larger gains associated with more frequent bivalent boosting, although the estimates were overall similar (Figure 1). We conducted a sensitivity analysis where the simulation included only persons with prior COVID-19 and found similar benefits of more frequent vaccination (See Supplemental Table S11). Additional results for sensitivity analysis are available in the Appendix.

Discussion

To inform vaccine guidance on schedules of booster vaccination, this modeling study compared different frequencies of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination and risk of severe COVID-19 in key age groups and the immunocompromised population. While both COVID-19 vaccination and natural infection generate protection against severe COVID-19, this protection wanes over time, prompting discussion on the optimal timing of booster vaccination[1,2]. We found that more frequent COVID-19 booster vaccination in older populations and those with immunocompromising conditions at risk for severe COVID-19, along with less frequent booster vaccination in younger, low-risk populations may more effectively mitigate the burden of severe COVID-19 in the United States than a single recommendation for the general population. We also found that the robustness and durability of hybrid protection lowers the value of repeated boosters. We did not account for the indirect effects of bivalent booster vaccination on transmission[9-11], and thus our model likely represents an underestimate of both the public health and individual impact of additional boosters. Our study supports current federal guidance that provide an option for repeating bivalent booster for those 65 years and older[12], and illustrates the importance of customizing bivalent booster timing based on personalized person-level risk defined by age and immunocompromised status.

The optimal timing and need for bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination will depend on value judgments, evaluation of the absolute and relative risks of severe COVID-19 from this study, and the perspective (individual or population level). Our goal was to provide these estimates to inform vaccine guidance and personalized patient, clinician, and public health decisions. For individual level decisions, interpreting these risk, benefit, and NNT results may be contextualized by comparing them to common preventive health measures. For example,

common primary care measures have a range of NNT from 50-400, such as influenza vaccination to prevent death (NNT 48), statin for primary prevention of death (NNT 286), and flexible sigmoidoscopy to prevent colon cancer associated death (NNT 400)[13-15]. For some persons, an absolute risk threshold such as averting a 1 in 1,000 chance of being hospitalized or dying from COVID-19 may be an informative threshold. While relative risks differences were similar across risk groups, the absolute risk differences for severe COVID-19 were much larger in the higher risk groups and a more meaningful measure of risk reduction. Overall, these findings support more frequent bivalent booster in populations 65 years and older and those with immunocompromising conditions, which broadly align with the absolute risk thresholds and NNT estimates discussed. For population-level decisions, these results can be used to estimate averted hospitalizations and strain to the healthcare system and associated economics effects, could be formulated into a formal cost-effectiveness analysis, or could be used by public health departments for focused interventions for vaccine uptake.

Most of the estimated benefit from more frequent bivalent booster vaccination occurred in older age groups, the immunocompromised, and those without prior COVID-19. Less benefit for frequent boosting is derived from vaccination in younger, low-risk populations. While vaccine guidance based on patient risk defined by age and immunocompromised status would be supported by this study, decisions on vaccine based on prior COVID-19 disease is likely more challenging. Our estimates on the protection of hybrid immunity against severe COVID-19 were limited data from one key study[1], and further studies of the robustness of hybrid immunity would be needed to support these findings prior to vaccine guidance that is specific to history of prior

infection. Additionally, people may misclassify their prior infection status in both directions – by either assuming a prior infection or not recognizing one based on inadequate formal testing.

The model relied upon literature estimates and simplifying assumptions on the level of protection against severe COVID-19. We assumed that each COVID-19 bivalent booster had comparable vaccine effectiveness. We conservatively assumed that these additional doses did not have higher absolute vaccine effectiveness, but rather restored the maximal protection prior to waning, an assumption that is broadly supported by literature[1,8]. Because of limited long-term (beyond 12 months of follow up) data on the waning of vaccine-induced protection, we estimated this waning by synthesizing results from multiple published studies and meta-analyses[1,2,4,5] (see Appendix). Specifically, the available evidence suggests hybrid immunity provides high and robust protection[1], and this literature guides our study findings, so additional research to confirm this finding will be important. While there is uncertainty in the level of protection and waning over time of vaccine-induced and hybrid immunity, in sensitivity analysis the overall result remains robust under broad range of assumptions. This is because different assumptions on level of protection and waning are offset in the model by changes in force of infection of COVID-19 during the calibration, leading to robust results.

Our study has several limitations. We simulated a fixed risk of severe COVID-19 over time among the study population, although this is a simplified approach given risk is challenging to predict, heterogenous within each age group, changes over time, and variable with emergence of novel variants. To address this, we performed sensitivity analyses to estimate how different scenarios would affect our results, and the relative findings between age groups appears to be

robust. Our study was not intended to perform prospective forecasting of COVID-19 outcomes. Our study did not rigorously evaluate COVID-19 outcomes of clinical cases given biased case ascertainment (due to at-home testing and sub-clinical infection) and less public health emphasis on this outcome, or long COVID-19 given limited data to inform these estimates. However, it is important to acknowledge that more frequent boosters may reduce risk of both COVID-19 cases and long COVID. We did not model outcomes in infants, children, or adolescents, nor did we model risk of myocarditis or any vaccine-related adverse events. We did not simulate booster vaccines more frequent than every 6 months.

In this study, we find that guidance on frequency of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination may be strengthened by customizing to risk of severe COVID-19 defined by age and immunocompromised status to optimally mitigate the burden of COVID-19 in the United States. These results may support patients, physicians, and public health officials to guide decisions on bivalent booster timing.

Methods

Microsimulation Model

We developed a stochastic, person-level simulation model (microsimulation) of severe COVID-19 cases in the United States. We created hypothetical cohorts of one million persons who were fully vaccinated, defined as having completed their primary series and received at least one monovalent mRNA booster dose. We modeled the population in five key risk groups defined by age or immune status: 18-49 years, 50-64 years, 65-74 years, 75+ years, and a moderately/severely immunocompromised population [12] (see Appendix).

Upon entry into the simulation, each person was assigned an age, vaccine status (1 or 2 monovalent mRNA booster doses)[16], and prior infection status[17]. For the age-specific cohorts and the immunocompromised risk group, prior infection status was informed by estimates of seroprevalence (nucleocapsid antibody consistent with prior infection; see Appendix for full methodologic approach)[17,18]. Each person was assigned a time since their last COVID-19 vaccine or infection (measured number of months). This was based on sampling from publicly available data on time series data of vaccine administration and COVID-19 cases and then tracked over the simulation period (see Appendix).

We simulated a two-year time horizon, which was chosen to allow adequate time for comparison of vaccine strategies (i.e., one year time horizon would not allow estimation of differences from one-time and annual strategies). We assumed a hypothetical fixed population with no aging or demography. At the start of the simulation (time 0), no one had received a bivalent booster vaccine, coinciding with approximately September 2022.

During the simulation, we applied a fixed risk group-specific probability of SARS-CoV-2 infection and severe COVID-19 for each month time step, informed by the model calibration using COVID-19 surveillance datasets in the six months prior to bivalent vaccination (see Calibration and Validation section). We simulated severe COVID-19 cases, defined as a composite outcome of COVID-19 related hospitalization or COVID-19 related death. Each person had a unique, time-varying level of protection against severe COVID-19 based on vaccine status (time since last vaccine) and prior infection history (time since last infection, if

applicable). This model explicitly accounted for waning of protection against severe COVID-19 based on timing of last vaccination and prior infection, which was estimated from literature[1,2,4,5] (see Appendix). We separately modeled vaccine-induced (without prior infection) and hybrid immunity (defined as vaccination with documented prior infection) since literature suggests far higher and more durable protection for hybrid immunity[1] (see Appendix and Figure A1). We assigned protective effectiveness curves to individuals in the simulation based on their prior infection status (Figure A1). The study focused on severe COVID-19 rather than clinical cases based on a public health priority to reduce hospitalizations and deaths, although we did simulate non-severe COVID-19 cases and subsequent effects on protection and immunity (see Appendix). All COVID-19 cases (severe and non-severe) reset the time since last COVID-19 case or vaccine. While acknowledging that a certain fraction of COVID-19 cases will result in long COVID, we did not account for long COVID given limited data to inform these estimates. We assumed no reinfections occurred within 90 days of a SARS-CoV-2 infection. Analysis was conducted in R (version 4.2.1).

Interventions

We simulated three distinct vaccination strategies with bivalent boosters for COVID-19, including: i) one-time bivalent booster at the start of the simulation (base case); ii) single bivalent booster followed by annual bivalent boosters (total of 2 doses); and iii) single bivalent booster followed by bivalent boosters every 6 months (semiannual; total of 4 doses). Each round of vaccination was administered in the population over a 3-month period rather than at a single time point. We calibrated the protection and waning of a bivalent mRNA booster dose to published data on vaccine effectiveness (using both monovalent and bivalent literature)[1,2,4,5], and

modeled the benefit of a bivalent booster dose to restore maximal protection against severe COVID-19 prior to waning (see Appendix). This approach to vaccine modeling resulted in estimates of relative vaccine effectiveness similar to published estimates on the bivalent mRNA booster (see Figure A2)[4]. We assumed that each repeated bivalent booster dose would achieve the same level of effectiveness without immune exhaustion, immune imprinting phenomenon, or reduced vaccine effectiveness due to new variants[19,20], although we explored this in sensitivity analysis.

Key Data

The population size (1 million) was chosen to broadly represent the geographic scale of a larger county in the United States (Table 2). Applying publicly available data from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) COVID-19 surveillance program, we generated age-specific monthly risk estimates of severe COVID-19 (defined as related hospitalization or death)[21,22]. Age-specific seroprevalence estimates were obtained from the CDC based on the nucleocapsid antibody, suggesting prior infection[17] (see Appendix). These data were necessary to define persons as having either protection from hybrid immunity (vaccine and prior documented infection) or vaccine alone. This informed different levels of protection against severe COVID-19 and waning based on timing since last vaccine and/or prior infection based on literature (see Appendix and Figure A1). Hybrid immunity has been suggested to provide more robust and durable protection[1] (see Appendix). Furthermore, simulating prior infection allowed us to estimate waning (often defined in literature as time since last vaccine dose or prior infection). We defined the study population as persons residing in the United States, age 18 years or older,

and fully vaccinated (defined as completion of their primary series and 1 or more monovalent booster doses).

Statistical Analysis

Base case analysis and study outcomes

The primary study outcome was the annual absolute risk of severe COVID-19 estimated over a 2-year simulation period in each risk group described above. Each of the bivalent boosting strategies was compared to the base case of a one-time bivalent booster at start of simulation. For each strategy, we estimated the total number of severe COVID-19 cases, absolute annual risk reduction of severe COVID-19 (cases per 100,000 persons), relative risk reduction, and number of persons needed to treat (NNT) with a specified vaccination frequency to avert one severe COVID-19 case. We generated 95% uncertainty intervals for the primary analysis based on uncertainty in vaccine effectiveness and waning over time using literature-based estimates (see Appendix).

Calibration and validation

We calibrated the model to age-specific estimates of severe COVID-19 risk generated from an average over the 6-month period preceding the bivalent vaccine rollout (March 2022 – August 2022). For the immunocompromised population, we used literature estimates for age distribution and relative risk of severe COVID-19[18,21,23] (see Appendix; see Table 2 for severe COVID-19 risk estimates). We estimated this risk for persons vaccinated with the primary series and at least one monovalent booster This calibration yielded a per month probability of severe COVID-19 specific to age group and immunocompromised status, which was multiplied against 1 minus an

individual's current level of protection to obtain individual per month risk. For model validation, we performed a comparison of model-predicted outcomes over the first 3 months of bivalent vaccination (September 2022- December 2022).

Sensitivity analysis

We conducted sensitivity analyses on model parameters to evaluate the robustness of our findings. First, we repeated the analysis under optimistic or pessimistic assumptions on level of protection (10% lower or higher) from vaccine-induced and hybrid immunity, as well as differential waning of protection (10% lower or higher) (see Appendix). Second, we repeated the analysis for a lower (0.5x) and higher (2x) incidence of severe COVID-19. Third, we performed analyses under the assumption that additional bivalent boosters would have lower vaccine effectiveness (i.e., immune exhaustion). Fourth, we performed the analysis with higher or lower seroprevalence and an additional analysis with a population of only previously infected persons (i.e., 100% seroprevalence). Fifth, we repeated the analysis assuming higher proportion of sub-clinical infections. Additional details on sensitivity analyses can be found in the Appendix.

Ethical Approval and Data Sharing

This study was not human subjects research given use of publicly available secondary datasets with aggregated estimates that are not identifiable. Analytic code and relevant data are available at: [https://github.com/hailey-park/booster-timing].

Role of the Funding Source

The funding source had no role in the design, conduct, or analysis of this study or in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Disclaimer

The findings and conclusions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views or opinions of the California Department of Public Health, California Health and Human Services Agency, or National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Bobrovitz N, Ware H, Ma X, Li Z, Hosseini R, Cao C, Selemon A, Whelan M, Premji Z, Issa H, Cheng B, Abu Raddad LJ, Buckeridge DL, Van Kerkhove MD, Piechotta V, Higdon MM, Wilder-Smith A, Bergeri I, Feikin DR, Arora RK, Patel MK, Subissi L. Protective effectiveness of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection and hybrid immunity against the omicron variant and severe disease: a systematic review and meta-regression. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2023; 23(5), 556-567.

2. Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, Mitchell PK, DeSilva MB, Irving SA, Lewis N, Natarajan K, Stenehjem E, Grannis SJ, Han J, McEvoy C, Ong TC, Naleway AL, Reese SE, Embi PJ, Dascomb K, Klein NP, Griggs EP, Liao IC, Yang DH, Fadel WF, Grisel N, Goddard K, Patel P, Murthy K, Birch R, Valvi NR, Arndorfer J, Zerbo O, Dickerson M, Raiyani C, Williams J, Bozio CH, Blanton L, Link-Gelles R, Barron MA, Gaglani M, Thompson MG, Fireman B. Waning of vaccine effectiveness against moderate and severe covid-19 among adults in the US from the VISION network: test negative, case-control study. *BMJ*. 2022; 379, e072141.

3. Lin DY, Gu Y, Xu Y, Wheeler B, Young H, Sunny SK, Moore Z, Zeng D. Association of Primary and Booster Vaccination and Prior Infection With SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Severe COVID-19 Outcomes. *JAMA*. 2022; 328(14), 1415-1426.

4. Lin DY, Xu Y, Gu Y, Zeng D, Wheeler B, Young H, Sunny SK, Moore Z. Effectiveness of Bivalent Boosters against Severe Omicron Infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2023; 388(8), 764-766.

5. Team C-F. Past SARS-CoV-2 infection protection against re-infection: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2023; 401(10379), 833-842.

6. Menegale F, Manica M, Zardini A, Guzzetta G, Marziano V, d'Andrea V, Trentini F, Ajelli M, Poletti P, Merler S. Evaluation of Waning of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine-Induced Immunity: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023; 6(5), e2310650.

7. Kelly JD, Leonard S, Hoggatt KJ, Boscardin WJ, Lum EN, Moss-Vazquez TA, Andino R, Wong JK, Byers A, Bravata DM, Tien PC, Keyhani S. Incidence of Severe COVID-19 Illness Following Vaccination and Booster With BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, and Ad26.COV2.S Vaccines. *JAMA*. 2022; 328(14), 1427-1437.

8. Menni C, May A, Polidori L, Louca P, Wolf J, Capdevila J, Hu C, Ourselin S, Steves CJ, Valdes AM, Spector TD. COVID-19 vaccine waning and effectiveness and side-effects of boosters: a prospective community study from the ZOE COVID Study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022; 22(7), 1002-1010.

9. Harris RJ, Hall JA, Zaidi A, Andrews NJ, Dunbar JK, Dabrera G. Effect of Vaccination on Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in England. *N Engl J Med*. 2021; 385(8), 759-760.

10. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM, Jr., Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Secondary Attack Rates of SARS-CoV-2 by Variant and Vaccination Status: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022; 5(4), e229317.

11. Tan ST, Kwan AT, Rodriguez-Barraquer I, Singer BJ, Park HJ, Lewnard JA, Sears D, Lo NC. Infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections and reinfections during the Omicron wave. *Nat Med*. 2023; 29(2), 358-365.

12. CDC. Interim Clinical Considerations for Use of COVID-19 Vaccines Currently Authorized in the United States. 2023;

13. Chou R, Cantor A, Dana T, Wagner J, Ahmed AY, Fu R, Ferencik M. Statin Use for the Primary Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease in Adults: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2022; 328(8), 754-771.

14. Diaz-Arocutipa C, Saucedo-Chinchay J, Mamas MA, Vicent L. Influenza vaccine improves cardiovascular outcomes in patients with coronary artery disease: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Travel Med Infect Dis*. 2022; 47, 102311.

15. Holme O, Bretthauer M, Fretheim A, Odgaard-Jensen J, Hoff G. Flexible sigmoidoscopy versus faecal occult blood testing for colorectal cancer screening in asymptomatic individuals. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013; 2013(9), CD009259.

16. Lu PJ, Zhou T, Santibanez TA, Jain A, Black CL, Srivastav A, Hung MC, Kriss JL, Schorpp S, Yankey D, Sterrett N, Fast HE, Razzaghi H, Elam-Evans LD, Singleton JA. COVID-19 Bivalent Booster Vaccination Coverage and Intent to Receive Booster Vaccination Among Adolescents and Adults - United States, November-December 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2023; 72(7), 190-198.

17. CDC. Nationwide COVID-19 Infection-Induced Antibody Seroprevalence (Commercial laboratories). (2023).

18. Patel M, Chen J, Kim S, Garg S, Flannery B, Haddadin Z, Rankin D, Halasa N, Talbot HK, Reed C. Analysis of MarketScan Data for Immunosuppressive Conditions and Hospitalizations for Acute Respiratory Illness, United States. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020; 26(8), 1720-1730.

19. Chevaisrakul P, Lumjiaktase P, Kietdumrongwong P, Chuatrisorn I, Chatsangjaroen P, Phanuphak N. Hybrid and herd immunity 6 months after SARS-CoV-2 exposure among individuals from a community treatment program. *Sci Rep*. 2023; 13(1), 763.

20. Monge S, Pastor-Barriuso R, Hernan MA. The imprinting effect of covid-19 vaccines: an expected selection bias in observational studies. *BMJ*. 2023; 381, e074404.

21. CDC. New admissions of patients with confirmed COVID-19. (2023).

22. CDC. Rates of COVID-19 Cases and Deaths by Vaccination Status. (2023).

23. Bahremand T, Yao JA, Mill C, Piszczek J, Grant JM, Smolina K. COVID-19 hospitalisations in immunocompromised individuals in the Omicron era: a population-based observational study using surveillance data in British Columbia, Canada. *Lancet Reg Health Am*. 2023; 20, 100461.

Tables and Figure

Table 1: Number of severe COVID-19 cases, risk, and number needed to treat to avert severe COVID-19 in five risk groups with different frequencies of bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccination.

	Total severe COVID-19 cases[a]	Absolute annual risk of severe COVID-19	Annual risk reduction of severe COVID-19		% Averted severe COVID-19		NNT to avert severe COVID-19 case[a]
		(cases per 100,000; 95% UI)	Absolute risk (cases per 100,000)	Relative risk (%)	No Prior Infection	Prior Infection	
One-time bivalent booster[b]							
18-49 years	2,158	108 (105 - 108)	--	--	--	--	--
50-64 years	4,365	218 (216 - 218)	--	--	--	--	--
65-74 years	11,491	575 (564 – 581)	--	--	--	--	--
75+ years	30,861	1,543 (1,529 – 1,553)	--	--	--	--	--
Immunocompromised	24,194	1,210 (1,202 – 1,218)	--	--	--	--	--
Annual bivalent booster							
18-49 years	1,751	88 (79 - 95)	20	19%	36%	64%	2,458
50-64 years	3,518	176 (162 – 182)	42	19%	64%	36%	1,181
65-74 years	9,093	455 (434 – 475)	120	21%	73%	27%	418
75+ years	24,638	1,232 (1,160 – 1,276)	311	20%	77%	23%	161
Immunocompromised	21,839	1,092 (1,084 – 1,114)	118	10%	53%	47%	425
Semiannual bivalent booster (every 6 months)							
18-49 years	1,417	71 (55 - 84)	37	34%	40%	60%	1,350
50-64 years	2,860	143 (121 – 158)	75	34%	62%	38%	665
65-74 years	7,041	352 (318 – 393)	223	39%	77%	23%	225
75+ years	19,296	965 (858 – 1,059)	578	37%	77%	23%	87
Immunocompromised	19,785	989 (962 – 1,020)	220	18%	54%	46%	227

[a]Estimated over 2-year simulation period in population of 1 million persons.
[b]One-time bivalent booster is the baseline intervention for risk reduction calculations.
NNT; number needed to treat, which is based on the number of persons needing to follow a vaccine schedule to avert one severe COVID-19 case
Scenario with no bivalent booster is available in Table S2.

Table 2: Baseline cohort characteristics and model parameters for severe COVID-19 risk and vaccine effectiveness.

	Model input	Reference
Cohort characteristics		
Population size (N)		
Each group	1 million	
Group		
18-49 years	-	Assumption
50-64 years	-	Assumption
65-74 years	-	Assumption
75+ years	-	Assumption
Immunocompromised population	-	Assumption
Baseline vaccination status (%)		
Boosted (1 dose)	60%	[16]
Boosted (2+ doses)	40%	
Seroprevalence[a] (%)		
18-49 years	82.4%	
50-64 years	65.8%	[17]
65-74 years	46.8%	
75+ years	46.8%	
Immunocompromised population	65.2%	(9, 12, 13)
Severe COVID-19 monthly incidence[b] (cases per 100,000 persons)		
18-49 years	8	[21]
50-64 years	16	[21]
65-74 years	41	[21]
75+ years	113	[21]
Immunocompromised population	95	[18,21,23]
Relative vaccine effectiveness and waning over time (against severe COVID-19)		
Bivalent vaccination		
Booster dose	Time-varying (See Appendix)	[1,2,4,5]

[a]Seroprevalence estimated by nucleocapsid antibody to support history of natural infection (see Appendix)[17].
[b]Incidence estimates for severe COVID-19 (defined by hospitalization or death) were generated using publicly available US CDC data, averaging over 6 months preceding bivalent vaccination introduction in September 2022. See Appendix for further methodologic description.

A. 18-49 years



B. 50-64 year



C. 65-74 years



D. 75+ years



E. Immunocompromised



Figure 1: Sensitivity analysis of model parameters for COVID-19 risk and bivalent booster vaccination. This sensitivity analysis tested alternative model parameters and assumption on overall vaccine-induced protection (optimistic and pessimistic assumptions), waning vaccine-induced protection (optimistic and pessimistic assumptions), COVID-19 incidence (0.5x lower or 2x higher) and seroprevalence (100% previously infected). For each sensitivity analysis, we simulated three bivalent COVID-19 booster vaccine schedules plotted annual risk of severe COVID-19.

Authorship contribution:

Ms. Hailey Park and Dr. Nathan Lo had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: RW, RS, NCL

Statistical analysis: HJP, NCL

Input on statistical analysis: GSG, ADP

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors

First draft of the manuscript: HJP, NCL

Critical revision of the manuscript: All authors

Contributed intellectual material and approved final draft: All authors

Funding/Support:

NCL is supported by the National Institutes of Health, NIAID New Innovator Award (DP2 AI170485). This study is supported by funding from the California Department of Public Health.

Previous presentations:

None.

Disclosure of interest:

None