Comparative Effectiveness of the Bivalent (Original/Omicron BA.4/BA.5) mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent in Adults in the United States

Hagit Kopel[1*], Van Hung Nguyen[2*], Catherine Boileau[2], Alina Bogdanov[3], Isabelle Winer[3], Thierry Ducruet[2], Ni Zeng[3], Mac Bonafede[3], Daina B. Esposito[1], David Martin[1], Andrew Rosen[1], Nicolas Van de Velde[1], Sten H Vermund[4], Stefan Gravenstein[5], and James A. Mansi[1]

Affiliations

1. Moderna, Inc., Cambridge, MA, USA
2. VHN Consulting Inc., Montreal, Quebec, Canada
3. Veradigm, Chicago, IL, USA
4. Yale School of Public Health, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA
5. Alpert Medical School and School of Public Health, Brown University

* Joint first authors

Corresponding author: James A. Mansi (james.mansi@modernatx.com)

Keywords: mRNA-1273.222; BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine; Bivalent vaccine; COVID-19 vaccine; hospitalization; symptomatic disease; relative vaccine effectiveness.

Abstract

Background: The emergence of Omicron variants coincided with declining vaccine-induced protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and other COVID-19-related outcomes. Two bivalent mRNA vaccines, mRNA-1273.222 (Moderna) and BNT162b2 Bivalent (Pfizer-BioNTech) were developed to provide greater protection against the predominate circulating variants by including the mRNA that encodes both the ancestral (original) strain and BA.4/BA.5. We estimated their relative vaccine effectiveness (rVE) in preventing COVID-19-related outcomes in the US.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective cohort study using a US nationwide dataset linking primary care electronic health records (EHR) and pharmacy/medical claims data. The adult study population (aged ≥18 years) received either mRNA-1273.222 or BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccination between August 31, 2022, and February 28, 2023. We used a propensity score weighting based on the inverse probability of treatment to adjust for the baseline differences in age, sex, race, ethnicity, geographic region, vaccination week, and health status between groups. Outcomes evaluated were rVE of the two bivalent mRNA vaccines against COVID-19-related hospitalizations (primary outcome) and outpatient visits (secondary). We weighted the vaccine groups prior to analysis and estimated adjusted hazard ratios (HR) using multivariable Cox regression models. We calculated rVE as $(1-HR) \times 100$.

Results: We evaluated outcomes for 1,034,538 mRNA-1273.222 and 1,670,666 BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine recipients. The adjusted rVE of mRNA-1273.222 versus BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccines against COVID-19-related hospitalization was 9.8% (95% confidence interval: 2.6%–16.4%). The adjusted rVE against COVID-19-related outpatient visits was 5.1% (95% CI: 3.2%–6.9%). When evaluated by age group, the incremental relative effectiveness was greater. Among adults ≥ 65, rVE against COVID-19-related

hospitalizations and outpatient visits was 13.5% (95% CI: 5.5%–20.8%) and 10.7% (8.2%–13.1%), respectively.

Conclusion: We found greater effectiveness of mRNA-1273.222 compared with the BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine in preventing COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits, with increased benefits in older adults.

Introduction

Despite high levels of vaccine effectiveness (VE) against the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain and variants observed in the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, the VE of a primary series of mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 monovalent vaccines decreased with the emergence of the Delta and Omicron (B.1.1.529 [BA.1]) variants and Omicron's subvariants (e.g. BA.2, BA.4, BA.5, XBB.1)[1,2]. Administration of a monovalent vaccine booster dose improved both immunogenicity and VE; however, effectiveness remained lower compared to that observed against earlier circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants. This led to March 2022 recommendations of yet an additional booster dose for vulnerable individuals, highlighting concern for waning protection and aiming to reduce disease severity and frequency of breakthrough infection.[3-7].

To counter waning immunity and broaden protection against emerging variants, new bivalent mRNA vaccines were developed targeting both the spike protein of the Omicron BA.4/BA.5 subvariant and the ancestral (original) SARS-CoV-2. These bivalent vaccines demonstrated increased protection against COVID-19-related symptomatic infections and severe outcomes.[1,8-12] and substantially boosted clinical protection and antibody titers for up to 6 months.[13] While the safety profile was similar between monovalent and bivalent mRNA vaccines, greater immunogenicity and relative vaccine effectiveness (rVE) were demonstrated with increased time since prior infection or prior COVID-19 vaccination.[12,14-22] On August 31, 2022,[23] bivalent vaccines (Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) were authorized in the United States (US) by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a booster dose for adults (≥18) and are now recommended by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for all individuals ≥6 months of age.[24] However, while approximately 70% of the eligible US population has completed a primary series, only ~17% of those eligible have received bivalent vaccination as of June 2023.[25]

While hospitalization rates during the period of omicron predominance are lower than those observed earlier in the pandemic,[25] more vulnerable sub-groups, including unvaccinated adults, older adults, immunocompromised persons, and those with certain chronic underlying medical conditions are at increased risk for severe disease outcomes and death. Hence, vaccine effectiveness and waning protection over time has immediate public health implications.[26] Furthermore, this information is essential for COVID-19 vaccine decision-makers and health care providers (HCP), to provide and convey presumptive recommendations and increase vaccine confidence among patients, particularly those at higher risk for COVID-19-related morbidity and mortality. [25,27,28]

Previous analyses of the primary series and booster reported slightly higher vaccine effectiveness for the monovalent mRNA-1273 (Moderna) vaccine compared with BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) in preventing both reported cases and COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatients visits. [29-32] However, rVE of these bivalent mRNA vaccines has not been established. The current study evaluated data from a large nationwide dataset to estimate the rVE of the mRNA-1273.222 bivalent vaccine (Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) with BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine (Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) administered for the prevention of COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits in adults in the US.

Methods

Data source and de-identification

We performed an observational, retrospective cohort study using real world data from two integrated sources. Widely used primary care electronic health record (EHR) platforms in the US (the Veradigm EHR dataset includes the Allscripts Tier 1, Allscripts Tier 2, and Practice Fusion EHR) served as the first source. Pharmacy and medical claims data (Komodo dataset)

served as the second source. Past research successfully used this integrated dataset to evaluate vaccine effectiveness[32-40] and its data to contain key variables for conducting effectiveness /outcomes research and demonstrated it to be representative of the US population. The dataset detailed by Nguyen et al 2023 includes variables based on structured data (e.g. from ICD-10 codes) across all care settings[32]. Each data asset meets the minimum protected health information (PHI) data requirements as specified for use by the algorithm. Research staff were not involved in preparation of datasets containing PHI or the actual running of the algorithm. The final linked data set merged the patient-level de-identified tokens in each individual dataset and contained no PHI. This linked, de-identified dataset was compliant with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and certified for research use. The retrospective observational study was designed, implemented, and reported in accordance with Good Pharmacoepidemiological Practice, applicable local regulations, and the ethical principles laid down in the Declaration of Helsinki. Approval by an institutional review board and patient consent were not necessary as the study was a noninterventional, retrospective cohort using a certified HIPAA-compliant deidentified research database.

In this study, we have used closed claims in the main analysis and open claims in the sensitivity analysis. The closed claims dataset follows three-tiered specified requirements (see **Supplementary Materials**). Open dataset includes all available claims for a patient, regardless of enrollment period, payer source, or closure status.

Participants and study design

Adults ≥18 years of age who had received either the mRNA-1273.222 (50 mcg), or BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine (30 mcg) between August 31, 2022, and February 28, 2023,

were eligible for inclusion in the study (see **Supplementary Table 1**). We defined the index date as the vaccination date with the bivalent vaccine, and the cohort entry date (CED) as 7 days later (**Figure 1**). Through the databases, we followed-up individuals for outcomes of interest from the CED until the end of the available data (February 28, 2023), receipt of another COVID-19 vaccine, or disenrollment from their medical/pharmacy plan, whichever occurred first. We classified individuals into two exposure cohorts based on the type of bivalent vaccine received (see **Supplementary Table 1** for a list of codes used to identify vaccinated individuals), with each individual only included once.

Inclusion criteria included a minimum of 365 days of continuous medical and pharmacy enrollment in a health plan contributing data to the claim set prior to receipt of the booster (index date), and at least one contact with a health service provider in the 365 days prior to the index date. Exclusion criteria included evidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination within the first 7 days after receipt of the bivalent vaccine, less than 1 day of follow-up, or missing birth year or sex.

Study objectives

The primary objective of this study was assessment of the rVE between mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent in preventing COVID-19-related illness requiring hospitalization, evaluated from the cohort entry date to first occurrence. The secondary objective was assessment of the rVE in prevention of COVID-19-related outpatient visits, evaluated from cohort entry date to first occurrence. We identified inpatient admissions based on all claims billed in the inpatient setting. Among these claims, we assigned those associated with inpatient hospital services to the inpatient hospital designation, and those associated with non-inpatient services (such as skilled nursing facilities or emergency department visits) to

the outpatient designation. Once encounters were identified as either inpatient or outpatient, we flagged claims with a diagnosis code for COVID-19 (in any position). We identified additional outpatient cases in the EHR via diagnosis codes (see **Supplementary Table 2**) and included telehealth consultations and emergency visits. Exploratory objectives included subgroup analysis for primary and secondary outcomes (COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits, respectively) by age group (≥50 years, and ≥65 years).

Statistical analysis

Using a multivariable logistic model for baseline variables, we calculated propensity score, and estimated weights to minimize the influence of potential confounders that we had identified prior to the analysis (**Supplementary Table 3**). We then used stabilized and truncated weights to re-weight the study sample using a 1% asymmetrical trim, to limit the effects of extreme weights on the study sample and performed weighting separately for the subgroup analysis by age group.

Using Cox regression models, we estimated unadjusted hazard ratios (HR) for the primary and secondary outcomes after propensity score weighting with exposure as the only predictor. Using multivariate Cox regression models, we then estimated the adjusted HRs, with any baseline variable with a standardized mean difference (SMD) of >0.1 after weighting included as a covariate. We considered the cohort to be well balanced if the difference in SMD between the comparison groups was <0.1.

To explore the possibility of residual confounding, we used a negative control. We evaluated the risk of COVID-19-related hospitalization within the first 7 days after vaccination and compared the cumulative incidence among the exposure groups during this immunization lag

period. This approach allows us to ensure that both groups are comparable before the cohort entry date (CED).

We calculated rVE as 100× (1−HR) for both unadjusted and adjusted estimates, with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI). To control inflation of type 1 error rate due to multiple testing (family wise error rate), we used a step-down testing procedure for secondary endpoints and the age subgroup analysis by adjusting the rejection criteria for each of the individually tested hypotheses.[41] We did statistical testing at a significance level of p=0.05 and stopped when a secondary endpoint did not reach statistical significance.

All statistical analyses were performed using SAS 9.4 or R Statistical Software (v4.1.3)[42] *survival* (v3.2-13).

Sensitivity analyses

We performed two sensitivity analyses. First, since the main analyses were conducted on closed claims, we compared open versus closed claims. For patients with open claims, follow-up was concluded at the end of data availability. The analysis utilized the last evidence of database activity (EHR or claims) as the endpoint for follow-up (see **Supplementary Materials** for further details).

Additionally, we performed sensitivity analyses using a cohort entry date of 14 days after vaccination (index date) instead of 7 days as specified in the main closed claims analysis.

Results

We had records available for 8,929,450 individuals who had received a bivalent mRNA vaccine within the study timeframe (**Figure 2**). Of these, 2,748,358 individuals were eligible for inclusion in the pre-weight cohort, with 1,049,575 in the mRNA-1273.222 group and 1,698,783 in the BNT162b2 Bivalent group. After weighting a total of 1,034,538 and 1,670,666 were included in the mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent groups respectively (**Table 1**). After weighting, key baseline demographic variables were broadly similar between the two groups: mean age was 58–59 years across groups, 58% were women, and 40% were white (where race was available). The majority (95%) of individuals in both groups had received the bivalent vaccine between September and December 2022 (**Supplementary Figure 1**). Median duration of follow-up was 108 and 107 days for mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccines, respectively (**Table 1**). Overall, 69.5% of individuals vaccinated with mRNA-1273.222 and 68.2 % of individuals vaccinated with BNT162b2 Bivalent had underlying medical conditions. As expected, we found a nearly identical hospitalization risk pattern in the evaluation of the negative control for both vaccines, with a p-value of 0.46, indicating that the groups were well balanced. (**Supplementary Figure 2**). Baseline characteristics of the age subgroups are provided in **Supplementary Tables 4 and 5**.

Relative vaccine effectiveness for the overall study population and by age group

Overall, 1,032 (0.10%) individuals who had received mRNA-1273.222 and 1,855 (0.11%) who had received BNT162b2 Bivalent were hospitalized for COVID-19. Of these, 91.2% and 92.5% were ≥50 years of age, and 71.6% and 74.5% were ≥65 years of age at the index date for the two vaccines, respectively. Over three-quarters reported no previous documented

COVID-19 infection (78.2% and 76.2% for mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccines, respectively), and 49.0% and 47.0% had last received a monovalent COVID-19 vaccine >180 days previously, for the two groups, respectively. The most common underlying medical conditions with increased risk for severe COVID-19 outcomes in hospitalized patients were cancer (mRNA-1273.222: 42.3%; BNT162b2 Bivalent: 44.6%), heart conditions (46.6%; 49.0%), and diabetes (40.4%; 44.0%) (**Supplementary Table 6**).

The rVE against COVID-19-related hospitalizations was 9.8% (95% CI: 2.6%–16.4%; p=0.008) for mRNA-1273.222 compared with BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccines across the entire study population. Differences between vaccines were evident within the first few weeks and persisted over the 6 months after vaccination (**Supplementary Figure 3**). As cohorts were well matched after inverse probability of treatment weighting, no covariates were included in the multivariable models for the overall population; therefore, estimates for both unadjusted and adjusted rVE are equal. Estimates of rVE against COVID-19-related outpatient visits were 5.1% (95% CI: 3.2%– 6.9%; p<0.001) for mRNA-1273.222 compared with the BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine (**Table 2**).

As the study met both primary and secondary endpoints for the overall population, subgroup analysis was performed by age group. rVE against both COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits increased with increasing age, with adjusted rVE against the two outcomes at 11.0% (95% CI: 3.7%–17.7%; p=0.004) and 7.3% (5.3%–9.3%; p<0.0001) for hospitalizations and outpatient visits, respectively, in the aged ≥50 years subgroup, and 13.5% (95% CI: 5.5%–20.8%; p=0.001) and 10.7% (8.2%–13.1%; p<0.0001) in the aged ≥65 years subgroup, respectively (**Table 3**).

Sensitivity analyses

Point estimates of rVE from evaluation of open claims were similar to those seen in the closed claims analysis (n=3,065,980 for mRNA-1273.222 and n=4,703,189 for BNT162b2 Bivalent): 12.9% (95% CI: 9.1%–16.4%) and 5.8% (4.7%–6.9%), against COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits, respectively (**Table 3**).

In addition, extending the time between vaccination (index date) and cohort entry date from 7 to 14 days in the closed claims analysis resulted in rVE estimates of 10.6% (95% CI: 3.1%–17.5%) and 4.6% (2.6%–6.5%) against COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits, respectively (**Table 3**).

Discussion

This is the first study that directly evaluates the relative vaccine effectiveness of bivalent mRNA vaccines containing the ancestral (original) and omicron BA.4/BA.5 strains in prevention of COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits. In this retrospective analysis of real- world data on more than 2.5 million vaccinated individuals, mRNA-1273.222, bivalent vaccine (Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) appears significantly more effective than BNT162b2 bivalent vaccine (Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) in preventing COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits in adults. The rVE against both hospitalizations and outpatient visits increased with increasing age. This is particularly important given the disproportionate burden of COVID-19 related morbidity and mortality in older adults.

The results of this study echo those observed following analysis of the primary series and monovalent booster in the same data-set.[32] Similar to the current study, incremental benefits in rVE against hospitalizations were observed following the monovalent booster with

increasing age, with rVE of 40% (95% CI: 11%–60%) in adults ≥65 years and 12% (0%–30%) in 18 to 64 age group. Other studies have also shown increased effectiveness of mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 boosters against symptomatic infections and severe outcomes.[29,31] In a matched cohort study comparing the effectiveness of a single monovalent booster dose of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 using the OpenSAFELY-TPP research platform in the UK, the hazard ratio of risk of hospital admission at 20 weeks post-booster was 0.89 (95% CI: 0.82 to 0.95), indicating a modest benefit of mRNA-1273.[29] In a similar matched cohort study of US Veterans, risks of 16-week COVID-19 outcomes were also lower for mRNA-1273 compared with BNT162b2 monovalent booster, with an excess number of COVID-19 hospitalization events over the 16-week post-booster period of 10.6 (95% CI: 5.1–19.7) for BNT162b2 compared with mRNA-1273.[31] Moreover, while there was no formal comparison between the vaccines, a study evaluating the effectiveness of bivalent vaccines containing any omicron subvariant also showed higher effectiveness of mRNA-1273.222 versus BNT162b2 Bivalent against infection. However, other outcomes were not evaluated in this study.[43]

The observed differences in effectiveness between the mRNA bivalent vaccines, particularly in older adults, may be explained at least in part by differences in vaccine humoral and T cell immunity. In terms of humoral immunity, Al-Sadeq et al., have shown that mRNA-1273 induces a significantly greater antibody immune response compared with the BNT162b2 vaccine.[44] Others have shown that this difference is consistent against different variants of concern, persisting even 6-8 months following vaccination.[45-48] Moreover, a greater and more durable immune response with mRNA-1273 compared with BNT162b2 has been demonstrated among older adults. Studies have shown that age is negatively correlated with antibody levels in participants who were vaccinated with BNT162b2 but not among mRNA-1273 vaccinees. Vaccination with mRNA-1273 induced higher antibody levels with a

corresponding lower waning rate that was not age-dependent, as opposed to the BNT162b2 cohort in which older individuals generate lower antibody levels with a higher waning ratio when compared to young adults.[46,49]

Antibodies that can rapidly opsonize pathogens and drive pathogen clearance via opsinophagocytosis or killing are key to protection against many other respiratory pathogens, such as *Streptococcus pneumonia*.[50] Thus, in addition to neutralizing antibodies, antibodies that bind to viral proteins may also contribute to the immune control of infection through the increased clearance of free virus or by targeting infected cells for immune clearance.[51] Indeed, there is emerging evidence describing functional antibody differences, beyond neutralization, between the vaccines that may account for differential mucosal protection. Kaplonek et al evaluated differences in antibody levels and pathogen-killing functions across the two mRNA vaccines. In this study, mRNA-1273 induced more opsonophagocytic and cytotoxic antibodies compared to BNT162b2 that may be important in the rapid capture and clearance of the virus from the mucosal tract.[52] Furthermore, following, mRNA-1273 vaccination higher levels of IgA were measure systemically compared to BNT162b2 which may be important for mucosal protection aiding the immune response even when new viral variants may emerge that subvert the neutralizing antibody response.[53] Along these lines, systemic vaccine induced IgA levels have been identified as a strong correlate of protection against viral breakthrough following boosting in the setting of high neutralizing antibody responses.[54]

In addition to the humoral response, several studies have shown that mRNA-1273 vaccination elicited more robust and long-term T-cells responses compared with BNT162b2.[55-58] Notably, Zhang et al. found that memory CD4+ T cell frequencies were significantly lower following immunization with BNT162b2 compared with mRNA-1273 (between 1.8- and 2.6-fold lower) measured over 6 months.[56] The enhanced functional

humoral immune response and T-cell immunity observed following vaccination with mRNA-1273 may contribute to the differences in effectiveness observed, especially in the older age groups who often have lower responses to immunization in part related to immunosenescence.[59,60]

In this study, we used real-world data from two integrated sources. Utilization of a comprehensive real-world dataset that integrates various sources of patient information enables the assessment of effectiveness outcomes that are typically not examined in randomized trials. It also facilitates the estimation of effects with robust statistical power. Relying solely on claims data or electronic health records data in many cases cannot offer a complete, accurate, and timely understanding of an individual's health status. However, combining integrated databases that link both EHR and claims data can provide a well-rounded perspective on an individual's health status and utilization of health care services.[61] Moreover, the richness and comprehensiveness of the data in this study allowed the adjustment of well-established confounders using robust confounder adjustment methodology. The information on exposure, outcome, and covariates was retrospectively collected from patient records in a consistent manner across all exposure cohorts, reducing the likelihood of differential misclassification of these elements. By employing EHRs linked to claims data to determine exposure status, the chances of exposure misclassification were minimized as specific product codes were used to identify vaccination status based on the type of vaccine. The conclusions from the main analysis were confirmed by planned sensitivity analyses.

As with all observational or quasi-experimental studies, it also has limitations. First, in this study, we did not evaluate long-term vaccine effectiveness. Our follow-up period for the study was relatively short, with a maximum of 6 months post-booster until the data cut-off. Given the differences in antibody waning and durability observed in immunogenicity studies

of earlier vaccine formulations.[17,45,62], it might be that rVE becomes more pronounced over a longer follow-up period. Future analysis, including longer follow-up periods, could provide a broader overview of long-term comparative vaccine performance and help guide decision-making on the optimal interval. In Addition, the current primary analysis was restricted to closed claims, which provide a comprehensive overview of a patient's healthcare interactions but may not capture all the cases and can be limited in terms of the sample size. However, sensitivity analysis performed on the open claims database supported the findings from the closed claims database. Furthermore, in this study, we included only individuals who had consulted healthcare providers during the previous 365 days, which excluded healthy individuals who received a vaccine but did not use healthcare services during the year prior to receipt, which can also limit our sample size or bias towards more at-risk population. Older adults and those with underlying chronic health conditions, who have an increased risk of more severe COVID-19 outcomes are more likely than average healthy adults to utilize healthcare services[63]. Thus, while our results may not be representative of a population of healthy individuals, they include the most vulnerable population. Finally, the results of the study should be interpreted within the context of its retrospective nature. As with the previous analysis on the primary series and monovalent booster,[32] there may have been differences between the two vaccine groups that were not fully accounted for by the pre-defined covariates and thereby confounded rVE estimates. It is possible that individuals with greater risk for COVID-19-related severe outcomes were vaccinated with BNT162b2 Bivalent compared to mRNA-1273.222 due to its earlier availability. While this could introduce some residual bias, we do not believe that it is a significant concern. Our negative control test results demonstrated no difference between the groups in term of hospitalizations, suggesting that patient behavior bias may not have influenced our findings. Additionally, the propensity

scoring analysis ensured the groups were well-balanced in terms of known comorbidities, reducing the likelihood of differences in patient behavior based on risk factors.

In summary, both bivalent vaccines have been shown to provide substantial protection against both COVID-19-related hospitalizations and outpatient visits. Here we report that the mRNA-1273.222 vaccine (Moderna Bivalent, Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) provided greater protection against hospitalizations and outpatient visits compared with BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine (Pfizer-BioNTech Bivalent, Original/ Omicron BA.4/BA.5) during a period of omicron BA.4/BA.5 transmission predominance. The results of this study can help guide decision-makers and raise the need to evaluate vaccine differences of current and future formulations to ensure optimized protection against continually emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants and subvariants.

Funding: This work was supported by Moderna Inc.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following individuals for their contribution:

Editorial assistance was provided by Dr Jenny Engelmoer (Sula Communications BV)

Conflicts of interest

Although not remunerated for work on this study, SHV has received a prior speaker honorarium from Moderna, Inc.

SG received honorarium or consulted for Moderna, Pfizer, Seqirus, GlaxoSmithKline, Novavax, Janssen, Vaxart, Icosavax, and Reviral. Grants from Pfizer, Sanofi, Genentech, CDC, NIH.

HK, DE, DM, AR, NVV and JAM are employees of Moderna, Inc. and may hold stock/stock options in the company.

AB, NZ, IW, and MB work for Veradigm, VHN, CB, and TD are employees of VHN Consulting. Both companies were contracted by Moderna and received fees for data management and statistical analyses.

Data Availability Statement

Individual-level data reported in this study are not publicly shared. Upon request, and subject to review, Veradigm may provide the de-identified aggregate-level data that support the findings of this study. Deidentified data (including participant data as applicable) may be shared upon approval of an analysis proposal and a signed data access agreement. Individual-level data reported in this study shared fully with regulatory agencies.

References

1. Andersson NW, Thiesson EM, Baum U, et al. Comparative effectiveness of the bivalent BA.4-5 and BA.1 mRNA-booster vaccines in the Nordic countries. *medRxiv* 2023: 2023.01.19.23284764.
2. Mohammed H, Pham-Tran DD, Yeoh ZYM, et al. A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis on the Real-World Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines against Infection, Symptomatic and Severe COVID-19 Disease Caused by the Omicron Variant (B.1.1.529). *Vaccines (Basel)* 2023; **11**(2).
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. ACIP Update to the Evidence to Recommendations for a 2nd COVID-19 Booster Dose in Adults Ages 50 Years and Older and Immunocompromised Individuals. 2022. https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/recs/grade/covid-19-second-booster-dose-etr.html (accessed 11 May 2023).
4. Bar-On YM, Goldberg Y, Mandel M, et al. Protection by a Fourth Dose of BNT162b2 against Omicron in Israel. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**(18): 1712-20.
5. Shrestha LB, Foster C, Rawlinson W, Tedla N, Bull RA. Evolution of the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variants BA.1 to BA.5: Implications for immune escape and transmission. *Rev Med Virol* 2022; **32**(5): e2381.
6. Tseng HF, Ackerson BK, Luo Y, et al. Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron and Delta variants. *Nat Med* 2022; **28**(5): 1063-71.
7. Buchan SA, Chung H, Brown KA, et al. Estimated Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines Against Omicron or Delta Symptomatic Infection and Severe Outcomes. *JAMA Network Open* 2022; **5**(9): e2232760-e.
8. Fabiani M, Mateo-Urdiales A, Sacco C, et al. Protection against severe COVID-19 after second booster dose of adapted bivalent (original/Omicron BA.4-5) mRNA vaccine in persons ≥60 years, by time since infection, Italy, 12 September to 11 December 2022. *Euro Surveill* 2023; **28**(8).
9. Link-Gelles R, Ciesla AA, Fleming-Dutra KE, et al. Effectiveness of Bivalent mRNA Vaccines in Preventing Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection - Increasing Community Access to Testing Program, United States, September-November 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(48): 1526-30.
10. Tenforde MW, Weber ZA, Natarajan K, et al. Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing COVID-19-Associated Emergency Department or Urgent Care Encounters and Hospitalizations Among Immunocompetent Adults - VISION Network, Nine States, September-November 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(5152): 1616-24.
11. Link-Gelles R, Ciesla AA, Roper LE, et al. Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Booster Dose Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection Attributable to Omicron BA.5- and XBB/XBB.1.5-Related Sublineages Among Immunocompetent Adults - Increasing Community Access to Testing Program, United States, December 2022-January 2023. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2023; **72**(5): 119-24.
12. Lin D-Y, Xu Y, Gu Y, et al. Effectiveness of Bivalent Boosters against Severe Omicron Infection. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2023; **388**(8): 764-6.
13. Gravenstein S, DeVone F, Oyebanji OA, et al. Durability of immunity and clinical protection in nursing home residents following bivalent SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. *medRxiv* 2023.
14. Chalkias S, Eder F, Essink B, et al. Safety, immunogenicity and antibody persistence of a bivalent Beta-containing booster vaccine against COVID-19: a phase 2/3 trial. *Nat Med* 2022; **28**(11): 2388-97.
15. Chalkias S, Harper C, Vrbicky K, et al. A Bivalent Omicron-Containing Booster Vaccine against Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **387**(14): 1279-91.
16. Hause AM, Marquez P, Zhang B, et al. Safety Monitoring of Bivalent COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine Booster Doses Among Persons Aged ≥12 Years - United States, August 31-October 23, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(44): 1401-6.
17. Tan NH, Geers D, Sablerolles RSG, et al. Immunogenicity of bivalent omicron (BA.1) booster vaccination after different priming regimens in health-care workers in the Netherlands (SWITCH ON):

results from the direct boost group of an open-label, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2023.
18. Winokur P, Gayed J, Fitz-Patrick D, et al. Bivalent Omicron BA.1-Adapted BNT162b2 Booster in Adults Older than 55 Years. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **388**(3): 214-27.
19. Surie D, DeCuir J, Zhu Y, et al. Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization Among Immunocompetent Adults Aged ≥65 Years - IVY Network, 18 States, September 8-November 30, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(5152): 1625-30.
20. Arbel R, Peretz A, Sergienko R, et al. Effectiveness of a bivalent mRNA vaccine booster dose to prevent severe COVID-19 outcomes: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2023.
21. El Sahly HM, Baden LR, Essink B, et al. Efficacy of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine at Completion of Blinded Phase. *N Engl J Med* 2021; **385**(19): 1774-85.
22. Wagenhäuser I, Reusch J, Gabel A, et al. Bivalent BNT162b2 mRNA original/omicron BA.4-5 booster vaccination: adverse reactions and inability to work compared with the monovalent COVID-19 booster. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2023; **29**(4): 554-6.
23. Us Food and Drug Administration. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Authorizes Moderna, Pfizer-BioNTech Bivalent COVID-19 Vaccines for Use as a Booster Dose. 2022. https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-authorizes-moderna-pfizer-biontech-bivalent-covid-19-vaccines-use (accessed 12 June 2023).
24. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Interim Clinical Considerations for Use of COVID-19 Vaccines in the United States. 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/clinical-considerations/interim-considerations-us.html (accessed 1 June 2023).
25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID Data Tracker. 2022. https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker (accessed 25 January 2023).
26. Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, et al. 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.
27. Sinclair AH, Taylor MK, Weitz JS, Beckett SJ, Samanez-Larkin GR. Reasons for Receiving or Not Receiving Bivalent COVID-19 Booster Vaccinations Among Adults - United States, November 1-December 10, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2023; **72**(3): 73-5.
28. Fisher JD, Fisher WA. An Information-Motivation-Behavioral Skills (IMB) Model of pandemic risk and prevention. *advancesin/psychology* 2023; **01**: 1-26.
29. Hulme WJ, Horne EMF, Parker EPK, et al. Comparative effectiveness of BNT162b2 versus mRNA-1273 covid-19 vaccine boosting in England: matched cohort study in OpenSAFELY-TPP. *Bmj* 2023; **380**: e072808.
30. Mayr FB, Talisa VB, Shaikh OS, Omer SB, Butt AA, Yende S. Comparative COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness Over Time in Veterans. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(7): ofac311.
31. Dickerman BA, Gerlovin H, Madenci AL, et al. Comparative effectiveness of third doses of mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccines in US veterans. *Nature Microbiology* 2023; **8**(1): 55-63.
32. Nguyen VH, Boileau C, Bogdanov A, et al. Relative effectiveness of BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, and Ad26.COV2.S vaccines and homologous boosting in preventing COVID-19 in adults in the US. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2023: ofad288.
33. Boikos C, McGovern I, Ortiz JR, Puig-Barberà J, Versage E, Haag M. Relative Vaccine Effectiveness of Adjuvanted Trivalent Influenza Vaccine over Three Consecutive Influenza Seasons in the United States. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022; **10**(9).
34. Imran M, Ortiz JR, McLean HQ, et al. Relative Effectiveness of Cell-based Versus Egg-based Quadrivalent Influenza Vaccines in Children and Adolescents in the United States During the 2019-2020 Influenza Season. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2022; **41**(9): 769-74.

35. Imran M, Puig-Barbera J, Ortiz JR, et al. Relative effectiveness of the cell-based quadrivalent influenza vaccine in preventing cardiorespiratory hospitalizations in subjects aged 18–64 years during the 2019–2020 US influenza season. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2023.
36. Imran M, Puig-Barbera J, Ortiz JR, et al. Relative Effectiveness of MF59 Adjuvanted Trivalent Influenza Vaccine vs Nonadjuvanted Vaccines During the 2019-2020 Influenza Season. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(5): ofac167.
37. Imran M, Ortiz JR, McLean HQ, et al. Relative Effectiveness of Cell-Based Versus Egg-Based Quadrivalent Influenza Vaccines in Adults During the 2019-2020 Influenza Season in the United States. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2022; **9**(10): ofac532.
38. Boikos C, Fischer L, O'Brien D, Vasey J, Sylvester GC, Mansi JA. Relative Effectiveness of the Cell-derived Inactivated Quadrivalent Influenza Vaccine Versus Egg-derived Inactivated Quadrivalent Influenza Vaccines in Preventing Influenza-related Medical Encounters During the 2018-2019 Influenza Season in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; **73**(3): e692-e8.
39. Boikos C, Fischer L, O'Brien D, Vasey J, Sylvester GC, Mansi JA. Relative Effectiveness of Adjuvanted Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine Versus Egg-derived Quadrivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccines and High-dose Trivalent Influenza Vaccine in Preventing Influenza-related Medical Encounters in US Adults ≥ 65 Years During the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 Influenza Seasons. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; **73**(5): 816-23.
40. Boikos C, Imran M, Nguyen VH, Ducruet T, Sylvester GC, Mansi JA. Effectiveness of the Cell-Derived Inactivated Quadrivalent Influenza Vaccine in Individuals at High Risk of Influenza Complications in the 2018-2019 United States Influenza Season. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2021; **8**(7): ofab167.
41. Holm S. A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* 1979; **6**(2): 65-70.
42. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020.
43. Lin DY, Xu Y, Gu Y, Zeng D, Sunny SK, Moore Z. Durability of Bivalent Boosters against Omicron Subvariants. *N Engl J Med* 2023; **388**(19): 1818-20.
44. Al-Sadeq DW, Shurrab FM, Ismail A, et al. Comparison of antibody immune responses between BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in naïve and previously infected individuals. *Journal of Travel Medicine* 2021; **28**(8): taab190.
45. Doornek T, Shao N, Burton P, Ceddia F, Fraile B. Antibody Response Following COVID-19 Boosters During the Omicron Wave in the United States: A Decentralized, Digital Health, Real-World Study. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.07.31.22278173.
46. Gil-Manso S, Alonso R, Catalán P, et al. IgG anti-RBD levels during 8-month follow-up post-vaccination with BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 vaccines in healthcare workers: A one-center study. *Front Cell Infect Microbiol* 2022; **12**: 1035155.
47. Markewitz R, Pauli D, Dargvainiene J, et al. B-cell responses to vaccination with BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 6 months after second dose. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2022; **28**(7): 1024.e1-.e6.
48. Moncunill G, Aguilar R, Ribes M, et al. Determinants of early antibody responses to COVID-19 mRNA vaccines in a cohort of exposed and naïve healthcare workers. *EBioMedicine* 2022; **75**: 103805.
49. Prather AA, Dutcher EG, Robinson J, et al. Predictors of long-term neutralizing antibody titers following COVID-19 vaccination by three vaccine types: the BOOST study. *Sci Rep* 2023; **13**(1): 6505.
50. LaFon DC, Nahm MH. Measuring immune responses to pneumococcal vaccines. *J Immunol Methods* 2018; **461**: 37-43.
51. Schäfer A, Muecksch F, Lorenzi JCC, et al. Antibody potency, effector function, and combinations in protection and therapy for SARS-CoV-2 infection in vivo. *J Exp Med* 2021; **218**(3).
52. Kaplonek P, Deng Y, Shih-Lu Lee J, et al. Hybrid immunity expands the functional humoral footprint of both mRNA and vector-based SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. *Cell Rep Med* 2023; **4**(5): 101048.

53. Kaplonek P, Cizmeci D, Fischinger S, et al. mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines elicit antibodies with differences in Fc-mediated effector functions. *Sci Transl Med* 2022; **14**(645): eabm2311.
54. Tomer H, Shlomia L, Daniel O, et al. Correlates of protection for booster doses of the BNT162b2 vaccine. *medRxiv* 2022: 2022.07.16.22277626.
55. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Geers D, Schmitz KS, et al. Divergent SARS-CoV-2 Omicron–reactive T and B cell responses in COVID-19 vaccine recipients. *Science Immunology* 2022; **7**(69): eabo2202.
56. Zhang Z, Mateus J, Coelho CH, et al. Humoral and cellular immune memory to four COVID-19 vaccines. *Cell* 2022; **185**(14): 2434-51.e17.
57. Ben Ahmed M, Bellali H, Gdoura M, et al. Humoral and Cellular Immunogenicity of Six Different Vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 in Adults: A Comparative Study in Tunisia (North Africa). *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022; **10**(8).
58. Gallagher KME, Leick MB, Larson RC, et al. Differential T-Cell Immunity to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in mRNA-1273- and BNT162b2-Vaccinated Individuals. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* 2022; **75**(1): e869-e73.
59. Ciabattini A, Nardini C, Santoro F, Garagnani P, Franceschi C, Medaglini D. Vaccination in the elderly: The challenge of immune changes with aging. *Semin Immunol* 2018; **40**: 83-94.
60. Liang CK, Lee WJ, Peng LN, Meng LC, Hsiao FY, Chen LK. COVID-19 Vaccines in Older Adults: Challenges in Vaccine Development and Policy Making. *Clin Geriatr Med* 2022; **38**(3): 605-20.
61. Boikos C, Imran M, De Lusignan S, Ortiz JR, Patriarca PA, Mansi JA. Integrating Electronic Medical Records and Claims Data for Influenza Vaccine Research. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022; **10**(5).
62. Naranbhai V, Garcia-Beltran WF, Chang CC, et al. Comparative Immunogenicity and Effectiveness of mRNA-1273, BNT162b2, and Ad26.COV2.S COVID-19 Vaccines. *J Infect Dis* 2022; **225**(7): 1141-50.
63. Bernstein AB HE, Moss AJ, Allen KF, Siller AB, Tiggle RB. Health care in America: Trends in utilization. Hyattsville, Maryland: National Center for Health Statistics; 2003.

Table 1. Key baseline characteristics of patients included in the mRNA-1273.222 and BNT162b2 Bivalent vaccine groups (pre- and post-weighting).

		Pre-weighting			Post-weighting		
		mRNA-1273.222	**BNT162b2 Bivalent**	**SMD**	**mRNA-1273.222**	**BNT162b2 Bivalent**	**SMD**
Number of patients		1,049,575	1,698,783		1,034,538	1,670,666	
Age at index, mean (SD)		60 (16.3)	58 (16.9)	0.1091	59 (16.5)	58 (16.7)	0.0238
Sex	Female	604,099 (57.6)	989,261 (58.2)	0.0137	598,134 (57.8)	969,767 (58.0)	0.0047
	Male	445,476 (42.4)	709,522 (41.8)		436,404 (42.2)	700,899 (42.0)	
Race	Black	41,438 (3.9)	71,545 (4.2)	0.0242	41,695 (4.0)	68,926 (4.1)	0.0064
	Other	43,292 (4.1)	72,004 (4.2)		43,444 (4.2)	70,448 (4.2)	
	White	425,675 (40.6)	670,704 (39.5)		413,323 (40.0)	663,768 (39.7)	
	Unknown	539,170 (51.4)	884,530 (52.1)		536,076 (51.8)	867,524 (51.9)	
Ethnicity	Hispanic	38,672 (3.7)	66,301 (3.9)	0.0140	39,044 (3.8)	64,185 (3.8)	0.0046
	Non-Hispanic	852,545 (81.2)	1,371,939 (80.8)		838,544 (81.1)	1,351,443 (80.9)	
	Unknown	158,358 (15.1)	260,543 (15.3)		156,950 (15.2)	255,038 (15.3)	
Region	Midwest	201,029 (19.2)	373,067 (22.0)	0.0760	210,897 (20.4)	354,455 (21.2)	0.021
	Northeast	272,159 (25.9)	437,311 (25.7)		268,924 (26.0)	432,274 (25.9)	
	South	314,939 (30.0)	470,675 (27.7)		296,959 (28.7)	471,340 (28.2)	
	West	196,278 (18.7)	315,809 (18.6)		194,309 (18.8)	311,409 (18.6)	
	Unknown	65,170 (6.2)	101,921 (6.0)		63,449 (6.1)	101,188 (6.1)	
Month of index	08-2022	12 (<0.1)	21 (<0.1)	0.0645	13 (<0.1)	21 (<0.1)	0.0206
	09-2022	252,601 (24.1)	453,304 (26.7)		259,247 (25.1)	433,404 (25.9)	
	10-2022	385,320 (36.7)	619,160 (36.4)		380,441 (36.8)	609,256 (36.5)	
	11-2022	230,341 (21.9)	351,626 (20.7)		221,444 (21.4)	351,191 (21.0)	
	12-2022	128,551 (12.2)	194,995 (11.5)		123,180 (11.9)	196,156 (11.7)	
	1-2023	42,133 (4)	63,853 (3.8)		40,173 (3.9)	64,422 (3.9)	
	2-2023	10,617 (1)	15,824 (0.9)		10,041 (1.0)	16,215 (1.0)	
Primary series COVID-19 vaccine	Heterologous	90,742 (8.6)	179,627 (10.6)	0.1652	102,076 (9.9)	169,119 (10.1)	0.0297
	Homologous	301,861 (28.8)	369,852 (21.8)		252,916 (24.4)	387,485 (23.2)	
	Not reported	656,972 (62.6)	1,149,304 (67.7)		679,546 (65.7)	1,114,062 (66.7)	
Time since last COVID-19 monovalent	≤90 days	15,489 (1.5)	18,482 (1.1)	0.2365	12,849 (1.2)	20,336 (1.2)	0.0440
	91–180 days	215,483 (20.5)	216,131 (12.7)		163,208 (15.8)	238,465 (14.3)	

vaccination	>180 days	614,126 (58.5)	1,029,498 (60.6)		622,635 (60.2)	1,015,967 (60.8)	
	Not reported	204,477 (19.5)	434,672 (25.6)		235,845 (22.8)	395,898 (23.7)	
Time since last COVID-19 infection	≤120 days	34,542 (3.3)	56,609 (3.3)	0.0219	34,348 (3.3)	55,608 (3.3)	0.0059
	121–180 days	19,610 (1.9)	31,653 (1.9)		19,479 (1.9)	31,327 (1.9)	
	>180 days	72,675 (6.9)	127,046 (7.5)		74,147 (7.2)	122,306 (7.3)	
	Not reported	922,748 (87.9)	1,483,475 (87.3)		906,564 (87.6)	1,461,425 (87.5)	
Follow-up duration, days, median (IQR)		106 (70–134)	108 (71–137)		108 (70–135)	107 (71–137)	
Underlying medical conditions	Asthma	89,784 (8.6)	146,786 (8.6)	0.0031	88,608 (8.6)	143,799 (8.6)	0.0015
	Cancer	331,893 (31.6)	507,975 (29.9)	0.0373	317,902 (30.7)	506,655 (30.3)	0.0087
	Cerebrovascular disease	57,932 (5.5)	89,250 (5.3)	0.0118	55,150 (5.3)	88,816 (5.3)	0.0007
	Chronic lung disease	82,755 (7.9)	126,674 (7.5)	0.0161	78,570 (7.6)	126,028 (7.5)	0.0019
	Chronic liver disease	11,770 (1.1)	18,988 (1.1)	0.0003	11,499 (1.1)	18,673 (1.1)	0.0006
	CKD	90,134 (8.6)	138,166 (8.1)	0.0164	85,505 (8.3)	137,539 (8.2)	0.0012
	Cystic fibrosis	235 (<0.1)	343 (<0.1)	0.0015	217 (<0.1)	342 (<0.1)	0.0004
	Diabetes type 1 or 2	210,600 (20.1)	325,656 (19.2)	0.0225	201,683 (19.5)	323,800 (19.4)	0.0029
	Disability	69,181 (6.6)	117,573 (6.9)	0.0131	69,582 (6.7)	114,107 (6.8)	0.0041
	Heart conditions	145,354 (13.8)	220,523 (13.0)	0.0255	137,513 (13.3)	220,348 (13.2)	0.0030
	HIV	5,471 (0.5)	8,770 (0.5)	0.0007	5,397 (0.5)	8,639 (0.5)	0.0006
	Mental health disorders	166,566 (15.9)	284,385 (16.7)	0.0236	167,713 (16.2)	275,635 (16.5)	0.0078
	Neurological conditions	21,962 (2.1)	39,359 (2.3)	0.0153	22,279 (2.2)	37,628 (2.3)	0.0067
	Obesity	210,605 (20.1)	339,268 (20.0)	0.0024	206,336 (19.9)	333,651 (20.0)	0.0007
	Primary immunodeficiencies	69,102 (6.6)	107,213 (6.3)	0.0111	66,569 (6.4)	106,563 (6.4)	0.0023
	Pregnancy[a]	2,861 (0.3)	5,465 (0.3)	0.0090	3,109 (0.3)	5,160 (0.3)	0.0015
	Physical inactivity	975 (0.1)	1,608 (0.1)	0.0006	962 (<0.1)	1,566 (<0.1)	0.0003
	Smoking[b]	125,869 (12)	202,673 (11.9)	0.0019	122,902 (11.9)	199,274 (11.9)	0.0015
	Solid organ or hematopoietic stem cell transplant	9,038 (0.9)	14,493 (0.9)	0.0009	8,727 (0.8)	14,231 (0.9)	0.0009
	Tuberculosis	325 (<0.1)	537 (<0.1)	0.0004	323 (<0.1)	523 (<0.1)	0.0001
	Use of immunosuppressants	54,552 (5.2)	84,577 (5.0)	0.0100	52,537 (5.1)	84,130 (5.0)	0.0019

Data are presented as n (%) unless otherwise stated

CKD, chronic kidney disease; IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation; SMD, standardized mean difference

[a]Includes recent pregnancy

[b]Includes current and former smokers

Table 2. Unadjusted and adjusted rVE for the bivalent vaccines (Original/Omicron BA.4/BA.5), mRNA-1273.222 versus BNT162b2 Bivalent for the overall study population.

COVID-19-related outcome	Unadjusted rVE	Adjusted rVE	P value[a]
Hospitalization	9.8% (2.6% – 16.4%)	9.8% (2.6% – 16.4%)	0.008
Outpatient	5.1% (3.2% – 6.9%)	5.1% (3.2% – 6.9%)	<0.0001

rVE, relative vaccine effectiveness

[a]Associated p values are given for the adjusted rVE, with secondary outcomes adjusted for multiple testing.

Table 3. Unadjusted and adjusted rVE for the bivalent vaccines (Original/Omicron BA.4/BA.5), mRNA-1273.222 versus BNT162b2 Bivalent for the subgroups and sensitivity outcomes.

COVID-19-related Outcome	Unadjusted rVE	Adjusted rVE	P value[a]
Subgroup analysis by age			
≥50 years			
Hospitalization	11.0% (3.7% – 17.7%)	11.0% (3.7% – 17.7%)	0.004
Outpatient	7.3% (5.3% – 9.3%)	7.3% (5.3% – 9.3%)	<0.0001
≥65 years			
Hospitalization	13.5% (5.5% – 20.8%)	13.5% (5.5% – 20.8%)	0.001
Outpatient	10.7% (8.2% – 13.1%)	10.7% (8.2% – 13.1%)	<0.0001
Sensitivity analysis			
Open claims			
Hospitalization	12.9% (9.1% – 16.4%)	12.9% (9.1% – 16.4%)	<0.0001
Outpatient	5.8% (4.7% – 6.9%)	5.8% (4.7% – 6.9%)	<0.0001
Cohort entry date 14 days post-vaccination closed claims			
Hospitalization	10.6% (3.1% – 17.5%)	10.6% (3.1% – 17.5%)	0.006
Outpatient	4.6% (2.6% – 6.5%)	4.6% (2.6% – 6.5%)	<0.0001

rVE, relative vaccine effectiveness

[a]Associated p values are given for the adjusted rVE, with secondary outcomes adjusted for multiple testing.

Figure 1. Study design



CED, cohort entry date; EHR, electronic health record.

Figure 2. Selection of study populations: bivalent vaccine recipients for inclusion in the analysis



Note: exclusion criteria were evaluated in a step-wise fashion, summing to the total excluded.