

1 **Sex and gender differences in adverse events following receipt of influenza and**
2 **COVID-19 vaccination among healthcare workers**

3
4 Anna Yin¹, Nadia Wang², Patrick J. Shea¹, Erica N. Rosser³, Helen Kuo³, Janna R.
5 Shapiro¹, Katherine Z.J. Fenstermacher⁴, Andrew Pekosz^{1,4}, Richard E. Rothman⁴,
6 Sabra L. Klein¹, and Rosemary Morgan³

7
8 ¹W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns
9 Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA.

10 ²Department of Population, Family, and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg
11 School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA.

12 ³Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
13 Baltimore, MD, USA.

14 ⁴Department of Emergency Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA.

15

16 **Keywords**

17 Birth control, COVID-19 mRNA vaccine, seasonal influenza vaccine, reactogenicity,
18 vaccine hesitancy

19 **Corresponding author contact**

20 Sabra L. Klein (sklein2@jhu.edu) and Rosemary Morgan (rosemary.morgan@jhu.edu)

21 **ABSTRACT**

22 **Introduction:** Active and passive surveillance studies have found that a greater
23 proportion of females report adverse events (AE) following receipt of either the COVID-
24 19 or seasonal influenza vaccine compared to males. We sought to determine the
25 intersection of biological sex and sociocultural gender differences in prospective active
26 reporting of vaccine outcomes, which remains poorly characterized.

27 **Methods:** This cohort study enrolled Johns Hopkins Health System healthcare workers
28 (HCWs) who were recruited from the annual fall 2019-2022 influenza vaccine and the
29 fall 2022 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine campaigns. Vaccine recipients were enrolled the
30 day of vaccination and AE surveys were administered two days post-vaccination (DPV)
31 for bivalent COVID-19 and Influenza vaccine recipients. Data were collected regarding
32 the presence of a series of solicited local and systemic AEs. Open-ended answers
33 about participants' experiences with AEs also were collected for the COVID-19 vaccine
34 recipients.

35 **Results:** Females were more likely to report local AEs after influenza (OR=2.28,
36 $p=0.001$) or COVID-19 (OR=2.57, $p=0.008$) vaccination compared to males, regardless
37 of age or race. Males and females had comparable probabilities of reporting systemic
38 AEs after influenza (OR=1.18, $p=0.552$) or COVID-19 (OR=0.96, $p=0.907$) vaccination.
39 Exogenous hormones from birth control use did not impact the rates of reported AEs
40 following COVID-19 vaccination among reproductive-aged female HCWs. Women
41 reported more interruptions in their daily routine following COVID-19 vaccination than
42 men and were more likely to seek out self-treatment. More women than men scheduled
43 their COVID-19 vaccination before their days off in anticipation of AEs.

44 **Conclusions:** Our findings highlight the need for sex- and gender-inclusive policies to
45 inform more effective occupational health vaccination strategies. Further research is
46 needed to evaluate the potential disruption of AEs on occupational responsibilities
47 following mandated vaccination for healthcare workers and to more fully characterize
48 the post-vaccination behavioral differences between men and women.

49 50 **KEY MESSAGE**

51 **What is already known on this topic**

- 52 ⇒ Among diversely aged adults 18-64 years, females report more AEs to vaccines,
53 including the influenza and COVID-19 vaccines, than males.
- 54 ⇒ Vaccine AEs play a role in shaping vaccine hesitancy and uptake.
- 55 ⇒ Vaccine uptake related to influenza and COVID-19 are higher among men than
56 women.
- 57 ⇒ Research that addresses both the sex and gender disparities of vaccine
58 outcomes and behaviors is lacking.

59 **What this study adds**

- 60 ⇒ This prospective active reporting study uses both quantitative and qualitative
61 survey data to examine sex and gender differences in AEs following influenza or
62 COVID-19 vaccination among a cohort of reproductive-aged healthcare workers.

63 **How this study might affect research, practice, or policy**

64

65 ⇒ Sex and gender differences in AEs and perceptions relating to vaccination should
66 drive the development of more equitable and effective vaccine strategies and
67 policies in occupational health settings.
68

69 INTRODUCTION

70 Females report more adverse events (AEs) than males to many vaccines, including the
71 influenza[1-3] and COVID-19[1-5] vaccines. These differences have been attributed to
72 biological differences between males and females (e.g., sex steroid effects on
73 inflammatory immune responses) as well as gender differences (e.g., the socio-cultural
74 differences between men and women), including gender reporting bias[2 ,4-10], with
75 few studies considering both sex and gender facets in the same study population[2].
76 AEs occur when the body mounts an immune response to the vaccine antigen,
77 increasing secretion of inflammatory cytokines and recruitment of immune cells to the
78 injection site, which can also enter the bloodstream and lead to more systemic AEs,
79 such as fever, malaise, and fatigue[11]. Sex steroid hormones (e.g., estrogens,
80 androgens, and progesterone) and their receptors have been hypothesized as critical
81 regulators of immune cell responses that cause differential cytokine secretion between
82 males and females[10 ,12-15]. In response to infection and vaccination, females have
83 been shown to have greater immune activation, higher production of antibodies, and
84 increased T cell activation, possibly making them more likely to experience AEs
85 compared to males[5 ,10 ,12 ,14 ,16 ,17].
86

87 Beyond the physical impacts of AEs, experiences with AEs following vaccination can
88 influence vaccine attitudes and patterns of uptake[18 ,19]. The World Health
89 Organization lists vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten threats to global health[20].
90 Vaccine hesitancy related to influenza and COVID-19 is higher among women than men,
91 which has been hypothesized to be due to the increased likelihood of AEs in females
92 than males[21-25]. Men consistently have higher influenza vaccine acceptance than
93 women, with White men often having less hesitancy than either Black or White women
94 or Black men[26-28]. Similarly, male healthcare workers (HCWs) have also been found
95 to have lower COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy with higher vaccine uptake than women[29-
96 32].
97

98 In the United States, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommends annual
99 influenza vaccination for anyone aged 6 months or older[33]. Among HCWs, many
100 employment or state laws require receipt of annual influenza vaccination to slow
101 disease transmission between providers and patients[34]. During the COVID-19
102 pandemic, COVID-19 vaccination was nationally mandated for HCWs as terms of
103 employment[35]. Despite SARS-CoV-2 becoming endemic with consistent spread and
104 mutations noted[36 ,37], COVID-19 vaccination requirements were terminated for
105 HCWs when federal legislation lifted the public health emergency in May 2023[35];
106 those policy changes have and are anticipated to significantly impact future vaccine
107 uptake. During the COVID-19 pandemic, we conducted a cohort study through the
108 Johns Hopkins Health System to explore sex and gender differences in active, self-
109 reported AEs following both seasonal quadrivalent influenza and bivalent COVID-19
110 vaccines. We further explored AEs by race/ethnicity and age among the influenza and

111 COVID-19 vaccine recipients. Gender-related responses were collected with open-
112 ended questions about AEs after receipt of the COVID-19 vaccine among women and
113 men. Our goal was to provide a thorough assessment of sex and gender differences in
114 AE reporting among HCWs to improve policies and messaging around mandatory
115 vaccine programs.

116

117 **METHODS**

118 **Study design and participants**

119 Our study involved two separate survey-based cohorts of human participants, which
120 were approved by the Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Boards (IRB00259171,
121 IRB00091667). Consent was obtained for all participants as part of the enrollment
122 process. Influenza vaccination has been a long-standing requirement at Johns Hopkins
123 for anyone working directly with patients or in a clinical setting; additionally, during the
124 pandemic from 2020-2022, a policy requiring the same workers to receive COVID-19
125 vaccination was established. Reproductive-aged adult (18-49) HCWs of the Johns
126 Hopkins Health System (JHHS) receiving the inactivated quadrivalent influenza vaccine
127 were considered eligible. Adult (≥ 18) HCWs receiving the 2022 Pfizer-BioNTech
128 ancestral/Omicron BA.5 bivalent COVID-19 vaccine were also considered eligible.
129 Influenza vaccine AE data was collected as part of a larger study designed to compare
130 immunological vaccine responses by sex with equal sample sizes of females and males
131 enrolled. HCWs were recruited by fliers, emails, and announcements about the annual
132 vaccination program and were enrolled upon receipt of the influenza vaccine at the
133 hospital. For the COVID-19 vaccine study, participants were recruited using flyers
134 distributed at the time of vaccination at key locations around the hospital.

135

136 **Data collection**

137 Annual influenza AE vaccination data were collected from September through October
138 of 2019-2022. COVID-19 vaccine AE data was collected from September through
139 October 2022. Influenza vaccine AE survey forms, provided as a hard copy at the time
140 of consent/enrollment, were to be completed within two days post-vaccination (DPV) by
141 participants and returned to study coordinators in-person at their next scheduled visit.
142 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine AE surveys were electronically administered and collected
143 via REDCap at two DPV for those who agreed to participate at the time of vaccination.
144 Participants' experience of local AEs at the site of injection (i.e., warmth, redness,
145 swelling, short-duration pain, long-duration pain, and itchiness), and systemic AEs (i.e.,
146 sweating, malaise, muscle aches, insomnia, headaches, fever, and chills) were
147 collected as yes/no answers and tallied by category. The level of inconvenience was
148 measured by multiple choice answers. Open-ended questions were included within the
149 COVID-19 vaccine study to explore reasons for vaccine uptake and responses to AEs.
150 All survey responses and demographics were self-reported by participants. Male and
151 female terminology was used to refer to biological differences. Man and woman
152 terminology was used to refer to gender differences in behaviors or outcomes.

153

154 **Quantitative statistical analysis**

155 Statistical analyses were performed using Stata 17.0 and GraphPad Prism. Any AE was
156 defined as having at least one local or systemic AE. Sex differences in the reporting of

157 AEs were analyzed using logistic regression models. Interaction terms were also
 158 included in the model to examine age, race/ethnicity, or hormonal birth control effects on
 159 the probabilities of AEs by sex. Probabilities were plotted along with 95% confidence
 160 intervals by sex. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

161
 162 **Qualitative analysis of open-ended questions within COVID-19 vaccine AE survey**

163 Open-ended questions regarding reasons for vaccine uptake, and response to AEs
 164 were analyzed using thematic analysis. Completed free-response answers from
 165 participants were explored and grouped into themes and responses from men and
 166 women were compared.

167
 168 **RESULTS**

169 **Participant characteristics**

170 A total of 300 influenza vaccines (n=50 for females and n=50 for males per year) were
 171 administered across the three years (2019-20, 2021-22, and 2022-23) with AE data
 172 available for 265 (88%) of the participants and missing for 35 (12%; **Table 1**). Of these,
 173 50.2% were female (n=133) and 49.8% male (n=132). The average age across the
 174 study years was 30.75 years. Participants were predominately White at 60.8% (n=160),
 175 followed by Asian at 19.4% (n=51), with 12.9% Black or African American (n=34). For
 176 the influenza cohort, 13.2% (n=35) identified as Hispanic or Latino.

177
 178 For the COVID-19 bivalent vaccine cohort, 212 HCWs enrolled and received
 179 vaccination with AE survey data missing for 16 (8%) and available for 196 (92%) of
 180 those participants, consisting of 76.5% (n=150) females and 23.5% (n=46) males (**Table**
 181 **1**). The average age was 38.4 years and the cohort predominately consisted of White
 182 participants at 64.8% (n=160) followed by Asian participants at 20.9% (n=41), and
 183 Black/African American participants at 8.7% (n=17).

184
 185 **Table 1. Study participant demographics**

Season	Influenza Vaccine Cohort				COVID-19 Vaccine Cohort
	2019-20	2021-22	2022-23	Total	2022-23
Sex, n (%)					
Male	45 (50.6%)	40 (45.45%)	47 (53.4%)	132 (49.8%)	46 (23.5%)
Female	44 (49.4%)	48 (54.55%)	41 (46.6%)	133 (50.2%)	150 (76.5%)
Ethnicity, n (%)					
Hispanic or Latino	15 (16.9%)	11 (12.5%)	9 (10.2%)	35 (13.2%)	n/a
Race, n (%)					
White	44 (50.6%)	67 (76.1%)	49 (55.7%)	160 (60.8%)	127 (64.8%)
Asian	15 (17.2%)	12 (13.6%)	24 (27.3%)	51 (19.4%)	41 (20.9%)

Black	16 (18.4%)	6 (6.8%)	12 (13.6%)	34 (12.9%)	17 (8.7%)
American Indian	2 (2.3%)	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (1.1%)	0 (0%)
Native Hawaiian	0 (0%)	2 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
Other	8 (9.2%)	0 (0%)	3 (3.4%)	11 (4.2%)	11 (5.6%)
Unknown	2 (2.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (0.8%)	0 (0%)
Age, mean (SD)	30.45 (6.9)	31.01 (6.7)	30.8 (7.6)	30.75 (7.0)	38.4 (12.3)
Any AE, n (%)	63 (71.8%)	55 (62.5%)	46 (52.3%)	164 (61.9%)	169 (86.2%)
Any local AE, n (%)	52 (58.4%)	41 (46.6%)	36 (40.9%)	129 (48.7%)	138 (70.4%)
Any systemic AE, n (%)	24 (27.0%)	26 (29.6%)	20 (22.7%)	70 (26.4%)	118 (60.2%)
Total	89 (33.6%)	88 (33.2%)	88 (33.2%)	265	196

186

187

188 **AEs were predominately localized and mild**

189 Among the 265 total influenza HCW recipients across the three years, 164 (62%)
 190 reported having at least one AE with 57% (n=94) having only local AEs, 21% (n=35)
 191 having only systemic AEs, and 21% (n=35) having both local and systemic AEs. Of the
 192 178 that responded to the question about level of inconvenience, the majority of
 193 recipients (n=142, 80%) did not experience any inconvenience when surveyed two DPV.
 194 Seventeen percent of HCWs (n=31) reported mild inconvenience where they were able
 195 to do 75-99% of their daily activities, 2% (n=4) reported moderate inconvenience where
 196 they were able to do 25-75% of their daily activities, and only 1% (n=1) reported severe
 197 inconvenience with capacity to do 0-25% of their daily activities.

198

199 Among the 196 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine recipients in 2022, 86% (n=169) of
 200 participants reported at least one AE. Of those, 30% reported only local AEs, 18%
 201 reported only systemic AEs, and 51% reported having both local and systemic AEs. The
 202 majority (53%, n=90) did not experience any inconvenience with their daily activities.
 203 Twenty-three percent reported mild inconvenience where they were able to do 75-99%
 204 of their daily activities. Eighteen percent of HCWs reported moderate inconvenience
 205 and were able to do 25-75% of their daily activities. Only 5% reported being severely
 206 inconvenienced with the ability to do 0-25% of their daily activities. Overall, these data
 207 suggest that experiencing mild AEs is common following vaccination with minimal
 208 impairment to daily activities.

209

210 **Females are more likely to report local AEs, regardless of age**

211 For the influenza vaccine cohort, logistic regression models (**Figure 1A**) for probabilities
 212 of reporting any AE, any local, or any systemic AE, adjusted for sex, demonstrated that
 213 age was not significantly associated with AE reporting. Inclusion of an age-by-sex
 214 interaction term in the models (**Figure 1A**) revealed that the effect of age on the
 215 probability of reporting any AE, any local AE or any systemic AE after influenza
 216 vaccination of HCWs did not vary by sex. The average age of our HCW cohorts

217 receiving the influenza vaccine (30.45 ± 6.9 , range: 21-49) was relatively young and
218 reproductive-aged (18-49).

219
220 Logistic regression models for probabilities of reporting any AE (at least one local or
221 systemic AE) among influenza vaccine recipients across all three seasons showed that
222 females had a significantly greater probability of reporting AEs compared to males
223 (OR=2.02, 95% CI: 1.2-3.4, $p=0.007$; **Figure 1B**). Females had a significantly greater
224 probability of reporting any local AE compared to males (OR=2.28, 95% CI: 1.4-3.7,
225 $p=0.001$; **Figure 1C**), whereas the probability of reporting any systemic AE was
226 comparable between males and females (OR=1.18, 95% CI: 0.68-2.0, $p=0.552$; **Figure**
227 **1D**).

228
229 For the COVID-19 vaccine cohort, logistic regression models (**Figure 2A**) also did not
230 find a significant association of age with the probabilities of reporting any AE, any local,
231 nor any systemic AE after adjusting for sex among the COVID-19 vaccine cohort. The
232 probability of reporting any AE, any local AE, or any systemic AE was similar across
233 ages for both male and female HCWs following bivalent COVID-19 vaccination (**Figure**
234 **2A**). The average age of our HCW cohort receiving the bivalent COVID-19 vaccine
235 (38.4 ± 12.3 ; range: 22-75) was relatively young with less than 25% of the participants
236 over 50 years-old. Taken together, these data suggest that age does not contribute to
237 the probability of reporting an AE, regardless of vaccine type.

238
239 There was no significant difference in the probability of reporting any AE following
240 bivalent COVID-19 vaccination between males and females (OR=2.14, 95% CI: 0.89-
241 5.1, $p=0.09$; **Figure 2B**). Female HCWs, however, had a significantly greater probability
242 of reporting any local AE compared to males (OR=2.57, 95% CI: 1.3-5.2, $p=0.008$;
243 **Figure 2C**). Systemic AEs were similarly reported by males and females (OR=0.96, 95%
244 CI: 0.49-1.9, $p=0.907$; **Figure 2D**).

245 246 **Sex differences of AEs are consistent across race categories in response to the** 247 **influenza vaccination**

248 Among the influenza vaccine HCW cohort, there were more females than males among
249 those identifying as White ($n=84$, 52.5% females; $n=76$, 47.5% males) or Black ($n=21$,
250 61.8% females; $n=13$, 38.2% males; **Figure 3A**). For those identifying as Asian ($n=22$,
251 43.1% females; $n=29$, 56.9% males) or other ($n=5$, 27.8% females; $n=13$, 72.2% males),
252 there were more males than females (**Figure 3A**). The logistic regression model for the
253 probability of any AE with an interaction term for race and sex, adjusted for age,
254 revealed that regardless of race, females consistently had greater probabilities of
255 reporting any AE compared to males (**Figure 3B**). The interaction model did not show
256 statically significant differences for reporting of any AE between males and females
257 across race categories except for Black/African Americans, likely due to smaller sample
258 sizes (**Figure 3A-B**). The probability of reporting any local AE consistently had a female
259 bias with White and Black/African American females having significantly greater
260 probabilities of reporting any local AE (**Figure 3C**). Systemic AEs were not significantly
261 different between males and females across all race categories (**Figure 3D**). Race-
262 disaggregated analyses were not performed with the COVID-19 AE dataset due to

263 insufficient numbers of males to compare against females across race/ethnicity
264 categories in the cohort.

265

266 **Hormonal birth control use among females was not associated with the** 267 **probability of reporting AEs**

268 Birth control use (e.g., barrier method, oral contraceptives, IUD, etc.) data was collected
269 at enrollment for 132 females with 55% (n=72) on birth control and 45% (n=60) not on
270 birth control (**Figure 4A**) in the influenza vaccine cohort only. The average ages of
271 female birth control users and non-users were 32.5 and 30.3 years, respectively. Among
272 birth control users, hormonal birth control was the most common method with 44%
273 (n=32) using oral contraceptives and 36% (n=26) using IUDs. Females who used the
274 barrier method (n=2 of 72) were excluded to limit the birth control users to those on
275 hormonal methods. Using logistic regression models, we assessed if the probability of
276 reporting any AE (**Figure 4B**), any local (**Figure 4C**), and any systemic AE (**Figure 4D**)
277 differed by hormonal birth control use among females. The probabilities of reporting any
278 AE (OR=1.43, 95% CI: 0.66-3.1, p=0.36), any local (OR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.46-1.9,
279 p=0.85), or any systemic AE (OR=1.78, 95% CI: 0.8-3.95, p=0.16) were similar between
280 females using and not using birth control. These data suggest that exogenous
281 hormones are no more likely than endogenous hormones to impact experiencing AEs in
282 young adults of reproductive ages.

283

284 **Women are more likely to report daily life disruptions following COVID-19** 285 **vaccination**

286 Analyses of the open-ended survey answers completed by n=195 bivalent COVID-19
287 vaccine recipients revealed that female HCWs were more likely to report disruptions in
288 their daily activities than males after receipt of the COVID-19 vaccination. There were
289 58 (38.7%) women who mentioned experiencing sleep disruption or changes in daily
290 routine due to AEs following vaccination as compared to 14 (31.1%) men. Women also
291 mentioned that AEs affected their ability to take care of their families.

292

293 *[The vaccine] made me sleep for 10 hours, with other symptoms, usually sleep 7-*
294 *8 hr. Felt harder to do activities of daily living and needed to lie down the next*
295 *afternoon [White_W_4]*

296

297 *Didn't clean up from dinner or do my usual heavy lifting in terms of getting the*
298 *kids to bed. [White_W_31]*

299

300 *[I was] not able to take care of my baby. [White_W_113]*

301

302 **Women and men differed in how they responded to AEs**

303 Women and men differed in how they responded to AEs. There were 36 (24%) women
304 who reported self-administration of medications to mitigate symptoms of their AEs after
305 receiving the COVID-19 vaccine as compared to 7 (15.6%) men, which is likely a
306 reflection of more women experiencing AEs overall. Ibuprofen, acetaminophen, and
307 over-the-counter pain relief medications were commonly used among those who did
308 self-treat.

309
310 *I took the recommended dose (2 capsules) of Tylenol every 6 hours for 18 hours*
311 *starting 24 hours after the vaccination. [White_W_69]*

312
313 *[I took] Acetaminophen and ibuprofen as well as increased electrolytes and*
314 *hydration. [White_W_48]*

315
316 Some women expected to experience AEs and intentionally scheduled their COVID-19
317 vaccinations prior to days off; for example, scheduling the vaccine on a Friday so they
318 did not have to miss work should they experience an AE.

319
320 *Just know to plan for a Friday. Glad it was the weekend as I would have missed a*
321 *day of work. I got the shot on a Friday on purpose as I had a bad reaction before*
322 *with one of the others. [White_W_71]*

323
324 *Planned the timing of the injection based on previous reactions so that I would be*
325 *able to rest at home, [White_W_57]*

326 327 **DISCUSSION**

328 We performed sex- and gender-disaggregated analyses of AE survey data for
329 two different vaccines—the quadrivalent influenza and bivalent COVID-19 vaccine—to
330 examine vaccine outcomes and vaccine-related behaviors among a cohort of adult
331 HCWs, which can inform public and occupational health vaccine strategies and policies.
332 Our study supports the existing evidence that influenza and COVID-19 vaccines do not
333 cause serious AEs with localized, mild AEs being the most common experience[38 ,39].
334 The bivalent COVID-19 vaccine recipients reported higher rates of AEs compared to
335 influenza vaccine recipients in our cohorts, consistent with a retrospective analysis of
336 VAERS data[40]. Increased AE reporting rates among COVID-19 vaccine recipients
337 may be potentially confounded by the heightened scrutiny and vaccine hesitancy
338 against mRNA COVID-19 vaccines at the time but is nonetheless important to note for
339 public health and education purposes. While the term “adverse event” may suggest
340 harmful or negative effects, non-serious AEs are normal and healthy manifestations of
341 the immune system’s response to the vaccine antigen[11]. Transparent and consistent
342 reporting of AEs is imperative to normalize these vaccine-related experiences, mitigate
343 fear and misinformation, and encourage vaccine uptake.

344
345 Studies identifying age effects on the reporting of AEs are most common among
346 older aged vaccinees. For example, Shapiro et al. found a female-specific effect where
347 the probability of reporting any AE, either local or systemic, significantly decreased with
348 increasing age for females, but not for males, 6-8 days after influenza vaccination
349 among older adults (75+)[2]. Xiong et al. found that the proportion of COVID-19 vaccine
350 AEs was greatest among younger adults (18-64) while the proportion of serious AEs
351 was greatest among older adults[41]. Our analyses did not identify a significant age
352 effect on the reporting of AEs following influenza or COVID-19 bivalent vaccination,
353 likely because the cohort was predominately younger and reproductive-aged individuals.
354

355 Sex-disaggregated analyses revealed that female HCWs were significantly more
356 likely to report local AEs, but not systemic AEs, after receipt of either the influenza
357 vaccine or COVID-19 vaccine. Similarly, an active surveillance study of predominately
358 younger adults (20-49) in South Korea reported females having significantly more AEs,
359 local or systemic, after receiving the first dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-
360 19(AstraZeneca/Oxford) vaccine as compared to males based on self-reported survey
361 results at 3 days post-vaccination[42]. In another highly vaccinated population of older
362 adults (75+), females had greater probabilities of reporting local AEs, but not systemic
363 AE, compared to males 7 days after receipt of the high-dose quadrivalent influenza
364 vaccine as measured by AE surveys[2]. Xiong et al. utilized real-world data extracted
365 from the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) to reveal that although
366 more adult (18-64) females reported AEs within one week of COVID-19 vaccination,
367 males had 1.5 times greater odds of reporting serious AEs[41].
368

369 Further disaggregation by sex and self-reported race demonstrated that females,
370 regardless of race, consistently had a higher probability of experiencing local AEs with
371 sex comparisons of White or Black participants reaching statistical significance. The
372 probability of experiencing a systemic AE was comparable between sexes, regardless
373 of race. While we did not find differences between racial categories, consideration for
374 race and ethnicity analyses are important for vaccine studies. Race is not a biological
375 variable associated with AEs, but race and ethnicity have been widely reported as
376 important predictors of vaccine behaviors and perceptions[1 ,43-47]. In a survey study
377 of over 10,000 HCWs, Momplaisir et al. found that COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy was
378 highest among Black and Hispanic or Latino HCWs when compared to White HCWs
379 with worries about side effects as the most frequently cited reason[43].
380

381 These sex differences in adverse events are not specific to vaccines and have
382 also been reported for other therapies, such as cancer immunotherapies, suggesting an
383 underlying biological mechanism[48-50]. In a study of small-cell lung cancer patients
384 receiving chemotherapy, Singh et al. reported that although a greater proportion of
385 females were found to have more chemotherapy toxicity (e.g., hematologic toxicity,
386 stomatitis, and vomiting) than males, females also had higher response rates and
387 longer median survival time[49]. Unger et al. performed a meta-analysis of 202 clinical
388 trials of cytotoxic therapy, immunotherapy, and targeted therapies[42] and found that
389 females had significantly greater odds of severe toxicity and had a 66% increased risk
390 of symptomatic AEs compared to males. Unlike vaccines that are mass-produced,
391 personalized medicine may provide new avenues for other therapies or drugs,
392 especially those with more severe AEs, to address sex differences in AEs[51 ,52].
393

394 The role of sex steroid hormones in the manifestation of vaccine AEs for males
395 and females is not clearly understood. Although our study was not designed to evaluate
396 the hormonal and immunological responses associated with post-vaccination AEs, we
397 were able to use hormonal birth control data (e.g., contraceptive use, IUD, implant, etc.)
398 among females to assess if exogenous hormones mediated the reporting of AEs. Our
399 data revealed that reporting of AEs did not differ by hormonal birth control use among
400 young, reproductive-aged female HCWs. This may be due to reproductive-aged females

401 already having sufficient endogenous sex steroid hormones such that birth control (i.e.,
402 exogenous hormones) did not change experience of vaccine AEs. Whether exogenous
403 hormone use among postmenopausal women affects experiences of vaccine AEs
404 requires consideration.

405
406 While more studies are implementing sex-disaggregated analyses, gender-
407 disaggregated analyses are sparse in biomedical research due to the lack of an
408 objective, standardized methodology for measuring gender and persistent
409 misunderstanding of gender and sex. Examining vaccine outcomes and behaviors with
410 a gender lens can inform public health messaging strategies and improve vaccine
411 uptake. For instance, studies have found women have greater influenza and COVID-19
412 vaccine hesitancy compared to men worldwide[26 ,27 ,44 ,53-55]. A survey study of
413 HCWs in New York found that men had a higher likelihood of planning to get the
414 COVID-19 vaccine within the next six months than women[31]. Although pregnancy and
415 breastfeeding have been hypothesized as factors contributing to reduced vaccine
416 uptake among women, Ciardi et al. did not find differences in vaccination uptake
417 between reproductive-aged and non-reproductive-aged women[31]. HCWs are a unique
418 population with increased access to accurate vaccine and medical information, yet
419 vaccine hesitancy, particularly due to AEs, is still persistent even when vaccines are
420 mandatory because of occupational exposure and spread[29 ,30 ,32].

421
422 Gender differences in vaccine behaviors pertaining to AEs are understudied. To
423 our knowledge, we are among the first to utilize both quantitative and qualitative
424 measures through open-ended survey questions to provide insight and context for the
425 findings in a vaccine AE study. Our qualitative thematic analysis of open-ended answers
426 revealed that women were more likely to seek out self-treatment (e.g., over-the-counter
427 pain medications, ibuprofen, and acetaminophen) for their AEs and to experience
428 disruptions in their daily routines than men after COVID-19 vaccination. In the meta-
429 analysis conducted by Beyer et al.[9], the authors reported more women experiencing
430 moderate to severe levels of inconvenience after influenza vaccination. In our study,
431 experience of AEs from prior vaccinations motivated some women, but not men, to
432 schedule their COVID-19 vaccinations on a day prior to their scheduled time off. Further
433 interrogation of these gender differences in vaccine AE-related behaviors may inform
434 vaccine campaign strategies or messaging, particularly among working-aged
435 populations.

436
437 According to the 2019 U.S. Census Bureau women comprised 76% of healthcare
438 jobs with 85% of nursing and health aide positions held by women[56]. We found that
439 women HCWs were more likely to experience AEs than men and were more likely to
440 seek out self-treatment and/or schedule vaccination prior to their days off from work. In
441 a California survey of over 2,000 HCWs studying COVID-19 vaccine side effects, 28%
442 experienced side effects that were disruptive to work and 18% missed work[57]. The
443 authors also found that 6.7% of physicians missed work as compared to 21.2% of other
444 HCW roles. Presenteeism, working despite feeling unwell or sick, and absenteeism are
445 linked to occupational expectations and pressures that may differ across HCW roles,
446 and can impact the quality of patient care, occupational burnout, and employee

447 morale[57]. With nearly 9 million HCWs nationwide receiving mandated vaccinations,
448 we can expect that millions of workers (the majority of whom are women) will
449 experience AEs annually with potential occupational health and labor force implications,
450 including increased vaccine hesitancy, missed work, and disruptions to recognized time
451 off. Our data add gender to the list of factors that need to be considered in policies
452 surrounding mandatory vaccines, including, for example, receipt of paid medical leave.

453

454 **LIMITATIONS**

455 There are several limitations to this study. First, the enrollment criteria (e.g., age) were
456 different and did not allow for direct comparison between the two cohorts. The sample
457 size of males and females enrolled were only pre-specified and balanced for the
458 influenza vaccine cohort and not the COVID-19 vaccine cohort; therefore, the COVID-
459 19 vaccine cohort may be more representative of the HCW demographics at JHHS.
460 Highly vaccinated HCWs are more likely to be biased towards vaccine acceptance and
461 the interpretations made from this unique demographic may not be applicable to non-
462 HCW populations. Second, the criteria and definitions for local and systemic AEs used
463 may differ from other studies. AEs were surveyed two days post-vaccination, so we
464 were unable to assess AEs after administration of the questionnaires. Lastly, biological
465 samples were not collected from participants; therefore, we were unable to study the
466 immunological mechanisms by which sex causes differences in AEs.

467

468 **CONCLUSIONS**

469 Our AE survey study of HCWs following influenza or COVID-19 vaccination
470 demonstrates that females were more likely to experience local AEs than males.
471 Women were more likely to experience interruptions in their daily routines and to self-
472 treat AEs. Additionally, more women reported scheduling their vaccines on a day before
473 their scheduled time off in anticipation of AEs. These data highlight the importance of
474 considering sex and gender in public health and occupational health vaccine strategies
475 and communications, particularly when targeting the predominately female healthcare
476 workforce. Further sex- and gender- disaggregated research is needed to build more
477 equitable and effective vaccine strategies with consideration for differences in AEs.
478 Development of such strategies is not only important for seasonal vaccination planning,
479 but also for planning effective vaccination campaigns for HCWs during pandemics.

480

481 **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

482 **Acknowledgements**

483 We kindly thank the healthcare workers of the Johns Hopkins Health System for their
484 participation in our studies and the clinical coordinators who helped with recruitment and
485 data collection.

486

487 **Contributors**

488 AY, PS, HK, JRS, KZJF, RER, AP, SLK, and RM contributed to the conception and
489 design of the study. Data collection and statistical analyses were done by AY, NW, HK,
490 and KZJF. AY, SLK, and RM wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors
491 contributed to the critical review, interpretation of the results, and revision process.

492

493 **Funding**

494 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy
495 and Infectious Diseases Center of Excellence in Influenza Research and Surveillance,
496 contract Health and Human Services (grant number N2772201400007C to R.E.R., A.P.,
497 and S.L.K.), the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
498 Diseases Center of Excellence in Influenza Research and Response, contract Health
499 and Human Services (grant number N7593021C00045 to R.E.R., A.P., and S.L.K.), and
500 National Institute of Health/National Institute of Aging Specialized Center of Research
501 Excellence U54 AG062333 to S.K.

502

503 **Competing interests**

504 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

505

506 **Patient and public involvement**

507 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or
508 dissemination plans of this research.

509

510 **Patient consent for publication**

511 Not required.

512

513 **Ethics approval**

514 Our study involves two cohorts of human participants, which were approved by the
515 Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Boards (IRB00259171, IRB00091667). Consent was
516 obtained for all participants as part of the enrollment process.

517

518 **Provenance and peer review**

519 Not commissioned; externally reviewed.

520

521 **Data availability statement**

522 Data may be obtained from a third party and are not publicly available.

523

524 **Supplemental material**

525 This content does not have supplemental materials.

526

527 **ORCID iDs**

528 Anna Yin <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1612-5532>

529 Sabra L. Klein <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0730-5224>

530 Rosemary Morgan <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5009-8470>

531

532 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

533 **Table 1. Table of study participant demographics**

534
535 **Figure 1. A greater proportion of female healthcare workers report local adverse events**
536 **(AE) than males following annual inactivated quadrivalent influenza vaccination,**
537 **regardless of age.** A total of 300 quadrivalent influenza vaccines were administered (151 males
538 and 149 females) to healthcare workers (HCWs) from the 2019-2022 seasons, but AE data were
539 only available for 265 of those participants (132 males and 133 females). **(A)** Logistic regression
540 models for any AE, any local, and any systemic AE were used to assess the effect of continuous
541 age, after adjusting for sex, or with an age-sex interaction term. Coefficients and p-values are
542 shown for the models. Age and age-sex interactions were not significantly associated with the
543 probability of reporting AEs following quadrivalent influenza vaccination; therefore, we focused
544 on the effect of sex. **(B-D)** We performed sex-disaggregated analyses of local and systemic AE
545 using logistic regression models to compare probabilities for **(B)** any AE, **(C)** any local AE, or **(D)**
546 any systemic AE. Probabilities of AEs along with 95% confidence intervals are shown along
547 with p-values for sex comparisons. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.
548

549 **Figure 2. Females, regardless of age, have a higher probability of reporting any local**
550 **adverse event (AE) than males following the bivalent Omicron ancestral/BA.5 COVID-19**
551 **vaccination.** A total of 196 HCWs (46 males and 150 females) received bivalent COVID-19
552 vaccines, enrolled, and completed AE data in the 2022-23 season. **(A)** Logistic regression models
553 for any AE, any local, and any systemic AE were used to assess the effect of continuous age,
554 after adjusting for sex, or with an age-sex interaction term. Coefficients and p-values are shown
555 for the models. Age and age-sex interactions were not significantly associated with the
556 probability of reporting AEs following bivalent COVID-19 vaccination; therefore, we focused on
557 the effect of sex. **(B-D)** We performed sex-disaggregated analyses of local and systemic AE
558 using logistic regression models to compare probabilities for **(B)** any AE, **(C)** any local AE, or **(D)**
559 any systemic AE. Probabilities of AEs along with 95% confidence intervals are shown along
560 with p-values for sex comparisons. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.
561

562 **Figure 3. Females have a higher probability of reporting local adverse events (AEs) than**
563 **males following annual inactivated quadrivalent influenza vaccination, regardless of race.**
564 **(A)** Descriptive table showing the breakdown of race categories by biological sex across the
565 cumulative seasonal influenza seasons among healthcare workers. **(B)** Age-adjusted logistic
566 regression model with a race and sex interaction term for any AE, **(C)** any local AE, or **(D)** any
567 systemic AE. Probabilities of AEs along with 95% confidence intervals are shown along with p-
568 values for sex comparisons. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.
569

570 **Figure 4. Hormonal birth control (BC) use among female healthcare workers did not**
571 **impact the probability of reporting adverse events (AEs) after influenza vaccination.** **(A)**
572 Table of female healthcare workers, disaggregated by hormonal birth control use. Logistic
573 regression models were used to examine probabilities of local and systemic adverse events (AE)
574 following **(B-D)** annual influenza vaccination from 2019-2022 seasons among healthcare
575 workers. Comparisons of probabilities for **(B)** any, **(C)** any local, or **(D)** any systemic AE
576 following influenza vaccination are shown, respectively, with $p < 0.05$ for birth control differences

577 considered statistically significant. Probabilities of AEs along with 95% confidence intervals are
578 shown.

579 **REFERENCES**

- 580 1. Kini A, Morgan R, Kuo H, et al. Differences and disparities in seasonal influenza vaccine,
581 acceptance, adverse reactions, and coverage by age, sex, gender, and race. *Vaccine*
582 2022;40(11):1643-54. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.013 [published Online First:
583 20210428]
- 584 2. Shapiro JR, Seddu K, Park H-S, et al. The intersection of biological sex and gender in adverse
585 events following seasonal influenza vaccination in older adults. *Immunity & Ageing*
586 2023;20(1) doi: 10.1186/s12979-023-00367-3
- 587 3. Tadount F, Doyon-Plourde P, Rafferty E, et al. Is there a difference in the immune response,
588 efficacy, effectiveness and safety of seasonal influenza vaccine in males and females? - A
589 systematic review. *Vaccine* 2020;38(3):444-59. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.10.091
590 [published Online First: 20191109]
- 591 4. Green MS, Peer V, Magid A, et al. Gender Differences in Adverse Events Following the
592 Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022;10(2) doi:
593 10.3390/vaccines10020233 [published Online First: 20220203]
- 594 5. Duijster JW, Lieber T, Pacelli S, et al. Sex-disaggregated outcomes of adverse events after
595 COVID-19 vaccination: A Dutch cohort study and review of the literature. *Front*
596 *Immunol* 2023;14:1078736. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1078736 [published Online First:
597 20230130]
- 598 6. Bignucolo A, Scarabel L, Mezzalana S, et al. Sex Disparities in Efficacy in COVID-19
599 Vaccines: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9(8) doi:
600 10.3390/vaccines9080825 [published Online First: 20210727]
- 601 7. Jensen A, Stromme M, Moyassari S, et al. COVID-19 vaccines: Considering sex differences in
602 efficacy and safety. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2022;115:106700. doi:
603 10.1016/j.cct.2022.106700 [published Online First: 20220208]
- 604 8. Cook IF. Sex differences in injection site reactions with human vaccines. *Hum Vaccin*
605 2009;5(7):441-9. doi: 10.4161/hv.8476 [published Online First: 20090718]
- 606 9. Beyer WE, Palache AM, Kerstens R, et al. Gender differences in local and systemic reactions
607 to inactivated influenza vaccine, established by a meta-analysis of fourteen independent
608 studies. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1996;15(1):65-70. doi: 10.1007/BF01586187
- 609 10. Klein SL, Flanagan KL. Sex differences in immune responses. *Nat Rev Immunol*
610 2016;16(10):626-38. doi: 10.1038/nri.2016.90 [published Online First: 20160822]
- 611 11. Herve C, Laupeze B, Del Giudice G, et al. The how's and what's of vaccine reactogenicity.
612 *NPJ Vaccines* 2019;4:39. doi: 10.1038/s41541-019-0132-6 [published Online First:
613 20190924]
- 614 12. Klein SL, Jedlicka A, Pekosz A. The Xs and Y of immune responses to viral vaccines. *Lancet*
615 *Infect Dis* 2010;10(5):338-49. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70049-9
- 616 13. Kennedy RB, Ovsyannikova IG, Pankratz VS, et al. Gender effects on humoral immune
617 responses to smallpox vaccine. *Vaccine* 2009;27(25-26):3319-23. doi:
618 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.01.086 [published Online First: 20090205]
- 619 14. Dhakal S, Chaulagain S, Klein SL. Sex biases in infectious diseases research. *J Exp Med*
620 2022;219(6) doi: 10.1084/jem.20211486 [published Online First: 20220505]
- 621 15. Ruggieri A, Anticoli S, D'Ambrosio A, et al. The influence of sex and gender on immunity,
622 infection and vaccination. *Ann Ist Super Sanita* 2016;52(2):198-204. doi:
623 10.4415/ANN_16_02_11

- 624 16. Beatty AL, Peyser ND, Butcher XE, et al. Analysis of COVID-19 Vaccine Type and Adverse
625 Effects Following Vaccination. *JAMA Netw Open* 2021;4(12):e2140364. doi:
626 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.40364 [published Online First: 20211201]
- 627 17. Harris T, Nair J, Fediurek J, et al. Assessment of sex-specific differences in adverse events
628 following immunization reporting in Ontario, 2012-15. *Vaccine* 2017;35(19):2600-04. doi:
629 10.1016/j.vaccine.2017.03.035 [published Online First: 20170329]
- 630 18. Yoda T, Katsuyama H. Willingness to Receive COVID-19 Vaccination in Japan. *Vaccines*
631 (*Basel*) 2021;9(1) doi: 10.3390/vaccines9010048 [published Online First: 20210114]
- 632 19. Azarpanah H, Farhadloo M, Vahidov R, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: evidence from an adverse
633 events following immunization database, and the role of cognitive biases. *BMC Public*
634 *Health* 2021;21(1):1686. doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-11745-1 [published Online First:
635 20210916]
- 636 20. Ten threats to global health in 2019: World Health Organization; 2019 [Available from:
637 <https://www.who.int/news-room/spotlight/ten-threats-to-global-health-in-2019>
638 .
639 .
- 640 21. Klein SL, Pekosz A. Sex-based biology and the rational design of influenza vaccination
641 strategies. *J Infect Dis* 2014;209 Suppl 3(Suppl 3):S114-9. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiu066
- 642 22. Pulcini C, Massin S, Launay O, et al. Factors associated with vaccination for hepatitis B,
643 pertussis, seasonal and pandemic influenza among French general practitioners: a 2010
644 survey. *Vaccine* 2013;31(37):3943-9. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.06.039 [published
645 Online First: 20130624]
- 646 23. Morales DX, Beltran TF, Morales SA. Gender, socioeconomic status, and COVID-19 vaccine
647 hesitancy in the US: An intersectionality approach. *Sociol Health Illn* 2022;44(6):953-71.
648 doi: 10.1111/1467-9566.13474 [published Online First: 20220502]
- 649 24. Zintel S, Flock C, Arbogast AL, et al. Gender differences in the intention to get vaccinated
650 against COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Z Gesundh Wiss* 2022:1-25.
651 doi: 10.1007/s10389-021-01677-w [published Online First: 20220107]
- 652 25. Brownstein NC, Reddy H, Whiting J, et al. COVID-19 vaccine behaviors and intentions
653 among a national sample of United States adults ages 18-45. *Prev Med* 2022;160:107038.
654 doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2022.107038 [published Online First: 20220407]
- 655 26. Endrich MM, Blank PR, Szucs TD. Influenza vaccination uptake and socioeconomic
656 determinants in 11 European countries. *Vaccine* 2009;27(30):4018-24. doi:
657 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.04.029 [published Online First: 20090503]
- 658 27. Jimenez-Garcia R, Hernandez-Barrera V, de Andres AL, et al. Gender influence in influenza
659 vaccine uptake in Spain: time trends analysis (1995-2006). *Vaccine* 2010;28(38):6169-75.
660 doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2010.07.029 [published Online First: 20100724]
- 661 28. Shapiro JR, Privor-Dumm L, Rosser EN, et al. The intersection of gender and race in older
662 adults' decision to receive COVID-19 vaccines. *Vaccine* 2023;41(1):211-18. doi:
663 10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.09.043 [published Online First: 20220920]
- 664 29. Dror AA, Eisenbach N, Taiber S, et al. Vaccine hesitancy: the next challenge in the fight
665 against COVID-19. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2020;35(8):775-79. doi: 10.1007/s10654-020-
666 00671-y [published Online First: 20200812]
- 667 30. Peterson CJ, Lee B, Nugent K. COVID-19 Vaccination Hesitancy among Healthcare
668 Workers-A Review. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022;10(6) doi: 10.3390/vaccines10060948
669 [published Online First: 20220615]




- 670 31. Ciardi F, Menon V, Jensen JL, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of COVID-19
671 Vaccination among Healthcare Workers of an Inner-City Hospital in New York. *Vaccines*
672 (*Basel*) 2021;9(5) doi: 10.3390/vaccines9050516 [published Online First: 20210517]
- 673 32. Pacella-LaBarbara ML, Park YL, Patterson PD, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake and Intent
674 Among Emergency Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *J Occup Environ Med*
675 2021;63(10):852-56. doi: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000002298
- 676 33. Bell J, Meng L, Barbre K, et al. Influenza and Up-to-Date COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage
677 Among Health Care Personnel - National Healthcare Safety Network, United States,
678 2022-23 Influenza Season. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2023;72(45):1237-43. doi:
679 10.15585/mmwr.mm7245a5 [published Online First: 20231110]
- 680 34. State Immunization Laws for Healthcare Workers and Patients: CDC: Center for Disease
681 Control and Prevention; [updated November 19, 2014. Available from:
682 [https://www2a.cdc.gov/vaccines/statevaccsApp/AdministrationbyVaccine.asp?Vaccinetsm
684 p=Influenza](https://www2a.cdc.gov/vaccines/statevaccsApp/AdministrationbyVaccine.asp?Vaccinetsm
683 p=Influenza).
- 685 35. The Biden-□Harris Administration Will End COVID-□19 Vaccination Requirements for
686 Federal Employees, Contractors, International Travelers, Head Start Educators, and
687 CMS-Certified Facilities: The White House; 2023 [updated May 01, 2023. Available
688 from: [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/05/01/the-
691 biden-administration-will-end-covid-19-vaccination-requirements-for-federal-employees-
692 contractors-international-travelers-head-start-educators-and-cms-certified-facilities/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/05/01/the-
689 biden-administration-will-end-covid-19-vaccination-requirements-for-federal-employees-
690 contractors-international-travelers-head-start-educators-and-cms-certified-facilities/).
- 693 36. Biancolella M, Colona VL, Mehrian-Shai R, et al. COVID-19 2022 update: transition of the
694 pandemic to the endemic phase. *Hum Genomics* 2022;16(1):19. doi: 10.1186/s40246-
695 022-00392-1 [published Online First: 20220601]
- 696 37. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and Definitions: CDC: Center for Disease Control and
697 Prevention; 2023 [updated September 01, 2023. Available from:
698 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/variant-classifications.html>.
- 699 38. Guo W, Deguise J, Tian Y, et al. Profiling COVID-19 Vaccine Adverse Events by Statistical
700 and Ontological Analysis of VAERS Case Reports. *Front Pharmacol* 2022;13:870599.
701 doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.870599 [published Online First: 20220624]
- 702 39. Ganesan S, Al Ketbi LMB, Al Kaabi N, et al. Vaccine Side Effects Following COVID-19
703 Vaccination Among the Residents of the UAE-An Observational Study. *Front Public*
704 *Health* 2022;10:876336. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.876336 [published Online First:
705 20220506]
- 706 40. Al-Ahmari AK, AlAsmari A, AlKorbi A, et al. Comparison of the post-marketing safety
707 profile between influenza and COVID-19 vaccines: An analysis of the vaccine adverse
708 event reporting system. *Saudi Pharm J* 2022;30(8):1137-42. doi:
709 10.1016/j.jsps.2022.06.009 [published Online First: 20220621]
- 710 41. Xiong X, Yuan J, Li M, et al. Age and Gender Disparities in Adverse Events Following
711 COVID-19 Vaccination: Real-World Evidence Based on Big Data for Risk Management.
712 *Front Med (Lausanne)* 2021;8:700014. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.700014 [published
713 Online First: 20210719]
- 714 42. Bae S, Lee YW, Lim SY, et al. Adverse Reactions Following the First Dose of ChAdOx1
nCoV-19 Vaccine and BNT162b2 Vaccine for Healthcare Workers in South Korea. *J*
Korean Med Sci 2021;36(17):e115. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e115 [published Online
First: 20210503]

- 715 43. Momplaisir FM, Kuter BJ, Ghadimi F, et al. Racial/Ethnic Differences in COVID-19 Vaccine
716 Hesitancy Among Health Care Workers in 2 Large Academic Hospitals. *JAMA Netw*
717 *Open* 2021;4(8):e2121931. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.21931 [published
718 Online First: 20210802]
- 719 44. McElfish PA, Willis DE, Shah SK, et al. Sociodemographic Determinants of COVID-19
720 Vaccine Hesitancy, Fear of Infection, and Protection Self-Efficacy. *J Prim Care*
721 *Community Health* 2021;12:21501327211040746. doi: 10.1177/21501327211040746
- 722 45. Bagasra AB, Doan S, Allen CT. Racial differences in institutional trust and COVID-19
723 vaccine hesitancy and refusal. *BMC Public Health* 2021;21(1):2104. doi:
724 10.1186/s12889-021-12195-5 [published Online First: 20211116]
- 725 46. Nguyen LH, Joshi AD, Drew DA, et al. Racial and ethnic differences in COVID-19 vaccine
726 hesitancy and uptake. *medRxiv* 2021 doi: 10.1101/2021.02.25.21252402 [published
727 Online First: 20210228]
- 728 47. Unger JM, Vaidya R, Albain KS, et al. Sex Differences in Risk of Severe Adverse Events in
729 Patients Receiving Immunotherapy, Targeted Therapy, or Chemotherapy in Cancer
730 Clinical Trials. *J Clin Oncol* 2022;40(13):1474-86. doi: 10.1200/JCO.21.02377
731 [published Online First: 20220204]
- 732 48. Wang S, Cowley LA, Liu XS. Sex Differences in Cancer Immunotherapy Efficacy,
733 Biomarkers, and Therapeutic Strategy. *Molecules* 2019;24(18) doi:
734 10.3390/molecules24183214 [published Online First: 20190904]
- 735 49. Singh S, Parulekar W, Murray N, et al. Influence of sex on toxicity and treatment outcome in
736 small-cell lung cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23(4):850-6. doi: 10.1200/JCO.2005.03.171
- 737 50. Klein SL, Morgan R. The impact of sex and gender on immunotherapy outcomes. *Biol Sex*
738 *Differ* 2020;11(1):24. doi: 10.1186/s13293-020-00301-y [published Online First:
739 20200504]
- 740 51. Winstead E. Severe Side Effects of Cancer Treatment Are More Common in Women than
741 Men: NIH: National Cancer Institute; 2022 [
- 742 52. Yu Y, Chen J, Li D, et al. Systematic Analysis of Adverse Event Reports for Sex Differences
743 in Adverse Drug Events. *Sci Rep* 2016;6:24955. doi: 10.1038/srep24955 [published
744 Online First: 20160422]
- 745 53. Alley SJ, Stanton R, Browne M, et al. As the Pandemic Progresses, How Does Willingness to
746 Vaccinate against COVID-19 Evolve? *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2021;18(2) doi:
747 10.3390/ijerph18020797 [published Online First: 20210119]
- 748 54. Neumann-Bohme S, Varghese NE, Sabat I, et al. Once we have it, will we use it? A European
749 survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. *Eur J Health Econ*
750 2020;21(7):977-82. doi: 10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6
- 751 55. Opstelten W, van Essen GA, Ballieux MJ, et al. Influenza immunization of Dutch general
752 practitioners: vaccination rate and attitudes towards vaccination. *Vaccine*
753 2008;26(47):5918-21. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2008.08.049 [published Online First:
754 20080917]
- 755 56. Cheeseman Day JC, C. Women Hold 76% of All Health Care Jobs, Gaining in Higher-Paying
756 Occupations: United States Census Bureau; 2019 [updated October 28, 2021. Available
757 from: [https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/08/your-health-care-in-womens-](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/08/your-health-care-in-womens-hands.html)
758 [hands.html](https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/08/your-health-care-in-womens-hands.html).
- 759 57. Chrissian AA, Oyoyo UE, Patel P, et al. Impact of COVID-19 vaccine-associated side effects
760 on health care worker absenteeism and future booster vaccination. *Vaccine*

761 2022;40(23):3174-81. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.04.046 [published Online First:
762 20220418]
763

A

Logistic Model	Age coefficient	p-value	95% CI	Age-sex interaction coefficient	p-value	95% CI
Any AE	-0.01	0.64	-0.04, 0.02	0.003	0.93	-0.07, 0.08
Any local AE	-0.01	0.61	-0.04, 0.03	0.02	0.64	-0.05, 0.09
Any systemic AE	-0.01	0.37	-0.06, 0.02	-0.04	0.30	-0.12, 0.04


B**C****D**

Males
 Females


A

Logistic Model	Age coefficient	p-value	95% CI	Age-sex interaction coefficient	p-value	95% CI
Any AE	-0.03	0.05	-0.12, 1.64	0.02	0.50	-0.4, 0.08
Any local AE	-0.02	0.08	-0.05, 0.002	-0.02	0.46	-0.07, 0.03
Any systemic AE	-0.01	0.60	-0.7, 0.64	0.05	0.07	-0.003, 0.10


B



C



D




 Males
  Females


A

Race Category, n (%)	Male	Female	Total
White	76 (47.5%)	84 (52.5%)	160 (60.4%)
Asian	29 (56.86%)	22 (43.14%)	51 (19.3%)
Black/African American	13 (38.24%)	21 (61.76%)	34 (12.8%)
Other	13 (72.22%)	5 (27.78%)	18 (6.8%)
Missing	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (0.8%)
Total	132 (49.8%)	133 (50.2%)	265 (100%)


B



C



D






Males



Females

A

Birth Control Use		
	Yes	No
Age, mean (SD)	32.5 (8.5)	30.3 (6.9)
Type, n (%)		
Barrier method	2 (2.8%)	-
Oral contraceptive	32 (44.4%)	-
Birth control shot	1 (1.4%)	-
IUD	26 (36.1%)	-
Vaginal ring	6 (8.3%)	-
Other (e.g., implant)	5 (6.9%)	-
Total n	72	60

B**C****D**

No Birth Control
 Birth Control