Dynamics of indirect protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection through vaccine and infection-acquired immunity

Sophia T. Tan BA[1], Isabel Rodríguez-Barraquer MD PhD[2], Ada T. Kwan PhD MHS[3], Seth Blumberg MD PhD[4-5], Justine Hutchinson PhD[6], David Leidner PhD[7], Joseph A. Lewnard PhD[8-10], David Sears MD[11], and Nathan C. Lo MD PhD[1*]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, USA

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

[3]Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

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

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

[6]California Correctional Health Care Services, Elk Grove, CA, USA

[7]California Correctional Health Care Services, Sacramento, CA, USA

[8]Division of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

[9]Division of Infectious Diseases and Vaccinology, School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

[10]Center for Computational Biology, College of Computing, Data Science, and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA

[11]Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

*Corresponding author:
Nathan C. Lo, MD PhD
Division of Infectious Diseases and Geographic Medicine
Stanford University
Stanford, CA, USA 94304
Nathan.Lo@stanford.edu

Abstract Word Count: 206

Main Text Word Count: 4140

Figures: 5

Tables: 1

Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, vaccination, indirect protection, transmission, epidemiology, correctional health

Abstract:

Early investigation revealed that COVID-19 vaccines confer indirect protection to fully susceptible and unvaccinated persons, defined as a reduced risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection among social contacts of vaccinated individuals. However, indirect protection from infection-acquired immunity and its comparative strength and durability to vaccine-derived indirect protection in the current epidemiologic context of high levels of vaccination, prior infection, and novel variants are not well characterized. Here, we show that both infection-acquired and vaccine-derived immunity independently yield indirect protection to close social contacts with key differences in their strength and waning. Analyzing anonymized data from a system-wide SARS-CoV-2 surveillance program of 177,319 residents across 35 California state prisons from December 2021 to December 2022, we find that vaccine-derived indirect protection against Omicron SARS-CoV-2 infection is strongest within three months post-vaccination [30% (95% confidence interval: 20-38%)], whereas infection-acquired immunity provides 39% (25-51%) indirect protection to roommates for 6 months after SARS-CoV-2 infection, with moderate indirect protection persisting for over one year. Variant-targeted vaccines (bivalent formulation including Omicron subvariants BA.4/BA.5) confer strong indirect protection for at least three months [51% (18-70%)]. These results have important implications for understanding the long-term transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 and can guide vaccine policy and public health measures, especially in high-risk environments such as prisons.

Main Text:

Transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 are driven in part by population immunity generated from vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity, which confer both direct and indirect protection[1,2]. Direct protection is the benefit to an individual with prior vaccination and/or infection-acquired immunity against developing an infection or disease after exposure[2]. In contrast, indirect protection refers to the reduced risk of infection among social contacts of individuals with vaccine- and/or infection-acquired immunity due to infection prevention (sterilizing immunity) and reduced infectiousness[2,3]. Understanding the dynamics of vaccine-derived and infection-acquired indirect protection is needed to understand population level transmission of SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., seasonality due to waning population immunity), especially in settings with high population immunity, and to guide public health control measures (e.g., value of booster doses)[1].

Indirect protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection has primarily been shown through studies that found a decrease in infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 infections among vaccinated individuals[3–10], with some evidence that suggests reinfections are less infectious than primary infections[4]. However, few studies have been able to quantify indirect protection while accounting for both pathways of indirect protection: infection prevention and reduced infectiousness upon infection[3,11]. Furthermore, these studies have only measured indirect protection among unvaccinated individuals in immunologically naïve populations, so there is limited evidence on the role of indirect protection in mitigating transmission in contemporary populations with high levels of vaccination and natural infection with emerging novel variants. The temporal dynamics (strength and durability over time) of both vaccine-derived and infection-acquired indirect

protection and the benefits of additional booster doses and variant-targeting vaccines (e.g., bivalent vaccine) also remain unclear. Investigation on these topics has been limited, in part given its study requires intensive testing of a large study population over the entire pandemic.

Studying the impact of an individual's vaccine-derived and infection-acquired protection on the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in their close social contacts is of particular relevance to public health control measures in high-transmission environments such as prisons[4]. At the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, prison populations experienced rates of infection more than five times higher than the general population in the United States[12–14]. The incarcerated population has since experienced sustained SARS-CoV-2 transmission due to dense congregate living and suboptimal ventilation conditions[14–17]. Characterizing the dynamics of indirect protection can inform public health control measures, such as the optimal interval timing of additional vaccine doses to slow transmission, and more broadly guide reactive vaccine response during outbreaks.

In this study, we use a test-negative design to quantify indirect protection from both vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity, including their strength and durability, and considering different vaccine formulations. We perform our study retrospectively within a SARS-CoV-2 surveillance program in the California prison system aimed at widespread testing and isolation of cases to reduce transmission. The study aims to understand the complex dynamics of indirect protection for SARS-CoV-2 infection and is directly relevant to infection control and vaccine measures in the incarcerated population and other high-risk environments.

Results

We conducted a retrospective test-negative case-control study using anonymized data from the California Correctional Health Care Services (CCHCS) and their system-wide SARS-CoV-2 surveillance program of 177,319 residents across 35 California state prisons to measure vaccine-derived and infection-acquired indirect protection. We defined indirect protection as the difference in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk between individuals living with roommates with and without vaccine- and/or infection-acquired immunity. We used a test-negative design to ensure similar testing practices between cases and controls and a clearly defined period of exposure[18,19]. The study period was from December 15, 2021, to December 15, 2022, to study Omicron variants/sub-variants over a period with consistent, high-volume testing within the surveillance program (Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1). The dominant circulating variants during this study period were Omicron BA.1, BA.2, BA.4, and BA.5 based on genomic surveillance in a subset of isolates, which also reflect variants circulating in California and the United States[20]. Descriptions of the system-wide testing, quarantine, and isolation practices implemented to reduce transmission are included in the Supplementary Notes.

Study population

Over the study period, we identified 36,754 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections, 11,331 of which were reinfections (Figure 1). In December 2021, 62% of residents had received at least one vaccine dose, and 17% of residents had received at least one booster dose (Figure 1). We identified 6,472 COVID-19 cases meeting our study criteria, defined as a resident with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test, residence in a two-person room, and without a positive test within the preceding 90 days. Subsequently, we identified 246,444 potential controls, defined as a resident with a negative SARS-CoV-2 test, residence in a two-person room, and without a positive test

within the preceding 90 days or subsequent 14 days (residents could have multiple negative SARS-CoV-2 tests that met study criteria). We defined their roommate based on the housing arrangements 3-6 days prior to test collection in the case or control to reflect both the biological latent period between exposure and detectable infection and movement of residents for quarantine after SARS-CoV-2 exposure. We tested alternative timings of the roommate definition in sensitivity analyses. We required that cases, controls, and their roommates were incarcerated by March 2020 or earlier to ensure complete record of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. A complete description of inclusion and exclusion criteria can be found in the Methods and Figure 2.

Cases and controls were matched in a 1:2 ratio by time (tests within two days), COVID-19 vaccine status (by dose), prior SARS-CoV-2 infection status, time since their last vaccine dose and/or infection, and building of residence and security level, which largely determined activities and number of possible social contacts, and demographic factors. Cases and controls were matched exactly by their vaccine and prior infection status to isolate differential risk due to differences in the indirect protection from their roommates' vaccine- and infection-acquired immunity. The final sample size included 4,640 cases and 7,915 controls; 3,275 cases were matched to two controls and 1,365 cases were matched to a single control. Match quality of cases and controls is shown in Supplementary Figure 1. Test acceptance in the 14 days prior to test collection was similar between cases and controls (61% of cases and 63% of controls had a SARS-CoV-2 test) and between roommates of cases and controls (61% of case roommates and 63% of control roommates had a SARS-CoV-2 test). Roommates of cases were more likely to have a new SARS-CoV-2 infection within the preceding 4 days (44% of case roommates

compared to 15% of control roommates with testing data in this period) (Supplementary Table 1). Characteristics of the cases, matched controls, and their roommates are shown in Table 1.

Indirect protection from COVID-19 vaccine and infection-acquired immunity

Cases were more likely to co-reside with unvaccinated individuals (14% of cases had an unvaccinated roommate compared to 12% of matched controls) and less likely to co-reside with individuals with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (47% of cases had roommates with documented prior infection compared to 52% of controls). There were differences in the time since most recent vaccination compared to most recent infection among roommates; their most recent infection was on average 461 days prior to study inclusion, but their most recent COVID-19 vaccine dose was only 149 days prior to study inclusion (Table 1).

With an adjusted model, co-residing with a vaccinated resident (received any vaccine dose at least 14 days prior to test collection date) was associated with 23% indirect protection (95% CI: 14-31%) against SARS-CoV-2 infection (Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 2). When defining vaccine status by the number of doses received by roommates, we found that each additional dose of COVID-19 vaccine was associated with 8% indirect protection (95% CI: 4-11%), with up to 28% indirect protection from a resident with two or more booster doses (Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 3). Co-residing with a resident with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (at least 14 days prior to test collection) was similarly associated with 17% indirect protection (95% CI: 10-24%) (Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 2). We found having hybrid immunity (both vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity) was associated with 38% indirect protection (95% CI: 27-47%) (Figure 3 and Supplementary Table 4). The strength of vaccine-derived

protection did not differ among persons with evidence of prior infection versus those without prior infection.

Strength and waning of indirect protection from COVID-19 vaccines and infection-acquired immunity

We assessed the persistence of indirect protection from vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity over time since their last vaccine, prior infection, or most recent vaccine/infection. COVID-19 vaccination among residents was associated with 30% indirect protection (95% CI: 20-38%) within the first three months of vaccination (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 5), with the strongest protection within 2 months of vaccination (Supplementary Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 8). Indirect protection from vaccine-derived immunity demonstrated waning after 3 months (range of 14-18%) (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 5).

Indirect protection from infection-acquired immunity in the study population was stronger and more durable over time than indirect protection from COVID-19 vaccination. Co-residing with an individual with a SARS-CoV-2 infection within six months was associated with 39% indirect protection (95% CI: 25-51%). Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection more than one year ago prior to testing was associated with 13% indirect protection (95% CI: 5-21%) (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 5). When measuring time since either the most recent vaccination or infection, indirect protection demonstrated some waning over time (Figure 4 and Supplementary Table 5).

Indirect protection from bivalent COVID-19 vaccines

Starting September 2022, residents received bivalent vaccine doses, which targeted both the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain and Omicron variants BA.4 and BA.5 to match circulating Omicron subvariants[21,22]. By December 2022, 20.5% of residents received a bivalent vaccine dose. We found that a bivalent COVID-19 vaccine dose provided 51% indirect protection (95% CI: 18-70%) within the first three months of vaccine receipt (September – December 2022); in contrast, we estimated that ancestral monovalent vaccines conferred 29% indirect protection (95% CI: 19-38%) for three months in the period before bivalent vaccine introduction (December 2021 – August 2022; Figure 5 and Supplementary Table 9).

Sensitivity analyses

Our findings were similar with different definitions for timing of co-residence for cases and controls. When alternatively defining co-residence on the third day prior to test collection in cases and controls, we found having a roommate with vaccine-derived immunity or infection-acquired immunity was associated with 24% (95% CI: 15-32%) and 17% (95% CI: 10-24%) indirect protection, respectively. When defining co-residence as the week leading up to test collection, we estimated indirect protection was 23% (95% CI: 13-32%) from vaccine-derived immunity and 14% (6-21%) from infection-acquired immunity (Supplementary Table 10). We found similar results when matching cases and controls in a 1:1 ratio (Supplementary Table 11). Study findings were robust to alternative specifications in matching and statistical model, including alternative matching criteria, alternative model covariates, and use of logistic regression (Supplementary Table 11).

Discussion

We found that vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity yield indirect protection against Omicron infection in a highly vaccinated and previously infected population with key differences in their strength and waning. Our results support that infection-acquired immunity may provide stronger and more durable indirect protection compared to vaccine-derived immunity. Indirect protection from both waned over time, potentially related to a mismatch between variant exposure from vaccination and/or prior infection and contemporary circulating variants. Notably, we evaluated indirect protection from variant-targeting (bivalent) vaccines and found they provided strong indirect protection and trended towards greater indirect protection compared to the monovalent ancestral vaccine, potentially due to greater concordance between vaccine formulation and circulating variants. These results have important implications for understanding long-term viral transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., predicting surges), which are likely governed by these indirect effects. These findings also have relevance to vaccine policy and public health measures in high-risk environments, such as reactive vaccination during periods of outbreaks and/or a higher frequency of routine vaccination to maximize indirect protection.

Our study makes significant strides in understanding the dynamics of indirect protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection, while accounting for both pathways of indirect protection (infection prevention and reduced infectiousness upon infection). First, prior literature has focused on measuring indirect protection in unvaccinated and fully susceptible persons[3,11]. Here, we identify measurable and meaningful indirect protection in a population with high cumulative vaccination and prior infection, which is most relevant at this stage of the COVID-19 pandemic. This protection is even more striking given we study person-level indirect protection in a high risk, close contact social context and during a period of intense transmission. Second, most studies on

indirect protection against SARS-CoV-2 focus on vaccines and not infection-acquired immunity. Here, we show that infection-acquired immunity generates indirect protection, describe its strength and durability, and directly compare its dynamics to vaccine-derived protection. We observe that infection-acquired immunity may generate stronger and more durable indirect protection compared to vaccine-derived indirect protection. Third, we demonstrate waning in indirect protection, which may drive SARS-CoV-2 transmission dynamics and timing of epidemic waves (e.g., rise in cases after waning of indirect protection). Finally, we find that variant-targeting vaccines, specifically the bivalent vaccine, continue to generate indirect protection, with a trend towards greater indirect protection compared to the monovalent ancestral vaccine, although this analysis was underpowered.

Several considerations further strengthen the study findings. We identify strong and consistent indirect protection generated by vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity across multiple primary and sensitivity analyses. We find the indirect protection from vaccination is dose-dependent, and indirect protection from both vaccination and infection-acquired immunity are time-dependent. The dose- and time-dependence are not only scientifically and policy relevant, but also strengthen the validity of our findings and reduce the likelihood of confounding. This time-dependence also matches literature on the comparative strength and waning of direct protection from vaccines and infection-acquired immunity[23–25]. While indirect protection may appear similar between vaccines and prior infection, the magnitude of protection and waning are more distinct when adjusting for time since vaccine and/or infection because the study population is more recently vaccinated than infected. We find that roommates of controls, who were more likely to have a history of prior vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection, were

also less likely to have a positive SARS-CoV-2 test in the 4 days prior to test collection than cases (Supplementary Table 1). This evidence supports the mechanism of indirect protection, e.g., reduction of infection risk in the roommate due to vaccination and/or infection-acquired immunity.

This study is important for improving health and addressing inequities in the incarcerated population due to COVID-19. Over the pandemic, this population has experienced high rates of SARS-CoV-2 transmission largely due to structural and environmental risk factors, including dense congregate living and suboptimal ventilation conditions[12–17]. Although severe COVID-19 (defined as hospitalization or death) outcomes were rare during the Omicron era, high SARS-CoV-2 infection incidence, despite high levels of vaccine coverage and prior infection, and risk for complications (such as long COVID) highlight the need for continued optimization of health policy for this vulnerable population. We find evidence of indirect protection to close social contacts, which suggests that residents who co-reside together can provide and receive indirect benefits that reduce transmission risk with additional vaccination. Housing arrangements based on vaccine and/or prior infection status may be particularly relevant for high-risk residents (e.g., 65+ years, immunocompromised, unvaccinated) and may reduce their risk of infection by up to 40%. Furthermore, we find transmission often occurs outside of their rooms (most cases were not exposed to a SARS-CoV-2 positive roommate leading up to test collection) (Supplementary Table 1) and benefits of indirect protection could extend to a broader spatial scale (e.g., building level). Therefore, increasing uptake of booster doses in residents and especially staff, where even vaccination with primary series alone has lagged behind residents (65%)[26], would likely reduce transmission to residents since we observe that additional vaccine doses can provide additive

indirect protection, even in individuals with infection-acquired immunity. Our findings also suggest that reactive vaccination campaigns may be used to mitigate transmission (via vaccine-derived indirect effects on transmission) during future outbreaks, and residents may benefit from considering more frequent routine COVID-19 vaccination.

This study has limitations. The design is observational, and confounding is possible. Residents with receipt of vaccination or prior infection may have unobserved differences in behavior (e.g., fewer social interactions, a more risk-averse social cohort, masking) that lower their risk of infection and/or transmission to social contacts. However, our analysis demonstrates time-dependent indirect protection (waning), which argues against the presence of such confounding factors. Furthermore, we match cases and controls by all observed characteristics (including vaccine and prior infection status), and roommate assignments are expected to be random with respect to vaccine and prior infection status. Our analysis examines indirect protection at the room level to focus on the benefit of housing arrangement policies that consider vaccine or prior infection status, although a substantial fraction of transmission likely occurs outside the room through interactions with other residents and staff. A higher proportion of outside-room transmission would reduce the indirect protection conferred by a roommate, so our analysis may underestimate the population-level indirect protection generated by vaccines and infection-acquired immunity. While testing is frequent in this population throughout the pandemic, there may be some misclassification of prior infection status or timing due to imperfect case ascertainment. We find that infection-acquired indirect protection is more durable than vaccine-derived indirect protection; however, this may be a result of better indirect protection from infection with contemporary variants compared to vaccination with an ancestral strain

formulation. We demonstrate waning of indirect protection, although this could also be explained by variant mismatch. This study focuses on indirect protection from Omicron SARS-CoV-2 infection, so these results may not be generalizable to other variants and vaccine formulations. While cases are required to have a new positive SARS-CoV-2 infection, timing of exposure and infection is unknown and we did not have access to cycle threshold values for PCR tests; however, when we varied our definition for timing of co-residence and roommate definitions, we observed robust results. Our study population is a subset of the overall California incarcerated population during the pandemic based on the study period and criteria. We do not have access to individual-level data on symptoms, masking, serologic status, or viral genome for cases.

This study finds that infection-acquired and vaccine-derived immunity confer indirect protection to close social contacts, with stronger and more durable indirect protection from immunity acquired from prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. These findings have implications for understanding transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 and can inform vaccine and public health control measures for high-risk environments.

Materials and Methods

Study design

We used a test-negative case control design to evaluate indirect protection of COVID-19 vaccination and prior infection conferred to residents in California prisons[18,19]. We defined indirect protection as the difference in risk for SARS-CoV-2 infection between individuals with an unvaccinated and previously uninfected roommate and individuals with vaccinated and/or previously infected roommate. While the test-negative case control design is most often applied

to measure direct vaccine effectiveness by comparing vaccine status in cases and controls[19], we match cases and controls by vaccine status and prior infection history to identify differential risk between cases and controls solely from their roommates' vaccine status and prior infection history.

Data

We used anonymized person-level data from CCHCS on demographics, SARS-CoV-2 testing, COVID-19 vaccination, and nightly housing information for incarcerated persons in the California state prison system from March 1, 2020, to December 15, 2022. We defined a study period from December 15, 2021, to December 15, 2022, based on a pre-specified objective of studying contemporary variants (e.g., Omicron subvariants BA.1, BA.2, BA.4, and BA.5) while ensuring consistent system-wide testing practices. Residents were isolated if they tested positive for SARS-CoV-2; the majority of tests were polymerase chain reaction. Isolation, quarantine, and testing practices during the study period are further described in the Supplementary Notes.

COVID-19 cases and controls

The inclusion and exclusion criteria for cases and controls are shown in Figure 2. Cases were defined as residents with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test (first positive test in at least 90 days). Controls were defined as residents with a negative SARS-CoV-2 test with no positive test in the preceding 90 days or subsequent 14 days. Both cases and controls were required to reside in rooms of only two residents in the 3-6 days leading up to their test. The timing of this housing requirement was chosen to represent the latent period between exposure and detectable infection and to account for movement of residents in response to SARS-CoV-2 exposure and was varied

in sensitivity analyses. Cases, controls, and their roommates were required to have been incarcerated before April 1, 2020, to ensure a more complete history of documented SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Statistical analysis

We performed matching of cases and controls to minimize risk of confounding and to account for differences by building and over time (Supplementary Notes). Cases and controls were first matched exactly by time (tests within two days), building and security level (which largely determines a resident's social contacts), COVID-19 vaccine status (unvaccinated, partially vaccinated, primary series alone, one booster dose, two or more booster doses), and prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (binary). We matched cases and controls by vaccine and prior infection status to limit confounding from direct protection. Cases and controls were then further matched to minimize differences in time since their most recent SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or COVID-19 vaccination and age (in years) and risk score for severe COVID-19 (weighted score of risk factors for severe COVID-19 used by CCHCS) between cases and controls and between their roommates. Cases and controls were ineligible for matching if they resided together. Cases and controls were matched in a 1:2 ratio (although a subset was matched 1:1 based on available controls) though this was varied in a sensitivity analysis. Descriptive data on the quality of matches are in Supplementary Figure 1.

To estimate the indirect protection from vaccine-derived and infection-acquired immunity, we fit conditional logistic regression models, defining strata for matched sets of cases and controls[27]. The model outcome was SARS-CoV-2 infection (case or control), and the primary exposures of

interest were the COVID-19 vaccine status (binary) and prior infection history (binary) of the roommate. Indirect protection (vaccine effectiveness against infection risk in the roommate) was estimated from one minus the adjusted odds ratio (OR)[18,19]. We adjusted for age and severe COVID-19 risk in cases, controls, and their roommates. Since the model was stratified by matched case and control pairs, we did not adjust for covariates that were exactly matched (e.g., building and security level, COVID-19 vaccine status, and prior infection history of cases and controls). We defined onset of vaccine protection as 14 days after receipt of each dose, which is consistent with literature[28,29]. We defined infection-acquired immunity as prior infection more than 14 days prior to testing to remove individuals who had an active SARS-CoV-2 infection.

We fit additional models to explore the dose- and time-dependence of indirect protection. We also tested an interaction between vaccine and prior infection exposures and measured indirect protection from hybrid immunity (both COVID-19 vaccine and prior SARS-CoV-2 infection). We defined COVID-19 vaccine status numerically by doses (unvaccinated, partially vaccinated, primary series alone, one booster dose, two or more booster doses). We assessed durability of indirect protection from COVID-19 vaccines and infection-acquired immunity in separate models by defining exposures by time. We defined key time categories based on vaccine literature[25,30], including <3 months, 3-6 months, 6-12 months, and 12+ months. We also measured indirect protection over time since most recent immunizing event (most recent vaccination or infection). Each model was adjusted for age and risk of severe COVID-19 of cases, controls, and their roommates and, if applicable, binary vaccine status or prior infection status of the case and control.

Bivalent COVID-19 vaccines targeting both the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain and Omicron subvariants BA.4 and BA.5 became the only available vaccine in the study population in September 2022. We performed an analysis where we estimated the indirect protection from bivalent vaccines (received after September 1, 2022). We compared these estimates to the indirect protection from monovalent vaccine (<3 months, 3+ months), although these estimates were from the period prior to bivalent introduction (see Supplementary Notes).

Analysis was conducted in R (version 4.3.1). All code is publicly available[31].

Sensitivity analyses

We conducted various sensitivity analyses of study design and analytical decisions. We tested different housing requirements for roommates of cases and controls (3 day, 0-6 days, 6-9 days). We assessed differences in results when matching cases and controls in a 1:1 ratio. We assessed robustness of results to adjustment for time since last COVID-19 vaccine and time since last SARS-CoV-2 infection. We also tested a logistic regression model without accounting for matched strata with the same study population of matched cases and controls.

Ethics

This study was approved by the IRB at Stanford University and UCSF. The IRB included a waiver of consent given use of retrospective secondary data without direct identifiers that were collected for public health surveillance and deemed to be minimal risk (see Supplementary Notes). Isolation, quarantine, and testing practices are further described in the Supplementary Notes.

References

1. Anderson RM, May RM. *Infectious Diseases of Humans: Dynamics and Control*. Oxford University Press; 1992.

2. Halloran ME, Haber M, Longini IM Jr, Struchiner CJ. Direct and Indirect Effects in Vaccine Efficacy and Effectiveness. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1991;133(4):323-331.

3. Hayek S, Shaham G, Ben-Shlomo Y, et. al. Indirect protection of children from SARS-CoV-2 infection through parental vaccination. *Science*. 2022;375:1155-1159.

4. Tan ST, Kwan AT, Rodríguez-Barraquer I, et al. Infectiousness of SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections and reinfections during the Omicron wave. *Nat Med*. 2023;29(2):358-365.

5. Prunas O, Warren JL, Crawford FW, et al. Vaccination with BNT162b2 reduces transmission of SARS-CoV-2 to household contacts in Israel. *Science*. 2022;375(6585):1151-1154.

6. Lyngse FP, Mortensen LH, Denwood MJ, et al. Household transmission of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in Denmark. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):5573.

7. Baker JM. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron) Variant Transmission Within Households — Four U.S. Jurisdictions, November 2021–February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2022;71.

8. Madewell ZJ, Yang Y, Longini IM Jr, Halloran ME, Dean NE. Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031756.

9. Jung J, Kim JY, Park H, et al. Transmission and Infectious SARS-CoV-2 Shedding Kinetics in Vaccinated and Unvaccinated Individuals. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(5):e2213606.

10. Richterman A, Meyerowitz EA, Cevik M. Indirect Protection by Reducing Transmission: Ending the Pandemic With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Vaccination. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2022;9(2):ofab259.

11. Salo J, Hägg M, Kortelainen M, et al. The indirect effect of mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccination on healthcare workers' unvaccinated household members. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):1162.

12. Burkhalter E, Colón I, Derr B, et al. Incarcerated and Infected: How the Virus Tore Through the U.S. Prison System. *The New York Times.* Accessed April 15, 2024. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/04/10/us/covid-prison-outbreak.html.

13. Data Visualizations. COVID Prison Project. Accessed April 15, 2024. https://covidprisonproject.com/data-visualizations/

14. Saloner B, Parish K, Ward JA, DiLaura G, Dolovich S. COVID-19 Cases and Deaths in Federal and State Prisons. *JAMA*. 2020;324(6):602-603.

15. Chin ET, Ryckman T, Prince L, et al. COVID-19 in the California State Prison System: an Observational Study of Decarceration, Ongoing Risks, and Risk Factors. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2021;36(10):3096-3102.

16. Kwan A, Sklar R, Cameron DB, et al. Respiratory pandemic preparedness learnings from the June 2020 COVID-19 outbreak at San Quentin California State Prison. *Int J Prison Health*. 2022;19(3):306-321.

17. Sklar R, Noth E, Kwan A, Sear D, Bertozzi S. Ventilation conditions during COVID-19 outbreaks in six California state carceral institutions. *PLOS ONE*. 2023;18(11):e0293533.

18. Lewnard JA, Patel MM, Jewell NP, et al. Theoretical Framework for Retrospective Studies of the Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines. *Epidemiology*. 2021;32(4):508.

19. Lewnard JA, Tedijanto C, Cowling BJ, Lipsitch M. Measurement of Vaccine Direct Effects Under the Test-Negative Design. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2018;187(12):2686-2697.

20. CDC. COVID Data Tracker. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Accessed April 15, 2024. https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker

21. Pfizer and BioNTech Granted FDA Emergency Use Authorization of Omicron BA.4/BA.5-Adapted Bivalent COVID-19 Vaccine Booster for Ages 12 Years and Older. Accessed April 15, 2024. https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-granted-fda-emergency-use-authorization

22. COVID-19 Vaccine Booster Questions & Answers. Accessed April 15, 2024. https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CID/DCDC/Pages/COVID-19/Vaccine-Booster-QA.aspx

23. Altarawneh HN, Chemaitelly H, Hasan MR, et al. Protection against the Omicron Variant from Previous SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(13):1288-1290.

24. Chin ET, Leidner D, Lamson L, et al. Protection against Omicron from Vaccination and Previous Infection in a Prison System. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;387(19):1770-1782.

25. Rennert L, Ma Z, McMahan CS, Dean D. Effectiveness and protection duration of Covid-19 vaccines and previous infection against any SARS-CoV-2 infection in young adults. *Nat Commun*. 2022;13(1):3946.

26. California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. COVID-19 Updates. COVID-19 Information. Accessed April 15, 2024. https://www.cdcr.ca.gov/covid19/covid-19-updates/

27. Pearce N. Analysis of matched case-control studies. *BMJ*. 2016;352:i969.

28. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(5):403-416.

29. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(27):2603-2615.

30. Menegale F, Manica M, Zardini A, et al. Evaluation of Waning of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine–Induced Immunity: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(5):e2310650.

31. GitHub Repository. https://github.com/sophttan/covid-indirects

Acknowledgments: We thank Dr. Heidi Bauer and Dr. Richard Sun for valuable input and acknowledge individuals at the Office of the California Prison Health Care Receivership and California Correctional Health Care Services. We acknowledge the individuals who provided the data underlying these analyses.

Disclaimer: The study content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

Funding: NCL is supported by the National Institutes of Health, NIAID New Innovator Award (DP2AI170485).

Author contributions: Ms. Sophia Tan and Dr. Nathan Lo had full access to all the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: STT, DS, NCL

Statistical analysis: STT, NCL

Analytic coding: STT

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors

First draft of the manuscript: STT, NCL

Critical revision of the manuscript: All authors

Contributed intellectual material and approved final draft: All authors

Competing interests: JAL has received grants, honoraria, and speaker fees from Pfizer; grants and honoraria from Merck, Sharp, & Dohme; honoraria from Valneva; and honoraria from VaxCyte; all unrelated to the subject of this work. ATK and DS received funding from California Prison Health Care Receivership. The remaining authors have no disclosures.

Data and materials availability: Data requests may be made to California Correctional Health Care Services and are subject to controlled access. All analytic code is publicly available[31].

Table and Figures

Table 1. Characteristics of the study population of COVID-19 cases, matched controls, and their roommates in California prisons.

	Case/Control (N (SD) or N (%))		Roommate (N (SD) or N (%))	
	Case (N=4,640)	Control (N=7,915)	Case (N=4,640)	Control (N=7,915)
Age (years)	42.3 (12.6)	42.6 (12)	42.7 (12.4)	42.4 (11.9)
Sex (male)	4,519 (97)	7,705 (97)	4,517 (97)	7,707 (97)
Race				
American Indian/Alaskan Native	52 (1)	85 (1)	52 (1)	84 (1)
Asian or Pacific Islander	51 (1)	126 (1.5)	49 (1)	93 (1)
Black	1,285 (28)	2,106 (26.5)	1,272 (27)	2,110 (27)
Hispanic	2,322 (50)	4,033 (51)	2,325 (50)	4,073 (52)
White	738 (16)	1,188 (15)	733 (16)	1,203 (15)
Other	192 (4)	377 (5)	209 (5)	352 (4)
Risk score for severe COVID-19[a]	1.4 (2)	1.4 (1.8)	1.4 (2)	1.3 (1.8)
Security level[b]				
Low	2,217 (48)	3,907 (50)	2,217 (48)	3,907 (50)
Moderate	899 (19)	1,455 (18)	899 (19)	1,455 (18)
High	1,524 (33)	2,553 (32)	1,524 (33)	2,553 (32)
Vaccine status				
Unvaccinated	541 (11.5)	833 (10.5)	653 (14)	905 (11.5)
Partially vaccinated	22 (0.5)	29 (0.5)	48 (1)	110 (1.5)
Primary series only	960 (20.5)	1,530 (19)	979 (21)	1,677 (21)
1 booster dose	2,773 (60)	4,913 (62)	2,578 (56)	4,580 (58)
2+ booster doses	344 (7.5)	610 (8)	382 (8)	643 (8)
Time since last vaccine dose (days)	155 (122)	147 (121)	151 (125)	148 (128)
Prior infection status				
Has prior infection	1,946 (42)	3,512 (44)	2,181 (47)	4,090 (52)
Time since last infection (days)	486 (147)	472 (152)	469 (169)	456 (175)

Cases and controls were matched exactly by vaccine status, prior infection status, building, and security level, with additional distance matching on other variables. Cases were matched with controls in a 1:2 ratio, although a subset were matched 1:1 based on available controls meeting study criteria. Full matching process is described in the Methods.

[a]Risk for severe COVID-19 is a composite score of the number of risk factors for severe disease including age and medical conditions. Risk scores were calculated by the California Correctional Health Care Services.

[b]Resident contact and activity are determined by their security level. Low level (score 1-2) reflects the lowest security level with more social contacts, while high level (score 4) is the highest security level with fewer social contacts.



Figure 1. SARS-CoV-2 infections, testing, and vaccination in California state prisons. We analyzed anonymized retrospective data from a SARS-CoV-2 surveillance program of residents incarcerated across 35 California state prisons. We plotted the total number of weekly SARS-CoV-2 infections and weekly SARS-CoV-2 tests (top) and cumulative vaccine coverage (bottom). Data are shown from March 2020 to December 2022, although the study period was December 2021 to December 2022 (shaded in gray) during circulation of Omicron variant/sub-variants. SARS-CoV-2 testing rates were consistent over the study period. Vaccine administration switched from ancestral monovalent vaccines to bivalent vaccines in September 2022.



Figure 2. Study population flow chart. We designed a test-negative case control study to measure the indirect protection provided by COVID-19 vaccination and/or infection-acquired immunity. We analyzed anonymized retrospective data from a SARS-CoV-2 surveillance program of residents incarcerated in the California state prison system from December 15, 2021, to December 15, 2022. We identified individuals with a new SARS-CoV-2 infection (cases) and individuals with a negative SARS-CoV-2 test (controls) during the same time and residing in the same building. Cases and controls were required to co-reside in rooms with a single other resident in the 3-6 days leading up to test collection, to account for the latent period from exposure to detectable infection. We required cases and controls and their roommates to be incarcerated since March 2020 to ensure a complete record of prior infection over the pandemic. Cases and controls were matched in a 1:2 ratio based on multiple characteristics (although a subset was only matched 1:1 based on available controls meeting study criteria), including vaccination and prior infection status. We then evaluated differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome in cases/controls based on the vaccine and prior infection history of their roommate. The sample size of the study population is shown at various stages of applying the study criteria and matching.



Figure 3. Overall vaccine-derived and infection-acquired indirect protection to close social contacts against SARS-CoV-2 infection. We estimated the indirect protection that COVID-19 vaccination and infection-acquired immunity provided to their roommate. We defined indirect protection as change in risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in an individual based on their roommate's vaccine and prior infection status. Residents in California state prisons were found to be less likely to be infected by the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant if they co-resided with an individual with vaccine-derived and/or infection-acquired protection. The mechanism of protection is likely that individuals with vaccination and/or prior infection are less likely to become infected (and then transmit infection) or are less infectious upon breakthrough infection or reinfection. For residents with hybrid immunity during the study period, most were more likely to be recently vaccinated than recently infected. We plotted the mean (point estimate) and associated 95% confidence intervals (bars) for indirect protection. We defined vaccination both as a binary variable and by dose and infection-acquired immunity as binary. Separate regression models were fit for binary vaccination and binary infection, vaccination by dose, and hybrid immunity.



Figure 4. Comparative strength and durability of vaccine-derived and infection-acquired indirect protection to close social contacts against SARS-CoV-2 infection. We estimated the strength and durability of indirect protection that COVID-19 vaccination and infection-acquired immunity provided to their close social contact (roommate). Residents in California state prisons were found to have benefit (e.g., less likely to be infected by the Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant) when residing with an individual with infection-acquired or vaccine-derived protection; both sources of indirect protection waned over time, but infection-acquired protection yielded stronger and more durable indirect protection. We estimated indirect protection based on time since last vaccine dose (left), time since last SARS-CoV-2 infection (middle), and time since either most recent vaccine or infection (right). We plotted the mean (point estimate) and associated 95% confidence intervals (bars) for indirect protection. We fit separate models for vaccine-derived immunity, infection-acquired immunity, and most recent vaccination or infection.



Figure 5. Indirect protection from variant-targeting bivalent COVID-19 vaccine and comparison to ancestral monovalent vaccine during Omicron era. We estimated the indirect protection from a variant-targeting vaccine (bivalent vaccine formulated with ancestral strain and Omicron subvariants BA.4/5 to target circulating variants) in California state prisons. Our goal was to determine how concordance of vaccine formulation and circulating variants would affect vaccine-derived indirect protection. Administration of bivalent vaccines began in September 2022, which yielded approximately 3 months of follow up; therefore, estimates were only available for 3 months. We include comparison to ancestral monovalent counterparts during the study period prior to bivalent introduction in September 2022. Bivalent vaccine formulations demonstrated strong indirect protection within three months, with trend towards larger degree of indirect protection compared to ancestral monovalent vaccines. We estimated indirect protection and plotted the mean (point estimate) and associated 95% confidence intervals (bars) for indirect protection.