

1 Depletion-of-susceptibles bias in influenza vaccine waning studies: how to ensure robust results

2

3

4 M. Lipsitch^{1,2*}, E. Goldstein¹, G.T. Ray³, B. Fireman³

5

6

7 1. Center for Communicable Disease Dynamics, Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T.H. Chan

8 School of Public Health, 677 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115 USA

9

10 2. Department of Immunology and Infectious Diseases, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public

11 Health, 665 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115 USA

12

13 3. Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente, 2000 Broadway Oakland, CA 94612 USA

14

15 *Corresponding author. mlipsitc@hsph.harvard.edu

16

17 Running head: Bias in vaccine waning studies

18

19

20

21

22 SUMMARY

23

24 Vaccine effectiveness (VE) studies are subject to biases due to depletion of at-risk persons or of
25 highly susceptible persons at different rates from different groups (depletion-of-susceptibles
26 bias), a problem that can also lead to biased estimates of waning effectiveness, including
27 spurious inference of waning when none exists. An alternative study design to identify waning
28 is to study only vaccinated persons, and compare for each day the incidence in persons with
29 earlier or later dates of vaccination. Prior studies suggested under what conditions this
30 alternative would yield correct estimates of waning. Here we define the depletion-of-
31 susceptibles process formally and show mathematically that for influenza vaccine waning
32 studies, a randomized trial or corresponding observational study that compares incidence at a
33 specific calendar time among individuals vaccinated at different times before the influenza
34 season begins will not be vulnerable depletion-of-susceptibles bias in its inference of waning
35 under the null hypothesis that none exists, and will – if waning does actually occur –
36 underestimate the extent of waning. Such a design is thus robust in the sense that a finding of
37 waning in that inference framework reflects actual waning of vaccine-induced immunity. We
38 recommend such a design for future studies of waning, whether observational or randomized.
39

40
41 Recent studies of influenza vaccine effectiveness (VE) have suggested that effectiveness declines
42 over the course of one season, i.e., that vaccine efficacy declines as the season progresses [1-3].
43 However, these results have been called into question because inferences of waning may be
44 biased. When there is no waning, some study designs (including the classic test-negative
45 observational design [4, 5] and randomized controlled trials [6-8]) may nonetheless infer
46 waning – measured as a decline in vaccine effectiveness as the season progresses. This biased
47 inference is predicted to occur when the vaccine offers “leaky” protection, reducing the
48 probability of infection on exposure by some proportion less than 100% , and either or both of
49 the following conditions holds and is unaccounted for in the analysis [5]: i) some infections
50 occur unobserved in the study population, such that individuals are infected and (for the
51 season) immune to further infection unbeknownst to the researchers [4, 9]; or ii) heterogeneity
52 in the population exists and is unaccounted for, such that certain persons are at higher risk of
53 becoming exposed or, if they are exposed, of becoming infected upon exposure for reasons
54 other than their vaccine status, for example due to age, history of infection or vaccination, or
55 occupation [6-8].

56
57 If either or both of these conditions hold, then over the course of the season, there will be
58 unobserved reductions in the population at risk (or, for the second, at high risk) in each arm of
59 the trial, and these reductions will be greater in any group that receives less vaccine protection,
60 more moderate in a group that is more protected. In a classic comparison of vaccinated vs.
61 unvaccinated persons, this “depletion of susceptibles” will reduce the pool of susceptible

62 individuals (and especially of highly susceptible individuals) in the unvaccinated group more
63 than in the vaccinated group, reducing the influenza incidence rate in the unvaccinated group
64 relative to the vaccinated group as time progresses; equivalently, the benefit of the vaccine will
65 appear to wane.

66

67 Recently, a novel, cohort variant of the test-negative design, was proposed and implemented
68 that sought to circumvent these sources of bias. This design [10] considered only persons who
69 received influenza vaccine and were subsequently tested for influenza infection. As in the
70 classic TND the vaccine history was compared between those testing positive vs. negative for
71 influenza infection, but unlike a classic TND, the time from vaccination to influenza test was the
72 exposure of interest (as the study was limited to those who had received vaccine and later
73 received a test). Relative VE for individuals vaccinated at different time points was estimated as
74 a function of this interval, by estimating – at a specific calendar time (using conditional logistic
75 regression) the odds ratio between influenza test-positive and test-negative participants, as
76 predicted by time of vaccine receipt and other covariates. Crucial to this method is that
77 individuals with different vaccination dates are compared on a fixed calendar date, rather than
78 (as in the classic TND) comparing individuals with a different vaccination statuses on different
79 calendar dates. The time from exposure (vaccination) to outcome (infection) is thus measured
80 precisely and not conflated with calendar time. That study estimated approximately 16%
81 waning in relative effectiveness of vaccination for each 28 days earlier a person had been
82 vaccinated [10].

83

84 Peer review and a commentary published alongside the study [11] questioned whether this
85 design had eliminated the potential bias associated with depletion of susceptibles. Subsequent
86 discussions led to reanalysis of the data set with restriction to those who had been vaccinated
87 before influenza season, that is, before infections with influenza could differentially deplete
88 susceptible hosts from different time-of-vaccination groups. The result confirmed the finding of
89 the previous analysis [12]. It was shown heuristically and with simulations that the following
90 was true of the revised analysis: under the null hypothesis that vaccine efficacy did not wane,
91 the study would in expectation be unbiased, estimating that indeed there was no waning, or
92 equivalently that vaccine effectiveness was equal regardless of the time since vaccination.
93 Under the alternative hypothesis that vaccine protection does wane, simulations showed that
94 differential depletion of susceptibles can bias this analysis toward underestimating waning, but
95 not toward overestimating waning and not toward an incorrect finding that VE wanes. By this
96 logic, a study of pre-season vaccinees only that found no waning might be hard to interpret
97 (either truly null, or waning does occur but bias in the design makes it hard to detect), but a
98 finding that waning does occur could not be attributed to these sources of bias.

99
100 It would be ethical and informative to undertake a randomized controlled trial in which persons
101 intending to be vaccinated are randomized to early or late vaccination, on dates anticipated to
102 precede the start of influenza circulation (eg. September 1 vs. October 15) and incidence rates
103 or proportions compared between these two arms, as we have proposed elsewhere [12, 13].
104 Knowing the expected outcomes under various scenarios would facilitate interpretation of such
105 a trial. Meanwhile, it would be valuable to know precisely under what circumstances designs

106 such as the test-negative case-control approach or a cohort-based modification of that
107 approach (as performed in the example described above [10]) would perform in similar ways.
108 For our purposes, a key difference between the classic test-negative case-control design and a
109 prospective observational or randomized cohort design is that the latter designs attempt to
110 track who is at risk for the outcome, for example by censoring people after they have had one
111 influenza test [10] or after they have had one positive test (a typical randomized trial). By
112 contrast, the test-negative case-control design relies on assumptions that the test-negative
113 participants are representative of the population at risk. Because the biases considered in this
114 study come from the unobserved changes in the susceptibility of the at-risk population, these
115 may be subtly different in the different designs, and we consider several different incidence
116 measures below that represent different approaches to tracking who is at risk.

117
118 Here, we consider a hypothetical comparison of two groups of persons, those vaccinated early
119 (group E) and those vaccinated later (group L) with the same vaccine. These might be the two
120 arms of a randomized trial, or might represent an idealized comparison in an observational
121 study. When we compare two groups vaccinated at different times, with the possibility of
122 waning, it becomes interesting to consider how either the earlier vaccinees or the later
123 vaccinees can be subject to greater depletion of susceptibles, and thus the bias in estimating
124 waning can go either way. Specifically, if influenza is circulating between the time when group
125 E is vaccinated and the later time when group L is vaccinated, group L may be more depleted by
126 incidence of infection prior to vaccination in that interval. On the other hand, if vaccine
127 protection in fact wanes, then group E may be less protected than group L on some or all days

128 after both groups have been vaccinated because the protection in group E will have had longer
129 to wane. Thus, in such a scenario – where group L was vaccinated during the influenza season --
130 either group can be get depleted of its susceptibles faster than the other and so the bias may
131 go in either direction. Here we show how this tradeoff occurs, and define a condition under
132 which the bias will overstate waning (group E will look less protected than they are, because
133 susceptibility is more depleted in group L), or will understate waning (group E will look more
134 protected than they are, because their susceptibles are less depleted than group L), or the
135 estimate of waning will be correct. As particular cases, we show that if vaccination of some
136 individuals occurs after influenza season begins, and there is no waning, then the study will
137 erroneously infer waning has occurred as a result of unobserved differential depletion of
138 susceptibles between early- and late-vaccinated participants. If there is waning, the estimated
139 extent of waning may be biased in either direction. On the other hand, if individuals are all
140 vaccinated before influenza season starts (so that there is no risk of infection in any participant
141 before they are vaccinated), and if there is no waning, the study will correctly infer that there is
142 no waning (unbiased estimate). If individuals are all vaccinated before influenza season starts,
143 and there is waning, then the degree of waning will be underestimated (and we cannot rule out
144 an erroneous estimate of increased effectiveness with time since vaccination). These results are
145 summarized in Table 1.

146

147

148

Truth

		No true waning (Null hypothesis)	True Waning (Alternative hypothesis)
	Include persons vaccinated after influenza season begins	Biased away from the null: Waning erroneously inferred. Claim 2(i)	Biased: Waning may be over- or under-estimated depending on balance of two effects. Claim 2(ii)
	Restrict analysis to persons vaccinated before start of season	Unbiased: No waning inferred (Claim 2(iii))	Waning under-estimated. Cannot rule out erroneous rise in VE with time since vaccination (“antiwaning”). Claim 2(iii))

149 Table 1: Summary of findings

150 **MODEL**

151 We consider a cohort split into groups and subgroups as described below, and describe its
 152 progress through an influenza season. We define a season as a period with nonzero influenza
 153 incidence, that is the period during the year during which $\lambda(t) > 0$, where $\lambda(t)$ is the force of
 154 infection with influenza, described more fully below. We denote the start of influenza season as
 155 t_0 . We assume that within a season it is possible to be infected with influenza at most once due
 156 to immunity. We focus on a comparison between groups with two different dates of
 157 vaccination, early (E vaccinated at time t_E) and late (L vaccinated at time $t_L > t_E$). We
 158 consider different scenarios where vaccination of these individuals is complete before ($t_L <$
 159 t_0), or not complete before ($t_L > t_0$), the start of influenza season. We envision a study in

160 which at some time before influenza season, persons are randomized to be vaccinated early or
161 late, or else choose their vaccination date in a way that is not confounded by predictors of the
162 outcome (test-positive influenza). We focus here on the control of bias from differential
163 depletion of susceptibles. In this study, all participants are vaccinated; the only difference is
164 when. Throughout the analysis we describe expected outcomes, or equivalently outcomes in an
165 arbitrarily large study, neglecting sampling variation; we also neglect all complexities such as
166 loss to follow up, nonadherence, and the like, to focus on the best-case scenario for inference
167 on the existence or nonexistence of waning. Waning is inferred to have occurred by time t if the
168 incidence at time t is greater in the early than in the late-vaccinated group, or equivalently, the
169 relative efficacy of the vaccine is greater in the late-vaccinated group than in the early. Note
170 that the exact timing when the vaccine began to lose efficacy is not specified; waning may have
171 begun before or during the season, as we infer only that it occurred between vaccination and
172 time t . Note also that this definition restricts attention to *host* biological processes by which an
173 individual's protection from the vaccine on a given day (with the strains circulating then) is less
174 if vaccination occurred longer ago. We define incidence in three alternative ways below,
175 corresponding to three possible targets for estimation in different observational or randomized
176 study designs.

177
178 Now, consider a population group G (this will take the value either E or L for early or late
179 vaccinees respectively). G is further split into N subgroups of homogeneous exposure to
180 infection and baseline "frailty" (probability of infection given exposure to infection if
181 unvaccinated) ($i = 1, \dots, N$) such that subgroup G_i is a proportion f_i of the population in G .

182 Because we envision a large study with no confounding (by randomization or simply by
183 assumption), the f_i are the same for both groups (E and L). Let $b_i \lambda(t)$ be the force of infection
184 to unvaccinated individuals still at risk of infection subgroup i at time t . We refer to b_i as the
185 frailty of group i , and we arrange the groups in decreasing order of frailty so that $b_i > b_{i+1}$.
186 Without loss of generality, we define $b_i = 1$. We allow for the possibility that some persons are
187 completely immune to influenza infection throughout the season and assign them (if they exist)
188 to the lowest-frailty group (group G_N with a frailty of $b_N = 0$). Let $\vartheta_G(t)$ be 1 minus vaccine
189 efficacy in group G at time t (thus $\vartheta_G(t) = 1$ if $t < t_G$, where t_G is the time of vaccination in
190 group G and $\vartheta_G(t) \leq 1$ after vaccination, that is when $t > t_G$). Thus we assume the vaccine
191 never harms an individual; it is at worst ineffective under extreme waning. For simplicity we
192 assume that $\vartheta_G(t_G) = \vartheta_G < 1$ and $\vartheta_G(t)$ is nondecreasing with t and is constant in the case of
193 no waning. Thus, we assume vaccine is most protective immediately after vaccination, and may
194 wane thereafter. Here we define waning to mean a scenario in which on a particular day, an
195 individual vaccinated longer ago is less protected against infection with the currently circulating
196 strains than had they been vaccinated more recently. We assume that vaccine efficacy, and
197 equivalently $\vartheta_G(t)$, is the same for all subgroups G_i within G ; this assumption may be
198 loosened but is kept for the sake of clearer exposition in the proofs.

199
200 Let $p_G^i(t)$ be the proportion of persons in subgroup G_i still at risk of influenza infection at time
201 t . Because we have placed all persons totally immune to infection in group N with frailty $b_N =$

202 0, we can assume that everyone in groups with nonzero frailty is susceptible at the start of flu
203 season, that is, $p_i^G(t_0) = 1$ if $b_i > 0$.

204

205 The proportion at risk in group G as a whole is

206
$$p_G(t) = \sum_i f_i p_G^i(t). \quad (1)$$

207 For each subgroup i , rate of change with time is

208
$$p_G^i(t)' = -\vartheta_G(t) b_i \lambda(t) p_G^i(t) \quad (2)$$

209 We define the mean frailty among those still at risk in group G as

210
$$B_G(t) = \frac{\sum_i b_i f_i p_G^i(t)}{\sum_i f_i p_G^i(t)} = \frac{\sum_i b_i f_i p_G^i(t)}{p_G(t)} \quad (3)$$

211 If a proportion a of all cases is ascertained (ie is symptomatic and comes for testing and tests
212 positive for influenza), then the rate at which influenza cases in group G present for care and
213 test positive for influenza, following the notation in ref. [4], but dropping the subscript for
214 influenza, is

215
$$\Lambda_G(t) = -\pi_I \mu p_G(t)' = -a \vartheta_G(t) \lambda(t) \sum_i b_i f_i p_G^i(t) = -a \vartheta_G(t) \lambda(t) B_G(t) p_G(t) \quad (4)$$

216

217 We note that the proportion of the population at risk in each group at time t , which we call
218 $p_G(t)$, will in general differ from the proportion the investigators believe to be at risk in that
219 group, as long as not all cases are ascertained [9]. The proportion thought to be no longer at
220 risk will be the cumulative number infected, times the probability of ascertainment given
221 infection. Denoting this probability of ascertainment as $a = \pi_I \mu$, the proportion thought to be
222 at risk in group G at time t is

223
$$x_G(t) = 1 - a(1 - p_G(t)). \quad (5)$$

224

225 RESULTS

226 The following claims state formally the conclusions summarized in Table 1. We describe each
227 claim, and give the proofs in the appendix.

228 **Claim 1:** Suppose that the influenza season begins at time t_0 after which influenza hazard of
229 infection $\lambda(s) \geq 0$ for $s > t_0$, and let the early and late groups be vaccinated at times t_E and t_L
230 respectively. These may be before or after t_0 . We consider various incidence measures at time
231 $t_1 > \max(t_L, t_0)$. Whenever the cumulative hazard for the highest-frailty subgroup, modified
232 by vaccination, by time t_1 in group E is less than in group L, which is equivalent to

$$233 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s) ds < \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s) ds \quad (6)$$

234 we will have

$$235 \text{ a) } \frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)} > \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$$

$$236 \text{ b) } \frac{\Lambda_E(t)/p_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/p_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$$

$$237 \text{ c) } \frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$$

238 and

239 d) if inequality 6 is reversed, then inequalities a, b, and c are reversed. Inequality b will be strict
240 if there is heterogeneous frailty ($N > 1$). Inequality c will be strict if there is heterogeneous
241 frailty ($N > 1$) and/or imperfect ascertainment of cases ($a < 1$), and equal otherwise ($a = N =$
242 1). All inequalities will become equalities if the two sides of eq. 6 are equal.

243 Remark: this claim concerns three different incidence measures that may be of interest. a)

244 $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)} > \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$: $\Lambda_G(t)$ is the incidence measure treating the original population at risk as the

245 denominator.

246 b) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/p_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/p_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} \cdot \frac{\Lambda_G(t)}{p_G}$ is an incidence measure including in the denominator only those

247 participants in the denominator who have not yet been infected at t . Here the inequality is

248 strict if there is heterogeneous frailty, but if frailty is homogeneous (only $N = 1$ subgroup in

249 each group) then equality holds and no waning would be inferred.

250 c) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} \cdot \frac{\Lambda_G(t)}{x_G}$ is incidence among those who were at risk at the start of the season

251 and are not known to have been infected before t (allowing for imperfect ascertainment of

252 each case with probability a as defined in equation (5).

253 **Claim 2: The particular cases considered in Table 1 are true, following from Claim 1:**

254 i) top row of Table 1: If there is no waning (so that $\frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$ for $t > t_L$) and vaccination is not

255 completed before the start of influenza season ($t_L > t_0$), then for all for $t > t_L$, the following

256 inequalities will hold, potentially producing erroneous inferences of waning:

257 a) $\Lambda_E(t) > \Lambda_L(t)$

258 b) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{p_E} \geq \frac{\Lambda_L(t)}{p_L}$: Here the inequality is strict if there is heterogeneous frailty, but if frailty is

259 homogeneous (only $N = 1$ subgroup in each group) then equality holds and no waning would

260 be inferred.

261 c) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{x_E} \geq \frac{\Lambda_L(t)}{x_L}$. Here, the inequality is strict if there is either heterogeneous frailty ($N > 1$) or

262 imperfect ascertainment ($a < 1$), but equality holds if neither of these applies ($a = N = 1$).

263 ii) If there is waning and vaccination is not completed before the influenza season, the net bias
264 may go either way. If equation 6 holds and $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s) ds = C_E(t_1) < C_L(t_1) =$
265 $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s) ds$, then waning will be overestimated, but if the inequality is switched, it will be
266 underestimated.

267
268 **iii)** (bottom row of Table 1): If vaccination is completed before influenza season begins ($t_E <$
269 $t_L < t_0$), then the following inequalities will hold, with waning underestimated when it exists
270 and correctly estimated as null when it does not.

271 a) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning ($\frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$)

272 b) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/p_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/p_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning or when frailty is homogeneous
273 ($N = 1$)

274 c) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning or when $a = N = 1$, ie both (i)

275 frailty is homogeneous and (ii) case ascertainment is perfect.

276

277 **DISCUSSION**

278 We have formalized and proved in the appendix the claims summarized in Table 1 about the
279 direction of bias when various study designs are employed to assess whether vaccine
280 protection against influenza infection wanes within a season with increasing time since
281 vaccination. If a study compares the incidence of influenza among persons with early vs. late
282 vaccination, and if all vaccinations are completed before the start of influenza season, the
283 design will be unbiased under the null: no waning will be inferred. Under the alternative

284 hypothesis that waning does occur, its extent will be underestimated. Therefore, if waning is
285 inferred, the inference that it is occurring is robust, and the true magnitude may be larger than
286 what is inferred. It is theoretically possible that early vaccination could look more protective
287 than late under such a scenario when comparing instantaneous incidence because of the
288 phenomenon of crossing hazards [4, 14], though the practical likelihood of such intense bias
289 may be small. On the other hand, in a design where some vaccinations occur after the start of
290 influenza season, the estimate is biased under the null: if there is no waning of vaccine-induced
291 protection, waning will be inferred spuriously. If there is waning, the direction of bias is not
292 determined.

293
294 The demonstrations of each of our findings for the vaccinee-only design rely on the same
295 principle, applied differently when the timing of vaccination relative to the season is different.
296 The common principle is that a group that has more vaccine-induced protection will retain a
297 higher proportion of susceptible or highly susceptible individuals, while these will be depleted
298 faster in the group with less vaccine-induced protection. The investigators will be unable to
299 track this differential depletion if (1) susceptibility (frailty as we called it in line with other
300 literature) is variable but unmeasured and/or (2) infections are not all ascertained (eg due to
301 some being mild), so the population at risk is less than that thought to be at risk, especially in
302 the less-protected group.

303
304 This common principle is applied in opposite ways in different scenarios, because the late-
305 vaccinated group is more depleted when some influenza incidence occurs before they are

306 vaccinated, and the early-vaccinated group is more depleted when protection wanes, making
307 them less protected. In claim 1, we show how these alternative directions of bias balance when
308 both are present, with bias toward less waning if the effect of waning dominates, and bias
309 toward more waning if the depletion of susceptibles from the late-vaccinated group before
310 they received vaccine dominates. In claim 2, we apply this to particular cases and
311 mathematically confirm previous heuristic results – that waning estimates would be null when
312 there is really no waning if vaccination is complete before influenza circulation, that waning
313 would be underestimated if it truly exists and vaccination is complete before influenza
314 circulation, and that waning will be erroneously inferred if it does not exist if vaccination is
315 incomplete at the start of the influenza season. These lead to the recommendation to restrict
316 waning studies to persons vaccinated before influenza season begins.

317
318 Estimation biases occurring due to cohort-selection, differential depletion of susceptibles, or
319 unaccounted-for frailty heterogeneity (three terms for the same phenomenon [4, 6, 8, 9, 14,
320 15]) have been recognized in the literature for some decades[4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15] but are often
321 not accounted for in study design and analysis. The analysis here contributes two aspects to the
322 discussion. First, it mathematically separates out the effect of heterogeneous frailty (variation
323 in b_i in our notation, emphasized for example in (in review) and [7, 16]), which leads to the less-
324 protected group being more rapidly depleted of its most frail members and thus looking less at-
325 risk in the aggregate, from the effect of having unobserved infections (more of these in the less
326 protected groups) that deplete the number of persons at any risk differentially from different
327 groups, emphasized for example in [4, 9]. These biases work in the same direction, so that the

328 biases discussed here arise when either or both are present. The second contribution is to
329 show a general condition under which biases in one direction or the other are dominant in a
330 comparison of persons vaccinated on two dates, depending on which group has been more
331 depleted of susceptibles. The third is to show in general that, as proposed in (manuscript in
332 review), designs that restrict comparison to times of vaccination before the onset of disease
333 exposure are not susceptible to spurious inference of waning. While not applicable in all cases
334 [7], this may be achieved conveniently in highly seasonal diseases where a vaccine can be
335 delivered before transmission begins – such as influenza in temperate climates.

336

337 We note that this analysis considers only the biases that result from susceptible depletion
338 (which can be seen as a form of selection bias [17]). It does not consider other issues of
339 confounding and selection bias that can plague observational studies in this area [18, 19].
340 Therefore, it is notable that these concerns apply even in randomized trials; the reason can be
341 clearly seen, in that the biases occur due to post-randomization differences that arise between
342 the two arms and influence the outcome (incidence). The exact degree of the bias depends on
343 details of the study design, however. We showed that a bias in the same direction occurs for
344 each of three incidence measures. The first (daily rate of reported cases, without reference to a
345 population at risk) would be most relevant to the classic test-negative case-control design,
346 where no explicit cohort is followed (so depletion of susceptibles is entirely unobserved) but
347 rather, incidence of “test-negative” infections is used to assess the population at risk indirectly.
348 The last (rate of reported cases, relative to a population at risk that has been reduced when
349 cases are observed (since by assumption no one can get influenza twice in a season) is most

350 relevant to a randomized controlled trial or a study similar to that of [10], where a cohort is
351 followed, and persons receiving an influenza diagnosis are removed from the at-risk group (this
352 particular study also removed those who received an influenza test and were negative, but this
353 does not change the general finding). The middle incidence measure would be a target for
354 estimation in a study where every influenza case would be diagnosed and removed from the at-
355 risk group [9]. We considered this to make explicit that, even if this is accomplished (eg by
356 virologic or serologic testing [9]) the existence of variable frailty will still lead to the bias. Only if
357 frailty is homogeneous and all infections are perfectly ascertained (or if the vaccine is entirely
358 ineffective, perhaps due to a mismatch) does it completely disappear in general [9]. In the
359 special case where there is no waning, however, the design with preseason vaccination only will
360 be unbiased, and if there is waning, the preseason vaccination design will not overestimate its
361 extent. Therefore a finding of waning under that design (as in (under review)), is compelling
362 (unless other important biases are posited), while a failure to detect waning with that design is
363 harder to interpret.

364

365 In summary, we have provided evidence that a small modification to some existing studies of
366 vaccine waning – specifically, restricting consideration to those vaccinated before influenza
367 season -- may be sufficient to make findings of measurable waning very convincing and worthy
368 of consideration in recommendations for the timing of vaccination. We recommend such an
369 approach in future studies, whether experimental or observational.

370

371 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS, FUNDING AND COMPETING INTERESTS:** Support for this work came
372 from: the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institute of Health, USA
373 grant #1R01AI107721-01; cooperative agreement U54GM088558 from the National Institute
374 Of General Medical Sciences, National Institutes of Health USA; UK National Institute for Health
375 Research (NIHR)grant PR-OD-1017-20006 (Epidemiology for Vaccinology stream) using UK aid
376 from the UK government; and The Permanente Medical Group. The content is solely the
377 responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the
378 National Institute of General Medical Sciences, the National Institutes of Health, the NIHR or
379 the UK Department of Health and Social Care. G. Thomas Ray reports research support from
380 Pfizer. Marc Lipsitch reports support from Merck, Pfizer, Antigen Discovery, and Affinivax. The
381 remaining authors have no potential conflicts of interest to disclose.

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390 **Appendix (960 words)**

391 **A. A useful result applied in the main proof**

392 **Generalized Grönwall inequality**

393 Suppose we have two functions $f(t), g(t)$ that are solutions to the following ODEs

394

$$395 \quad f'(t) = u(t)f(t), \quad g'(t) = v(t)g(t)$$

396

397 If $f(0) \geq g(0) > 0$, one also has that $f(t) \geq g(t)$ for $t > t_0$ as long as

398

$$399 \quad \int_0^t u(s)ds \geq \int_0^t v(s)ds$$

400

401 In particular, that holds if $u(s) \geq v(s)$.

402 Moreover, the inequality $f(t) \geq g(t)$ is strict if either $f(0) > g(0)$ or $\int_0^t u(s)ds > \int_0^t v(s)ds$

403

404

405 **Proof:** The ODE for $f(t)$ can be re-written as $f'/f = u$, which mean $\frac{d}{ds}(\ln(f(s))) = u(s)$.

406 Integrating this from t_0 to t we get that

407

$$408 \quad f(t) = f(t_0)\exp\left(\int_0^t u(s)ds\right)$$

409 similarly,

$$410 \quad g(t) = g(t_0)\exp(\int_0^t v(s)ds)$$

411

412 From this the Generalized Gronwall Equality follows.

413

414

415

416 **B. Proofs of the main claims**

417 **Proof of claim 1:**

418 By eq. 4, $\frac{\Lambda_E(t_1)}{\Lambda_L(t_1)} = \frac{\vartheta_E(t_1)B_E(t_1)p_E(t_1)}{\vartheta_L(t_1)B_L(t_1)p_L(t_1)}$. We prove here that when eq. 6 is true,

$$419 \quad p_E(t_1) > p_L(t_1) \quad (7)$$

420 and

$$421 \quad B_E(t_1) \geq B_L(t_1) \quad (8)$$

422 Together these demonstrate claim 1a, and eq. 8 alone demonstrates Claim 1b.

423

424 Proof that eq. 6 implies eq. 7:

425 For each i , eq. 6 implies

$$426 \quad \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -b_i\vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s)ds > \int_{t_0}^{t_1} -b_i\vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s)ds \quad (9)$$

427 Using eq. 3, let $g(t) = p_L^i(t)$, $f(t) = p_E^i(t)$, $v(t) = -\vartheta_L(t)b_i\lambda(t)$, $u(t) = -\vartheta_E(t)b_i\lambda(t)$ in the

428 notation of the Generalized Gronwall Inequality. Eq. 9 then satisfies the condition of the

429 Generalized Gronwall Inequality. This implies that $p_E^i(t_1) > p_L^i(t_1)$, for all i and thus by eq. 1 that
 430 $p_E(t_1) > p_L(t_1)$. This is eq. 7, QED

431

432

433 Proof of eq. 8 when eq. 6 holds:

434 Assume there are at least two subgroups with different frailties: for subgroups i and j , with $i <$
 435 j , we will have $b_i > b_j$. Then eq. 6 implies eq. 9, which implies for these two subgroups:

437

$$436 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [b_i \vartheta_E(s) + b_j \vartheta_L(s)] \lambda(s) ds > \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [b_i \vartheta_L(s) + b_j \vartheta_E(s)] \lambda(s) ds \quad (10)$$

438

439 Now, to show that $B_E(t_1) < B_L(t_1)$, we need to prove that at time t_1

$$440 \frac{\sum f_i p_E^i b_i}{\sum f_i p_E^i} < \frac{\sum f_i p_L^i b_i}{\sum f_i p_L^i}$$

441

442 Subtracting the l.h.s. from the r.h.s. we get

443

$$444 0 < \frac{\sum_{i < j} f_i f_j (b_i - b_j) (p_L^i p_E^j - p_L^j p_E^i)}{\sum f_i p_L^i \cdot \sum f_i p_E^i}$$

445 Recall that we ordered b_k in the descending order so that $b_i > b_j$ when $i < j$. We need, for $i <$

446 j , and $t > t_0$ to show that

$$447 p_L^i p_E^j > p_L^j p_E^i \quad (11)$$

448

449 We note that the two sides of eq. 11 are equal at $t = t_0$

450 Differentiating the function $p_L^i p_E^j$ and using the Generalized Gronwall inequality, we note that

451 this function is a solution to the ODE

$$452 \quad f' = uf = -\lambda(b_i \vartheta_E + b_j \vartheta_L)f \quad (12)$$

453 Similarly, the function $p_E^i p_L^j$ is a solution to the ODE

454

$$455 \quad g' = vg = -\lambda(b_i \vartheta_L + b_j \vartheta_E)g \quad (13)$$

456

457 Thus eq. 8 will hold when

$$458 \quad \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [b_i \vartheta_E(s) + b_j \vartheta_L(s)] \lambda(s) ds > \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [b_i \vartheta_L(s) + b_j \vartheta_E(s)] \lambda(s) ds, \text{ but this is eq 10, so we have}$$

459 proven that eq. 6 implies eq. 8.

460 Note that the foregoing relied on heterogeneous frailty ((more than one group with different

461 values of b_i). When there is one level of frailty ($N = 1, b_1 = 1$), $B_G(t) = 1$ for all G, t .

462

463 Having proven eq (7) and eq (8) we have claim 1(a), with always a strict inequality. Having

464 proven eq (8) alone we have claim 1(b). The inequality is strict when there is more than one

465 subgroup with different frailties; otherwise, we have equality.

466

467

468 **Proof of claim 1(c):** To show that $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$, when eq. 6 holds, we note that we have

469 proven $\frac{\Lambda_E}{\Lambda_L} > \frac{\vartheta_E}{\vartheta_L}$ and $\frac{p_E}{p_L} > 1$ when eq. 6 holds. But $\frac{\frac{\Lambda_E}{x_E}}{\frac{\Lambda_L}{x_L}} = \frac{\Lambda_E B_E}{\Lambda_L B_L} \times \frac{p_E/[1-a(1-p_E)]}{p_L/[1-a(1-p_L)]}$. Given that $a \leq 1$

470 and $p_E < p_L \in (0,1]$, a little algebra shows that that $\frac{p_E/[1-a(1-p_E)]}{p_L/[1-a(1-p_L)]} \leq 1$ with equality when $a =$

471 1. Thus $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with strict inequality either $a < 1$ (imperfect ascertainment, making

472 the x_G inequality strict) or $N > 1$ (heterogeneous frailty, making the B_G inequality strict. We

473 have equality for claim 1(c) when $a = N = 1$.

474

475 **Proof of claim 1(d):** All of the foregoing proofs are symmetric in groups E and L. If

476 $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s) ds = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s) ds$ then results 1(a)-(c) hold with the inequalities

477 reversed, proven by identical arguments. Likewise, if the two sides are equal, then all quantities

478 in the proofs will be equal between groups and claims 1a-c will be show equality.

479

480 **Proof of claim 2(i):** If there is no waning (so that $\frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$ for $t > t_L$) and vaccination is not

481 completed before the start of influenza season ($t_L > t_0$), then

482 $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s) ds < \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s) ds$ because group E will experience protection ($\vartheta_E(s) <$

483 $1 = \vartheta_L(s)$) for the time between the start of the season or vaccination in group E (whichever is

484 latest), and vaccination of group L ($\max(t_0, t_E) < s < t_L$), and thereafter $\vartheta_E(s) = \vartheta_L(s) = \vartheta$.

485 Therefore the condition of Claim 1 is fulfilled, so

486 By Claim 1,

487 a) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)} > \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$

488 b) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/p_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/p_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$

489 c) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \geq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$

490 In the case of (b), there is equality when frailty is homogeneous, and the inequality is strict
491 when there is heterogeneous frailty (more than one group with different values of b_i), as noted
492 in Claim 1(b). In the case of (c), there is equality when ascertainment is perfect and frailty is
493 homogeneous ($a = N = 1$), and strict inequality otherwise.

494
495 **Proof of claim 2(ii)** (Top right of Table 1): If vaccination is incomplete at the start of the
496 influenza season and waning occurs, then there will be conflicting biases due to depletion of
497 susceptibles. Rearranging eq. 6 we have:

$$498 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [\vartheta_E(s) - \vartheta_L(s)] \lambda(s) ds = \int_{t_0}^{t_L} [\vartheta_E(s) - \vartheta_L(s)] \lambda(s) ds + \int_{t_L}^{t_1} [\vartheta_E(s) - \vartheta_L(s)] \lambda(s) ds$$

499 where the first integral on the right is negative due to earlier vaccination of group E, and the
500 second integral is positive due to waning. The balance determines whether the extent of
501 waning will be overestimated or underestimated.

502
503 **Proof of claim 2 (iii)** (bottom row of Table 1): If vaccination is completed before influenza
504 season begins ($t_E < t_L < t_0$), then the following inequalities will hold, with waning
505 underestimated when it exists and correctly estimated as null when it does not. This comes
506 from an application of Claim 1, with the sign reversed (if there is waning) or equality (if there is
507 no waning). If vaccination is complete before influenza season, then the only source of
508 differences in $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_G(s) \lambda(s) ds$ is waning; otherwise the cumulative vaccine-adjusted incidence
509 will be equal between groups throughout the study, which will give $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_E(s) \lambda(s) ds >$
510 $\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \vartheta_L(s) \lambda(s) ds$. Therefore the condition of Claim 1 is satisfied (with the inequality reversed) if

511 there is waning, and equality holds in the condition of claim 1 under the null of no waning.

512 From this it immediately follows that:

513 a) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning ($\frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)} = 1$)

514 b) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/p_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/p_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning or when frailty is homogeneous

515 ($N = 1$)

516 c) $\frac{\Lambda_E(t)/x_E(t)}{\Lambda_L(t)/x_L(t)} \leq \frac{\vartheta_E(t)}{\vartheta_L(t)}$ with equality under the null of no waning or when $a = N = 1$, ie both (i)

517 frailty is homogeneous and (ii) case ascertainment is perfect .

518

519 (1) **Puig-Barbera J, et al.** Waning protection of influenza vaccination during four influenza
520 seasons, 2011/2012 to 2014/2015. *Vaccine* 2017; **35**(43): 5799-5807.

521 (2) **Ferdinands JM, et al.** Intraseason waning of influenza vaccine protection: Evidence from
522 the US Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness Network, 2011-12 through 2014-15. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017;
523 **64**(5): 544-550.

524 (3) **Ray GT, et al.** Intra-season Waning of Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness. *Clin Infect Dis*
525 2018; **68**(10): 1623-1630.

526 (4) **Lewnard JA, et al.** Measurement of Vaccine Direct Effects Under the Test-Negative
527 Design. *Am J Epidemiol* 2018; **187**(12): 2686-2697.

528 (5) **Lipsitch M.** Challenges of vaccine effectiveness and waning studies. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018;
529 **68**: 1631-1633.

530 (6) **Vaupel JW, Yashin AI.** Heterogeneity's ruses: some surprising effects of selection on
531 population dynamics. *Am Stat* 1985; **39**(3): 176-185.

532 (7) **O'Hagan JJ, et al.** Apparent declining efficacy in randomized trials: examples of the Thai
533 RV144 HIV vaccine and South African CAPRISA 004 microbicide trials. *AIDS* 2012; **26**(2): 123-
534 126.

535 (8) **Halloran ME, Longini IM, Jr., Struchiner CJ.** Estimability and interpretation of vaccine
536 efficacy using frailty mixing models. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 1996; **144**(1): 83-97.

537 (9) **Kahn R, et al.** Analyzing Vaccine Trials in Epidemics With Mild and Asymptomatic
538 Infection. *Am J Epidemiol* 2019; **188**(2): 467-474.

539 (10) **Ray GT, et al.** Intra-season Waning of Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness. *Clin Infect Dis*
540 2018.

541 (11) **Lipsitch M.** Challenges of vaccine effectiveness and waning studies. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018.

542 (12) **Ray GT, et al.** Depletion of Susceptibles Bias in Analyses of Intra-season Waning of
543 Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2019; **in press**.

- 544 (13) **Klein NP, Fireman B.** If Influenza Vaccines Wane Can We Delay Vaccination Without
545 Compromising Coverage? *Clin Infect Dis* 2019.
- 546 (14) **Hernan MA.** The hazards of hazard ratios. *Epidemiology* 2010; **21**(1): 13-15.
- 547 (15) **Gomes MG, et al.** How host heterogeneity governs tuberculosis reinfection? *Proc Biol*
548 *Sci* 2012; **279**(1737): 2473-2478.
- 549 (16) **O'Hagan JJ, Lipsitch M, Hernan MA.** Estimating the per-exposure effect of infectious
550 disease interventions. *Epidemiology* 2014; **25**(1): 134-138.
- 551 (17) **Hernan MA, Hernandez-Diaz S, Robins JM.** A structural approach to selection bias.
552 *Epidemiology* 2004; **15**(5): 615-625.
- 553 (18) **Lipsitch M, Jha A, Simonsen L.** Observational studies and the difficult quest for
554 causality: lessons from vaccine effectiveness and impact studies. *Int J Epidemiol* 2016.
- 555 (19) **Sullivan SG, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Cowling BJ.** Theoretical Basis of the Test-Negative
556 Study Design for Assessment of Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness. *Am J Epidemiol* 2016; **184**(5):
557 345-353.
558
- 559