Immunogenicity of COVID-19 vaccines in patients with haematological malignancy: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Joanne S.K. Teh^{1,2}, Julien Coussement^{1,2}, Zoe C. F. Neoh^{1,2}, Tim Spelman³, Smaro Lazarakis⁴, Monica A. Slavin^{1,2,5,6}, Benjamin W. Teh^{1,2,5}

¹ Department of Infectious Diseases, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

² National Centre for Infections in Cancer, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³ Department of Health Services Research, Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁴ Health Sciences Library, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

⁵ Sir Peter MacCallum Department of Oncology, University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

⁶ Victorian Infectious Diseases Service, Royal Melbourne Hospital, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Primary contact:

A/Prof. Benjamin W. Teh
Department of Infectious Diseases,
Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre,
305 Grattan Street,
Melbourne 3000,
Victoria, Australia

Tel: +613 8559 7994

Fax: +613 8559 XXXX

Email: ben.teh@petermac.org

Keywords: COVID-19; vaccination; haematological; malignancy; immune response

Short title: COVID-19 vaccine response in haematology patients

Abstract length: 246 words

Manuscript length: 3997

Tables and figures: 4 tables, 3 figures

Supplementary appendix

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

The objectives of this study were to assess the immunogenicity and safety of COVID-19 vaccines in patients with haematological malignancy. A systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical studies of immune responses to COVID-19 vaccination stratified by underlying malignancy and published from 1 January 2021 to 31 August 2021 was conducted using MEDLINE, EMBASE and CENTRAL. Primary outcome was the rate of seropositivity following 2 doses of COVID-19 vaccine with rates of seropositivity following 1 dose, rates of positive neutralising antibody (nAb), cellular responses and adverse events as secondary outcomes. Rates were pooled from single arm studies while rates of seropositivity were compared against the rate in healthy controls for comparator studies using a random effects model and expressed as a pooled odds ratio with 95% confidence intervals.

Forty-four studies (16 mixed group, 28 disease specific) with 7064 patients were included in the analysis (2331 following first dose, 4733 following second dose). Overall seropositivity rates were 61-67% following 2 doses and 37-51% following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine. The lowest seropositivity rate was 51% in CLL patients and was highest in patients with acute leukaemia (93%). Following 1 dose, nAb and cellular response rates were 18-63% and 33-86% respectively. Active treatment, ongoing or recent treatment with targeted and CD-20 monoclonal antibody therapies within 12 months was associated with poor COVID-19 vaccine immune responses. New approaches to prevention are urgently required to reduce COVID-19 infection morbidity and mortality in high-risk patient groups that respond poorly to COVID-19 vaccination.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus has resulted in global mortality of over 3 million deaths. SARS-CoV-2 is likely to remain an endemic viral pathogen, with new variants continuously emerging¹. There is a significant burden of morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 infection in haematology patients. Over 80% of patients require hospitalisation and up to 50% present with severe disease²⁻⁵. Approximately 15% require intensive care unit admission and mortality rates are high at 30-40% depending on underlying disease²⁻⁷. Poor control of infection due to immune compromise lead to emergence of new variants which further complicate management⁸.

Vaccination is an effective public health measure to reduce risk of infection and severe complications from COVID-19⁹. However, patients with haematological malignancies were excluded from the pivotal trials which preceded regulatory approvals of the currently recommended COVID-19 vaccines¹⁰⁻¹³. Understanding the impact of COVID-19 vaccines on cancer patients is critical as social distancing restrictions are being eased in countries with relatively high rates of vaccination coverage¹⁴. Assessing immune response post-vaccination is the basis of many vaccination studies in patients with haematological malignancy and is often utilised as a surrogate marker of vaccine efficacy¹⁵⁻¹⁷. These studies are the basis for vaccination recommendations contained within international guidelines^{18,19}. Therefore, this study was conducted to systematically review available data on the humoral and cellular immune responses to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with haematological malignancy to build the evidence base for its utility.

Objectives

The main objective of this systematic review was to assess the immunogenicity (i.e., vaccine-induced immune response) of COVID-19 vaccines in patients with haematological malignancy, stratified by underlying disease type. The secondary objective was to assess the safety of COVID-19 vaccines in the same patient groups.

Methods

This systematic review was preregistered with PROSPERO (CRD42021276851), and conducted in line with Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines²⁰.

Types of studies and participants

Studies eligible for inclusion into the systematic review were those that investigated the vaccine-induced immunity in patients with haematological malignancy who received at least one dose of COVID-19 vaccine. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs), quasi-RCTs and observational studies were eligible for inclusion. All types of observational studies were included (including prospective and retrospective studies, and studies with or without a control group). This systematic review evaluated all studies that reported on at least one of the following haematology patient groups:

- 1) All patients with haematological malignancy
- 2) Patients with multiple myeloma (MM)
- 3) Patients with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia (CLL)
- 4) Patients with lymphoma; Hodgkins (HL) and non-Hodgkins lymphoma (NHL)
- 5) Patients with acute myeloid or lymphocytic leukaemia (AML, ALL)
- 6) Patients undergoing or who have completed haematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HCT) and chimeric antigen T-cell receptor (CAR-T) therapy
- 7) Patients with myeloproliferative neoplasm (MPN) and chronic myeloid leukaemia (CML)

Types of intervention and evaluation

The type of intervention was the use of one or two doses of COVID-19 vaccine (of any type). Immune response to COVID-19 vaccination included humoral and cellular immune responses. For the purpose of this systematic review, humoral response consists of seropositivity which was defined by the SARS-CoV-2 spike/receptor binding domain specific IgG level above the threshold of detection for the assay utilised in each study. Rate of positive neutralising antibody response (nAb) was defined by SARS-CoV-2 specific nAb level above the threshold established by the dedicated neutralisation assay utilised in each study. A positive cellular response was defined by the appropriate increase in frequency of SARS-CoV-2 specific CD4+/CD8+ T cells following vaccination according to assays utilised. Where available, the immune response for each malignant patient group was compared to a control group. If there was no comparator group, the immune response for each haematology patient group was described and summarised.

Outcome measures

The primary outcome was rates of seropositivity following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine stratified by disease groups while secondary outcome measures were the rates of seropositivity following one dose of vaccine, rates of positive nAb response following one and two doses of COVID-19 vaccine, rates of positive cellular response following one and two doses of COVID-19 vaccine and rates of systemic and/or local adverse events (whichever rate was higher) following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine.

Search strategy

Electronic searching

Literature searches were conducted by an experienced research librarian (SL) using the following databases to identify relevant articles: Ovid Medline, EMBASE and Cochrane CENTRAL from 1 January 2020 to 31 August 2021 and for articles in English only. A combination of subjects and keyword terms encompassing haematologic cancers, COVID-19 and vaccines and all their associated terms was used for the search. The terms used included: haematological neoplasms, leukemia, lymphoma, multiple myeloma, myeloproliferative

disorders, myelodysplastic-myeloproliferative diseases, stem cell transplantation, bone marrow transplantation, chimeric antigen receptor therapy, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, vaccines, vaccination, immunise, immunisation, BNT162b2, CHAdOx1, AZD 1222, mRNA-1273, Ad26, Ad5, NVX-CoV2373. All word variations were searched and Medical subject headings were exploded. The detailed search strategy is summarised in Supplementary Appendix.

Selection of studies

Studies were excluded from the systematic review if they did not measure or report immunogenicity after COVID-19 vaccination, if insufficient details were reported for the haematology patient groups in mixed group studies, if there were less than 10 patients including case reports, if data was exclusive to paediatric patients less than 18 years of age or animal studies. Studies that were not peer reviewed and/or published such as pre-prints, abstracts and government reports were excluded. Review articles and other publications without original data such as expert opinions, editorials and consensus statements were also excluded.

Study eligibility was assessed by two independent reviewers (BT, JT), and Covidence systematic review software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) was used to screen titles, abstracts, and full texts. Irrelevant reports were discarded, and the full texts of the other reports were accessed. Disagreements between the two main reviewers with respect to study eligibility were resolved by discussion, or via consultation with a third author.

Data extraction

For studies fulfilling inclusion criteria, data were extracted manually and independently by authors (JT, JC, BT) using a predefined data extraction form. Extracted data elements included study design (enrolment, follow up period, randomisation/allocation, laboratory analysis, predefined outcomes, adjusted analysis, funding source), participant information (inclusion criteria, number of participants, characteristics, disease, treatment), intervention (vaccine type, dose, schedule, comparator group) and outcomes (definitions, timing, adverse events).

Assessment of risk of bias

Two review authors (ZN, MS) independently assessed the risk of bias of each cohort study using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale²¹. Each included study was assessed based on three domains: (1) the selection of the study groups, (2) the comparability of the study groups, and (3) the ascertainment of outcome of interest. The rating system proposed by Sharmin et al²² was adopted with a good quality study scoring 3 or 4 stars in the selection domain, 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain, and 2 or 3 stars in the outcome domain. For single arm studies, a good quality study would score 3 stars in selection domain, and 2 or 3 stars in outcome domain.

Measures of treatment effect

For each study, the number of patients achieving seropositivity and the total number of patients receiving vaccination was extracted and expressed as a proportion. For the meta-analysis, rate of response following Ad26 vaccine was analysed at the same time point and therefore summarised as part of a two-vaccine dose response. For each haematology disease group, the proportions from each study were pooled and expressed as an overall proportion (response rate) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) utilising inverse variance/generalised mixed modelling.

For each study with a control group, the number of patients with seropositivity in each group and the total number of patients receiving vaccination were extracted, expressed as a proportion with 95% CI and compared against each other. A meta-analysis was performed if there were two or more studies identified with a similar population and sufficient data for the outcomes of interest. The rate of seropositivity as a dichotomous outcome of interest across studies was summarised using a random effects model and expressed as a pooled odds ratio with 95% CI. Analysis was performed using metaprop function on R 4.1.1 (R foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna).

Assessment of heterogeneity

Clinical and methodological heterogeneity between included studies was assessed by comparing the key patient factors and study factors (vaccine type, type of assay utilised, threshold for positive response, duration of follow up). Statistical heterogeneity was assessed by using the I^2 statistic and χ^2 with a p value ≤ 0.05 considered significant for the presence of heterogeneity.

Management of missing data

If available, reason(s) for missing data were outlined. Due to time limitations, further information was not sought from the original author/corresponding author(s).

Subgroup analysis

Pre-planned subgroup analysis was performed to evaluate impact of active treatment (versus no active treatment), anti-CD-20 therapy in the last 12 months including current CD-20 therapy (versus anti-CD-20 therapy 12 or more months ago), targeted therapy (defined as Bruton's tyrosine kinase inhibitor [BTKi], BCL-2 antagonist venetoclax) in last 12 months (versus no targeted therapy), timing of vaccination in relation to HCT (within 12 months versus longer than 12 months) and response by types of vaccine (BNT162b2 vs others including mRNA-1273 [Spikevax, Moderna], ChAdOx1 [Vaxzevria, AstraZeneca] or Ad26 [Janssen]). For subgroup analysis only studies containing sufficient level of detail for the outcome of interest (e.g. therapy < 12 months) were included. For analysis by vaccine type, only studies reporting use and immune response of multiple vaccines types were included.

Results

Search results

A search of electronic databases yielded 520 results and following exclusion of duplicate results, 411 abstracts were reviewed. Forty-eight studies were identified for full text review

and subsequently 44 studies fulfilled inclusion criteria and underwent data extraction (Figure 1). Overall there were 44 studies of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with haematological malignancy. Sixteen studies²³⁻³⁸ involved mixed group of patients with various underlying haematological malignancies and 28 studies focused on specific malignancies and treatments; 8 myeloma studies³⁹⁻⁴⁶, 6 CLL studies⁴⁷⁻⁵², 4 lymphoma studies⁵³⁻⁵⁶, 4 studies of HCT^{57,58} and CAR-T^{59,60} and 6 MPN studies⁶¹⁻⁶⁶. A total of 7064 patients were included in the analysis (2331 following first dose and 4733 following second dose). Characteristics of patients, primary and secondary outcomes in included studies are summarised in Table 1.

Risk of bias and quality assessment

Overall 23 studies (52%) were evaluated to be good or fair quality (Good = 11, Fair = 12) with low risk of bias whilst the remaining 21 studies were rated as poor quality (high risk of bias) predominantly due to lack of details regarding patient selection, demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study, comparability of cohorts (design or analysis) and follow up duration. Risk of bias and quality assessment of studies are summarised in Supplementary Table 1.

Seropositivity rates

There were 44 studies measuring humoral immune responses in patients with haematological malignancy. The majority of studies evaluated the use of BNT162b2 (Tozinameran, Pfizer) and utilised SARS-CoV-2 spike specific IgG levels above the threshold of detection (seropositivity). Several studies attempted to establish potential thresholds for clinical protection with higher antibody levels than the seropositivity threshold utilised. Malard et. al. correlated SARS-CoV-2 spike IgG levels with nAb levels and ≥ 3100 AU/mL on the Abbott assay was predictive of a nAb $\geq 30\%$ ³³. Utilising this threshold, the rate of humoral response was 47% in haematology patients compared to 97% of healthy controls following second dose of the BNT162b2 vaccine³³. Pimpinelli et. al. also evaluated humoral responses utilising a higher threshold of ≥ 80 AU/ml (Diasorin, Italy) and noted response rates of 55% for myeloma patients and 84% for MPN patients compared to 97% for healthy controls³⁶. Other studies correlated SARS-CoV-2 IgG levels with plaque reduction neutralisation tests or with levels seen in clinical vaccination trials. Stampfer et. al. defined >250 IU/ml as a clinically relevant response which was attained by 45% of myeloma patients after two doses of a COVID-19 vaccine⁴³. For HCT patients, Redjoul et. al. utilised a threshold of 4160 AU/ml and 59% of patients achieved this response after two doses⁵⁸.

Overall pooled seropositivity rates in haematological malignancy were 61% and 67% in single arm and comparator studies respectively, following two doses of COVID-19 vaccination. Following a single dose, the pooled seropositivity rates were 51% and 37% in single arm and comparator studies respectively. Compared to healthy or aged matched controls, patients with haematological malignancy were less likely to achieve seropositivity with odds ratio (OR) of 0.05 (95% confidence interval [95% CI] 0.02-0.15, $p<0.01$) following two doses and OR of 0.10 (95% CI 0.04-0.29, $p<0.01$) following a single dose of COVID-19 vaccine. Heterogeneity was 86 and 88% respectively ($p<0.01$). Pooled seropositivity rates by disease type and vaccine doses are summarised in Table 2. Overall results were graded moderate quality due to statistical and clinical heterogeneity and the proportion of high risk of bias studies (48%).

Patients with myeloma

There were 8 dedicated studies and 9 other studies that reported immune response rates in myeloma patients (Supplementary Table 2). For the two studies by Terpos et. al, only nAb at two levels were reported and thresholds of $\geq 30\%$ and $\geq 50\%$ were utilised to define seropositivity and rate of positive nAb respectively^{44,45}. There were 1218 myeloma patients who received 2 doses of vaccine and seropositivity rates were 76-80%. Seropositivity rates were 29-43% following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine in 685 patients. The OR for achieving seropositivity was 0.09 (95% CI 0.03-0.29, $p < 0.01$) in myeloma patients compared to healthy control group following 2 doses and 0.23 (95% CI 0.05-0.99, $p = 0.05$) following 1 vaccine dose (Table 2).

Patients with CLL

A total of 1557 CLL patients in 12 studies (6 CLL specific, 6 haematology) were included in this review (Supplementary Table 3). Pooled seropositivity rates were 51% in 1446 CLL patients following 2 doses of COVID-19 vaccine. Rate of seropositivity was 18% following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine and it was 37% in one single arm study by Ollila et. al³⁵. ORs for seropositivity were 0.01 (95% CI 0.01-0.03, $p < 0.01$) and 0.03 (95% CI 0.00-0.80, $p = 0.05$) for CLL patients following 2 doses and 1 dose of vaccine compared to healthy controls.

Patients with lymphoma

For 1296 patients with lymphoma across 11 studies included (Supplementary Table 4), pooled seropositivity rates were 52-55% following 2 doses and 33% following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine. Compared to healthy cohort, ORs for achieving seropositivity were 0.01 to 0.02 for lymphoma patients (Table 2).

Patients following HCT and CAR-T

A total of 6 studies included in this review reported on immune responses following HCT and CAR-T therapy (Supplementary Table 5). Two studies involved allogeneic HCT (alloHCT) patients^{57,58}, one included alloHCT and CAR-T treated patients⁵⁹ and the other study included all HCT and CAR-T patients⁶⁰. Two studies were larger studies of haematology patients with subset of HCT and CAR-T patients^{28,29}. 422 patients were included consisting of 401 patients who had 2 doses and the remainder received 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine. Pooled seropositivity rate was 61% following 2 COVID-19 vaccine doses. For patients following alloHCT the rate was 74% while following CAR-T, it was 31%. In a single study with a healthy control cohort, seropositivity rate was 81% in autologous HCT patients compared to 99%²⁹. In the only study of immune response following one COVID-19 vaccine dose, rate of seropositivity was 38% in alloHCT patients⁵⁷.

Patients with acute leukaemia and MDS

There were no dedicated studies of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with acute leukaemia. A subset of 126 patients with acute leukaemia and MDS were reported in 6 studies (Supplementary Table 6) and seropositivity rate was 93% following 2 doses of COVID-19 vaccine. In a single study, the seropositivity rate was 80% in acute leukaemia, 94% in MDS patients compared to 99% in the control group²⁹. No patients with acute leukaemia mounted an immune response following a single vaccine dose compared to 86% of controls³⁴.

Patients with MPN and CML

Of 12 studies encompassing 503 MPN and CML patients (281 following 2 doses, 222 following a single dose), rates of seropositivity were 87-88% following 2 doses and 54-71% following 1 dose of vaccine. Compared to a healthy patient cohort, the OR was 0.07 (95% CI 0.0-1.55, $p=0.06$) of MPN/CML patient achieving seropositivity with 2 doses of COVID-19 vaccine and 0.13 (95% CI 0.01-1.71, $p=0.09$) after a single dose.

Rates of neutralising antibody, cellular response and adverse events

Only 6 studies (14%) reported nAb responses and 4 studies (9%) reported cellular responses. In the only study on nAb following 2 COVID-19 vaccine doses, 71% of myeloma patients achieved a positive nAb response compared to 90% of the control group⁴⁵. Following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccine, the overall pooled rate of a positive nAb response was 18% for all patients with haematological malignancy (Table 3). The pooled rate of 2 single arm studies of MPN patients was 63%. For cellular responses following COVID-19 vaccination, the rate of achieving a positive response was 40-75% for all patients following 2 doses and 33-86% following a single dose. In a single study of alloHCT and CAR-T patients, cellular response rates were 19% and 50% respectively following 2 doses⁵⁹. In MPN patients, this rate was 86% following one dose^{64,65}. In 10 studies (22%) the rate of at least one systemic or local adverse event was reported. Overall, the pooled rate of at least one adverse event was 36% following 2 doses and 39% following a single dose (Table 3).

Subgroup analysis

Study characteristics and outcomes of studies included in subgroup analyses are summarised in Supplementary Tables 8-12. Vaccination with 2 vaccine doses during active therapy was associated with seropositivity rates of 28% compared to 62% off therapy with OR 0.21 (95% CI 0.06-0.67, $p=0.02$). Lower seropositivity rates (19% vs. 61%) were reported with vaccination during or within 12 months of CD-20 antibody therapy compared to vaccination 12 or more months after completion of therapy. Use of targeted therapy was associated with a pooled seropositivity rate of 35% following 2 doses of COVID-19 vaccine. Seropositivity rates did not differ by timing of vaccination in relation to HCT (66% vs 68%) or vaccine type (62% vs 68%, 95% vs 91%) following 1 or 2 doses. Table 4 summarises the seropositivity rates by each subgroup analysed.

Sensitivity analysis

Exclusion of studies that were assessed as poor quality and high risk of bias did not alter the pooled seropositivity rates (single arm) but in comparator studies, OR was now 0.31 (95%CI 0.13-0.78, $p=0.03$) following 1 dose instead of 0.10 (Supplementary Table 13).

Discussion

In this systematic review and meta-analysis of over 7000 patients with haematological malignancy, rate of seropositivity was 61-67% following 2 doses and 37-51% following 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccination. Compared to age matched and non-matched healthy controls primarily healthcare workers, odds of achieving seropositivity were significantly lower by 95% and 90% following 2 doses and 1 dose of COVID-19 vaccination respectively. Statistical heterogeneity was substantial at over 80% and studies were also clinically heterogenous due

to the variety of underlying haematological malignancies, lack of standardised laboratory platforms by which to measure immune response to vaccination and variable follow up periods. Reassuringly, reported rates of at least one adverse effect following vaccination were lower at 36% compared to rates reported in clinical trials of the general population^{10,13}.

Amongst different haematological malignancies, pooled seropositivity rates following 2 doses were highest at close to 90% in patients with acute leukaemia, MDS and MPN and the lowest at 51% in CLL patients. Patients with CLL respond poorly to vaccination, especially to new or novel antigens compared to recall antigens from previous infections or vaccination⁶⁷. Poor response is compounded by use of B-cell depleting and targeted therapies such as CD-20 monoclonal antibodies and BTKi⁶⁷. Immune response to other vaccines including seasonal influenza vaccine is negatively impacted by these therapies and the poor response persists for at least 6 to 12 months following cessation of therapy⁶⁸.

A similar negative impact of treatment on COVID-19 vaccine responses was noted in subgroup analysis of published studies. Rates of seropositivity were lower in the setting of active treatment (28%) and the lowest response rates of 19%, 35% and 31% were reported in the setting of current or CD-20 monoclonal antibody therapy within 12 months, targeted therapies and following CAR-T cell therapy. Seropositivity rates were two to three times higher at 61 and 62% when patients were vaccinated when not on active therapy or 12 or more months following completion of CD-20 monoclonal antibody respectively.

Unvaccinated CLL patients have a high burden of morbidity from COVID-19 infection with close to 90% of patients requiring hospital admission, 35% intensive care unit admission and mortality rates⁴. Yet, CLL patients have poor humoral responses to vaccination at 18% following 1 dose and 51% following 2 doses. In CLL patients, immune suppression from underlying disease and ongoing treatments such as anti-CD20 monoclonal antibodies and BTKi continue to pose a risk for SARS-CoV-2 infection and concurrently limit protective responses from vaccination. Although vaccination remains highly recommended, new strategies are required to further improve immune responses in this high-risk patient population. In other immune compromised groups, the use of an additional dose of COVID-19 vaccine improved serological response rates by 37% and use of heterologous vaccination schedules (mixing vaccine types) appear promising⁶⁹⁻⁷¹. International health bodies now recommend third COVID-19 vaccine doses in immune compromised patients including haematological malignancy^{72,73}. Heterologous prime-boost or use of high dose vaccine formulations have been utilised in randomised trials of seasonal influenza vaccination in haematology and HCT patient with mixed success^{17,74}. In addition, other preventative approaches such as the use of anti-SARS-CoV-2 monoclonal antibody therapy as pre exposure (NCT04625725) and post exposure prophylaxis require further evaluation in vulnerable patient groups who respond poorly to vaccination⁷⁵.

Serological responses are classically utilised as surrogate end points for clinical efficacy in clinical trials of vaccination in patients with haematological malignancy¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Serological thresholds for protection (seroprotection) following vaccination have been established for infections such as seasonal influenza¹⁷. In the majority of studies included in this review, however, the outcome of interest was seropositivity as defined by antibody levels above the detection threshold. This is not equivalent to seroprotection as thresholds have not been

standardised nor established across the variety of commercial and research platforms utilised by these studies. Some authors such as Redjoul, Stampfer and Malard et. al. have attempted to define serological thresholds that correlate with nAb and clinical protection^{33,43,58}. Unsurprisingly a lower proportion of patients (by 20-35% compared to pooled rates) achieve these higher antibody thresholds^{33,43,58}. For serological response measurement to guide clinical management of COVID-19 vaccination, further work is required to achieve harmonisation across testing platforms and to derive and validate thresholds that correlate with clinical protection.

Measurement of serological responses only offers a glimpse of the potential breadth of immune responses to COVID-19 vaccination. Both nAb and cellular responses to vaccination play complementary and vital roles in protection against COVID-19 and remain under reported⁷⁶⁻⁷⁸. As reported in 14% of studies, at least 18% of haematology patients achieved a positive nAb response. Positive cellular response rates were at least 15% higher than nAb responses following 1 or 2 vaccine doses. While serological responses have been utilised as surrogate endpoints in vaccination studies of immune compromised patients, more larger studies are required to identify new immune markers for vaccine response and to determine efficacy of vaccination.

There are several limitations to this review. In particular the moderate quality of findings due to significant clinical and statistical heterogeneity of included studies and the proportion of poorer quality studies. In line with other established studies of vaccination in haematology patients, only immune response data was analysed as clinical efficacy data was limited.

In conclusion, this systematic review and meta-analysis has comprehensively summarised the latest data on response to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with haematological malignancy. Overall, seropositive rates were reasonable at 67% following two doses of vaccination respectively. Higher risk patient groups were identified, namely patients with CLL and patients receiving active therapy including targeted and CD-20 monoclonal therapies. New approaches to high risk patients who are poor responders to vaccination are urgently required.

Acknowledgement

B.W.T is supported by the Australian Government Medical Research Future Fund Investigator Fellowship. M.A.S is supported by the National Health and Medical Research Council Investigator fellowship.

Authorship contributions

B.W.T coordinated the study, performed abstract and full text screening, data extraction and manuscript writing. J.T performed abstract and full text screening and data extraction. J.C. developed the study protocol and performed data extraction. S.L. developed the search strategy. T.S. conducted the statistical analysis. Z.N and M.A.S conducted the risk of bias assessment. All authors reviewed and revised the manuscript.

Conflict of interest

M.A.S. has received research funding and honoraria from Pfizer, Merck Sharp and Dohme and research funding from Gilead. B.W.T has received research funding and honoraria from CSL-Behring, Merck Sharp and Dohme and Sanofi.

References

1. Phillips N. The coronavirus is here to stay - here's what that means. *Nature*. 2021;590(7846):382-384.
2. Wood WA, Neuberg DS, Thompson JC, et al. Outcomes of patients with hematologic malignancies and COVID-19: a report from the ASH Research Collaborative Data Hub. *Blood Adv*. 2020;4(23):5966-5975.
3. Sharma A, Bhatt NS, St Martin A, et al. Clinical characteristics and outcomes of COVID-19 in haematopoietic stem-cell transplantation recipients: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Haematol*. 2021;8(3):e185-e193.
4. Mato AR, Roeker LE, Lamanna N, et al. Outcomes of COVID-19 in patients with CLL: a multicenter international experience. *Blood*. 2020;136(10):1134-1143.
5. Regalado-Artamendi I, Jimenez-Ubieto A, Hernandez-Rivas JA, et al. Risk Factors and Mortality of COVID-19 in Patients With Lymphoma: A Multicenter Study. *Hemasphere*. 2021;5(3):e538.
6. Chari A, Samur MK, Martinez-Lopez J, et al. Clinical features associated with COVID-19 outcome in multiple myeloma: first results from the International Myeloma Society data set. *Blood*. 2020;136(26):3033-3040.
7. Cook G, John Ashcroft A, Pratt G, et al. Real-world assessment of the clinical impact of symptomatic infection with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus (COVID-19 disease) in patients with multiple myeloma receiving systemic anti-cancer therapy. *Br J Haematol*. 2020;190(2):e83-e86.
8. Corey L, Beyrer C, Cohen MS, Michael NL, Bedford T, Rolland M. SARS-CoV-2 Variants in Patients with Immunosuppression. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(6):562-566.
9. Vasileiou E, Simpson CR, Shi T, et al. Interim findings from first-dose mass COVID-19 vaccination roll-out and COVID-19 hospital admissions in Scotland: a national prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10285):1646-1657.
10. 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.
11. Heath PT, Galiza EP, Baxter DN, et al. Safety and Efficacy of NVX-CoV2373 Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2021.
12. Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10269):99-111.
13. 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.
14. Tau N, Manuel O, Rozen-Zvi B, Shargian L, Yahav D. Precautions after vaccinating immunosuppressed patients with mRNA-based vaccines against SARS-CoV-2: does one size fit all? *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2021.
15. Cordonnier C, Labopin M, Chesnel V, et al. Randomized study of early versus late immunization with pneumococcal conjugate vaccine after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(10):1392-1401.
16. Cordonnier C, Ljungman P, Juergens C, et al. Immunogenicity, safety, and tolerability of 13-valent pneumococcal conjugate vaccine followed by 23-valent pneumococcal polysaccharide vaccine in recipients of allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant aged ≥ 2 years: an open-label study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61(3):313-323.

17. Teh BW, Leung VKY, Mordant FL, et al. A randomised trial of two 2-dose influenza vaccination strategies for patients following autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020.
18. Tomblyn M, Chiller T, Einsele H, et al. Guidelines for preventing infectious complications among hematopoietic cell transplantation recipients: a global perspective. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2009;15(10):1143-1238.
19. Rubin LG, Levin MJ, Ljungman P, et al. 2013 IDSA clinical practice guideline for vaccination of the immunocompromised host. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(3):e44-100.
20. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*. 2021;372:n71.
21. Wells G SB, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. . 2013.
22. Sharmin S, Kypri K, Khanam M, Wadolowski M, Bruno R, Mattick RP. Parental Supply of Alcohol in Childhood and Risky Drinking in Adolescence: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2017;14(3).
23. Addeo A, Shah PK, Bordry N, et al. Immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccines in patients with cancer. *Cancer Cell*. 2021;39(8):1091-1098 e1092.
24. Agha ME, Blake M, Chilleo C, Wells A, Haidar G. Suboptimal Response to Coronavirus Disease 2019 Messenger RNA Vaccines in Patients With Hematologic Malignancies: A Need for Vigilance in the Postmasking Era. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2021;8(7):ofab353.
25. Benda M, Mutschlechner B, Ulmer H, et al. Serological SARS-CoV-2 antibody response, potential predictive markers and safety of BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in haematological and oncological patients. *Br J Haematol*. 2021.
26. Cohen D, Hazut Krauthammer S, Cohen YC, et al. Correlation between BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine-associated hypermetabolic lymphadenopathy and humoral immunity in patients with hematologic malignancy. *Eur J Nucl Med Mol Imaging*. 2021.
27. Gavriatopoulou M, Terpos E, Kastritis E, et al. Low neutralizing antibody responses in WM, CLL and NHL patients after the first dose of the BNT162b2 and AZD1222 vaccine. *Clin Exp Med*. 2021.
28. Greenberger LM, Saltzman LA, Senefeld JW, Johnson PW, DeGennaro LJ, Nichols GL. Antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in patients with hematologic malignancies. *Cancer Cell*. 2021;39(8):1031-1033.
29. Herzog Tzarfati K, Gutwein O, Apel A, et al. BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine is significantly less effective in patients with hematologic malignancies. *Am J Hematol*. 2021.
30. Iacono D, Cerbone L, Palombi L, et al. Serological response to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cancer older than 80 years. *J Geriatr Oncol*. 2021.
31. Jurgens EM, Ketas TJ, Zhao Z, et al. Serologic response to mRNA COVID-19 vaccination in lymphoma patients. *Am J Hematol*. 2021.
32. Maneikis K, Sablauskas K, Ringeleviciute U, et al. Immunogenicity of the BNT162b2 COVID-19 mRNA vaccine and early clinical outcomes in patients with haematological malignancies in Lithuania: a national prospective cohort study. *Lancet Haematol*. 2021.
33. Malard F, Gaugler B, Gozlan J, et al. Weak immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in patients with hematologic malignancies. *Blood Cancer J*. 2021;11(8):142.
34. Monin L, Laing AG, Munoz-Ruiz M, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of one versus two doses of the COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b2 for patients with cancer: interim analysis of a prospective observational study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2021;22(6):765-778.

35. Ollila TA, Lu S, Masel R, et al. Antibody Response to COVID-19 Vaccination in Adults With Hematologic Malignant Disease. *JAMA Oncol.* 2021.
36. Pimpinelli F, Marchesi F, Piaggio G, et al. Fifth-week immunogenicity and safety of anti-SARS-CoV-2 BNT162b2 vaccine in patients with multiple myeloma and myeloproliferative malignancies on active treatment: preliminary data from a single institution. *J Hematol Oncol.* 2021;14(1):81.
37. Re D, Barriere J, Chamorey E, et al. Low rate of seroconversion after mRNA anti-SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients with hematological malignancies. *Leuk Lymphoma.* 2021:1-3.
38. Thakkar A, Gonzalez-Lugo JD, Goradia N, et al. Seroconversion rates following COVID-19 vaccination among patients with cancer. *Cancer Cell.* 2021.
39. Avivi I, Balaban R, Shragai T, et al. Humoral response rate and predictors of response to BNT162b2 mRNA COVID19 vaccine in patients with multiple myeloma. *Br J Haematol.* 2021.
40. Bird S, Panopoulou A, Shea RL, et al. Response to first vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 in patients with multiple myeloma. *Lancet Haematol.* 2021;8(6):e389-e392.
41. Ghandili S, Schonlein M, Lutgehetmann M, et al. Post-Vaccination Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Response in Patients with Multiple Myeloma Correlates with Low CD19+ B-Lymphocyte Count and Anti-CD38 Treatment. *Cancers (Basel).* 2021;13(15).
42. Ramasamy K, Sadler R, Jeans S, et al. COVID symptoms, testing, shielding impact on patient-reported outcomes and early vaccine responses in individuals with multiple myeloma. *Br J Haematol.* 2021.
43. Stampfer SD, Goldwater MS, Jew S, et al. Response to mRNA vaccination for COVID-19 among patients with multiple myeloma. *Leukemia.* 2021.
44. Terpos E, Trougakos IP, Gavriatopoulou M, et al. Low neutralizing antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 in older patients with myeloma after the first BNT162b2 vaccine dose. *Blood.* 2021;137(26):3674-3676.
45. Terpos E, Gavriatopoulou M, Ntanasis-Stathopoulos I, et al. The neutralizing antibody response post COVID-19 vaccination in patients with myeloma is highly dependent on the type of anti-myeloma treatment. *Blood Cancer J.* 2021;11(8):138.
46. Van Oekelen O, Gleason CR, Agte S, et al. Highly variable SARS-CoV-2 spike antibody responses to two doses of COVID-19 RNA vaccination in patients with multiple myeloma. *Cancer Cell.* 2021.
47. Benjamini O, Rokach L, Itchaki G, et al. Safety and efficacy of BNT162b mRNA Covid19 Vaccine in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Haematologica.* 2021.
48. Del Poeta G, Bomben R, Polesel J, et al. COVID-19 vaccination: Evaluation of risk for protection failure in chronic lymphocytic leukemia patients. *Hematol Oncol.* 2021.
49. Herishanu Y, Avivi I, Aharon A, et al. Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Blood.* 2021;137(23):3165-3173.
50. Parry H, McIlroy G, Bruton R, et al. Antibody responses after first and second Covid-19 vaccination in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia. *Blood Cancer J.* 2021;11(7):136.
51. Roeker LE, Knorr DA, Thompson MC, et al. COVID-19 vaccine efficacy in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Leukemia.* 2021.
52. Tadmor T, Benjamini O, Braester A, Rahav G, Rokach L. Antibody persistence 100 days following the second dose of BNT162b mRNA Covid19 vaccine in patients with chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Leukemia.* 2021.
53. Ghione P, Gu JJ, Attwood K, et al. Impaired humoral responses to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with lymphoma receiving B-cell directed therapies. *Blood.* 2021.

54. Gurion R, Rozovski U, Itchaki G, et al. Humoral serologic response to the BNT162b2 vaccine is abrogated in lymphoma patients within the first 12 months following treatment with anti-CD20 antibodies. *Haematologica*. 2021.
55. Lim SH, Campbell N, Johnson M, et al. Antibody responses after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients with lymphoma. *Lancet Haematol*. 2021;8(8):e542-e544.
56. Perry C, Luttwak E, Balaban R, et al. Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in patients with B-cell non-Hodgkin lymphoma. *Blood Adv*. 2021;5(16):3053-3061.
57. Easdale S, Shea R, Ellis L, et al. Serologic Responses following a Single Dose of SARS-Cov-2 Vaccination in Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplantation Recipients. *Transplant Cell Ther*. 2021.
58. Redjoul R, Le Bouter A, Beckerich F, Fourati S, Maury S. Antibody response after second BNT162b2 dose in allogeneic HSCT recipients. *Lancet*. 2021;398(10297):298-299.
59. Ram R, Hagin D, Kikozashvili N, et al. Safety and Immunogenicity of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine in Patients after Allogeneic HCT or CD19-based CART therapy-A Single-Center Prospective Cohort Study. *Transplant Cell Ther*. 2021.
60. Dhakal B, Abedin SM, Fenske TS, et al. Response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients after hematopoietic cell transplantation and CAR-T cell therapy. *Blood*. 2021.
61. Caocci G, Mulas O, Mantovani D, et al. Ruxolitinib does not impair humoral immune response to COVID-19 vaccination with BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in patients with myelofibrosis. *Ann Hematol*. 2021.
62. Chowdhury O, Bruguier H, Mallett G, et al. Impaired antibody response to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with chronic myeloid neoplasms. *Br J Haematol*. 2021.
63. Guglielmelli P, Mazzoni A, Maggi L, et al. Impaired response to first SARS-CoV-2 dose vaccination in myeloproliferative neoplasm patients receiving ruxolitinib. *Am J Hematol*. 2021.
64. Harrington P, Doores KJ, Radia D, et al. Single dose of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) induces neutralising antibody and polyfunctional T-cell responses in patients with chronic myeloid leukaemia. *Br J Haematol*. 2021.
65. Harrington P, de Lavallade H, Doores KJ, et al. Single dose of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 induces high frequency of neutralising antibody and polyfunctional T-cell responses in patients with myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Leukemia*. 2021.
66. Pimpinelli F, Marchesi F, Piaggio G, et al. Lower response to BNT162b2 vaccine in patients with myelofibrosis compared to polycythemia vera and essential thrombocythemia. *J Hematol Oncol*. 2021;14(1):119.
67. Pleyer C, Ali MA, Cohen JI, et al. Effect of Bruton tyrosine kinase inhibitor on efficacy of adjuvanted recombinant hepatitis B and zoster vaccines. *Blood*. 2021;137(2):185-189.
68. Vijenthira A, Gong I, Betschel SD, Cheung M, Hicks LK. Vaccine response following anti-CD20 therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 905 patients. *Blood Adv*. 2021;5(12):2624-2643.
69. Hall V.G. FV, Ku T, Ierullo M, Majchrzak-Kita B, Chaparro C., Selzner N., Schiff J, McDonald M., Tomlinson G., Kulasingam V., Kumar D., Humar A. Randomized Trial of a Third Dose of mRNA-1273 Vaccine in Transplant Recipients. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2021.
70. Liu X, Shaw RH, Stuart ASV, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of heterologous versus homologous prime-boost schedules with an adenoviral vectored and mRNA COVID-19 vaccine (Com-COV): a single-blind, randomised, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2021.

71. Hill J.A. UCS, Greninger A.L, Shadman M, Gopal AK. Immunogenicity of a heterologous COVID-19 vaccine after failed vaccination in a lymphoma patient. *Cancer Cell*. 2021.
72. Prevention CfDCA. COVID-19 Vaccines for Moderately to Severely Immunocompromised People. Vol. 2021; 2021.
73. Experts WHOSAGo. WHO advisory group recommends extra COVID-19 vaccine dose for immunocompromised; 2021.
74. Halasa NB, Savani BN, Asokan I, et al. Randomized Double-Blind Study of the Safety and Immunogenicity of Standard-Dose Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine versus High-Dose Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine in Adult Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Patients. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2016;22(3):528-535.
75. Cohen MS, Nirula A, Mulligan MJ, et al. Effect of Bamlanivimab vs Placebo on Incidence of COVID-19 Among Residents and Staff of Skilled Nursing and Assisted Living Facilities: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2021;326(1):46-55.
76. Dagotto G, Yu J, Barouch DH. Approaches and Challenges in SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Development. *Cell Host Microbe*. 2020;28(3):364-370.
77. Flanagan KL, Best E, Crawford NW, et al. Progress and Pitfalls in the Quest for Effective SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) Vaccines. *Front Immunol*. 2020;11:579250.
78. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(7):1205-1211.

Mixed group studies										
Study	Type /Location	Study population/ Comparator	Number of participants (analysed)	Age Median	Male/ Female	Vaccine type	Analysis	Seropositivity	Rate of positive neutralising antibody/ cellular response	Adverse events
Addeo et. al. ²³	Multicentre prospective cohort study Europe, North America	Haematology Solid tumour	25 patients 106 patients	Not specified for haem.	Not specified for haem.	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 Not specified for haem.	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	Haematology 3-4 weeks post first dose: 18/25 (72%) 3-4 weeks post second dose: 17/22 (77%) Solid tumour First dose: 80/96 (83%) Second dose: 99/101 (98%)	Not reported	Not reported
Agha et. al. ²⁴	Single centre retrospective cohort study United States	Haematology	67 patients	71 years (IQR 65-77)	35 Male 32 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 51% 42% 7% unknown	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Beckman Coulter ≥1.00 = positive	21 days post second dose: 36/67 (54%)	Not reported	Not reported
Benda et. al. ²⁵	Single centre prospective cohort study	Haematology	123 patients -34% Myeloma	Not reported in haem	Not reported in haem	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche	21 days post first dose: 53/123 (43%)	Not reported	Not reported for haematology

	Austria		-38% CLL/lymphoma/WM -28% AML/MDS/ MPN Solid tumour 136 patients				≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	28 days post second dose: 85/119 (71%)		
Cohen et. al. ²⁶	Single centre retrospective study Israel	Haematology	54 patients	69 years (IQR 61-77)	32 Male 22 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	2-3 weeks post second dose: 34/54 (63%)	Not reported	Not reported
Gavriatopoulou et. al. ²⁷	Single centre prospective cohort study Greece	Haematology Control group	58 patients -48% WM -38% CLL -14% NHL 213 controls	75 years (40-88)	28 Male 30 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 76% 24%	Neutralising antibody Genescript ≥ 30% = positive ≥ 50% = clinically relevant inhibition	22 days post first dose: ≥ 30% 8/58 (14%) patients vs 114/213 (54%) controls	22 days post first dose: ≥ 50% 3/58 (5%) patients vs. 50/213 (24%) controls	Not reported
Greenberger et. al. ²⁸	Multicentre prospective cohort study United States	Haematology	1445 patients -45% CLL -25% NHL -5% HL -15% MM -4% acute leukaemia -2% CML -2% MPN -2% others	68 years (16-110)	574 Male 871 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 45% 55%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	>14 days post second dose: 1088/1445 (75%)	Not reported	Not reported

Herzog Tzarfati et. al. ²⁹	Single centre prospective cohort study Israel	Haematology Matched Healthy control	315 patients -22% MPN -17% Myeloma -16% aggressive NHL -13% indolent NHL -11% CLL -7% CML -5% HL -5% Acute leukemia -5% MDS 108 controls	70 years (IQR 61-77)	223 Male 200 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 12 AU/ml = positive	30-60 days post second dose: 235/315 (75%) vs. 107/108 (99%) control	Not reported	Not reported
Iacano et. al. ³⁰	Single centre prospective cohort study Italy	Haematology ≥ 80 years Control health care workers ≥ 66 years (results not reported)	10 patients	Not specified for haem	Not specified for haem	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 AU/ml = positive	28 days post second dose: 4/10 (40%)	Not reported	Not reported
Jurgens et. al. ³¹	Single centre prospective cohort study	Haematology	67 patients -31% CLL -63% NHL -6% HL	71 years (24-90)	36 Male 31 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 46%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG 'in house'	21 days post second dose: 41/67 (61%) vs.	Not reported	Not reported

	United States	Control health care workers	35 controls			54%	OD450 ≥ 3 = positive	35/35 (100%) controls		
Maneikis et. al. ³²	Multicentre prospective cohort study Europe	Haematology Control - Healthcare workers	857 patients 68 controls	65 years (IQR 54-72)	404 Male 453 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 AU/ml = positive	7-21days post first dose: 481/857 (56%) Not reported for control group	Not reported	At least 1 adverse event: 56/575 (9%) dose 1 72/575 (13%) dose 2
Malard et. al. ³³	Single centre retrospective cohort study France	Haematology Healthy controls	195 patients -27% myeloma -23% NHL -3% HL -13% CLL -16% AML -2% ALL -9% MPN -7% others 30 controls	69 years (22-92)	117 Male 78 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 AU/ml = positive ≥ 3100 AU/ml = neutralisation >30% SARS-CoV-2 T cell response ELISPOT ≥ 10 spot forming cells/ 10^6 PBMCs and ratio 2.5 = positive	≥ 3100 AU/ml Threshold* 28 days post first dose: 3/195 (2%) 14 days post second dose: 91/196 (47%) vs. 26/30 (87%) controls	Cellular response 14 days post second dose: 36/68 (53%)	At least 1 adverse event: 88/154 (57%) Dose 1 55/163 (34%) Dose 2

Monin et. al. ³⁴	Multicentre prospective cohort study United Kingdom	Haematology Health care workers controls	56 patients -68% B cell malignancy -9% T cell malignancy -18% myeloid/acute leukaemia -5% others 54 controls	73 years (IQR 65-80)	Not extractable for haem	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 Spike IgG ≥ 70 EC ₅₀ = positive SARS-CoV-2 specific T cells secreting IFN-gamma and/or IL2 >7 cytokine-secreting cells per 10 ⁶ PBMC = positive	21 days post first dose: 8/44 (18%) vs. 32/34 (94%) Controls 35 days post first dose: 4/36 (11%) vs. 18/21 (86%) controls 35 days post first dose (with second dose): 3/5 (60%) vs. 12/12 (100%) controls	Cellular response 21 days post first dose: 9/18 (50%) vs. 14/17 (82%) controls 35 days post first dose: 6/18 (33%) vs. 9/13 (69%) controls 35 days post first dose (with second dose): 3/4 (75%) vs. 3/3 (100%) controls	Not extractable for haematology patients
Ollila et. al. ³⁵	Single centre retrospective cohort study United States	Haematology	160 patients -36% aggressive lymphoma -21% indolent lymphoma -15% plasma cell -12% CLL	72 years (65-79)	86 Male 74 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 Ad26 60% 31% 7% 1% - not determined	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott Signal/cutoff ratio ≥ 1.4 = positive	56 days post first dose: 63/160 (39%)	Not reported	Not reported

			- 9% other lymphoma - 6% myeloid							
Pimpinelli et. al. ³⁶	Single centre prospective study Italy	Haematology -Myeloma -MPN Older age (> 80 years) control group	92 patients -46% myeloma -54% MPN 36 controls	73 years (47-78) 70 years (28-80)	Myeloma 23 Male 19 Female MPN 26 Male 24 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 15 AU/ml = positive	21 days post first dose: 9/42 (21%) myeloma 26/50 (52%) MPN vs. 19/36 (53%) controls 14 days post second dose: 33/42 (79%) myeloma 44/50 (88%) MPN vs. 36/36 (100%) controls ≥ 80 AU/ml threshold* 14 days post second dose 23/42 (55%) myeloma 42/50 (84%) MPN vs. 34/36 (97%) control	Not reported	Reported with different patient numbers

Re et. al. ³⁷	Multicentre retrospective cohort study France	Haematology	102 patients -45% lymphoma -22% myeloma -13% MDS/AML -10% CLL -10% MPN	76 years (33-93)	67 Male 35 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 93% 7%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Range of commercial kits utilising their threshold	21-28 days post second dose 64/102 (62%)	Not reported	Not reported
Thakkar et. al. ³⁸	Single centre prospective and retrospective cohort study United States	Haematology Solid tumours Healthy control	66 patients -39% lymphoid -27% myeloid -33% plasma cell 134 patients 26 controls	Not reported for haem	Not reported for haem	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 Ad26 58% 31% 10% 2% mRNA type unknown	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 AU/ml = positive	>7 days after second dose: 56/66 (85%) vs. 131/134 (98%) solid tumours Rate not reported for controls	Not reported	Not reported for haematology
Myeloma specific studies										
Avivi et. al. ³⁹	Single centre Prospective cohort study Israel	Myeloma Healthy volunteers	171 patients 64 controls	70 years (38-94)	96 Male 75 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 UI/ml = positive	14-21 days post second dose: 133/171 (78%) vs. 63/64 (98%) controls	Not reported	At least one adverse event: 90/161 (53%) vs. 29/53 (55%) controls
Bird et. al. ⁴⁰	Single centre retrospective cohort study	Myeloma	93 patients	67 years (47-87)	55 Male 38 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG	≥ 21 days post first dose:	Not reported	Not reported

	United Kingdom					52%/48%	Ortho clinical ≥1 signal/cut-off = positive	52/93 (56%)		
Ghandili et. al. ⁴¹	Single centre prospective cohort study Germany	Myeloma	82 patients	68 years (40-85)	49 Male 33 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 77% 23%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 34 AU/ml = positive	21 days post first dose: 17/74 (23%)	Not reported	Not reported
Ramasamy et. al. ⁴²	Multicentre web-based prospective cohort study United Kingdom	Myeloma	105 patients -28 patients sampled	63 years	67 Male 42 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 42% 58%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott COI ≥ 50 = positive	>21 days post first dose: 17/28 (61%)	Not reported	Not reported
Stampfer et. al. ⁴³	Single centre prospective cohort study United States	Myeloma Healthy controls Pre-COVID-19 controls	103 patients 31 controls 34 controls	68 years (35-88)	61 Male 42 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 50% 50%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG 'in house' 50-250 IU/ml = positive (partial response) >250 IU/ml = clinically relevant response	14-21 days post first dose: 20/93 (22%) 14-21 days post second dose: 64/96 (67%) vs. 31/31 (100%) controls	Not reported	Not reported

								>250 IU/ml 14-21 days post first dose: 2/93 (2%) 14-21 days post second dose: 43/93 (46%) vs. 29/31 (94%) controls		
Terpos et. al. ⁴⁴	Single centre prospective cohort study Greece	Myeloma Matched Controls	48 patients 102 controls	83 years (59-92)	29 Male 19 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 neutralising Ab Genscript $\geq 30\%$ = positive $\geq 50\%$ = clinically relevant	$\geq 30\%$ 22 days post first dose: 12/48 (25%) vs. 57/102 (55%) controls	$\geq 50\%$ 22 days post first dose: 4/48 (8%) vs. 21/102 (20%) controls	Not reported
Terpos et. al. ⁴⁵	Single centre prospective cohort study Greece	Myeloma Matched Controls	276 patients -77% myeloma -14% sMM -9% MGUS 226 controls	74 years (62-80)	151 Male 125 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 78% 22%	SARS-CoV-2 neutralising Ab Genscript $\geq 30\%$ = positive $\geq 50\%$ = clinically relevant	$\geq 30\%$ Day 22 post first dose: 117/276 (42%) vs. 145/226 (64%) controls	$\geq 50\%$ Day 22 post first dose: 55/276 (20%) vs. 73/226 (32%) controls	First dose BNT162b2 71/215 (33%) local reaction 28/215 (13%) systemic reaction ChAdOx1 20/61 (33%) local reaction

								Day 50 post first dose: 196/276 (71%) vs. 204/226 (90%) controls	Day 50 post first dose: 158/276 (57%) vs. 183/226 (81%) controls	Second dose BNT162b2 68/215 (32%) local reaction 45/215 (21%) systemic reaction
Van Oekelen et. al. ⁴⁶	Single centre prospective and retrospective cohort study United States	Myeloma Matched control health care workers	320 patients -260 sampled 67 controls	68 years (38-93)	185 Male 135 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 unknown 69% 27% 4%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG 'in house' ≥ 5 AU/ml = positive	51 days post second dose: 219/260 (84%) vs. 67/67 (100%) controls	Not reported	Not reported
CLL specific studies										
Benjamini et. al. ⁴⁷	Multicentre prospective cohort study Israel	CLL patients	373 patients	70 years (40-89)	222 Male 151 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 15 AU/ml = positive Abbott >50 U/ml = positive 'in house' >1.1 = positive	14-21 days post second dose: 160/373 (43%)	Not reported	At least 1 adverse event: 151/331 (47%)

Del Poeta et. al. ⁴⁸	Single centre prospective cohort study Italy	CLL patients	46 patients	Not reported	29 Male 17 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Maglumi ≥1.1 = positive	14-21 days post second dose: 25/46 (54%)	Not reported	Not reported
Herishanu et. al. ⁴⁹	Single centre prospective cohort study Israel	CLL patients Control -age, sex matched	167 patients 52 controls	71 years (63-76)	112 Male 55 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	14-21 days post second dose: 66/167 (40%) patients vs. 52/52 (100%) controls	Not reported	First dose 52/167 (31%) local reaction 21/167 (13%) Systemic reaction Second dose 56/167 (34%) local reaction 21/167 (23%) Systemic reaction
Parry et. al. ⁵⁰	Single centre prospective cohort study United Kingdom	CLL patients Healthy age matched controls	299 patients 93 controls	69 years (IQR 63-74)	159 Male 140 Female	BNT162b2 ChAxOd1 52% 48%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive Dried blood sampling Roche ratio ≥ 1.0 = positive	43 days post first dose: Serum 29/86 (34%) vs. 89/95 (94%) Control Dried blood* 63/267 (24%) vs. 66/93 (71%) control	Not reported	Not reported

								18 days post second dose: Serum 9/12 (75%) vs. 59/59 (100%) Controls Dried blood* 39/55 (71%) vs. 36/37 (97%) controls		
Roeker et. al. ⁵¹	Single centre retrospective cohort study United States	CLL patients	44 patients	71 years (37-89)	23 Male 21 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 57% 43%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 15 AU/ml = positive	21 days post second dose: 23/44 (52%)	Not reported	Not reported
Tadmor et. al. ⁵²	Multicentre prospective observation study Israel	CLL patients	84 patients	69 years (44-87)	53 Male 29 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 U/ml = positive SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG >1.1 = positive	22 days post second dose: 49/84 (58%)	Not reported	Not reported
Lymphoma specific studies										

Ghione et. al. ⁵³	Single centre prospective cohort study United States	B-cell lymphoma Control age-care, healthcare workers	86 patients 47 controls 154 controls	70 years (35-91)	45 Male 41 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 Ad26 47% 52% 1%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG BioRad ≥1.0 = positive	14-56 days post completion of vaccination: 36/86 (42%) patients vs. 43/47 (92%) age-care 154/154 (100%) healthcare	Not reported	Not reported
Gurion et. al. ⁵⁴	Multicentre prospective cohort study Israel	Lymphoma	162 patients -88% NHL -12% HL	65 years (52-73)	89 Male 73 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 IU/ml = positive	28 days post second dose: 83/162 (51%)	Not reported	Not reported
Lim et. al. ⁵⁵	Multicentre prospective cohort study Interim analysis United Kingdom	Lymphoma	129 patients recruited 119 analysed -66% indolent B-NHL -29% aggressive B-NHL -10% HL -3% other 150 control	69 years (IQR 57-74)	81 Male 48 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Meso Scale Discovery >0.55 BAU/ml = positive RBD IgG >0.73 BAU/ml = positive	14 days post first dose: 32/59 (54%) patients vs. 65/65 (100%) controls 14-28 days post second dose: 61/86 (71%) patients vs.	Not reported	Not reported

		Healthy control						85/85 (100%) controls		
Perry et. al. ⁵⁶	Single centre prospective cohort study Israel	Lymphoma -B cell NHL Healthy control	149 patients -53% indolent NHL -47% aggressive NHL 65 controls	64 years (20-92)	88 Male 61 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 IU/ml = positive	14-21 days post second dose: 73/149 (49%) vs. 64/65 (99%) controls 38/80 (48%) indolent NHL 34/69 (49%) aggressive NHL	Not reported	At least 1 adverse event: 60/118 (51%) 44/118 (37%) local AE 23/118 (20%) Systemic AE
HCT specific studies										
Easdale et. al. ⁵⁷	Single centre retrospective cohort study United Kingdom	Allogeneic HCT >3 months	55 patients	50 years (18-73)	34 Male 21 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 38% 62%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Ortho clinical ≥1 signal/cut-off = positive	42 days post first dose: 21/55 (38%)	Not reported	Not reported
Redjoul et. al. ⁵⁸	Single centre retrospective cohort study France	Allogeneic HCT	88 patients	Not reported	47 Male 41 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott >21 AU/ml = positive >4160 AU/ml =	28 days post second dose: 69/88 (78%) >4160 AU/ml 28 days post second dose:	Not reported	Not reported

							neutralisation	52/88 (59%)		
Ram et. al. ⁵⁹	Single centre prospective cohort study Israel	Allogeneic HCT and CAR-T >3 months	80 patients -83% alloHCT -17% CAR-T	65 years (23-83)	44 Male 37 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Roche ≥ 0.8 U/ml = positive SARS-CoV-2 specific cells ELISPOT, (IFN, IL2) 4 spots/well = positive	7 to 14 days post second dose: 47/63 (75%) alloHCT 5/14 (36%) CAR-T	Cellular 7 to 14 days post second dose: 7/37 (19%) alloHCT 6/12 (50%) CAR-T	At least 1 adverse event: First dose 11/80 (14%) 3/80 (4%) GvHD Second dose 18/74 (24%) 3/74 (4%) GvHD
Dhakai et. al. ⁶⁰	Single centre retrospective cohort study United States	Autologous Allogeneic HCT CAR-T	130 patients -45 autoHCT -71 alloHCT -14 CAR-T	AutoHCT 65 years (45-75) AlloHCT 64 years (25-77) CAR-T Not reported	Not reported	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 Ad26 59% 36% 5%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG EUROIMMUN ≥1.1 signal/cut-off = positive	14 days post completion of vaccination: 27/45 (60%) autoHCT 49/71 (38%) alloHCT 3/14 (21%) CAR-T	Not reported	Not reported
Myeloproliferative neoplasms and chronic myeloid leukaemia specific studies										
Caocci et. al. ⁶¹	Single centre prospective cohort study Italy	MPN	20 patients -65% MF -30% ET -5% PV	66 years (48-82)	Not reported	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 15 AU/ml = positive	42 days post second dose: 13/20 (65%)	Not reported	Not reported

Chowdhury et. al. ⁶²	Single centre retrospective cohort United Kingdom	CML and MPN Healthcare workers > 60 years old	59 patients 232 controls	62 years (IQR 52-73)	27 Male 32 Female	BNT162b2 ChAdOx1 37% 63%	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG Abbott ≥ 50 AU/mL = positive	≥ 2 weeks post first dose: 34/59 (57%) 224/232 (97%)	Not reported	Not reported
Guglielmi et. al. ⁶³	Single centre prospective cohort study Italy	MPN Healthy controls	30 patients -43% MF -33% PV -23% ET 14 controls	Not reported overall	10 Male 20 Female	BNT162b2 mRNA-1273 83% 17%	SARS-CoV-2 S/RBD IgG Not specified	21 to 28 days post first dose: 18/30 (60%) vs. 14/14 (100%) controls	21 to 28 days post first dose: 13/30 (43%) vs. 14/14 (100%) controls	Not reported
Harrington et. al. ⁶⁴	Single centre prospective cohort study United Kingdom	CML	16 patients -CML	45 years (23-74)	12 Male 4 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG 'in house' 1:25 = positive SARS-CoV-2 neutralising 'in house' ID50 = positive SARS-CoV-2 T cells ICS (IFN, IL2) 3 fold increase = positive	21 days post first dose: 14/16 (88%)	Neutralising antibody 21 days post first dose: 6/16 (38%) Cellular: 14/15 (80%)	Local adverse events: 8/16 (50%) Systemic adverse events: 9/16 (56%)

Harrington et. al. ⁶⁵	Single centre prospective cohort study United Kingdom	MPN	21 patients	58 years (36-72)	7 Male 21 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG 'in house' 1:25 = positive SARS-CoV-2 neutralising 'in house' ID50 = positive SARS-CoV-2 T cells ICS (IFN, IL2) 3 fold increase = positive	21 days post first dose: 16/21 (76%)	Neutralising antibody 21 days post first dose: 18/21 (86%) Cellular (CD4): 15/20 (75%)	At least 1 adverse event: 12/21 (57%) local 10/21 (48%) systemic
Pimpinelli et. al. ⁶⁶	Single centre prospective cohort study Italy	MPN	42 patients -40% ET -36% PV -24% MF	72 years (52-82)	20 Male 22 Female	BNT162b2	SARS-CoV-2 S IgG DiaSorin ≥ 15 AU/ml = positive	21 days post first dose: 23/42 (55%) 14 days post second dose: 36/42 (86%)	Not reported	Not reported

*Excluded from meta-analysis

Haem: haematology; CLL: chronic lymphocytic leukaemia; NHL: non hodgkins lymphoma; HL: hodgkins lymphoma; AML: acute myeloid leukaemia; MDS: myelodysplastic syndrome; MM: myeloma; MGUS: monoclonal gammopathy of unknown significance; WG: Waldenstrom's magroglobulinaemia; HCT: haematopoietic stem cell transplantation; CAR-T: chimeric antigen receptor T cell; MPN: myeloproliferative neoplasm; CML: chronic myeloid leukaemia; ET: Essential thrombocytosis; PV: polycythaemia vera; MF: myelofibrosis; AU: arbitrary unit

BNT162b2: Tozinameran (Pfizer); mRNA1273: Spikevax (Moderna); ChAdOx1: Vaxzevria (AstraZeneca); Ad26: Janssen

Table 1: Summary of study characteristics and outcomes for patients with haematological malignancy by overall cohort and by specific underlying disease

	Single arm studies Pooled response rate (95% CI)	Malignancy arm of comparator studies Pooled response rate (95% CI)	Control arm of comparator studies Pooled response rate (95% CI)	Intervention vs. control cohort Odds ratio (95% CI) Heterogeneity <i>p</i> -value
Overall: Patients with haematological malignancy				
Following second dose 4733 patients	0.61 (0.54-0.69) $I^2 = 92\%, p < 0.01$	0.67 (0.58-0.76) $I^2 = 93\%, p < 0.01$	0.96 (0.91-1.00) $I^2 = 84\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.05 (0.02-0.15) $p < 0.01$ $I^2 = 88\%, p < 0.01$
Following first dose 2331 patients	0.51 (0.38-0.64) $I^2 = 92\%, p < 0.01$	0.37 (0.23-0.51) $I^2 = 90\%, p < 0.01$	0.78 (0.62-0.95) $I^2 = 98\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.10 (0.04-0.29) $p < 0.01$ $I^2 = 86\%, p < 0.01$
Myeloma				
Following second dose 1218 patients	0.80 (0.64-0.95) $I^2 = 85\%, p < 0.01$	0.76 (0.70-0.82) $I^2 = 90\%, p < 0.01$	0.98 (0.95-1.00) $I^2 = 71\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.09 (0.03-0.29) $P < 0.01$ $I^2 = 49\%, p = 0.08$
Following first dose 685 patients	0.43 (0.18-0.68) $I^2 = 91\%, p < 0.01$	0.29 (0.09-0.48) $I^2 = 81\%, p < 0.01$	0.64 (0.42-0.87) $I^2 = 76\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.23 (0.05-0.99) $p = 0.05$ $I^2 = 49\%, p = 0.11$
Chronic lymphocytic leukaemia				
Following second dose	0.51 (0.37-0.65)	0.51 (0.34-0.68)	1.00 (0.99-1.00)	OR 0.01 (0.01-0.03) $p < 0.01$

1446 patients	$I^2 = 91\%, p < 0.01$	$I^2 = 56\%, p = 0.06$	$I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.07$	$I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.9$
Following first dose	Single study	0.18 (0.00-1.00)	0.92 (0.52-1.00)	OR 0.03 (0.00-0.80)
111 patients		$I^2 = 89\%, p < 0.01$	$I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.32$	$p = 0.05$ $I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.60$
Lymphoma				
Following second dose	0.52 (0.28-0.75)	0.55 (0.35-0.76)	0.99 (0.98-1.00)	OR 0.02 (0.01-0.02)
1227 patients	$I^2 = 97\%, p < 0.01$	$I^2 = 84\%, p < 0.01$	$I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.72$	$p < 0.01$ $I^2 = 0\%, p = 1.0$
Following first dose	No studies available	0.33 (0.00-1.00)	0.95 (0.09-1.00)	OR 0.01 (0.0-1.24)
69 patients		$I^2 = 93\%, p < 0.01$	$I^2 = 71\%, p = 0.06$	$p = 0.05$ $I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.7$
Haematopoietic stem cell transplant and cellular therapies				
Following second dose	0.61 (0.42-0.80)	Single study	Single study	Single study
401 patients	$I^2 = 88\%, p = 0.05$			
Following first dose	Single study	No studies available	No studies available	No studies available
21 patients				
Acute leukaemia and Myelodysplastic syndrome				
Following second dose	0.93 (0.80-1.00)	Single study	Single study	Single study
113 patients	$I^2 = 29\%, p = 0.24$			

Following first dose 13 patients	Single study	Single study	Single study	Single study
Myeloproliferative neoplasm and chronic myeloid leukaemia				
Following second dose 281 patients	0.88 (0.72-1.00) $I^2 = 70\%, p=0.01$	0.87 (0.81-0.92) $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.83$	0.99 (0.98-1.00) $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.90$	OR 0.07 (0.0-1.55) $p = 0.06$ $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.77$
Following first dose 222 patients	0.71 (0.30-1.00) $I^2 = 76\%, p=0.01$	0.54 (0.37-0.71) $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.46$	0.85 (0.51-1.00) $I^2 = 90\%, p<0.01$	OR 0.13 (0.01-1.71) $p=0.09$ $I^2 = 88\%, p<0.01$

Table 2: Summary of pooled seropositivity rates for patients with haematological malignancy and by underlying disease type and number of vaccine doses

	Positive neutralising antibody response	Positive cellular response	At least 1 adverse event rate
	Pooled response rate (95% CI)	Pooled response rate (95% CI)	Pooled response rate (95% CI)
Overall: Patients with haematological malignancy			
Following second dose	Malignancy arm of comparator studies: 0.57 (Single study)	Single arm: 0.40 (0.00-1.00) Malignancy arm of comparator studies: 0.75 (single study)	0.36 (0.24-0.48) $I^2 = 97\%, p < 0.01$
Following first dose	Single arm: 0.63 (0.00-1.00) Malignancy arm of comparator studies: 0.18 (0.00-0.44)	Single arm: 0.86 (0.00-1.00) Malignancy arm of comparator studies: 0.33 (single study)	0.39 (0.18-0.60) $I^2 = 97\%, p < 0.01$

Table 3: Summary of pooled rates of positive neutralising antibody, cellular responses and adverse events

	Intervention arm Pooled response rate (95% CI) Heterogeneity <i>p</i> -value	Control arm Pooled response rate (95% CI) Heterogeneity <i>p</i> -value	Intervention vs. control cohort Odds ratio (95% CI) Heterogeneity <i>p</i> -value
Active therapy vs. no active therapy			
Following second dose	0.28 (0.08-0.48) $I^2 = 83\%, p < 0.01$	0.62 (0.39-0.86) $I^2 = 94\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.21 (0.06-0.67) $p = 0.02$ $I^2 = 75\%, p < 0.01$
Following first dose	0.42 (0.09-0.75) $I^2 = 49\%, p = 0.08$	0.81 (0.66-0.95) $I^2 = 0\%, p = 0.62$	OR 0.19 (0.03-1.19) $p = 0.06$ $I^2 = 24\%, p = 0.27$
CD-20 antibody therapy within 12 months vs. CD-20 therapy 12 or more months			
Following second dose	0.19 (0.00-0.50) $I^2 = 88\%, p < 0.01$	0.61 (0.41-0.82) $I^2 = 88\%, p < 0.01$	OR 0.08 (0.01-0.59) $p = 0.02$ $I^2 = 57\%, p = 0.04$
Following first dose	Single study	Single study	Single study
Targeted therapy			
Following second dose	0.35 (0.19-0.52) $I^2 = 94\%, p < 0.01$	No control	No analysis
Following first dose	Single study	No control	No analysis

Haematopoietic stem cell transplant or cellular therapy within 12 months vs. 12 or more			
Following second dose	0.66 (0.43-0.88) $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.63$	0.68 (0.40-0.95) $I^2 = 45\%, p=0.16$	OR 0.96 (0.11-8.74) $p=0.94$ $I^2 = 36\%, p=0.21$
Following first dose	Single study	Single study	Single study
Vaccine type BNT162b2 vs. non-BNT162b2			
Following second dose	0.95 (0.39-1.00) $I^2 = 66\%, p=0.09$	0.91 (0.62-1.00) $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.44$	OR 1.93 (0.00- >1) $p=0.69$ $I^2 = 71\%, p=0.06$
Following first dose	0.62 (0.29-0.95) $I^2 = 52\%, p=0.12$	0.68 (0.24-1.00) $I^2 = 76\%, p=0.02$	OR 0.80 (0.42-1.51) $p=0.26$ $I^2 = 0\%, p=0.82$

Table 4: Summary of subgroup analysis by active treatment, timing of CD20 antibody therapy, haematopoietic stem cell transplantation, receipt of targeted therapies and type of COVID-19 vaccine

Figure legend

Figure 1: Flow diagram of studies identified, screened and included.

Figure 2:

(A) Odds ratio for achieving seropositivity in patients with haematological malignancy versus healthy control group following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine

(B) Odds ratio of achieving seropositivity in patients with haematological malignancy versus healthy control group following one dose of COVID-19 vaccine

Figure 3:

(A) Pooled rates of seropositivity in single arm studies involving patients with haematological malignancy following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine

(B) Pooled rates of seropositivity in single arm studies involving patients with haematological malignancy following one dose of COVID-19 vaccine

Figure 1: Flow diagram of studies identified, screened and included

Figure 2A: Odds ratio for achieving seropositivity in patients with haematological malignancy versus healthy control group following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine

Figure 3A: Pooled rates of seropositivity in single arm studies involving patients with haematological malignancy following two doses of COVID-19 vaccine

Figure 3B : Pooled rates of seropositivity in single arm studies involving patients with haematological malignancy following one dose of COVID-19 vaccine