1

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

- 3
- 4
- Anna Yin¹, Nadia Wang², Patrick J. Shea¹, Erica N. Rosser³, Helen Kuo³, Janna R. Shapiro¹, Katherine Z.J. Fenstermacher⁴, Andrew Pekosz^{1, 4}, Richard E. Rothman⁴, 5
- Sabra L. Klein¹, and Rosemarv Morgan³ 6
- 7
- ¹W. Harry Feinstone Department of Molecular Microbiology and Immunology, Johns 8
- Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA. 9
- ²Department of Population, Family, and Reproductive Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg 10 School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA. 11
- ³Department of International Health, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 12
- Baltimore, MD, USA. 13
- ⁴Department of Emergency Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA. 14
- 15

Keywords 16

- Birth control, COVID-19 mRNA vaccine, seasonal influenza vaccine, reactogenicity, 17
- 18 vaccine hesitancy
- 19 **Corresponding author contact**
- 20 Sabra L. Klein (sklein2@jhu.edu) and Rosemary Morgan (rosemary.morgan@jhu.edu)

2

21 ABSTRACT

- 22 Introduction: Active and passive surveillance studies have found that a greater
- 23 proportion of females report adverse events (AE) following receipt of either the COVID-
- 24 19 or seasonal influenza vaccine compared to males. We sought to determine the
- 25 intersection of biological sex and sociocultural gender differences in prospective active
- 26 reporting of vaccine outcomes, which remains poorly characterized.
- 27 **Methods:** This cohort study enrolled Johns Hopkins Health System healthcare workers
- 28 (HCWs) who were recruited from the annual fall 2019-2022 influenza vaccine and the
- 29 fall 2022 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine campaigns. Vaccine recipients were enrolled the
- 30 day of vaccination and AE surveys were administered two days post-vaccination (DPV)
- for bivalent COVID-19 and Influenza vaccine recipients. Data were collected regarding 31
- 32 the presence of a series of solicited local and systemic AEs. Open-ended answers
- 33 about participants' experiences with AEs also were collected for the COVID-19 vaccine 34 recipients.
- 35 **Results:** Females were more likely to report local AEs after influenza (OR=2.28,
- 36 p=0.001) or COVID-19 (OR=2.57, p=0.008) vaccination compared to males, regardless
- 37 of age or race. Males and females had comparable probabilities of reporting systemic
- 38 AEs after influenza (OR=1.18, p=0.552) or COVID-19 (OR=0.96, p=0.907) vaccination.
- 39 Exogenous hormones from birth control use did not impact the rates of reported AEs
- 40 following COVID-19 vaccination among reproductive-aged female HCWs. Women
- reported more interruptions in their daily routine following COVID-19 vaccination than 41
- men and were more likely to seek out self-treatment. More women than men scheduled 42
- 43 their COVID-19 vaccination before their days off in anticipation of AEs.
- 44 **Conclusions:** Our findings highlight the need for sex- and gender-inclusive policies to
- 45 inform more effective occupational health vaccination strategies. Further research is
- 46 needed to evaluate the potential disruption of AEs on occupational responsibilities
- 47 following mandated vaccination for healthcare workers and to more fully characterize
- 48 the post-vaccination behavioral differences between men and women.
- 49

52

53

50 **KEY MESSAGE**

51 What is already known on this topic

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

59 What this study adds

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

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

64

3

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

68

69 INTRODUCTION

70 Females report more adverse events (AEs) than males to many vaccines, including the 71 influenza[1-3] and COVID-19[1-5] vaccines. These differences have been attributed to 72 biological differences between males and females (e.g., sex steroid effects on 73 inflammatory immune responses) as well as gender differences (e.g., the socio-cultural 74 differences between men and women), including gender reporting bias[2,4-10], with 75 few studies considering both sex and gender facets in the same study population[2]. 76 AEs occur when the body mounts an immune response to the vaccine antigen, 77 increasing secretion of inflammatory cytokines and recruitment of immune cells to the 78 injection site, which can also enter the bloodstream and lead to more systemic AEs, 79 such as fever, malaise, and fatigue[11]. Sex steroid hormones (e.g., estrogens, 80 androgens, and progesterone) and their receptors have been hypothesized as critical 81 regulators of immune cell responses that cause differential cytokine secretion between 82 males and females[10,12-15]. In response to infection and vaccination, females have 83 been shown to have greater immune activation, higher production of antibodies, and 84 increased T cell activation, possibly making them more likely to experience AEs 85 compared to males [5, 10, 12, 14, 16, 17]. 86 Beyond the physical impacts of AEs, experiences with AEs following vaccination can 87 88 influence vaccine attitudes and patterns of uptake[18,19]. The World Health 89 Organization lists vaccine hesitancy as one of the top ten threats to global health[20]. 90 Vaccine hesitancy related to influenza and COVID-19 is higher among women than men.

91 which has been hypothesized to be due to the increased likelihood of AEs in females

than males[21-25]. Men consistently have higher influenza vaccine acceptance than
 women, with White men often having less hesitancy than either Black or White women

 or Black men[26-28]. Similarly, male healthcare workers (HCWs) have also been found
 to have lower COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy with higher vaccine uptake than women[29-32].

96 97

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

- 111 COVID-19 vaccine recipients. Gender-related responses were collected with open-
- ended questions about AEs after receipt of the COVID-19 vaccine among women and
- men. Our goal was to provide a thorough assessment of sex and gender differences in
- AE reporting among HCWs to improve policies and messaging around mandatory
- 115 vaccine programs.116

117 METHODS

118 Study design and participants

119 Our study involved two separate survey-based cohorts of human participants, which

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

135

136 Data collection

- 137 Annual influenza AE vaccination data were collected from September through October
- 138 of 2019-2022. COVID-19 vaccine AE data was collected from September through
- 139 October 2022. Influenza vaccine AE survey forms, provided as a hard copy at the time
- of consent/enrollment, were to be completed within two days post-vaccination (DPV) by
- participants and returned to study coordinators in-person at their next scheduled visit.
 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine AE surveys were electronically administered and collected
- 142 via REDCap at two DPV for those who agreed to participate at the time of vaccination.
- 144 Participants' experience of local AEs at the site of injection (i.e., warmth, redness.
- swelling, short-duration pain, long-duration pain, and itchiness), and systemic AEs (i.e.,
- sweating, malaise, muscle aches, insomnia, headaches, fever, and chills) were
- 147 collected as yes/no answers and tallied by category. The level of inconvenience was
- measured by multiple choice answers. Open-ended questions were included within the
- 149 COVID-19 vaccine study to explore reasons for vaccine uptake and responses to AEs.
- 150 All survey responses and demographics were self-reported by participants. Male and
- 151 female terminology was used to refer to biological differences. Man and woman
- 152 terminology was used to refer to gender differences in behaviors or outcomes.
- 153

154 **Quantitative statistical analysis**

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

5

157 AEs were analyzed using logistic regression models. Interaction terms were also 158 included in the model to examine age, race/ethnicity, or hormonal birth control effects on 159 the probabilities of AEs by sex. Probabilities were plotted along with 95% confidence 160 intervals by sex. P-values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant. 161 162 Qualitative analysis of open-ended questions within COVID-19 vaccine AE survey 163 Open-ended questions regarding reasons for vaccine uptake, and response to AEs 164 were analyzed using thematic analysis. Completed free-response answers from 165 participants were explored and grouped into themes and responses from men and 166 women were compared. 167 168 RESULTS 169 **Participant characteristics** 170 A total of 300 influenza vaccines (n=50 for females and n=50 for males per year) were 171 administered across the three years (2019-20, 2021-22, and 2022-23) with AE data 172 available for 265 (88%) of the participants and missing for 35 (12%; Table 1). Of these, 173 50.2% were female (n=133) and 49.8% male (n=132). The average age across the 174 study years was 30.75 years. Participants were predominately White at 60.8% (n=160), 175 followed by Asian at 19.4% (n=51), with 12.9% Black or African American (n=34). For 176 the influenza cohort, 13.2% (n=35) identified as Hispanic or Latino. 177 178 For the COVID-19 bivalent vaccine cohort, 212 HCWs enrolled and received 179 vaccination with AE survey data missing for 16 (8%) and available for 196 (92%) of 180 those participants, consisting of 76.5% (n=150) females and 23.5% (n=46) males (Table 181 1). The average age was 38.4 years and the cohort predominately consisted of White 182 participants at 64.8% (n=160) followed by Asian participants at 20.9% (n=41), and 183 Black/African American participants at 8.7% (n=17). 184 185 Table 1. Study participant demographics **COVID-19 Vaccine** Influenza Vaccine Cohort Cohort

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

6

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

186 187

188 **AEs were predominately localized and mild**

Among the 265 total influenza HCW recipients across the three years, 164 (62%)

reported having at least one AE with 57% (n=94) having only local AEs, 21% (n=35)

191 having only systemic AEs, and 21% (n=35) having both local and systemic AEs. Of the

192 178 that responded to the question about level of inconvenience, the majority of

recipients (n=142, 80%) did not experience any inconvenience when surveyed two DPV.

194 Seventeen percent of HCWs (n=31) reported mild inconvenience where they were able

to do 75-99% of their daily activities, 2% (n=4) reported moderate inconvenience where

they were able to do 25-75% of their daily activities, and only 1% (n=1) reported severe

197 inconvenience with capacity to do 0-25% of their daily activities.

198

Among the 196 COVID-19 bivalent vaccine recipients in 2022, 86% (n=169) of

200 participants reported at least one AE. Of those, 30% reported only local AEs, 18%

reported only systemic AEs, and 51% reported having both local and systemic AEs. The

202 majority (53%, n=90) did not experience any inconvenience with their daily activities.

203 Twenty-three percent reported mild inconvenience where they were able to do 75-99%

204 of their daily activities. Eighteen percent of HCWs reported moderate inconvenience

and were able to do 25-75% of their daily activities. Only 5% reported being severely

inconvenienced with the ability to do 0-25% of their daily activities. Overall, these data

207 suggest that experiencing mild AEs is common following vaccination with minimal

- 208 impairment to daily activities.
- 209

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

211 For the influenza vaccine cohort, logistic regression models (Figure 1A) for probabilities

of reporting any AE, any local, or any systemic AE, adjusted for sex, demonstrated that

age was not significantly associated with AE reporting. Inclusion of an age-by-sex

interaction term in the models (**Figure 1A**) revealed that the effect of age on the

215 probability of reporting any AE, any local AE or any systemic AE after influenza

216 vaccination of HCWs did not vary by sex. The average age of our HCW cohorts

7

217 receiving the influenza vaccine $(30.45 \pm 6.9, \text{ range: } 21-49)$ was relatively young and 218 reproductive-aged (18-49). 219 220 Logistic regression models for probabilities of reporting any AE (at least one local or 221 systemic AE) among influenza vaccine recipients across all three seasons showed that 222 females had a significantly greater probability of reporting AEs compared to males 223 (OR=2.02, 95% CI: 1.2-3.4, p=0.007; Figure 1B). Females had a significantly greater 224 probability of reporting any local AE compared to males (OR=2.28, 95% CI: 1.4-3.7, 225 p=0.001; Figure 1C), whereas the probability of reporting any systemic AE was comparable between males and females (OR=1.18, 95% CI: 0.68-2.0, p=0.552; Figure 226 227 1D). 228 229 For the COVID-19 vaccine cohort, logistic regression models (Figure 2A) also did not 230 find a significant association of age with the probabilities of reporting any AE, any local, 231 nor any systemic AE after adjusting for sex among the COVID-19 vaccine cohort. The 232 probability of reporting any AE, any local AE, or any systemic AE was similar across 233 ages for both male and female HCWs following bivalent COVID-19 vaccination (Figure 234 **2A**). The average age of our HCW cohort receiving the bivalent COVID-19 vaccine 235 $(38.4 \pm 12.3; range: 22-75)$ was relatively young with less than 25% of the participants 236 over 50 years-old. Taken together, these data suggest that age does not contribute to 237 the probability of reporting an AE, regardless of vaccine type. 238 239 There was no significant difference in the probability of reporting any AE following 240 bivalent COVID-19 vaccination between males and females (OR=2.14, 95% CI: 0.89-241 5.1, p=0.09; Figure 2B). Female HCWs, however, had a significantly greater probability 242 of reporting any local AE compared to males (OR=2.57, 95% CI: 1.3-5.2, p=0.008; 243 Figure 2C). Systemic AEs were similarly reported by males and females (OR=0.96, 95%) 244 Cl: 0.49-1.9, p=0.907; Figure 2D). 245 246 Sex differences of AEs are consistent across race categories in response to the 247 influenza vaccination 248 Among the influenza vaccine HCW cohort, there were more females than males among 249 those identifying as White (n=84, 52.5% females; n=76, 47.5% males) or Black (n=21, 250 61.8% females; n=13, 38.2% males; Figure 3A). For those identifying as Asian (n=22, 251 43.1% females; n=29, 56.9% males) or other (n=5, 27.8% females; n=13, 72.2% males), 252 there were more males than females (Figure 3A). The logistic regression model for the 253 probability of any AE with an interaction term for race and sex, adjusted for age, 254 revealed that regardless of race, females consistently had greater probabilities of 255 reporting any AE compared to males (Figure 3B). The interaction model did not show 256 statically significant differences for reporting of any AE between males and females 257 across race categories except for Black/African Americans, likely due to smaller sample 258 sizes (Figure 3A-B). The probability of reporting any local AE consistently had a female

- bias with White and Black/African American females having significantly greater
- 260 probabilities of reporting any local AE (Figure 3C). Systemic AEs were not significantly
- different between males and females across all race categories (**Figure 3D**). Race-
- disaggregated analyses were not performed with the COVID-19 AE dataset due to

8

263 insufficient numbers of males to compare against females across race/ethnicity

- categories in the cohort.
- 265

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

- Birth control use (e.g., barrier method, oral contraceptives, IUD, etc.) data was collected
- at enrollment for 132 females with 55% (n=72) on birth control and 45% (n=60) not on
- birth control (**Figure 4A**) in the influenza vaccine cohort only. The average ages of
- female birth control users and non-users were 32.5 and 30.3 years, respectively. Among
- birth control users, hormonal birth control was the most common method with 44%
- (n=32) using oral contraceptives and 36% (n=26) using IUDs. Females who used the
- barrier method (n=2 of 72) were excluded to limit the birth control users to those on
- hormonal methods. Using logistic regression models, we assessed if the probability of reporting any AE (**Figure 4B**), any local (**Figure 4C**), and any systemic AE (**Figure 4D**)
- differed by hormonal birth control use among females. The probabilities of reporting any
- AE (OR=1.43, 95% CI: 0.66-3.1, p=0.36), any local (OR=0.94, 95% CI: 0.46-1.9,
- 279 p=0.85), or any systemic AE (OR=1.78, 95% CI: 0.8-3.95, p=0.16) were similar between
- females using and not using birth control. These data suggest that exogenous
- hormones are no more likely than endogenous hormones to impact experiencing AEs in
- 282 young adults of reproductive ages.
- 283

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

- Analyses of the open-ended survey answers completed by n=195 bivalent COVID-19 vaccine recipients revealed that female HCWs were more likely to report disruptions in their daily activities than males after receipt of the COVID-19 vaccination. There were 58 (38.7%) women who mentioned experiencing sleep disruption or changes in daily
- routine due to AEs following vaccination as compared to 14 (31.1%) men. Women also mentioned that AEs affected their ability to take care of their families.
- 292
- [The vaccine] made me sleep for 10 hours, with other symptoms, usually sleep 78 hr. Felt harder to do activities of daily living and needed to lie down the next
 afternoon [White_W_4]
- 296
 297 Didn't clean up from dinner or do my usual heavy lifting in terms of getting the
 298 kids to bed. [White_W_31]
- 299

301

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

302 Women and men differed in how they responded to AEs

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

9

309 I took the recommended dose (2 capsules) of Tylenol every 6 hours for 18 hours 310 311 starting 24 hours after the vaccination. [White_W_69] 312 313 [I took] Acetaminophen and ibuprofen as well as increased electrolytes and 314 hydration. [White_W_48] 315 316 Some women expected to experience AEs and intentionally scheduled their COVID-19 317 vaccinations prior to days off; for example, scheduling the vaccine on a Friday so they did not have to miss work should they experience an AE. 318 319 320 Just know to plan for a Friday. Glad it was the weekend as I would have missed a 321 day of work. I got the shot on a Friday on purpose as I had a bad reaction before 322 with one of the others. [White W 71] 323 324 Planned the timing of the injection based on previous reactions so that I would be 325 able to rest at home, [White W 57] 326 327 DISCUSSION 328 We performed sex- and gender-disaggregated analyses of AE survey data for 329 two different vaccines—the quadrivalent influenza and bivalent COVID-19 vaccine—to 330 examine vaccine outcomes and vaccine-related behaviors among a cohort of adult 331 Our study supports the existing evidence that influenza and COVID-19 vaccines do not 332 333 cause serious AEs with localized, mild AEs being the most common experience[38, 39]. 334 The bivalent COVID-19 vaccine recipients reported higher rates of AEs compared to 335 influenza vaccine recipients in our cohorts, consistent with a retrospective analysis of

HCWs, which can inform public and occupational health vaccine strategies and policies. 336 VAERS data[40]. Increased AE reporting rates among COVID-19 vaccine recipients 337 may be potentially confounded by the heightened scrutiny and vaccine hesitancy 338 against mRNA COVID-19 vaccines at the time but is nonetheless important to note for 339 public health and education purposes. While the term "adverse event" may suggest 340 harmful or negative effects, non-serious AEs are normal and healthy manifestations of 341 the immune system's response to the vaccine antigen[11]. Transparent and consistent 342 reporting of AEs is imperative to normalize these vaccine-related experiences, mitigate 343 fear and misinformation, and encourage vaccine uptake.

344

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

Sex-disaggregated analyses revealed that female HCWs were significantly more likely to report local AEs, but not systemic AEs, after receipt of either the influenza vaccine or COVID-19 vaccine. Similarly, an active surveillance study of predominately younger adults (20-49) in South Korea reported females having significantly more AEs, local or systemic, after receiving the first dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-

360 19(AstraZeneca/Oxford) vaccine as compared to males based on self-reported survey 361 results at 3 days post-vaccination [42]. In another highly vaccinated population of older 362 adults (75+), females had greater probabilities of reporting local AEs, but not systemic 363 AE, compared to males 7 days after receipt of the high-dose guadrivalent influenza 364 vaccine as measured by AE surveys[2]. Xiong et al. utilized real-world data extracted 365 from the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) to reveal that although 366 more adult (18-64) females reported AEs within one week of COVID-19 vaccination, 367 males had 1.5 times greater odds of reporting serious AEs[41].

368

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

380

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

393

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

11

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

405

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

421

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

436

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

- 447 morale[57]. With nearly 9 million HCWs nationwide receiving mandated vaccinations,
- we can expect that millions of workers (the majority of whom are women) will
- 449 experience AEs annually with potential occupational health and labor force implications,
- 450 including increased vaccine hesitancy, missed work, and disruptions to recognized time
- 451 off. Our data add gender to the list of factors that need to be considered in policies
- 452 surrounding mandatory vaccines, including, for example, receipt of paid medical leave.
- 453

454 **LIMITATIONS**

- There are several limitations to this study. First, the enrollment criteria (e.g., age) were
- different and did not allow for direct comparison between the two cohorts. The sample
- 457 size of males and females enrolled were only pre-specified and balanced for the
- 458 influenza vaccine cohort and not the COVID-19 vaccine cohort; therefore, the COVID-
- 459 19 vaccine cohort may be more representative of the HCW demographics at JHHS.
 460 Highly vaccinated HCWs are more likely to be biased towards vaccine acceptance and
- 461 the interpretations made from this unique demographic may not be applicable to non-
- 462 HCW populations. Second, the criteria and definitions for local and systemic AEs used
- 463 may differ from other studies. AEs were surveyed two days post-vaccination, so we
- 464 were unable to assess AEs after administration of the questionnaires. Lastly, biological
- samples were not collected from participants; therefore, we were unable to study the
- 466 immunological mechanisms by which sex causes differences in AEs.
- 467

468 **CONCLUSIONS**

- 469 Our AE survey study of HCWs following influenza or COVID-19 vaccination
- 470 demonstrates that females were more likely to experience local AEs than males.
- 471 Women were more likely to experience interruptions in their daily routines and to self-
- treat AEs. Additionally, more women reported scheduling their vaccines on a day before
- their scheduled time off in anticipation of AEs. These data highlight the importance of
- 474 considering sex and gender in public health and occupational health vaccine strategies
- 475 and communications, particularly when targeting the predominately female healthcare
- 476 workforce. Further sex- and gender- disaggregated research is needed to build more
- 477 equitable and effective vaccine strategies with consideration for differences in AEs.
- 478 Development of such strategies is not only important for seasonal vaccination planning, 479 but also for planning effective vaccination compares for HCW/a during pandomics
- 479 but also for planning effective vaccination campaigns for HCWs during pandemics.
- 480

481 **ARTICLE INFORMATION**

482 Acknowledgements

- 483 We kindly thank the healthcare workers of the Johns Hopkins Health System for their
- 484 participation in our studies and the clinical coordinators who helped with recruitment and
- 485 data collection.
- 486

487 **Contributors**

- 488 AY, PS, HK, JRS, KZJF, RER, AP, SLK, and RM contributed to the conception and
- design of the study. Data collection and statistical analyses were done by AY, NW, HK,
- 490 and KZJF. AY, SLK, and RM wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors
- 491 contributed to the critical review, interpretation of the results, and revision process.
- 492

493 Funding

- 494 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy
- 495 and Infectious Diseases Center of Excellence in Influenza Research and Surveillance,
- 496 contract Health and Human Services (grant number N2772201400007C to R.E.R., A.P.,
- 497 and S.L.K.), the National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious
- 498 Diseases Center of Excellence in Influenza Research and Response, contract Health
- and Human Services (grant number N7593021C00045 to R.E.R., A.P., and S.L.K.), and
- 500 National Institute of Health/National Institute of Aging Specialized Center of Research
- 501 Excellence U54 AG062333 to S.K.
- 502

503 Competing interests

- 504 The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.
- 505

506 Patient and public involvement

- 507 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or
- 508 dissemination plans of this research.
- 509

510 Patient consent for publication

- 511 Not required.
- 512

513 Ethics approval

- 514 Our study involves two cohorts of human participants, which were approved by the
- 515 Johns Hopkins Institutional Review Boards (IRB00259171, IRB00091667). Consent was 516 obtained for all participants as part of the enrollment process.
- 517

518 **Provenance and peer review**

- 519 Not commissioned; externally reviewed.
- 520

521 Data availability statement

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

523524 Supplemental material

- 525 This content does not have supplemental materials.
- 526

527 ORCID iDs

- 528 Anna Yin <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1612-5532</u>
- 529 Sabra L. Klein <u>https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0730-5224</u>
- 530 Rosemary Morgan https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5009-8470
- 531

14

532 FIGURE LEGENDS

- 533 Table 1. Table of study participant demographics
- 534

535 Figure 1. A greater proportion of female healthcare workers report local adverse events

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

549 Figure 2. Females, regardless of age, have a higher probability of reporting any local

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

562 Figure 3. Females have a higher probability of reporting local adverse events (AEs) than

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

570 Figure 4. Hormonal birth control (BC) use among female healthcare workers did not

- 571 impact the probability of reporting adverse events (AEs) after influenza vaccination. (A)
- 572 Table of female healthcare workers, disaggregated by hormonal birth control use. Logistic
- 573 regression models were used to examine probabilities of local and systemic adverse events (AE)
- 574 following (**B-D**) annual influenza vaccination from 2019-2022 seasons among healthcare
- 575 workers. Comparisons of probabilities for (**B**) any, (**C**) any local, or (**D**) any systemic AE
- 576 following influenza vaccination are shown, respectively, with p<0.05 for birth control differences

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

shown.

16

579 **REFERENCES**

- 580 1. Kini A, Morgan R, Kuo H, et al. Differences and disparities in seasonal influenza vaccine,
 581 acceptance, adverse reactions, and coverage by age, sex, gender, and race. *Vaccine*582 2022;40(11):1643-54. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.04.013 [published Online First:
 583 20210428]
- Shapiro JR, Seddu K, Park H-S, et al. The intersection of biological sex and gender in adverse
 events following seasonal influenza vaccination in older adults. *Immunity & Ageing* 2023;20(1) doi: 10.1186/s12979-023-00367-3
- 3. Tadount F, Doyon-Plourde P, Rafferty E, et al. Is there a difference in the immune response,
 efficacy, effectiveness and safety of seasonal influenza vaccine in males and females? A
 systematic review. *Vaccine* 2020;38(3):444-59. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.10.091
 [published Online First: 20191109]
- 4. Green MS, Peer V, Magid A, et al. Gender Differences in Adverse Events Following the
 Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2022;10(2) doi:
 10.3390/vaccines10020233 [published Online First: 20220203]
- 5. Duijster JW, Lieber T, Pacelli S, et al. Sex-disaggregated outcomes of adverse events after
 COVID-19 vaccination: A Dutch cohort study and review of the literature. *Front Immunol* 2023;14:1078736. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1078736 [published Online First:
 20230130]
- 6. Bignucolo A, Scarabel L, Mezzalira S, et al. Sex Disparities in Efficacy in COVID-19
 Vaccines: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021;9(8) doi:
 10.3390/vaccines9080825 [published Online First: 20210727]
- 7. Jensen A, Stromme M, Moyassari S, et al. COVID-19 vaccines: Considering sex differences in
 efficacy and safety. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2022;115:106700. doi:
- 603 10.1016/j.cct.2022.106700 [published Online First: 20220208]
- 6048. Cook IF. Sex differences in injection site reactions with human vaccines. Hum Vaccin6052009;5(7):441-9. doi: 10.4161/hv.8476 [published Online First: 20090718]
- 9. Beyer WE, Palache AM, Kerstens R, et al. Gender differences in local and systemic reactions
 to inactivated influenza vaccine, established by a meta-analysis of fourteen independent
 studies. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1996;15(1):65-70. doi: 10.1007/BF01586187
- 10. Klein SL, Flanagan KL. Sex differences in immune responses. *Nat Rev Immunol* 2016;16(10):626-38. doi: 10.1038/nri.2016.90 [published Online First: 20160822]
- 611 11. Herve C, Laupeze B, Del Giudice G, et al. The how's and what's of vaccine reactogenicity.
 612 *NPJ Vaccines* 2019;4:39. doi: 10.1038/s41541-019-0132-6 [published Online First:
 613 20190924]
- Klein SL, Jedlicka A, Pekosz A. The Xs and Y of immune responses to viral vaccines. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2010;10(5):338-49. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(10)70049-9
- 616 13. Kennedy RB, Ovsyannikova IG, Pankratz VS, et al. Gender effects on humoral immune
 617 responses to smallpox vaccine. *Vaccine* 2009;27(25-26):3319-23. doi:
 618 10.1016/j.vaccine.2009.01.086 [published Online First: 20090205]
- 619 14. Dhakal S, Chaulagain S, Klein SL. Sex biases in infectious diseases research. *J Exp Med* 620 2022;219(6) doi: 10.1084/jem.20211486 [published Online First: 20220505]
- 15. Ruggieri A, Anticoli S, D'Ambrosio A, et al. The influence of sex and gender on immunity,
 infection and vaccination. *Ann Ist Super Sanita* 2016;52(2):198-204. doi:
- 623 10.4415/ANN_16_02_11

17

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

670	31. Ciardi F, Menon V, Jensen JL, et al. Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions of COVID-19
671	Vaccination among Healthcare Workers of an Inner-City Hospital in New York. Vaccines
672	(Basel) 2021;9(5) doi: 10.3390/vaccines9050516 [published Online First: 20210517]
673	32. Pacella-LaBarbara ML, Park YL, Patterson PD, et al. COVID-19 Vaccine Uptake and Intent
674	Among Emergency Healthcare Workers: A Cross-Sectional Survey. J Occup Environ Med
675	2021;63(10):852-56. doi: 10.1097/JOM.00000000002298
676	33. Bell J, Meng L, Barbre K, et al. Influenza and Up-to-Date COVID-19 Vaccination Coverage
677	Among Health Care Personnel - National Healthcare Safety Network, United States,
678	2022-23 Influenza Season. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2023;72(45):1237-43. doi:
679	10.15585/mmwr.mm7245a5 [published Online First: 20231110]
680	34. State Immunization Laws for Healthcare Workers and Patients: CDC: Center for Disease
681	Control and Prevention; [updated November 19, 2014. Available from:
682	https://www2a.cdc.gov/vaccines/statevaccsApp/AdministrationbyVaccine.asp?Vaccinetm
683	p=Influenza.
684	35. The Biden- Harris Administration Will End COVID- 19 Vaccination Requirements for
685	Federal Employees, Contractors, International Travelers, Head Start Educators, and
686	CMS-Certified Facilities: The White House; 2023 [updated May 01, 2023. Available
687	from: https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/05/01/the-
688	biden-administration-will-end-covid-19-vaccination-requirements-for-federal-employees-
689	contractors-international-travelers-head-start-educators-and-cms-certified-facilities/.
690	36. Biancolella M, Colona VL, Mehrian-Shai R, et al. COVID-19 2022 update: transition of the
691	pandemic to the endemic phase. Hum Genomics 2022;16(1):19. doi: 10.1186/s40246-
692	022-00392-1 [published Online First: 20220601]
693	37. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and Definitions: CDC: Center for Disease Control and
694	Prevention; 2023 [updated September 01, 2023. Available from:
695	https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/variant-classifications.html.
696	38. Guo W, Deguise J, Tian Y, et al. Profiling COVID-19 Vaccine Adverse Events by Statistical
697	and Ontological Analysis of VAERS Case Reports. Front Pharmacol 2022;13:870599.
698	doi: 10.3389/fphar.2022.870599 [published Online First: 20220624]
699	39. Ganesan S, Al Ketbi LMB, Al Kaabi N, et al. Vaccine Side Effects Following COVID-19
700	Vaccination Among the Residents of the UAE-An Observational Study. Front Public
701	Health 2022;10:876336. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2022.876336 [published Online First:
702	20220506]
703	40. Al-Ahmari AK, AlAsmari A, AlKorbi A, et al. Comparison of the post-marketing safety
704	profile between influenza and COVID-19 vaccines: An analysis of the vaccine adverse
705	event reporting system. Saudi Pharm J 2022;30(8):1137-42. doi:
706	10.1016/j.jsps.2022.06.009 [published Online First: 20220621]
707	41. Xiong X, Yuan J, Li M, et al. Age and Gender Disparities in Adverse Events Following
708	COVID-19 Vaccination: Real-World Evidence Based on Big Data for Risk Management.
709	<i>Front Med (Lausanne)</i> 2021;8:700014. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2021.700014 [published
710	Online First: 20210719]
711	42. Bae S, Lee YW, Lim SY, et al. Adverse Reactions Following the First Dose of ChAdOx1
712	nCoV-19 Vaccine and BNT162b2 Vaccine for Healthcare Workers in South Korea. J
713	<i>Korean Med Sci</i> 2021;36(17):e115. doi: 10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e115 [published Online
714	First: 20210503]

19

715 716	43. Momplaisir FM, Kuter BJ, Ghadimi F, et al. Racial/Ethnic Differences in COVID-19 Vaccine Hesitancy Among Health Care Workers in 2 Large Academic Hospitals. <i>JAMA Netw</i>
717	Open 2021:4(8):e2121931. doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.21931 [published]
718	Online First: 20210802]
719	44. McElfish PA, Willis DE, Shah SK, et al. Sociodemographic Determinants of COVID-19
720	Vaccine Hesitancy. Fear of Infection, and Protection Self-Efficacy. J Prim Care
721	Community Health 2021:12:21501327211040746. doi: 10.1177/21501327211040746
722	45 Bagasra AB Doan S Allen CT Racial differences in institutional trust and COVID-19
723	vaccine hesitancy and refusal <i>BMC Public Health</i> 2021:21(1):2104 doi:
723	10 1186/s12889-021-12195-5 [published Online First: 20211116]
725	46 Nouven I H. Joshi AD. Drew DA. et al. Racial and ethnic differences in COVID-19 vaccine
726	hesitancy and untake <i>medRriv</i> 2021 doi: 10.1101/2021.02.25.21252402 [published]
720	Online First: 202102281
727	47 Unger IM Vaidva R Albain KS et al Sex Differences in Risk of Severe Adverse Events in
720	Patients Receiving Immunotherany Targeted Therany or Chemotherany in Cancer
720	Clinical Trials I Clin Oncol 2022:40(13):1474-86 doi: 10.1200/ICO.21.02377
730	[nublished Online First: 20220204]
731	18 Wang S. Cowley I. A. Liu XS. Sey Differences in Cancer Immunotherapy Efficacy
732	40. Wang S, Cowiey LA, Elu XS. Sex Differences in Cancer minimulourerapy Efficacy, Biomarkers, and Therapeutic Strategy, <i>Molecules</i> 2019:24(18) doi:
734	10 3390/molecules 24183214 [published Online First: 2019,24(10) doi:
735	49 Singh S Parulekar W Murray N et al. Influence of sex on toxicity and treatment outcome in
736	small-cell lung cancer I Clin Oncol 2005:23(4):850-6 doi: 10.1200/ICO.2005.03.171
730	50 Klein SL Morgan R The impact of sex and gender on immunotherapy outcomes <i>Biol Sex</i>
738	Differ 2020:11(1):24 doi: 10.1186/s13293-020-00301-y [published Online First:
730	2020,11(1).24. doi: 10.1100/3152/5-020-00501-y [published Online 1 list.
740	51 Winstead F. Severe Side Effects of Cancer Treatment Are More Common in Women than
740	Men: NIH: National Cancer Institute: 2022 [
742	52 Yu Y Chen I Li D et al Systematic Analysis of Adverse Event Reports for Sex Differences
743	in Adverse Drug Events Sci Rep 2016:6:24955 doi: 10.1038/srep24955 [published
744	Online First: 20160422]
745	53 Alley SI, Stanton R, Browne M, et al. As the Pandemic Progresses, How Does Willingness to
746	Vaccinate against COVID-19 Evolve? Int J Environ Res Public Health 2021:18(2) doi:
747	10.3390/jierph18020797 [published Online First: 20210119]
748	54 Neumann-Bohme S. Varghese NE, Sabat L et al. Once we have it, will we use it? A European
749	survey on willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. Eur I Health Econ
750	2020:21(7):977-82. doi: 10.1007/s10198-020-01208-6
751	55 Opstelten W. van Essen GA. Ballieux MI, et al. Influenza immunization of Dutch general
752	practitioners: vaccination rate and attitudes towards vaccination. Vaccine
753	2008:26(47):5918-21. doi: 10.1016/i.vaccine.2008.08.049 [published Online First:
754	20080917]
755	56. Cheeseman Day JC, C. Women Hold 76% of All Health Care Jobs, Gaining in Higher-Paving
756	Occupations: United States Census Bureau: 2019 [updated October 28, 2021, Available
757	from: https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2019/08/vour-health-care-in-womens-
758	hands.html.
759	57. Chrissian AA, Oyoyo UE, Patel P, et al. Impact of COVID-19 vaccine-associated side effects
760	on health care worker absenteeism and future booster vaccination. Vaccine

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

763

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



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



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



Α

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

