Title

Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccines for Preventing Covid-19 Hospitalizations in the United States

Journal

Clinical Infectious Diseases, 74(9)

ISSN

1058-4838

Authors

Tenforde, Mark W
Patel, Manish M
Ginde, Adit A
et al.

Publication Date

2022-05-03

DOI

10.1093/cid/ciab687

Peer reviewed

Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccines for Preventing Covid-19 Hospitalizations in the United States

1. Mark W. Tenforde, MD, PhD
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
2. Manish M. Patel, MD
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
3. Adit A. Ginde, MD, MPH
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado
4. David J. Douin, MD
Department of Anesthesiology, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado
5. H. Keipp Talbot, MD, MPH
Departments of Medicine and Health Policy, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
6. Jonathan D. Casey, MD, MSci
Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
7. Nicholas M. Mohr, MD, MS
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
8. Anne Zepeski, PharmD
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
9. Manjusha Gaglani, MBBS
Baylor Scott and White Health, Texas A&M University College of Medicine, Temple, Texas
10. Tresa McNeal, MD
Baylor Scott and White Health, Texas A&M University College of Medicine, Temple, Texas
11. Shekhar Ghamande, MD
Baylor Scott and White Health, Texas A&M University College of Medicine, Temple, Texas
12. Nathan I. Shapiro, MD, MPH
Department of Emergency Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts
13. Kevin W. Gibbs, MD
Department of Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
14. D. Clark Files, MD
Department of Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, North Carolina
15. David N. Hager, MD, PhD
Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland
16. Arber Shehu, MD
Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland
17. Matthew E. Prekker, MD, MPH
Department of Emergency Medicine and Medicine, Hennepin County Medical Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota
18. Heidi L. Erickson, MD
Department of Medicine, Hennepin County Medical Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota

19. Matthew C. Exline, MD, MPH
Department of Medicine, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio
20. Michelle N. Gong, MD
Department of Medicine, Montefiore Health System, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York
21. Amira Mohamed, MD

Department of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, New York
22. Daniel J. Henning, MD, MPH
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington
23. Jay S. Steingrub, MD
Department of Medicine, Baystate Medical Center, Springfield, Massachusetts
24. Ithan D. Peltan, MD, MSc
Department of Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, Utah and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
25. Samuel M. Brown, MD, MS
Department of Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, Utah and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
26. Emily T. Martin, PhD
School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
27. Arnold S. Monto, MD
School of Public Health, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
28. Akram Khan, MD
Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Sciences University, Portland, Oregon
29. C. Terri Hough, MD
Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Sciences University, Portland, Oregon
30. Laurence Busse, MD
Department of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia
31. Caitlin C. ten Lohuis, ACNP-BC
Emory Critical Care Center, Emory Healthcare, Atlanta, Georgia
32. Abhijit Duggal, MD
Department of Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio
33. Jennifer G. Wilson, MD
Department of Emergency Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California
34. Alexandra June Gordon, MD
Department of Emergency Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California
35. Nida Qadir, MD
Department of Medicine, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California
36. Steven Y. Chang, MD, PhD
Department of Medicine, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California
37. Christopher Mallow, MD, MHS
Department of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida
38. Hayley B. Gershengorn, MD
Department of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida
39. Hilary M. Babcock, MD, MPH
Department of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
40. Jennie H. Kwon, DO, MS
Department of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
41. Natasha Halasa, MD, MPH
Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
42. James D. Chappell, MD, PhD
Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
43. Adam S. Lauring, MD, PhD
Departments of Internal Medicine and Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

44. Carlos G. Grijalva, MD, MPH
Department of Health Policy, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
45. Todd W. Rice, MD, MSci
Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
46. Ian D. Jones, MD
Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
47. William B. Stubblefield, MD, MPH
Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
48. Adrienne Baughman
Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
49. Kelsey N. Womack, PhD
Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
50. Christopher J. Lindsell, PhD
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
51. Kimberly W. Hart, MA
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
52. Yuwei Zhu, MD, MS
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee
53. Samantha M. Olson, MPH
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
54. Meagan Stephenson, MPH
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
55. Stephanie J. Schrag, DPhil
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
56. Miwako Kobayashi, MD
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
57. Jennifer R. Verani, MD*
CDC COVID-19 Response Team, Atlanta, Georgia
58. Wesley H. Self, MD, MPH*
Department of Emergency Medicine and Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee

For the Influenza and Other Viruses in the Acutely Ill (IVY) Network**

* Dr. Self and Dr. Verani contributed equally to this work.

**A full list of investigators and collaborators in the Influenza and other Viruses in the Acutely Ill (IVY) Network is available in the Supplementary Appendix A.

Corresponding Author:
Wesley H. Self, MD, MPH; Vanderbilt University Medical Center; 312 Oxford House, 1313 21st Avenue South, Nashville, Tennessee 37232. Email: wesley.self@vumc.org; phone: 615-936-8047; fax: 615-936-3754.

Summary: From March–May 2021, full vaccination using authorized mRNA products was associated with 87.1% (95% CI: 80.7 to 91.3%) protection against Covid-19 hospitalization among US adults. Vaccine effectiveness was lower in adults with versus without immunosuppression (62.9% versus 91.3%).

ABSTRACT

Background: As SARS-CoV-2 vaccination coverage increases in the United States (US), there is a need to understand the real-world effectiveness against severe Covid-19 and among people at increased risk for poor outcomes.

Methods: In a multicenter case-control analysis of US adults hospitalized March 11-May 5, 2021, we evaluated vaccine effectiveness to prevent Covid-19 hospitalizations by comparing odds of prior vaccination with an mRNA vaccine (Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna) between cases hospitalized with Covid-19 and hospital-based controls who tested negative for SARS-CoV-2.

Results: Among 1212 participants, including 593 cases and 619 controls, median age was 58 years, 22.8% were Black, 13.9% were Hispanic, and 21.0% had immunosuppression. SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 (Alpha) was the most common variant (67.9% of viruses with lineage determined). Full vaccination (receipt of two vaccine doses ≥14 days before illness onset) had been received by 8.2% of cases and 36.4% of controls. Overall vaccine effectiveness was 87.1% (95% CI: 80.7 to 91.3%). Vaccine effectiveness was similar for Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines, and highest in adults aged 18-49 years (97.4%; 95% CI: 79.3 to 99.7%). Among 45 patients with vaccine-breakthrough Covid hospitalizations, 44 (97.8%) were ≥50 years old and 20 (44.4%) had immunosuppression. Vaccine effectiveness was lower among patients with immunosuppression (62.9%; 95% CI: 20.8 to 82.6%) than without immunosuppression (91.3%; 95% CI: 85.6 to 94.8%).

Conclusion: During March–May 2021, SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines were highly effective for preventing Covid-19 hospitalizations among US adults. SARS-CoV-2 vaccination was beneficial for patients with immunosuppression, but effectiveness was lower in the immunosuppressed population.

Key Words:
COVID-19; vaccine effectiveness; mRNA vaccines; hospitalized; immunocompromised.

INTRODUCTION

Over 2.3 million hospitalizations and 600,000 deaths related to coronavirus disease 2019 (Covid-19) occurred in the United States (US) through July 2021.[1] In December 2020, the Food and Drug Administration granted Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for two messenger RNA (mRNA) vaccines (from Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna) against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2).[2] Widespread public health initiatives resulted in over 65% of the US adult population receiving at least one dose of a SARS-CoV-2 vaccine by the end of July 2021.[1] Among those vaccinated, the mRNA vaccines have been the predominate (>95%) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine products used in the US.[1]

Phase 3 clinical trials of mRNA vaccines found a 94–95% reduction in Covid-19 illness and near 100% protection against severe Covid-19.[3, 4] However, these clinical trials had few cases of hospitalized Covid-19, and limited power to assess efficacy among persons with underlying illnesses who are at high risk for severe Covid-19. Observational vaccine effectiveness evaluations are important to understand how well the vaccines protect against Covid-19 in real-world settings across diverse populations, including immunocompromised hosts. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) collaborates with the Influenza and Other Viruses in the Acutely Ill (IVY) Network to monitor the effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines for the prevention of Covid-19 hospitalizations among US adults. In this analysis, we evaluated the effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines for preventing Covid-19 hospitalizations by vaccine product, by age group, and by underlying medical conditions.[5]

METHODS

Design

We conducted a prospective observational case-control evaluation of vaccine effectiveness by comparing the odds of antecedent SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in hospitalized case-patients with Covid-19 versus control-patients without Covid-19. We included two control groups: 1) "test-negative" controls were hospitalized with signs or symptoms of an acute respiratory illness but tested negative for SARS-CoV-2; and 2) "syndrome-negative" controls were hospitalized without signs or symptoms of an acute respiratory illness and tested negative for SARS-CoV-2. Test-negative controls are commonly used in hospital-based vaccine effectiveness evaluations;[6-9] in the test-negative design, utilizing a comparison group with the same clinical syndrome and similar level of acuity as cases reduces bias due to differential healthcare seeking behavior. Because of the potential for misclassification of true cases as test-negative controls due to false-negative tests, particularly for those presenting late in the course of illness, we included the second control group of hospitalized patients without an acute respiratory illness. [10][11]

Setting

This surveillance activity included patients hospitalized from March 11 through May 5, 2021 at 18 US hospitals within the IVY Network.[6, 12] This activity was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy (Supplementary Appendix B).

Participants

Sites screened hospitalized adults ≥18 years old for potential eligibility through daily review of hospital admission logs and electronic medical records. Detailed eligibility criteria are shown in Supplementary Appendix B. Covid-19 cases included patients hospitalized with a clinical syndrome consistent with acute Covid-19 (≥1 of the following: fever; cough; shortness of breath; loss of taste; loss of smell; use of respiratory support for the acute illness; or new pulmonary findings on chest

imaging consistent with pneumonia) and a positive test for SARS-CoV-2 within 10 days following symptom onset.[13-15] Test-negative controls were hospitalized with a clinical syndrome consistent with acute Covid-19 and tested negative for SARS-CoV-2. Syndrome-negative controls were hospitalized without a clinical syndrome consistent with Covid-19 and tested negative for SARS-CoV-2. Individual matching between cases and controls was not performed. Sites attempted to capture all cases admitted to the hospital during the surveillance period and targeted a case: control ratio of approximately 1:1. Information on vaccination status was not collected until after patients were included.

Data Collection

Participants (or their proxies) were interviewed by trained personnel to collect data on demographics, medical conditions, SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, and other patient characteristics. Additional information on underlying medical conditions and SARS-CoV-2 clinical testing was obtained through standardized medical record review.

Laboratory Analysis

Upper respiratory specimens (nasal swabs or saliva) were collected, frozen, and shipped to a central laboratory at Vanderbilt University Medical Center (Nashville, Tennessee). Specimens underwent reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) testing for the SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid gene using standardized methods and interpretive criteria.[16] Specimens positive for SARS-CoV-2 with a cycle threshold <32 were shipped to the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, Michigan) for viral whole genome sequencing using the ARTIC Network version 3 protocol on an Oxford Nanopore Technologies instrument (Supplementary Appendix B).[17] SARS-CoV-2 lineages were assigned with >80% coverage using Pangolin genomes.[18]

Classification of Case-Control Status

Final classification of case-control status was determined with consideration of both clinical SARS-CoV-2 testing completed at local hospital laboratories and RT-PCR testing completed at the central laboratory. Cases tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by a clinical test or central laboratory RT-PCR test. Cases with SARS-CoV-2 detected by RT-PCR with a cycle threshold >32 were included in the analysis, but viral sequencing information was not available for these cases. Test-negative and syndrome negative controls tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 by all clinical and central laboratory testing.

Classification of Vaccination Status

Details of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination, including dates and location of vaccination, vaccine product, and lot number, were ascertained through a systematic process including patient or proxy interview and source verification. Sources of documentation included vaccination card, hospital records, state vaccine registries which were searched at the time of interview and again approximately 28 days later, and vaccine records requested from clinics and pharmacies. Vaccine doses were classified as administered if source documentation was identified or if the patient/proxy reported a vaccine dose with a plausible date and location of vaccination.

The SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines are administered as a two-dose series; participants were considered fully vaccinated 14 days after receipt of the second vaccine dose.[19] Vaccination status was classified based on the number of mRNA vaccine doses received before a reference date, which was the date of symptom onset for cases and test-negative controls and date of hospital admission for syndrome-negative controls. Participants were classified as: unvaccinated if they had received no vaccine doses prior to the reference date; partially vaccinated if they received one dose ≥14 days before the reference date; and fully vaccinated if they received both doses ≥14 days before the reference date. As protective immunity from SARS-CoV-2 vaccines is not expected immediately after the first dose,[12] patients who received a first dose <14 days before the reference date were

excluded from the analysis. Patients who received a SARS-CoV-2 vaccine that had not been authorized in the US were excluded. Due to recent introduction of the Janssen (Johnson & Johnson) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine following its EUA in February 2021,[2] patients who received this vaccine were also excluded.

Statistical Analysis

Vaccine effectiveness and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were determined by comparing the odds of prior SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in case-patients and control-patients, calculated as: vaccine effectiveness = (1 – odds ratio) × 100%.[20]

Primary vaccine effectiveness estimates were calculated in adults of all ages for full vaccination versus unvaccinated and for partial vaccination versus unvaccinated. Unadjusted odds ratios were calculated with simple logistic regression and then a model building approach was applied to estimate adjusted vaccine effectiveness accounting for potential confounders. Prespecified covariates in base multivariable logistic regression models included calendar time in biweekly intervals, US Department of Health and Human Services region, age, sex, and self-reported race and Hispanic ethnicity. We repeated the regression by adding health status indicators (such as number of chronic conditions and prior hospitalizations in the past year) and SARS-CoV-2 exposure variables (such as mask use and attending large gatherings) potentially associated with the likelihood of vaccination and risk of Covid-19 hospitalization (detailed in Supplementary Appendix B). An absolute change in the odds ratio of vaccination of more than 5% in either direction was used as a pre-specified cutoff for inclusion of additional variables to the base model. Potential effect modification of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (at least 14 days prior to the current illness) was assessed using a likelihood ratio test (with a P-value <0.15 suggestive of effect modification).[21]

Separate assessments were initially performed using the test-negative control and the syndrome-negative control groups to assess comparability of estimates. Effectiveness estimates

were very similar using the test-negative and syndrome-negative control groups. Therefore, control groups were combined to improve precision.

Vaccine effectiveness estimates were stratified by age group (18–49, 50–64, or ≥65 years), SARS-CoV-2 vaccine product (Pfizer-BioNTech or Moderna), SARS-CoV-2 variant, and underlying medical conditions with a prevalence ≥20% in the population, including immunocompromising conditions[6], diabetes mellitus, chronic lung disease, chronic cardiovascular disease, and obesity (definitions provided in Supplementary Appendix B). Sensitivity analyses are described in Supplementary Appendix B. Stata Version 16 (College Station, TX) and SAS 9.4 (Cary, NC) were used for statistical analysis.

RESULTS

Participants

We included 1212 patients (593 cases, 334 test-negative controls, and 285 syndrome-negative controls) (Figure S1) enrolled from 18 clinical sites (Figure 1) over the course of 51 days (Figure S2). Overall, median age was 58 years, 276 (22.8%) were non-Hispanic Black, 168 (13.9%) were Hispanic, and 254 (21.0%) had an immunocompromising condition (Table 1, Table S1). Among the 593 case patients, 32.2% were admitted to an intensive care unit (ICU) and 8.3% died during the hospitalization.

After excluding 75 patients with a first vaccine dose 0-13 days before the reference date, full SARS-CoV-2 vaccination had been received by 45 (8.2%) cases, 115 (36.7%) test-negative controls, and 100 (36.0%) syndrome-negative controls (Figure 2); 456 (83.5%) cases were unvaccinated. Among fully vaccinated patients, median time between the last vaccine dose and onset of Covid-like symptoms was 44 days (interquartile range [IQR] 25 to 54 days) for cases and 42 days (IQR 27 to 60 days) for test-negative controls. Among fully vaccinated patients, 251 (96.5%) had source verification

of vaccine doses. SARS-CoV-2 whole genome sequencing with lineage determination was available for 234 cases, with variant of concern B.1.1.7 (Alpha) the most common lineage (159/234, 67.9%) (Table 2).

Vaccine effectiveness

The base vaccine effectiveness model was used as additional variables that were considered did not change the odds ratio of vaccination by the pre-specified cutoff of more than 5%. Vaccine effectiveness results for full vaccination were very similar using the test-negative control group (86.6%, 95% CI: 79.0–91.4%) and syndrome-negative control group (87.0%, 95% CI: 79.0–91.9%) (Figure S3 and Figure S4). Thus, we combined the test negative and syndrome negative control groups. After combining control groups and comparing fully vaccinated versus unvaccinated status, 45/501 (9.0%) cases and 215/488 (44.1%) controls were fully vaccinated; SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness for full vaccination to prevent Covid-19 hospitalizations was 87.1% (95% CI: 80.7–91.3%) (Figure 3). Vaccine effectiveness for full vaccination was similar for Pfizer-BioNTech (84.4%, 95% CI: 74.9–90.4%) and Moderna (90.1%, 95% CI: 82.3–94.5) vaccines. Point estimates were higher for people aged 18–49 years (97.4%, 95% CI: 79.3–99.7%) than aged 50–64 years (75.2%, 95% CI: 48.3–88.1%) and aged ≥65 years (87.3%, 95% CI: 77.8–92.7%). Among adults aged ≥65 years, vaccine effectiveness was similar in those 65-74 years (88.3%, 95% CI: 74.8–94.5%) and ≥75 years (90.5%, 95% CI: 73.2–96.7%). Vaccine effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 (Alpha) lineage was 92.4% (95% CI: 83.6–96.5%).

Vaccine effectiveness was significantly reduced for patients with immunocompromising conditions (62.9%, 95% CI: 20.8–82.6%) compared to individuals without an immunocompromising condition (91.3%, 95% CI: 85.6-94.8%) (Figure 3). Restricted to immunocompromised patients with an active solid organ or hematologic malignancy or solid organ transplant, vaccine effectiveness was 51.2% (95% CI: -30.7–81.8%). Vaccine effectiveness point estimates were lower for patients with underlying cardiovascular disease (83.0%, 95% CI: 72.6–89.4%), chronic lung disease (82.1%, 95% CI:

60.3–91.9%), and diabetes mellitus (82.5%, 95% CI: 66.4–90.9%) compared to patients without these underlying conditions but 95% confidence limits overlapped.

Partial vaccination had a vaccine effectiveness of 76.1% (95% CI: 64.0–84.2%). Evidence of effect modification by prior laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection was not observed (likelihood ratio test p-value = 0.59). Sensitivity analyses produced results similar to the primary analysis (Table S2).

Breakthrough vaccine Covid-19 hospitalizations

Forty-five Covid-19 case patients were fully vaccinated before symptom onset (Table S3). Among these, median age was 68 years (IQR 62–77 years), median time between the final vaccine dose and symptom onset was 44 days (IQR: 25 to 54 days), and 20 (44.4%) had an immunocompromising condition, including active solid organ or hematologic malignancy (n=9), or prior solid organ transplant (n=7). Of vaccine breakthrough cases with SARS-CoV-2 lineage determined, 9/20 (45.0%) had B.1.1.7 (Alpha) variant viruses. Admission to an ICU occurred in 9/45 (20.0%) breakthrough cases versus 153/455 (33.6%) unvaccinated cases (p=0.06); in-hospital death occurred in 2/45 (4.4%) breakthrough cases versus 42/455 (9.2%) unvaccinated cases (p=0.28).

DISCUSSION

In this prospective observational surveillance program conducted at 18 geographically dispersed sites in the US during the early phase of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccination program, the two mRNA vaccines authorized for use in the US were approximately 87% effective for preventing Covid-19 hospitalizations, with similar effectiveness observed for the Pfizer BioNTech and Moderna products. This analysis adds to early real-world evaluations that demonstrated high vaccine effectiveness against Covid-19 in groups prioritized for early vaccination, such as healthcare workers.[22, 23]

These results also add to a limited body of evidence that the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines are highly effective for preventing Covid-19 hospitalizations.

These results expand upon findings of high efficacy for SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines reported from phase 3 clinical trials.[3, 4] The trials included patient populations healthier at baseline than those commonly hospitalized with Covid-19 and were not powered to evaluate the protective benefits of vaccination for preventing severe outcomes, such as hospitalization. The design of this surveillance analysis with concurrent inclusion of patients hospitalized with Covid-19 and two separate control groups enabled a robust evaluation of vaccine effectiveness for the prevention of severe Covid-19, including among patients with multiple and serious medical comorbidities. Vaccination coverage in the two control groups was very similar to one another and to vaccine uptake in the US during the surveillance period for this analysis,[1] adding confidence to our vaccine effectiveness results. The findings of high vaccine effectiveness in the US adult population and across subgroups defined by age, demographics, and comorbidities suggest that the mRNA vaccines are broadly effective for the prevention of severe Covid-19, including in populations at high risk of severe illness.

The protective benefits of any vaccination require an immune response to the vaccine. A history of solid organ transplant and other immunocompromising conditions have been associated with reduced cell-mediated and humoral immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines.[24, 25] Our results suggested substantial clinical benefit from vaccination in immunosuppressed people, with a vaccine effectiveness of about 60% for the prevention of Covid-19 hospitalizations in this population. However, vaccine effectiveness was significantly lower in patients with immunocompromising conditions compared to those without immunocompromising conditions. Among patients with vaccine breakthrough Covid-19 hospitalizations in this analysis, almost one-half had an immunocompromising condition, most commonly a history of solid organ transplantation or an actively treated malignancy. Immunosuppressive conditions affect millions of adults in the United

States.[26] This highlights the need for continued focus on prompt diagnosis and treatment of Covid-19 in the immunocompromised population, even among those who have been vaccinated. Future work is needed to understand vaccine effectiveness among people with specific immunocompromising conditions and the durability of protection in this population.

During implementation of the national SARS-CoV-2 vaccination program in Israel between December 2020 and February 2021, the Pfizer BioNTech vaccine product demonstrated 87% vaccine effectiveness for the prevention of Covid-19 hospitalizations with a mean follow-up of 15 days.[27] Results of our US analysis in a population with a higher burden of comorbidities demonstrated similar vaccine effectiveness for both the Pfizer BioNTech and Moderna mRNA vaccines with longer follow-up time (median 43 days and maximum 113 days). Evaluating the duration of protection from SARS-CoV-2 vaccines will require additional evaluation with longer follow-up time.

This analysis had certain limitations. While we included control groups that were likely to reduce bias from differential healthcare seeking behavior, there was potential for residual confounding. People who chose to be vaccinated may have been more likely to engage in other behaviors to reduce their risk for Covid-19, such as mask use and avoiding large crowds. However, adjusting for self-reported variables on non-vaccine preventive measures did not substantively change vaccine effectiveness estimates suggesting this was not a major confounder. Race and Hispanic ethnicity differed between case and control groups; this likely represented underlying differences in the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection by race and ethnicity in the US and models were adjusted for race and ethnicity.[28] Different immunocompromising conditions are likely associated with varying severity of immunosuppression; more severe immunosuppression may be associated with lower vaccine effectiveness, but this analysis was not powered to look at vaccine effectiveness among subgroups of immunocompromising conditions. In an effort to capture all COVID-19 cases admitted to participating hospitals during a period of high community transmission, enrollment of cases and controls was not matched on a day-to-day basis; however, all cases and controls were

enrolled within a 51-day period and vaccine effectiveness models were adjusted for calendar time. As hospitalized adults frequently had multiple chronic medical conditions that may impact effectiveness of vaccines, findings from this analysis may not be broadly generalizable to populations with lower burden of chronic medical conditions. Lastly, most sequenced viruses in this analysis were B.1.1.7 (Alpha) variants, which represented the majority of circulating viruses in the US during this time period;[1] vaccine effectiveness against other emerging variants will require additional study.

In conclusion, the SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines were highly effective for preventing Covid-19 hospitalizations among US adults in March through May 2021. Widespread vaccination can be expected to have a major beneficial impact on Covid-19 hospitalizations and associated outcomes, such as death and post-Covid complications.[29, 30] Continued efforts are needed to address vaccine hesitancy and access and improve population coverage. While SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines appear to provide substantial benefit to immunocompromised people, effectiveness is lower in this population than in the immunocompetent population. It will be crucial to understand the benefit of additional preventive measures, such as vaccine boosters and continued masking, in patients at highest risk for vaccine breakthrough.

NOTES

Disclaimer:
The findings and conclusions in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Funding: Primary funding for this study was provided by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (75D30121F00002). The REDCap data tool was supported by a Clinical and Translational Science Award (UL1 TR002243) from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences. J.H.K. is supported by the National Institute of Allergy And Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health (award 1K23AI137321) Dr. Self received grant/contract funding for CDC to perform this work.

Potential Conflicts of Interest: Vaccine manufacturers had no role in the conduct, analysis, or dissemination of this work. The primary funder for this work was the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC); CDC scientists participated in this work and are included as authors. The following potential conflicts of interest have been reported by the authors. Dr. Brown reports grants from CDC during the conduct of the study; personal fees for chairing a DSMB for a trial in respiratory failure from Hamilton, money paid to institution for thier service on a trial steering committee from Faron, grants and money paid to institution for their service on a trial steering committee from Sedana, grants from Janssen, grants from NIH, grants from DoD, book royalties from Oxford University, book royalties from Brigham Young University, and personal fees for service on a DSMB from NYU, outside the submitted work. Dr. Casey reports grants from National Institute of Health (K23HL153584), outside the submitted work. Dr. Chang was a speaker for La Jolla Pharmaceuticals in 2018, and consulted for PureTech Health in 2020. Dr. Chappell reports grants from CDC, grants from NCATS/NIH during the conduct of the study. Dr. Exline reports sponsored talks on nutrition in COVID pneumonia at ASPEN conference for Abbott Labs, outside the submitted work. Dr. Files reports personal fees as consultant from Cytovale, DSMB member from Medpace, outside the submitted work. Dr. Gaglani reports grants from CDC-Vanderbilt (IVY3 subcontract study), during the conduct of the

study; grants from CDC (HAIVEN - COVID VE (Adult Inpatient) and Ambulatory US Flu VE Network), grants from CDC-Abt (RECOVER COVID VE in HCP and FW), grants from CDC-Westat (VISION COVID VE, EMR based), outside the submitted work. Dr. Gershengorn reports personal fees for serving on advisory board for COVID treatments from Gilead Sciences, Inc, outside the submitted work. Dr. Ginde reports grants from CDC, during the conduct of the study; grants from AbbVie, grants from Faron Pharmaceuticals, outside the submitted work. Dr. Gong reports grants from CDC, during the conduct of the study; grants from NIH, grants from AHRQ, fees for participating on DSMB not related to this work from Regeneron, personal fees from Philips Healthcare for participation on scientific advisory panel not related to this work, outside the submitted work. Dr. Grijalva reports consultantship from Pfizer, consultantship from Merck, consultantship from Sanofi-Pasteur, grants from Campbell Alliance/Syneos Health, grants from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, grants from National Institutes of Health, grants from Food and Drug Administration, grants from Agency for Health Care Research and Quality, grants from Sanofi, outside the submitted work. Dr. Hager reports other from CDC via subcontract with Vanderbilt (contract for patient recruitment and data collection) during the conduct of the study; per pt compensation to enroll subjects in the RUXCOVID-DEVENT Trial from Incyte Corporation, Salary Support for conduct of VICTAS Trial from Marcus Foundation, Salary Support for participation in EMPACT Network from EMPACT Precision Medicine via VUMC, outside the submitted work. Dr. Halasa reports grants from CDC during the conduct of the study; grants and non-financial support from Sanofi for HAI and MN testing, grants from Quidel outside the submitted work. Dr. Khan reports grants from United Therapeutics, grants from Johnson & Johnson, grants from 4D Medical, grants from Lung LLC, grants from Reata Pharmaceuticals, outside the submitted work. Dr. Kwon reports grants from CDC, during the conduct of the study. Dr. Lauring reports personal fees for serving as consultant on antiviral drugs from Sanofi, personal fees from Roche (Paid member of trial steering committee), outside the submitted work. Dr. Lindsell reports grants from CDC, during the conduct of the study; grants from NIH, grants from DoD, grants from Marcus Foundation, contracts to organization from bioMerieux, contracts to organization from Endpoint LLC, contracts to organization

from Entegrion Inc, outside the submitted work; in addition, Dr. Lindsell has a patent for risk stratification in sepsis and septic shock issued to Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center. Dr. Martin reports grants from Vanderbilt University / Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, during the conduct of the study; personal fees from Pfizer for unrelated work, grants from Merck for unrelated work, outside the submitted work. Dr Monto reports consulting fees from Sanofi-Pasteur and Seqirus outside the submitted work. Dr. Peltan reports grants from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, during the conduct of the study; grants from National Institutes of Health, grants from Janssen Pharmaceuticals, payment to institution for trial enrollments from Asahi Kasei Pharma, payment to institution for trial enrollments from Regeneron, outside the submitted work. Dr. Rice reports grants from Centers for Disease Control (IVY Network), during the conduct of the study; personal fees for serving as Director of Medical Affairs from Cumberland Pharmaceuticals, Inc, personal fees for consulting from Avisa Pharma, LLC, personal fees for serving as DSMB member from Sanofi, outside the submitted work. Dr. Self reported research funding from CDC for the current project and consulting fees outside the submitted work from Aeprio Pharmaceuticals and Merck. Dr. Self reports receiving research funding and consultant fees from Merck related to pneumococcal vaccine work and receiving consultant fees from Aerpio Pharmaceuticals related to development of an ARDS small molecule drug, outside the submitted work. The other authors reported no potential conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. COVID data tracker. Available at: https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home. Accessed on: 25 July 2021.
2. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. COVID-19 vaccines. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/emergency-preparedness-and-response/coronavirus-disease-2019-covid-19/covid-19-vaccines. Accessed on: 26 May 2021.
3. 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): 403-16.
4. 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): 2603-15.
5. Garg S, Kim L, Whitaker M, et al. Hospitalization Rates and Characteristics of Patients Hospitalized with Laboratory-Confirmed Coronavirus Disease 2019 - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 1-30, 2020. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep **2020**; 69(15): 458-64.
6. Grijalva CG, Feldstein LR, Talbot HK, et al. Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness for Prevention of Severe Influenza-Associated Illness among Adults in the United States, 2019-2020: A test-negative study. Clin Infect Dis **2021**.
7. Tenforde MW, Talbot HK, Trabue CH, et al. Influenza vaccine effectiveness against hospitalization in the United States, 2019-2020. J Infect Dis **2020**.
8. Ferdinands JM, Gaglani M, Martin ET, et al. Prevention of Influenza Hospitalization Among Adults in the United States, 2015-2016: Results From the US Hospitalized Adult Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness Network (HAIVEN). J Infect Dis **2019**; 220(8): 1265-75.
9. Foppa IM, Haber M, Ferdinands JM, Shay DK. The case test-negative design for studies of the effectiveness of influenza vaccine. Vaccine **2013**; 31(30): 3104-9.
10. Lewnard JA, Patel MM, Jewell NP, et al. Theoretical framework for retrospective studies of the effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass) **2021**.

11. World Health Organization. Evaluation of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness: Interim guidance. Available at: https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccine_effectiveness-measurement-2021.1. Accessed on: 25 June 2021.

12. Tenforde MW, Olson SM, Self WH, et al. Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna Vaccines Against COVID-19 Among Hospitalized Adults Aged ≥65 Years - United States, January-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep **2021**; 70(18): 674-9.

13. Lauer SA, Grantz KH, Bi Q, et al. The Incubation Period of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) From Publicly Reported Confirmed Cases: Estimation and Application. Ann Intern Med **2020**.

14. Feldstein LR, Ferdinands JM, Self WH, et al. Modeling the impacts of clinical influenza testing on influenza vaccine effectiveness estimates. J Infect Dis **2021**.

15. Feldstein LR, Self WH, Ferdinands JM, et al. Incorporating Real-time Influenza Detection Into the Test-negative Design for Estimating Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness: The Real-time Test-negative Design (rtTND). Clin Infect Dis **2021**; 72(9): 1669-75.

16. U.S. Food & Drug Administration. CDC 2019-Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Real-Time RT-PCR Diagnostic Panel. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/media/134922/download. Accessed on: 26 May 2021.

17. Quick J. nCoV2-2019 sequencing protocol v3 (LoCost) V.3. Available at: https://www.protocols.io/view/ncov-2019-sequencing-protocol-%20v3-locost-bh42j8ye. Accessed on: 26 May 2021.

18. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, et al. A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. Nat Microbiol **2020**; 5(11): 1403-7.

19. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim clinical considerations for use of COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized in the United States. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/clinical-considerations/covid-19-vaccines-us.html#footnote-01. Accessed on: 1 June 2021.

20. Jackson ML, Chung JR, Jackson LA, et al. Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness in the United States during the 2015-2016 Season. N Engl J Med **2017**; 377(6): 534-43.

21. Durand CP. Does raising type 1 error rate improve power to detect interactions in linear regression models? A simulation study. PLoS One **2013**; 8(8): e71079.

22. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Health Care Personnel, First Responders, and Other Essential and Frontline Workers - Eight U.S. Locations, December 2020-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep **2021**; 70(13): 495-500.

23. Pilishvili T, Fleming-Dutra KE, Farrar JL, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna COVID-19 Vaccines Among Health Care Personnel - 33 U.S. Sites, January-March 2021. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep **2021**; 70(20): 753-8.

24. Boyarsky BJ, Werbel WA, Avery RK, et al. Antibody Response to 2-Dose SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccine Series in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients. JAMA **2021**.

25. Ruddy JA, Connolly CM, Boyarsky BJ, et al. High antibody response to two-dose SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccination in patients with rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases. Ann Rheum Dis **2021**.

26. Patel M, Chen J, Kim S, et al. Analysis of MarketScan Data for Immunosuppressive Conditions and Hospitalizations for Acute Respiratory Illness, United States. Emerg Infect Dis **2020**; 26(8): 1720-30.

27. Dagan N, Barda N, Kepten E, et al. BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination Setting. N Engl J Med **2021**; 384(15): 1412-23.

28. Hollis ND, Li W, Van Dyke ME, et al. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection, 22 US States and DC, January 1-October 1, 2020. Emerg Infect Dis **2021**; 27(5): 1477-81.

29. Zhou F, Yu T, Du R, et al. Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. Lancet **2020**; 395(10229): 1054-62.

30. Roth GA, Emmons-Bell S, Alger HM, et al. Trends in Patient Characteristics and COVID-19 In-Hospital Mortality in the United States During the COVID-19 Pandemic. JAMA Netw Open **2021**; 4(5): e218828.

31. HealthData.gov. COVID-19 reported patient impact and hospital capacity by state. Available at: https://beta.healthdata.gov/dataset/COVID-19-Reported-Patient-Impact-and-Hospital-Capa/6xf2-c3ie. Accessed on: 27 May 2021.

32. United States Census Bureau. Annual estimates of the resident population. Available at: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=state%20popuation&g=0100000US.04000.001&tid=PEPPOP2019.PEPANNRES&hidePreview=true. Accessed on: 27 May 2021.

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of hospitalized Covid-19 case and control patients — IVY Network, United States, March–May 2021.

Characteristic	**Covid-19 Cases (N = 593)**	**Combined Test-negative and Syndrome-negative Controls (N = 619)**	**Test-negative Controls (N = 334)**	**Syndrome-negative Controls (N = 285)**
Median age (IQR*) – years	56 (44 – 65)	61 (47 – 70)	62 (48 – 71)	59 (47 – 70)
Age category – no./total no. (%)				
18-49 years	213/593 (35.9)	177/619 (28.6)	90/334 (27.0)	87/285 (30.5)
50-64 years	221/593 (37.3)	185/619 (29.9)	99/334 (29.6)	86/285 (30.2)
≥65 years	159/593 (26.8)	257/619 (41.5)	145/334 (43.4)	112/285 (39.3)
Female sex – no./total no. (%)	283/593 (47.7)	314/619 (50.7)	166/334 (49.7)	148/285 (51.9)
Race/ethnicity – no./total no. (%)†				
Non-Hispanic White	275/593 (46.4)	414/619 (66.9)	204/334 (61.1)	210/285 (73.7)
Non-Hispanic Black	150/593 (25.3)	126/619 (20.4)	80/334 (24.0)	46/285 (16.1)
Hispanic, any race	110/593 (18.6)	58/619 (9.4)	37/334 (11.1)	21/285 (7.4)
Non-Hispanic, all other races	48/593 (8.1)	19/619 (3.1)	12/334 (3.6)	7/285 (2.5)
Unknown	10/593 (1.7)	2/619 (0.3)	1/334 (0.3)	1/285 (0.4)
U.S. Census region – no./total no. (%)				
East	105/593 (17.7)	114/619 (18.4)	63/334 (18.9)	51/285 (17.9)
South	196/593 (33.1)	235/619 (38.0)	121/334 (36.2)	114/285 (40.0)
Midwest	141/593 (23.8)	174/619 (28.1)	86/334 (25.8)	88/285 (30.9)
West	151/593 (25.5)	96/619 (15.5)	64/334 (19.2)	32/285 (11.2)

Residence in long-term care facility – no./total no. (%) ‡	12/588 (2.0)	42/613 (6.9)	22/330 (6.7)	20/283 (7.1)
Health insurance – no./total no. (%)	544/593 (91.7)	597/619 (96.5)	322/334 (96.4)	275/285 (96.5)
Employed – no./total no. (%)	210/478 (43.9)	178/568 (31.3)	89/311 (28.6)	89/257 (34.6)
Healthcare worker – no./total no. (%)	33/478 (6.9)	33/568 (5.8)	15/311 (4.8)	18/257 (7.0)
Education level: attended some college or more – no./total no. (%)	202/413 (48.9)	333/547 (60.9)	173/300 (57.7)	160/247 (64.8)
Reported always wearing mask when around others in public – no./total no. (%)	315/433 (72.8)	429/538 (79.7)	236/290 (81.4)	193/248 (77.8)
Reported attending ≥1 gathering with more than 10 people in past 2 weeks – no./total no. (%)	167/443 (37.7)	145/551 (26.3)	62/303 (20.5)	83/248 (33.5)
Number of medications – median (IQR)	6 (2 – 11)	9 (4 – 14)	10 (5 – 14)	8 (4 – 13)
Reported ≥1 hospital admission in past year – no./total no. (%)	155/543 (28.6)	322/588 (54.8)	193/324 (59.6)	129/264 (48.9)
Underlying medical conditions – no./total no. (%) §				
Chronic cardiovascular disease	320/593 (54.0)	393/619 (63.5)	231/334 (69.2)	162/285 (56.8)
Chronic lung disease	122/593 (20.6)	204/619 (33.0)	128/334 (38.3)	76/285 (26.7)
Diabetes mellitus	187/593 (31.5)	201/619 (32.5)	122/334 (36.5)	79/285 (27.7)
Immunocompromising condition	99/593 (16.7)	155/619 (25.0)	93/334 (27.8)	62/285 (21.8)
Obesity by body-mass index	329/586 (56.1)	276/618 (44.7)	159/334 (47.6)	117/284 (41.2)
Self-reported prior laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection	15/593 (2.5)	58/618 (9.4)	31/334 (9.3)	27/284 (9.5)
SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status – no./total no. (%)¶				
Unvaccinated	456/593 (76.9)	273/619 (44.1)	144/334 (43.1)	129/285 (45.3)
First vaccine dose within 0-13 days	47/593 (7.9)	28/619 (4.5)	21/334 (6.3)	7/285 (2.5)
Partially vaccinated	45/593 (7.6)	103/619 (16.6)	54/334 (16.2)	49/285 (17.2)
Fully vaccinated	45/593 (7.6)	215/619 (34.7)	115/334 (34.4)	100/285 (35.1)
Among fully vaccinated patients, vaccine product received – no./total no. (%)				
Moderna two doses	17/45 (37.8)	93/215 (43.3)	46/115 (40.0)	47/100 (47.0)
Pfizer-BioNTech two doses	28/45 (62.2)	122/215 (56.7)	69/115 (60.0)	53/100 (53.0)

Among fully vaccinated patients, days between second vaccine dose and symptom onset (or hospital admission for syndrome-negative control group) – median (IQR)	44 (25 – 54)	43 (26 – 65)	42 (27 – 60)	47 (24 – 66.5)

***** IQR denotes interquartile range

† Race and ethnic groups were reported by the patient or proxy

‡ Long-term care facility included reporting living in a nursing home, assisted living home, or rehab hospital / other sub-acute or chronic facility before the hospital admission

§ Chronic medical condition categories were obtained through medical chart review by trained personnel

¶ Vaccination status was classified based on the number of mRNA vaccine doses received before a reference date, which was the date of symptom onset for cases and test-negative controls and date of hospital admission for syndrome-negative controls. Unvaccinated patients received no doses of vaccine before the reference date, partially vaccinated patients received one of two doses of mRNA vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date or both doses with the second dose received <14 days before the reference date, and fully vaccinated patients received both doses of vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date.

Table 2. SARS-CoV-2 lineages identified by whole genome sequencing of upper respiratory specimens collected from Covid-19 cases — IVY Network, United States, March–May 2021.*

SARS CoV-2 lineage	Patients hospitalized with Covid-19 and SARS CoV-2 sequencing completed				
	Fully vaccinated cases (n =24)	Partially vaccinated cases (n=21)	First vaccine dose 0-13 days before symptom onset (n=18)	Unvaccinated cases (n=200)	All cases with sequencing completed (n=263)
Variants of concern					
B.1.1.7	9	14	14	122	159
P.1	2	2	0	10	14
B.1.429	0	0	0	10	10
B.1.351	1	0	1	2	4
Variants of interest					
B.1.526.1	1	1	0	6	8
B.1.526	2	0	0	4	6
B.1.525	0	1	0	2	3
Other variants					
B.1.1.519	0	0	1	6	7
B.1.2	2	0	0	3	5
B.1	1	0	1	1	3
B.1.621	0	0	0	3	3
B.1.526.2	1	0	0	2	3
B.1.526.3	0	0	0	2	2
B.1.623	0	0	0	2	2
R.1	0	0	0	1	1
B.1.612	0	0	0	1	1
B.1.361	0	0	0	1	1
B.1.517	0	0	0	1	1
C.37	1	0	0	0	1
Sequencing completed but lineage could not be assigned	4	3	1	21	29

*Specimens with SARS-CoV-2 detection by RT-PCR with cycle threshold <32 for at least one of two nucleocapsid gene targets tested underwent whole genome sequencing. SARS-CoV-2 lineages were assigned with >80% coverage using Pangolin genomes; 263/593 (44.4%) Covid-19 cases had samples with complete sequencing. Of these 263 samples with complete sequencing, 234 (89.0%) had a lineage assigned.

FIGURE LEGENDS AND FOOTNOTES

Figure 1. Map of continental United States with incidence of Covid-19 hospitalizations by state in April 2021 indicated by color (red). Participating sites are shown on the map with circles; the size of each circle represents the number of Covid-19 cases included from each site in this analysis -- IVY Network, United States, March–May 2021.*

Figure 1 footnote:

***** Sources of state Covid-19 hospitalization data and population census data were HealthData.gov and United States Census Bureau. [31, 32]

Figure 2. Vaccination status of case patients (N=546), test-negative controls (N=313), and syndrome-negative controls (N=278) — IVY Network, United States, March–May 2021.*****

Figure 2 footnote:

* Vaccination status was classified based on the number of mRNA vaccine doses received before a reference date, which was the date of symptom onset (for cases and test-negative controls) or date of hospital admission (for syndrome-negative controls). Unvaccinated patients received no doses of mRNA vaccine before the reference date, partially vaccinated patients received one of two doses of mRNA vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date or both doses with the second dose received <14 days before the reference date, and fully vaccinated patients received both doses of vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date. Patients who received the first dose of a SARS-CoV-2 vaccine 0-13 days before the reference date (47 cases; 21 test-negative controls; 7 syndrome-negative controls) were excluded from this analysis.

Figure 3. Vaccine effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines for the prevention of Covid-19 hospitalizations overall and by subgroups — IVY Network, United States, March–May 2021.*

Figure 3 footnote:

* The analysis included case patients with Covid-19-like illness who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection and control patients combined from two groups, including a (1) test-negative control group with Covid-19-like illness and negative SARS-CoV-2 testing and (2) a syndrome-negative control group without Covid-19-like illness and negative for SARS-CoV-2. Vaccine effectiveness models were adjusted for calendar time in biweekly intervals, US Department of Health and Human Services region, age in years, sex, race and ethnicity. Vaccination status was classified based on the number of mRNA vaccine doses received before a reference date, which was defined as the date of symptom onset for cases and test-negative controls and date of hospital admission for syndrome-negative controls. Unvaccinated patients received no doses of vaccine before the reference date, partially vaccinated patients received one of two doses of vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date or both doses with the second dose received <14 days before the reference date, and fully vaccinated patients received both doses of vaccine ≥14 days before the reference date.

Figure 1



Figure 2


100%
90%
80%
70%
60%
50%
40%
30%
20%
10%
0%
8.2%
8.2%
83.5%
36.7%
17.3%
46.0%
36.0%
17.6%
46.4%
CASES
(N=546)
TEST-NEGATIVE CONTROLS
(N=313)
SYNDROME-NEGATIVE CONTROLS
(N=278)
Unvaccinated
Partial vaccination
Full vaccination

Figure 3

Subgroup	Vaccinated case patients / total case patients (%)	Vaccinated control patients / total control patients (%)	Vaccine effectiveness (95% confidence interval)
Full vaccination			
Overall	45/501 (9.0)	215/488 (44.1)	87.1 (80.7 to 91.3)
18 to 49 yr	1/186 (0.5)	25/139 (18.0)	97.4 (79.3 to 99.7)
50 to 64 yr	14/186 (7.5)	39/136 (28.7)	75.2 (48.3 to 88.1)
≥65 yr	30/129 (23.3)	151/213 (70.9)	87.3 (77.8 to 92.7)
Covid-19 vaccine product			
Pfizer-BioNTech	28/484 (5.8)	122/395 (30.9)	84.4 (74.9 to 90.4)
Moderna	17/473 (3.6)	93/366 (25.4)	90.1 (82.3 to 94.5)
B.1.1.7 variant lineage	9/131 (6.9)	215/488 (44.1)	92.4 (83.6 to 96.5)
Underlying medical condition			
Chronic cardiovascular disease	38/264 (14.4)	150/311 (48.2)	83.0 (72.6 to 89.4)
No chronic cardiovascular disease	7/237 (3.0)	65/177 (36.7)	95.5 (88.8 to 98.2)
Chronic lung disease	14/98 (14.3)	72/158 (45.6)	82.1 (60.3 to 91.9)
No chronic lung disease	31/403 (7.7)	143/330 (43.3)	89.4 (82.7 to 93.5)
Diabetes mellitus	19/153 (12.4)	73/162 (45.1)	82.5 (66.4 to 90.9)
No diabetes mellitus	26/348 (7.5)	142/326 (43.6)	89.9 (83.0 to 94.0)
Immunocompromising condition	20/82 (24.4)	59/119 (49.6)	62.9 (20.8 to 82.6)
No immunocompromising condition	25/419 (6.0)	156/369 (42.3)	91.3 (85.6 to 94.8)
Obesity	21/291 (7.2)	95/215 (44.2)	89.1 (80.3 to 93.9)
No obesity	24/204 (11.8)	120/272 (44.1)	84.8 (73.2 to 91.4)
Partial vaccination			
Overall	45/501 (9.0)	103/376 (27.4)	76.1 (64.0 to 84.2)