

1 Effect of Vaccination on Household Transmission of
2 SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC

3

Frederik Plesner Lyngse^{1,2,3,*}

Kåre Mølbak^{3,4}

Matt Denwood⁴

Lasse Engbo Christiansen⁵

Camilla Holten Møller³

Morten Rasmussen³

Arieh Sierrah Cohen³

Marc Stegger³

Jannik Fonager³

Raphael Sieber³

Kirsten Ellegaard³

Claus Nielsen³

Carsten Thure Kirkeby⁴

4

January 6, 2022

*Correspondence to Frederik Plesner Lyngse, fpl@econ.ku.dk. Affiliations: ¹Department of Economics & Center for Economic Behaviour and Inequality, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark; ²Danish Ministry of Health, Copenhagen, Denmark; ³Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark; ⁴Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.; ⁴Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, DTU Lyngby, Lyngby, Denmark.

5 1 Abstract

6 The SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant of concern (VOC), which has shown increased trans-
7 mission compared with previous variants, emerged rapidly globally during the first half
8 of 2021, and became one of the most widespread SARS-CoV-2 variants worldwide. We
9 utilized total population data from 24,693 Danish households with 53,584 potential sec-
10 ondary cases to estimate household transmission of the Delta VOC in relation to vacci-
11 nation status. We found that the vaccine effectiveness against susceptibility (VES) was
12 61% (95%-CI: 59-63) and that the vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET)
13 was 42% (95%-CI: 39-45). We also found that unvaccinated individuals with an infec-
14 tion exhibited a higher viral load (one third of a standard deviation) compared to fully
15 vaccinated individuals with a breakthrough infection. Our results imply that vaccina-
16 tions reduce susceptibility as well as transmissibility. The results are important for policy
17 makers to select strategies for reducing transmission of SARS-CoV-2.

18 2 Introduction

19 The current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is of major concern worldwide, and vaccination for
20 SARS-CoV-2 is a central part of the strategy to control the epidemic. Nevertheless, pan-
21 demic control is being challenged by the ability of SARS-CoV-2 to continuously evolve
22 into new genomic variants of concern (VOC) with differing characteristics in terms of
23 transmissibility and immune evasion. During 2021, the Delta VOC (SARS-CoV-2 Lin-
24 eage B.1.617.2) became a major concern, due to the evidence for higher transmissibility
25 compared to previous variants (Liu & Rocklöv, 2021; Campbell et al., 2021; Lopez Bernal
26 et al., 2021; Dagpunar, 2021; Allen et al., 2021). Furthermore, some studies suggest
27 that the Delta VOC possess increased immune evasion properties relative to previous
28 variants, causing a higher number of breakthrough infections in vaccinated individuals
29 (Farinholt et al., 2021; Mlcochova et al., 2021). During the second half of 2021, the Delta
30 VOC caused new surges in COVID-19 infections and hospitalizations in several countries,
31 putting a pressure on health care systems despite broad vaccination rollout. In response,
32 several countries reintroduced restrictions and non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs)
33 to sustain epidemic control. To understand the full potential of the Delta VOC, it is
34 essential to estimate the vaccine effectiveness for this variant. It is inherently difficult to
35 estimate real-world vaccine effectiveness (VE), as vaccination roll-out has prioritized spe-
36 cial risk-groups, and take-up has been large, causing potential bias in the control group of
37 unvaccinated individuals. Furthermore, waning immunity complicates the identification
38 of the VE.

39 It is therefore essential to quantify the vaccine effectiveness for susceptibility (VES), the
40 vaccine effectiveness for transmissibility (VET), and the combined effect (VEC). Har-
41 ris et al. (2021) studied the effect of first vaccination and found that transmission from
42 vaccinated individuals was 40% to 50% lower than from unvaccinated individuals. They
43 pointed out that more data and studies are needed to estimate the reduction in transmis-
44 sion for fully vaccinated individuals.

45 There are several issues that make it difficult to quantify the VES and VET. In principle,
46 an infection with SARS-CoV-2 generally requires three things: i) an infected primary
47 case that is able to transmit the virus, ii) a potential secondary case that is susceptible
48 to the virus, and iii) a contact/transmission event between the primary and the potential
49 secondary case. Vaccinations affect the susceptibility of the potential secondary case,
50 but may also affect the transmissibility of a primary case, conditional on a breakthrough
51 infection overcoming the vaccinated status of the individual. Furthermore, individuals
52 may change their behavior due to the vaccination status of themselves and/or others,
53 complicating the process of separating the effects of VES and VET.

54 For policy makers aiming to control the pandemic, vaccinations play a key role. It is
55 essential to quantify the vaccine effectiveness—not just against susceptibility—but also
56 against transmissibility.

57 In this study we used national population data to estimate vaccine effectiveness within
58 Danish households. We estimate two key parameters: Vaccine effectiveness against sus-
59 ceptibility (VES) and vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) for the Delta
60 VOC to and from individuals with and without vaccination against SARS-CoV-2.

61 **3 Data and Methods**

62 **3.1 Study period**

63 We selected the study period to include primary cases with the Delta VOC, which became
64 dominant in Denmark around the middle of July 2021. We used data where the primary
65 case within each household was between 21 June 2021 to 26 October 2021. Potential
66 secondary cases were followed up to 9 November to provide sufficient time for them to
67 subsequently test positive. Appendix 6 provides background information on the study
68 period, including the number of tests performed, the number of cases, and vaccination
69 roll-out.

70 3.2 Data

71 This study was conducted using Danish register data. In Denmark, all citizens have a
72 personal identification number that allows their information to be linked across different
73 data registers at the individual level. We linked all members of the same household
74 via their registered home address and merged this with data on all RT-PCR tests for
75 SARS-CoV-2 from the Danish Microbiology Database (MiBa). We identified the first
76 positive test result in each household and defined the corresponding individual as the
77 primary case. All other household members were defined as potential secondary cases.
78 Information on vaccinations of each individual was obtained from the Danish Vaccination
79 Register (DDV) as described below. We only considered households with 2-6 members in
80 order to exclude e.g. student dorms, social housing, and care facilities. We only included
81 households where the primary case tested positive with the Delta VOC and where no other
82 household member tested positive on the same day. Secondary cases were defined as all
83 cases testing positive within 1-14 days of the primary case within each household.

84 Individuals were classified depending on their vaccination status on the test-positive day
85 of the primary case. Individuals who had not received a first dose were classified as not
86 vaccinated. The definitions of full vaccinations were: Comirnaty (Pfizer/BioNTech): 7
87 days after second dose; Vaxzevria (AstraZeneca): 15 days after second dose; Spikevax
88 (Moderna): 14 days after second dose; COVID-19 VACCINE Janssen (Johnson & John-
89 son): 14 days after vaccination. If an individual was cross vaccinated (mainly first dose
90 of Vaxzevria and second dose of Comirnaty), the definition of the second dose vaccination
91 was used. Individuals that were in the period between the first dose and fully vaccinated
92 were defined as partially vaccinated and excluded. Any individual that had received a
93 booster vaccination was also excluded. Lastly, all households with a previous infection
94 (positive RT-PCR test) were excluded.

95 3.3 Statistical analyses

96 We defined the overall household secondary attack rate (SAR) as the proportion of po-
97 tential secondary cases that tested positive between 1-14 days following the identification
98 of the primary case within the same household.

99 We defined the combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC, the combined effect of vaccination
100 on both the infected primary case and the potential secondary case) as one minus the rel-
101 ative risk (RR) of vaccinated individuals compared to unvaccinated individuals, following
102 Halloran et al. (2003).

103 To estimate the vaccine effectiveness, we used a generalized linear model (GLM), with
104 Poisson distribution response and a log link function, comparing fully vaccinated individ-
105 uals with unvaccinated individuals (see below). The modified GLM routine also included
106 standard errors clustered on the household level. The use of a Poisson distribution to
107 describe a binary response was to facilitate estimation of relative risks rather than odds
108 ratios. The regression model included fixed effects controls for age (categorical effects in
109 5-year age groups) and sex of both the primary and potential secondary cases, and fixed
110 effects for household size (categorical effects). We also included calendar week fixed ef-
111 fects to control for temporal variation, e.g., behavior, changes in restrictions, vaccination
112 coverage and overall incidence.

113 To estimate the extent to which vaccination reduces susceptibility to infection (VES), we
114 estimated the relative risk (RR) of the SAR for potential secondary cases that were fully
115 vaccinated compared to the SAR for the potential secondary cases that were not vacci-
116 nated. To separate the effect of vaccination affecting susceptibility (VES) from transmis-
117 sibility (VET), we also stratified by vaccination status of the primary case.

118 To estimate the extent to which vaccination protects against transmissibility to other
119 household members, i.e., the VET, we estimated the RR of the SAR for primary cases that
120 were fully vaccinated compared to the SAR for primary cases that were not vaccinated.

121 To separate the effect of vaccination affecting transmissibility (VET) from susceptibility
122 (VES), we also stratified by vaccination status of the potential secondary case.

123 To estimate the combined effect of vaccine protection against susceptibility and transmis-
124 sibility, we estimated the RR of the SAR for primary cases and potential secondary cases
125 that were fully vaccinated compared to primary cases and potential secondary cases that
126 were not vaccinated.

127 To explore the effect of vaccinations on infectiousness, we investigated the difference in
128 viral load (proxied by Ct values) for vaccinated and unvaccinated secondary cases testing
129 positive on the same day after exposure.

130 A more detailed description of the statistical methods is provided in Appendix 8.

131 **3.3.1 Additional analyses**

132 To test the robustness of our main results, we conducted a number of additional analy-
133 ses. To investigate the age related transmission patterns, we estimated the SAR, VET,
134 VES and VEC stratified by the age of primary case and potential secondary cases. To
135 investigate if secondary cases were due to household or community transmission, we in-
136 vestigated the intra-household correlation of subtype lineages of the Delta variant. We
137 investigated the intra-household correlation of vaccination status, as the vaccination sta-
138 tus between household members are likely correlated. We also investigated the sample
139 Ct values from unvaccinated and fully vaccinated primary cases. Because a positive test
140 result is provided conditionally on actually having a test, we investigated the probability
141 of being tested across vaccination status of both the primary and potential secondary
142 case. To investigate the robustness of our main results, we estimated the VES, VET and
143 VEC, conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result. To investigate the
144 effect of waning immunity, we estimated the VES, VET and VEC by time intervals since
145 vaccination. Finally, to investigate if the VES, VET and VEC estimates are driven by a
146 change in the viral load of the primary case, we estimated these while adjusting for the
147 viral load of the primary case, using the sample Ct value as a proxy.

148 The results of the additional analyses are presented in Appendix 7.

149 **3.4 Ethical statement**

150 This study was conducted on administrative register data. According to Danish law,
151 ethics approval is not needed for this type of research. All data management and analyses
152 were carried out on the Danish Health Data Authority's restricted research servers with
153 project number FSEID-00004942. The publication only contains aggregated results and
154 no personal data. The publication is, therefore, not covered by the European General
155 Data Protection Regulation.

156 **3.5 Data availability**

157 The data used in this study are available under restricted access due to Danish data
158 protection legislation. The data are available for research upon reasonable request to The
159 Danish Health Data Authority and Statens Serum Institut and within the framework of
160 the Danish data protection legislation and any required permission from Authorities. We
161 performed no data collection and performed no sequencing specifically for this study.

162 **4 Results**

163 Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the data included in this study. The study in-
164 cluded 24,693 primary cases, of which 33% (8,262) were fully vaccinated and 67% (16,431)
165 were not vaccinated, and 53,584 potential secondary cases, of which 49% (26,098) were
166 fully vaccinated and 52% (27,486) were not vaccinated. The SAR was generally lower
167 among vaccinated potential secondary cases than among unvaccinated (Table 1). Lastly,
168 for children between 0-10 years of age, we found a SAR at 27%.

Table 1: Summary Statistics

	Fully vaccinated				Unvaccinated			
	Primary Cases	Potential Secondary Cases	Positive Secondary Cases	Secondary Attack Rate (%)	Primary Cases	Potential Secondary Cases	Positive Secondary Cases	Secondary Attack Rate (%)
Total	8,262	26,098	3,816	15	16,431	27,486	7,815	28
Sex								
Male	4,001	12,868	1,711	13	8,301	13,801	3,626	26
Female	4,261	13,230	2,105	16	8,130	13,685	4,189	31
Age								
0-10	0	0	0		3,668	11,687	3,198	27
10-20	721	3,482	181	5	4,859	5,742	1,720	30
20-30	1,368	2,633	224	9	4,131	3,756	983	26
30-40	1,131	4,434	730	16	2,316	3,014	1,028	34
40-50	1,676	7,961	1,210	15	923	2,015	585	29
50-60	1,601	4,808	686	14	407	994	247	25
60-70	1,085	1,893	445	24	109	211	42	20
70-80	680	887	340	38	18	67	12	18
Household Size								
2	3,859	4,832	1,209	25	3,704	2,731	812	30
3	1,809	5,660	702	12	4,092	5,132	1,402	27
4	1,785	9,246	1,204	13	5,080	9,416	2,801	30
5	643	4,980	572	11	2,762	7,260	2,029	28
6	166	1,380	129	9	793	2,947	771	26
Vaccination								
Vaxzevria	514	1,398	229	16				
Janssen	529	546	108	20				
Spikevax	366	2,441	243	10				
Cormirnaty	6,853	21,713	3,236	15				

Notes: The secondary attack rate (SAR) is expressed in percentages. Primary cases and potential secondary cases are here shown by groups of sex, age, household size and vaccination status, independent of each other. Appendix Table 3 provides summary statistics for potential and positive secondary cases are grouped based on the primary case characteristics.

169 Table 2 shows the vaccine effectiveness (VE) estimates. The pooled vaccine effectiveness
170 against susceptibility (VES) was 61% (95%-CI: 59-63). The VES was 61% (95%-CI: 59-
171 63) when the primary case was unvaccinated, compared to 46% (95%-CI: 40-52) when the
172 primary case was fully vaccinated primary cases. The pooled vaccine effectiveness against
173 transmissibility (VET) was 42% (95%-CI: 39-45). The VET was 31% (95%-CI: 26-36)
174 when the potential secondary was for unvaccinated, compared to 10% (95%-CI: 0-18)
175 when the potential secondary case was fully vaccinated. The combined effect (VEC) was
176 66% (95%-CI: 63-68), i.e., when both the primary case and potential secondary case were
177 fully vaccinated compared to them being unvaccinated. Note that the VE estimates across
178 columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples.

Table 2: Vaccine effectiveness (%)


Primary cases vaccinated Potential secondary cases vaccinated Estimator	Susceptibility			Transmissibility			Combined
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully	
	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/N,V}$	$VET_{V.,/N.,}$	$VEC_{V,V/N,N}$
VE (%)	61	61	46	42	31	10	66
(95%-CI)	(59;63)	(59;63)	(40;52)	(39;45)	(26;36)	(0;18)	(63;68)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Conditional on test	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
N Observations	53,584	38,336	15,248	53,584	27,486	26,098	33,822
N Households	24,693	16,431	8,262	24,693	15,559	16,493	20,175

Notes: This table provides estimates of vaccine effectiveness (%) against susceptibility (VES) as a pooled estimate ("Pool") as well as stratified by whether the primary case was unvaccinated ("Not") or fully vaccinated ("Fully"). The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model. VE estimates conditional on the potential secondary case being tested is presented in Appendix Table 7. VE estimates controlling for Ct value of the primary case sample is presented in Appendix Tables 8 and 9. VE estimates of waning immunity is presented in Appendix Tables 10 and 11.

179 Further robustness of the VE estimates are presented in Appendix 7.6. Tables 10 and 11
 180 show estimates of VE since time of vaccination, i.e., waning immunity. The VES and VET
 181 decreased from 71% (95%-CI: 69-72) and 57% (95%-CI: 53-61), respectively, to 32% (95%-
 182 CI: 16-45) and 29% (95%-CI: 14-41), respectively, between time points corresponding to
 183 0-1 months and 7-8 months after vaccination (Table 10).

184 Vaccinated secondary cases have a significantly lower viral load (higher Ct value) com-
 185 pared to unvaccinated secondary cases, independent of the day of testing after identifi-
 186 cation of the primary case (Figure 1). Vaccinated secondary cases have an increased Ct
 187 value of 1.6, corresponding to a third of a standard deviation (Appendix Table 6).

Figure 1: Ct values across vaccinated and unvaccinated positive secondary cases



Notes: The Ct values in samples for positive secondary cases of unvaccinated and fully vaccinated follow the same pattern, indicating that the higher Ct values for fully vaccinated individuals is consistent and unrelated to the time of testing positive. Regression estimates include age fixed effects. Shaded areas are 95%-confidence intervals clustered on the household level. Appendix Table 6 provides regression estimates of the increased Ct values for vaccinated positive secondary cases.

188 5 Discussion and Conclusion

189 We used Danish national population data to estimate household transmission of SARS-
190 CoV-2 Delta VOC to and from unvaccinated and fully vaccinated individuals. We found a
191 vaccine effectiveness against susceptibility (VES) against the Delta VOC of 61% (95%-CI:
192 59-63), when the primary case was not vaccinated, and a VES of 46% (95%-CI: 40-52),
193 when they were fully vaccinated. Furthermore, we found a vaccine effectiveness against
194 transmissibility (VET) of 31% (95%-CI: 26-36), when the potential secondary case was
195 not vaccinated, and 10% (95%-CI: 0-18), when they were fully vaccinated. Lastly, we

196 found a combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) of 66% (95%-CI: 63-68), when both the
197 primary and potential secondary case were fully vaccinated.

198 Other studies used contact tracing data and found similar estimates. In the Netherlands,
199 de Gier et al. (2021) found a household VET of 63% (95%-CI: 46–75) among unvaccinated
200 potential secondary cases and a VET of 40% (95%-CI: 20–54) among fully vaccinated
201 potential secondary cases. In Singapore, Ng et al. (2021) found a pooled VES of 62%
202 (95%-CI: 38-80). Moreover, in a recent study, using the same approach as the present
203 study, Lyngse et al. (2021b) showed a general higher VET for unvaccinated cases and a
204 lower VET for booster-vaccinated cases, compared to fully vaccinated cases. They also
205 found no significant difference in the VET for cases infected with the Omicron VOC
206 compared to the Delta VOC.

207 It has previously been shown that vaccination protects against infection and hospital-
208 ization duration (Veneti et al., 2021; Levine-Tiefenbrun et al., 2021), severity of disease
209 (Ruian Ke, 2021), and mortality (Mor et al., 2021) caused by the Delta VOC (Chia et al.,
210 2021). We have demonstrated that vaccinations further protect against transmission, con-
211 ditional on having a breakthrough infection. This protective effect is important, as some
212 studies have indicated that the Delta VOC has increased immune evasion properties rel-
213 ative to other variants, causing a higher number of breakthrough infections in vaccinated
214 individuals (Farinholt et al., 2021). This ability may be caused by a higher replication
215 within the airway cells (Mlcochova et al., 2021).

216 Lower viral loads in vaccinated cases compared to unvaccinated cases could be a potential
217 mechanism for this reduction in transmissibility. However, there is currently no agreement
218 on the effect of vaccination on the viral load. Some studies found that vaccinations did
219 not reduce the viral load of cases with a breakthrough infection. Chia et al. (2021), for
220 example, found that vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals infected with the Delta VOC
221 had similar Ct values at diagnosis, but that the viral loads decreased faster in vaccinated
222 individuals. Contrary to this, we found that vaccinated cases had lower viral loads (higher
223 Ct values), corroborating the findings of Levine-Tiefenbrun et al. (2021), who found that

224 breakthrough infections with the Delta VOC resulted in lower viral loads in vaccinated
225 cases compared with unvaccinated cases.

226 Our study found that the pooled VES generally decreased from 71% (95%-CI: 69-72) at 0-1
227 months after vaccination, compared to 32% (95%-CI: 16-45) 7-8 months after vaccination
228 (Appendix Table 10). Similarly, the pooled VET generally decreased from 57% (95%-CI:
229 53-61) at 0-1 months after vaccination, compared to 29% (95%-CI: 14-41) 7-8 months
230 after vaccination. This highlights the need for booster vaccinations in order to improve
231 protection and reduce transmission.

232 Our results have important implications for policy makers. First, we have shown that
233 vaccination reduces the transmission between infected and susceptible individuals, corrob-
234 orating existing studies. Vaccination can therefore be used to reduce the risk of infection.
235 Second, we found that vaccinations protect more against susceptibility than transmissibil-
236 ity. Therefore NPIs acting mostly on the transmissibility, such as wearing masks (Abaluck
237 et al., 2021), can be necessary even for vaccinated individuals, especially when close to
238 unvaccinated individuals. On the other hand, the reduced susceptibility of vaccinated
239 individuals may facilitate the relaxation of guidelines among vaccinated individuals, e.g.,
240 at mass gatherings. This suggests that immunity passports can be an effective measure to
241 reduce transmission, as previously suggested (Brown et al., 2020). Third, we showed that
242 vaccination also protects against transmissibility, conditional on having a breakthrough in-
243 fection. This indicates that prioritizing the vaccination of groups that have many contacts
244 or work with vulnerable individuals—e.g., nursing home staff—is important for pandemic
245 control. Fourth, our estimates can be used to inform simulation models of the current
246 pandemic, which crucially rely on the parameters of susceptibility and transmissibility.
247 As vaccination affects both the susceptibility and transmissibility, accurate estimates of
248 these effects are critical to the models that are used to inform decision makers.

249 We here found a substantial degree of transmission to and from children. Unvaccinated
250 children aged 0-10 years were susceptible to the SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC with a SAR of
251 27% (Table 1). Furthermore, we found that unvaccinated children aged 0-20 years that

252 were primary cases were able to infect vaccinated household members aged 20-60 with a
253 SAR of 15% (Figure 7).

254 This study has several strengths. First, we combined several national-level datasets in
255 order to control for individual specific factors relating to both the primary and potential
256 secondary case. This is unique because standard approaches to estimating VE usually
257 focus on VES or a combined measure. Second, throughout the study period, Denmark
258 had a large testing capacity: testing was free and widely used. Third, all positive cases
259 were being contacted by the official contact tracing unit. All household members are
260 per definition close contacts and recommended to become RT-PCR tested twice after the
261 identification of the primary case—unconditional on the vaccination status. Forth, Den-
262 mark has a high vaccination uptake across all vaccination groups. Overall, this provides
263 a setting that allows us to estimate vaccine effectiveness both from and to vaccinated and
264 unvaccinated individuals. Lyngse et al. (2021a) used data from whole genome sequencing
265 to validate the same methods as used in the present study. They found an intra-household
266 correlation of lineages between primary and positive secondary cases of 96-99%, indicat-
267 ing that most secondary cases were infected with the same lineage as the primary case.
268 In the present study, the Delta VOC comprised more than 95% of all cases in society
269 (Figure 3), making it impossible to investigate variation across different variants. How-
270 ever, using the subtype lineages of the Delta VOC, we found no significant difference in
271 the intra-household correlation of lineages across vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals
272 (Appendix 7.2). The data were collected while the Danish vaccination program was rolled
273 out to all above 12 years of age. Therefore, unvaccinated individuals mainly represents
274 individuals who were not yet invited for vaccination. This is a major strength of our study
275 because a self-selected unvaccinated group might introduce a bias due to the fact that
276 reluctance to receive immunizations may correlate with other types of behavior.

277 Some limitations apply to this study. Firstly, we did not have access to clinical infor-
278 mation. Secondly, vaccination status may affect the behavior of both primary cases and
279 potential secondary cases, as they may adhere less to non-pharmaceutical interventions
280 (NPIs) once they or others are vaccinated. Thus, the estimates in our study reflect both

281 the biological aspect of susceptibility and transmissibility, as well as the behavioral as-
282 pects, and does not confer any information regarding severity of illness, which is expected
283 to be lower among vaccinated individuals.

284 There are several behavioral aspects relating to vaccination. Once a primary case is
285 identified within the household, the other members might allocate their time with that
286 individual, conditional on their own vaccination status. For example, if the primary case
287 is a child and one parent is fully vaccinated, while the other is not, then the family may
288 choose to allocate the majority of childcare during the infection to the vaccinated parent,
289 as they have a lower risk of being infected. This changed contact pattern may lead to
290 a higher rate of infections in vaccinated individuals in households where there are also
291 unvaccinated members. Furthermore, vaccinated individuals may in general adhere less
292 to non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as keeping distance, wearing masks, etc. due
293 to a perceived lower susceptibility and transmissibility. Unvaccinated individuals may be
294 identified earlier in their infection than vaccinated individuals, as they are being more
295 regularly tested. However, in Denmark, all contacts are encouraged to be PCR tested—
296 regardless of their vaccination status—when a positive individual is found within the
297 same household. We tested the difference of the probability of being tested after exposure
298 between fully vaccinated and unvaccinated potential secondary cases. We found that
299 vaccinated potential secondary cases were about 7 percentage points (10%) more likely
300 to be tested compared to unvaccinated individuals (Appendix 7.4). This suggests that
301 there are differences across the two groups that we cannot fully control for, e.g., general
302 compliance to NPIs. These results are in line with the results in Nielsen & Petersen
303 (2021) that show that unvaccinated individuals are less likely to adhere to government
304 recommendations. This also implies that our VE estimates are a lower bound. When
305 we restrict our analyses to only include individuals with a test result, we obtain higher
306 VE estimates (Appendix Tables 7, 9, and 11). Moreover, there is likely a correlation of
307 vaccination status between household members. i) Individuals living together may be
308 more likely to share the same belief, for instance towards vaccination. ii) Individuals are
309 likely to have a partner around their own age. As vaccination roll-out is based on age,

310 household members are likely to be eligible for vaccination around the same calendar time.
311 iii) There may be a fixed cost of being vaccinated, e.g., the travel from the home to the
312 vaccination location. Thus, a household might pool their day of vaccination together to
313 minimize travel costs. We found an intra-household correlation of vaccination status of
314 0.72 for individuals above age 12 years (Appendix 7.3).

315 Estimating VES and VET include several challenges. When few individuals are vacci-
316 nated in a population, it is less complicated to estimate the approximate vaccine effec-
317 tiveness against susceptibility (VES), because their exposure can be assumed to come
318 from unvaccinated cases. As vaccinations are rolled out in a country, the proportion of
319 the population that is vaccinated increases. As a consequence, the proportion of contacts
320 with vaccinated individuals also increases. Therefore, the real-life observed VES estimates
321 are a composition of exposure from and to both vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals.
322 If vaccination not only protects against infection, but also against transmission, the esti-
323 mates are a combined effect of both VES and VET. The VET becomes increasingly more
324 important, as vaccination rates throughout society increase. Furthermore, it is necessary
325 to link primary cases to exposed contacts in order to estimate the VET.

326 Age is correlated with susceptibility and transmissibility as well as eligibility and roll-out
327 of vaccinations. This implies a natural imbalance in the number of primary and potential
328 secondary cases across age groups. To address this, we provide estimates of SAR and VE
329 in all combinations of age groups, stratified by vaccination status of both the primary and
330 potential secondary case (Appendix 7.1).

331 The estimates of VES are probably conservative compared with the general VES at the
332 overall population level. Transmission within household is associated with more intense
333 exposure than in the community in general, and since there is a relation between the
334 degree of exposure and likelihood of breakthrough infection, it is expected that vaccines
335 may work better in the community than in households. Secondly, the estimates based on
336 an infection in a fully vaccinated individual is naturally conditioned on a breakthrough
337 infection. The virus variant that has caused this infection may have been adapted to vac-

338 cine derived immunity, and may therefore be more likely to result in another breakthrough
339 infection.

340 In conclusion, we have demonstrated that vaccination was able to reduce the transmission
341 of the Delta VOC in Danish households over our study period. We estimated a vaccine
342 effectiveness against susceptibility (VES) of 61% (95%-CI: 59-63) among unvaccinated
343 primary cases and a vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) of 31% (95%-
344 CI: 26-36) among unvaccinated potential secondary cases. This implies that vaccinations
345 reduce susceptibility as well as transmissibility.

References

- 346
- 347 Abaluck, J., Kwong, L. H., Styczynski, A., Haque, A., Kabir, M. A., Bates-Jefferys, E.,
348 Crawford, E., Benjamin-Chung, J., Raihan, S., Rahman, S., Benhachmi, S., Bintee,
349 N. Z., Winch, P. J., Hossain, M., Reza, H. M., Jaber, A. A., Momen, S. G., Rahman,
350 A., Banti, F. L., Huq, T. S., Luby, S. P., & Mobarak, A. M. (2021). Impact of commu-
351 nity masking on COVID-19: A cluster-randomized trial in Bangladesh. *Science*, 0(0),
352 eabi9069.
- 353 Allen, H., Vusirikala, A., Flannagan, J., Twohig, K. A., Zaidi, A., Chudasama, D., Lam-
354 agni, T., Groves, N., Turner, C., Rawlinson, C., et al. (2021). Household transmission
355 of COVID-19 cases associated with SARS-CoV-2 delta variant (B. 1.617. 2): national
356 case-control study. *The Lancet Regional Health-Europe*, (pp. 100252).
- 357 ARTIC (2022). Real-time molecular epidemiology for outbreak response. *ARTIC Network*.
358 <https://artic.network> (Accessed 2022-01-02).
- 359 Brown, R. C., Savulescu, J., Williams, B., & Wilkinson, D. (2020). Passport to freedom?
360 Immunity passports for COVID-19. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 46(10), 652–659.
- 361 Campbell, F., Archer, B., Laurenson-Schafer, H., Jinnai, Y., Konings, F., Batra, N.,
362 Pavlin, B., Vandemaele, K., Van Kerkhove, M. D., Jombart, T., et al. (2021). Increased
363 transmissibility and global spread of SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern as at June 2021.
364 *Eurosurveillance*, 26(24), 2100509.
- 365 Chia, P. Y., Ong, S. W. X., Chiew, C. J., Ang, L. W., Chavatte, J.-M., Mak, T.-M., Cui,
366 L., Kalimuddin, S., Chia, W. N., Tan, C. W., et al. (2021). Virological and serological
367 kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant vaccine-breakthrough infections: a multi-center
368 cohort study. *medRxiv*.
- 369 Dagpunar, J. S. (2021). Interim estimates of increased transmissibility, growth rate, and
370 reproduction number of the Covid-19 B. 1.617. 2 variant of concern in the United
371 Kingdom. *medRxiv*.

- 372 DCGC (2021). Genomic overview of SARS-CoV-2 in Denmark. *Danish Covid-19 Genome*
373 *Consortium*. <https://www.covid19genomics.dk/statistics> (Accessed 2021-12-20).
- 374 de Gier, B., Andeweg, S., Backer, J. A., Hahné, S. J., van den Hof, S., de Melker, H. E.,
375 Knol, M. J., et al. (2021). Vaccine effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2 transmission to
376 household contacts during dominance of Delta variant (B. 1.617. 2), the Netherlands,
377 August to September 2021. *Eurosurveillance*, 26(44), 2100977.
- 378 Farinholt, T., Doddapaneni, H., Qin, X., Menon, V., Meng, Q., Metcalf, G., Chao, H.,
379 Gingras, M.-C., Farinholt, P., Agrawal, C., et al. (2021). Transmission event of SARS-
380 CoV-2 Delta variant reveals multiple vaccine breakthrough infections. *medRxiv*.
- 381 Halloran, M. E., Préziosi, M. P., & Chu, H. (2003). Estimating vaccine efficacy from
382 secondary attack rates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(461), 38–
383 46.
- 384 Harris, R. J., Hall, J. A., Zaidi, A., Andrews, N. J., Dunbar, J. K., & Dabrera, G. (2021).
385 Effect of Vaccination on Household Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in England. *New*
386 *England Journal of Medicine*.
- 387 Levine-Tiefenbrun, M., Yelin, I., Alapi, H., Katz, R., Herzel, E., Kuint, J., Chodick,
388 G., Gazit, S., Patalon, T., & Kishony, R. (2021). Viral loads of Delta-variant SARS-
389 CoV-2 breakthrough infections after vaccination and booster with BNT162b2. *Nature*
390 *medicine*, 27(12), 2108–2110.
- 391 Liu, Y. & Rocklöv, J. (2021). The reproductive number of the Delta variant of SARS-
392 CoV-2 is far higher compared to the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus. *Journal of Travel*
393 *Medicine*.
- 394 Lopez Bernal, J., Andrews, N., Gower, C., Gallagher, E., Simmons, R., Thelwall, S.,
395 Stowe, J., Tessier, E., Groves, N., Dabrera, G., et al. (2021). Effectiveness of Covid-19
396 vaccines against the B. 1.617. 2 (Delta) variant. *New England Journal of Medicine*.
- 397 Lyngse, F. P., Mølbak, K., Skov, R. L., Christiansen, L. E., Mortensen, L. H., Albertsen,
398 M., Møller, C. H., Krause, T. G., Rasmussen, M., Michaelsen, T. Y., et al. (2021a).

- 399 Increased transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B. 1.1. 7 by age and viral load. *Nature*
400 *Communications*, 12(1), 1–8.
- 401 Lyngse, F. P., Mortensen, L. H., Denwood, M. J., Christiansen, L. E., Møller, C. H.,
402 Skov, R. L., Spiess, K., Fomsgaard, A., Lassaunière, M. M., Rasmussen, M., Stegger,
403 M., Nielsen, C., Sieber, R. N., Cohen, A. S., Møller, F. T., Overvad, M., Mølbak, K.,
404 Krause, T. G., & Kirkeby, C. T. (2021b). SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC Transmission in
405 Danish Households. *medRxiv*.
- 406 Mlcochova, P., Kemp, S., Dhar, M. S., Papa, G., Meng, B., Mishra, S., Whittaker, C.,
407 Mellan, T., Ferreira, I., Datir, R., et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 B. 1.617. 2 Delta variant
408 emergence and vaccine breakthrough. *medRxiv*.
- 409 Mor, S., Vicki, M., & Rachel, W.-M. (2021). Changes in infectivity, severity and vaccine
410 effectiveness against delta COVID-19 variant ten months into the vaccination program:
411 The Israeli case. *Preventive Medicine*, (pp. 106890).
- 412 Ng, O. T., Koh, V., Chiew, C. J., Marimuthu, K., Thevasagayam, N. M., Mak, T. M.,
413 Chua, J. K., Ong, S. S. H., Lim, Y. K., Ferdous, Z., et al. (2021). Impact of Delta
414 Variant and Vaccination on SARS-CoV-2 Secondary Attack Rate Among Household
415 Close Contacts. *The Lancet Regional Health-Western Pacific*, 17, 100299.
- 416 Nielsen, L. H. & Petersen, M. B. (2021). Smitteforebyggende adfærd blandt færdigvac-
417 cinerede og ikke-færdigvaccinerede. *HOPE-projektet*.
- 418 O’Toole, Á., Hill, V., Pybus, O. G., Watts, A., Bogoch, I. I., Khan, K., Messina, J. P.,
419 COVID, T., et al. (2021). Tracking the international spread of SARS-CoV-2 lineages
420 B. 1.1. 7 and B. 1.351/501Y-V2. *Wellcome Open Research*, 6.
- 421 Ritchie, H., Mathieu, E., Rodés-Guirao, L., Appel, C., Giattino, C., Ortiz-Ospina,
422 E., Hasell, J., Macdonald, B., Beltekian, D., & Roser, M. (2020). Coro-
423 navirus Pandemic (COVID-19), (Accessed 2021-11-26). *Our World in Data*.
424 <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>.

425 Ruian Ke, P. M. e. a. (2021). Longitudinal analysis of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine breakthrough
426 infections reveal 2 limited infectious virus shedding and restricted tissue distribution-
427 Longitudinal analysis of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine breakthrough infections reveal limited
428 infectious virus shedding and restricted tissue distribution. *medRxiv*.

429 SSI (2021a). Dagens covid-19-opgørelser. *Statens Serum Institut*.
430 <https://covid19.ssi.dk/overvagningsdata/download-fil-med-overvaagningdata> (Ac-
431 cessed 2021-11-26).

432 SSI (2021b). Download fil med vaccinationsdata for covid-19. *Statens Serum Institut*.
433 <https://covid19.ssi.dk/overvagningsdata/download-fil-med-vaccinationsdata> (Accessed
434 2021-11-25).

435 Veneti, L., Valcarcel Salamanca, B., Seppälä, E., Starrfelt, J., Storm, M. L., Bragstad, K.,
436 Hungnes, O., Bøås, H., Kvåle, R., Vold, L., Nygård, K., Buanes, E. A., & Whittaker,
437 R. (2021). No difference in risk of hospitalisation between reported cases of the SARS-
438 CoV-2 Delta variant and Alpha variant in Norway. *medRxiv*.

439 **Aknowledgements**

440 We thank Statens Serum Institut and The Danish Health Data Authority for data access.
441 We also thank the rest of the Expert Group for Mathematical Modelling of COVID-19 at
442 Statens Serum Institut for helpful discussions, as well as as the Danish Covid-19 Genome
443 Consortium for typing of positive COVID-19 samples.

444 **Funding**

445 Frederik Plesner Lyngse: Independent Research Fund Denmark (Grant no. 9061-00035B.);
446 Novo Nordisk Foundation (grant no. NNF17OC0026542); the Danish National Research
447 Foundation through its grant (DNRF-134) to the Center for Economic Behavior and In-
448 equality (CEBI) at the University of Copenhagen.

449 **Contributions**

450 FPL performed data analysis and produced all estimates and figures presented. FPL,
451 CTK and KM wrote the first draft. MD contributed to the selection and description of
452 statistical methods. All other authors contributed to the discussion and writing the final
453 draft. All authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

454 **Competing interests**

455 The authors declare no competing interests.


456 Supplementary Appendix

457 6 Background

458 This section provides some background statistics on the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic situation
459 in Denmark, between June and November, 2021.

460 Figure 2 shows the number of tests performed per million Danish citizens and the number
461 of new positive cases identified per thousand Danish citizens between June and November,
462 2021.


Figure 2: Tests and Cases



Notes: This figure shows the number of tests performed per million Danish citizens and the number of new positive cases identified per thousand Danish citizens, June to November, 2021. Data source: SSI (2021a).

463 Between June and July the Delta VOC became the dominant variant in Denmark, reaching
464 approximately 100% of all new cases (Figure 3).


Figure 3: Share of Cases with Delta VOC



Notes: This figure shows the proportion of sequenced positive samples that were identified as the Delta VOC in Denmark, April to November, 2021. Data source: Ritchie et al. (2020).

465 In the study period, vaccinations were rolled out, going from below 40% fully vaccinated
466 to more than 75% fully vaccinated individuals (Figure 4).

Figure 4: Proportion of population vaccinated




Notes: This figure shows the proportion of the population partially and fully vaccinated, June to November 2021. Data source: SSI (2021b).

467 Denmark had a vaccination roll-out strategy with prioritization of vulnerable people.
468 Nursery home residents were prioritized (group 01), followed by citizens above age 65
469 who had the need of personal help and care (group 02), then elderly people above age 85
470 (group 03). The next three groups (04-06) contained employees in healthcare and social
471 work, high-risk patients, and relatives of high-risk patients. The remaining population
472 was subsequently prioritized based on birth year (groups 07-17). Naturally, this leads to
473 a correlation between calendar time and vaccination status conditional on age. Figure 5
474 shows the proportion of each group being fully vaccinated from January to November,
475 2021. We see that the compliance is generally high, and fast roll-out is seen in all groups.
476 This roll-out strategy also meant that most of the vulnerable population was fully vacci-

477 nated, when the Delta VOC was first detected in Denmark. For example, more than 90%
478 of individuals above age 65 (group 09) were fully vaccinated.


Figure 5: Vaccination roll-out



Notes: This figure shows the proportion of the vaccination groups that are fully vaccinated by calendar week, January to November, 2021. Data source: SSI (2021b).

479 Finally, Denmark had relatively lenient restrictions during our study period. Figure 6
480 shows the government stringency index between June and November, 2021. The index is
481 a composite measure of the strictness of policy responses and is based on nine response
482 indicators including school closures, workplace closures, and travel bans. The index is
483 calculated by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker.

Figure 6: Government stringency index



Notes: This figure shows the government stringency index June to November, 2021. The index is a composite measure of the strictness of policy responses and is based on nine response indicators including school closures, workplace closures, and travel bans. The index is calculated by the Oxford COVID-19 Government Response Tracker. Data source: Ritchie et al. (2020).

484 6.1 Danish testing program

485 The Danish SARS-CoV-2 testing program is based on easily accessible testing that is free
486 of charge. The use of testing has been broadly accepted by the public and by December
487 2021, more than 15% of the Danish population were RT-PCR tested each week and a
488 similar percentage were antigen tested. There are three tracks in the testing program:
489 The healthcare track; the community track; and the rapid test track. Both the health-

490 care track and the community track are based on RT-PCR detection of SARS-CoV-2 in
491 oropharyngeal swabs, whereas the rapid test track is based on antigen detection. The
492 RT-PCR results are usually reported within 24 hours. Individuals that test positive in
493 the rapid test track are recommended to take a follow up RT-PCR test. All positive test
494 results are registered in the Danish national microbiology database (MiBa), which thus
495 provides a comprehensive overview of the pandemic on a national level.

496 **6.2 Genomic data**

497 All RT-PCR-positive samples in the study period were selected for whole-genome sequenc-
498 ing by The Danish COVID-19 Genome Consortium (DCGC, 2021) if they showed a Ct
499 value below 35 (Lyngse et al., 2021a). Whole-genome sequencing of the positive samples
500 was performed on short read Illumina technology (Illumina, San Diego, California, United
501 States) with the Illumina COVIDSeq Test kit (Illumina, San Diego, California, United
502 States). The library preparation was performed as described by the manufacturer with a
503 few modifications: COVIDSeq primer pool 2 was spiked with 1x amplicon 64 primer pair
504 and 0.2x amplicon 70 and 74 primer pairs from the ARTIC v3 amplicon sequencing panel
505 (ARTIC, 2022). Furthermore, in the cDNA amplification, the denaturation was adjusted
506 to 95°C for 15 seconds and annealing at 63°C for 5 min. Samples were pooled and se-
507 quenced in batches for 384 on the Illumina NextSeq 500/550 using the mid-output kit v2.5
508 (150 cycles) kit, or 2x384 on the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 using the SP reagent kit (Illumina,
509 San Diego, California, United States). Consensus sequences were called using “IVAR con-
510 sensus”, with an in-house implementation of IVAR (version 1.3.1). The resulting consen-
511 sus sequences were considered for variant calling when containing <3,000 ambiguous sites
512 including N’s. Variants were called using Pangolin (version 3.1.16) with PangoLEARN
513 assignment algorithm on the consensus sequences (O’Toole et al., 2021).

514 7 Additional Analyses

Table 3: Summary Statistics, stratified by primary case level

	Fully vaccinated				Unvaccinated			
	Primary Cases	Potential Secondary Cases	Positive Secondary Cases	Secondary Attack Rate (%)	Primary Cases	Potential Secondary Cases	Positive Secondary Cases	Secondary Attack Rate (%)
Total	8,262	15,248	3,069	20	16,431	38,336	8,562	22
Sex								
Male	4,001	7,209	1,562	22	8,301	19,279	4,075	21
Female	4,261	8,039	1,507	19	8,130	19,057	4,487	24
Age								
0-10	0	0	0		3,668	9,963	2,110	21
10-20	721	1,731	97	6	4,859	12,351	2,150	17
20-30	1,368	2,271	199	9	4,131	7,584	1,436	19
30-40	1,131	2,619	671	26	2,316	5,274	1,813	34
40-50	1,676	3,980	798	20	923	2,224	798	36
50-60	1,601	2,597	564	22	407	766	198	26
60-70	1,085	1,304	382	29	109	154	49	32
70-80	680	746	358	48	18	20	8	40
Household Size								
2	3,859	3,859	1,110	29	3,704	3,704	911	25
3	1,809	3,336	520	16	4,092	7,456	1,584	21
4	1,785	4,963	879	18	5,080	13,699	3,126	23
5	643	2,320	430	19	2,762	9,920	2,171	22
6	166	770	130	17	793	3,557	770	22
Vaccination								
AstraZeneca	514	1,015	204	20				
Janssen	529	879	163	19				
Moderna	366	689	115	17				
Pfizer	6,853	12,665	2,587	20				


Notes: The secondary attack rate (SAR) is expressed in percentages. Potential and positive secondary cases are grouped based on the primary case characteristics. See table 1 for potential and positive secondary cases grouped by their own characteristics.

515 7.1 Age-by-age transmission

516 To investigate the age-related transmission patterns, we split the data into 20-year age
517 groups of both the primary cases and potential secondary cases and estimated the sec-
518 ondary attack rate between all combinations of age groups, stratified by vaccination status
519 of both the primary and potential secondary case (Figure 7). Generally, the SAR was
520 highest, when both the primary and potential secondary case were unvaccinated (top-left
521 panel). Furthermore, the SAR was generally higher when the primary case was vaccinated
522 and the secondary case was not vaccinated (bottom left panel), than when the opposite

523 was true (top right panel), showing that vaccination overall has a higher VES than VET,
 524 corroborating the findings in Table 2.

Figure 7: Secondary Attack Rate, age-by-age, stratified by vaccination status.



Notes: This figure presents attack rates stratified by the age of the primary and potential secondary case, stratified by the vaccination status of the primary and potential secondary case. Numbers show the estimated secondary attack rates with 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. Table 4 provides number of observations used to estimate the SAR for each combination.


Table 4: Number of observations for Figure 7

Primary case: Not vaccinated \ Contact: Not Vaccinated				
Age of contact (years)				
60-80	[12/59/54]	[7/108/99]	[9/42/40]	[23/38/38]
40-60	[402/1,520/1,230]	[180/800/671]	[205/471/446]	[9/25/22]
20-40	[484/1,704/1,373]	[1,312/3,906/3,357]	[121/469/394]	[<5/35/27]
0-20	[1,840/7,540/5,519]	[1,482/4,850/2,937]	[587/1,444/803]	[<5/19/17]
	0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80
	Age of primary case (years)			
Primary case: Fully vaccinated \ Contact: Not Vaccinated				
Age of contact (years)				
60-80			[<5/11/11]	[<5/8/8]
40-60	[<5/24/20]	[8/47/44]	[23/91/89]	[<5/31/30]
20-40	[<5/24/23]	[47/352/307]	[33/231/203]	[6/49/44]
0-20	[19/163/135]	[465/1,653/955]	[516/1,699/1,106]	[8/61/42]
	0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80
	Age of primary case (years)			
Primary case: Not vaccinated \ Contact: Fully Vaccinated				
Age of contact (years)				
60-80	[13/280/241]	[28/470/384]	[13/91/78]	[16/35/35]
40-60	[993/6,742/4,598]	[112/1,457/1,090]	[45/267/253]	[<5/11/11]
20-40	[471/3,232/2,408]	[122/1,116/988]	[12/109/99]	
0-20	[45/1,237/1,072]	[6/151/144]	[<5/97/86]	
	0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80
	Age of primary case (years)			
Primary case: Fully vaccinated \ Contact: Fully Vaccinated				
Age of contact (years)				
60-80	[<5/42/35]	[12/145/115]	[79/315/300]	[620/1,402/1,391]
40-60	[53/1,070/639]	[76/696/520]	[524/2,202/2,166]	[89/324/311]
20-40	[7/120/108]	[247/1,769/1,523]	[84/590/524]	[11/122/103]
0-20	[8/288/254]	[15/216/182]	[102/1,438/1,073]	[<5/53/46]
	0-20	20-40	40-60	60-80
	Age of primary case (years)			

Notes: This table provides number of observations used for estimating the SAR stratified by age and vaccination status in Figure 7. [././.] Number of positive secondary cases / number of potential secondary cases / number of primary cases. Contacts equals the potential secondary cases within each household.

525 Next, we estimated the pooled VES, pooled VET, and VEC for each combination of age
 526 group (Figure 8). Generally, there was a positive VE across all age group combinations,
 527 implying that the SAR is reduced by vaccination of both the susceptible and infectious
 528 individual. Also, there was generally a decreasing VE with age of both the primary and
 529 potential secondary case, which could be related to waning immunity.

Figure 8: Crude VE estimates, stratified by age of the primary case and potential secondary case.



Notes: This figure shows crude VE estimates stratified by age of the primary and potential secondary case. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. Panel a shows the pooled VES. Panel b shows the pooled VET. Panel c shows the combined effect, VEC.

530 7.2 Intra-household correlation of lineages

531 We find an overall intra-household correlation of SARS-CoV-2 lineages of 88% (95%-CI:
532 87-89) (Table 5), i.e., 88% of all positive secondary cases had the same lineage as the
533 primary case within the same household (conditional on the secondary test sample having
534 a successfully sequenced genome). This intra-household correlation is lower compared to
535 the one found in Lyngse et al. (2021a), at 96-99%. This could be because the society is
536 more open, so there is a higher risk of community infection relative to household infection.
537 However, it could also be due to uncertainty in the classification of subtype lineages of the
538 Delta VOC, which is changing over time. In the present study, we used PANGO Lineage
539 classifications from 2021-11-10.

540 In the present study, there is potential bias in the intra-household correlation of lineages
541 across vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals, which could invalidate our comparisons
542 of the relative risks. Table 5 presents the intra-household correlation of lineages across all
543 combinations of vaccinated and unvaccinated primary and secondary cases. We found no
544 statistically significant difference across any of the combinations, so there is no evidence
545 for differential bias across our groups of comparison.

Table 5: Intra-household correlation of lineages

	Secondary Case		
	Pool	Vaccinated	Unvaccinated
Primary Case			
Pool	88 (87-89) [9,580/6,852]	89 (88-90) [3,156/2,860]	88 (87-89) [6,424/4,652]
Vaccinated	90 (88-91) [2,443/1,980]	89 (87-91) [1,573/1,499]	90 (88-92) [870/656]
Unvaccinated	88 (87-89) [7,137/4,872]	89 (87-90) [1,583/1,361]	87 (86-88) [5,554/3,996]


Notes: This table provides estimates on the intra-household correlation of lineages, i.e., the probability that the positive secondary case had the same subtype lineage as the primary case. 95%-confidence intervals clustered on the household level presented in parenthesis. Number of observations and household clusters for each point estimate are presented in hard brackets: [Number of observations/number of households].

546 **7.3 Correlation of vaccination status within households**

547 Vaccination status among household members are likely correlated due to several reasons.
548 First, individuals are probably likely to live with other individuals with the same beliefs.
549 Thus individuals that are pro being vaccinated are more likely to live together with other
550 individuals that also are pro being vaccinated—and vice versa. Second, individuals are
551 likely to live with a partner around their own age. As vaccination eligibility is correlated
552 with age, individuals are likely to be eligible for vaccination around the same time. Third,
553 there may be a fixed cost of being vaccinated, e.g., transportation time to the vaccination
554 place. Thus, households may pool their time of vaccination on the same day to minimize
555 these costs.

556 Figure 9 provides estimates of the correlation of the vaccination status between primary
557 cases and potential secondary cases, stratified by five year age groups. It clearly shows
558 some correlation among household members. Among young children (<12 years) there is
559 perfect correlation, as they were not eligible for being vaccinated. We found a correlation
560 of 0.63 within the full sample and a correlation of 0.72, when restricting the sample to
561 individuals above age 12.

Figure 9: Correlation of vaccination status within households




Notes: This figure provides estimates of the correlation of the vaccination status between primary cases and potential secondary cases, stratified by ten-year age groups.

7.4 Testing probabilities across vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals

When estimating the probability that an individual tests positive, it is conditional on the individual actually being tested. Selection bias is a potential concern, if the vaccination status of a potential secondary case within the household is correlated with the probability of being tested after the identification of the primary case. Overall, we find that potential secondary cases that are fully vaccinated are 7 percentage points (on a basis of 75%) more likely to be tested 1-14 days after exposure, compared to unvaccinated individuals (Table 10). Furthermore, potential secondary cases being exposed to primary cases that are fully vaccinated are also more likely to be tested. This suggests that there is a correlation

572 between the household vaccination status and the compliance with being tested after
573 exposure to a close contact.

Figure 10: Probability of being tested after household exposure




Notes: This figure provides estimates of the difference in the probability that a fully vaccinated potential secondary cases have been tested after identification of a primary case compared with an unvaccinated potential secondary case. It shows that the potential secondary cases are exhibiting the same trend in testing since vaccination, unconditional of the vaccination status. Vaccinated potential secondary cases have a significantly higher rate of being tested after diagnosis of a primary case in the same household. Shaded areas are 95%-confidence intervals clustered on the household level.

574 7.5 Ct values for vaccinated vs unvaccinated cases

575 One concern in investigating the transmissibility among vaccinated and unvaccinated cases
576 is that the viral load may differ across the two groups. Indeed the literature has shown
577 that the viral load can be reduced for vaccinated individuals with breakthrough infections
578 compared to unvaccinated individuals (Levine-Tiefenbrun et al., 2021). We found that

579 samples from vaccinated primary cases had a lower viral load distribution (higher Ct
580 values) compared to samples from unvaccinated primary cases (Figure 11).

Figure 11: Ct values across vaccinated and unvaccinated primary cases



Notes: This figure shows the density of the Ct values of primary cases stratified by the vaccination status. Samples from vaccinated cases had a lower viral load (higher Ct values) distribution compared to samples from unvaccinated primary cases.

581 However, this result may be biased if, for example, vaccinated cases with a breakthrough
582 infection are being diagnosed later in their infection compared to unvaccinated cases. This
583 could for example occur if vaccinated individuals are tested less regularly than unvacci-
584 nated individuals, if they are asymptomatic or do not develop as severe symptoms, or if
585 they believe they are less likely to be infected because of their vaccination status. We
586 investigated this potential selection bias by comparing secondary cases that were fully
587 vaccinated with unvaccinated secondary cases that tested positive on the same day after
588 exposure of the primary case (Figure 1 and Table 6). We found that vaccinated secondary

589 cases had a lower viral load—a 1.6 point higher Ct value, translating into a third of a
590 standard deviation.

Table 6: Comparison of Ct values between vaccinated and unvaccinated secondary cases

	I	II	III	IV
Fully vaccinated	0.29 (0.8882)	1.61 (0.8655)	1.63 (0.1843)	1.30 (0.2458)
Unvaccinated, mean	28.95	28.95	28.95	28.95
Unvaccinated, STD	4.74	4.74	4.74	4.74
Estimate / STD	0.06	0.34	0.34	0.27
Days since primary case FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age FE	NO	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	NO	NO	YES	YES
Fully vaccinated index	NO	NO	YES	YES
Ct value index	NO	NO	NO	YES
N Observations	6,938	6,938	6,938	4,091
N households	5,088	5,088	5,088	2,963

Notes: This table provides regression estimates for the Ct value for secondary cases, comparing unvaccinated cases with vaccinated cases, controlling for the day of testing since exposure to the primary case and 5 year age fixed effects. FE = Fixed Effects.

591 7.6 Robustness of VE estimates

592 This section addresses the robustness of the VE estimates presented in Table 2. Table 7
593 provides VE estimates, conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result.
594 Thus, we do not assume that all untested contacts are negative. Table 8 provides VE
595 estimates, including Ct values of the primary case as a proxy for viral load. Table 9
596 provides VE estimates, including Ct values of the primary case as a proxy for viral load,
597 conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result. Table 10 provides VE
598 estimates stratified by time since vaccination, in order to take waning immunity into
599 account. Table 11 provides VE estimates stratified by time since vaccination, in order to
600 take waning immunity into account, conditional on the potential secondary case having a
601 test result.

Table 7: Vaccine effectiveness, conditional on potential secondary case having a test result

Primary cases vaccinated Potential secondary cases vaccinated Estimator	Susceptibility			Transmissibility			Combined
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully	
	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/N,V}$	$VET_{V.,/N.,}$	$VEC_{V,V/N,N}$
VE (%)	65	61	61	51	36	28	72
(95%-CI)	(64;67)	(59;64)	(56;65)	(48;53)	(32;40)	(20;35)	(70;73)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Conditional on test	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
N Observations	42,170	29,472	12,698	42,170	20,592	21,578	26,310
N Households	21,086	13,698	7,388	21,086	12,744	14,201	17,220

Notes: This table provides VE estimates from the same model as Table 2, conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result. The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model.

Table 8: Vaccine effectiveness, controlling for primary case Ct values

Primary cases vaccinated Potential secondary cases vaccinated Estimator	Susceptibility			Transmissibility			Combined
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully	
	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/N,V}$	$VET_{V.,/N.,}$	$VEC_{V,V/N,N}$
VE (%)	61	62	47	40	30	4	66
(95%-CI)	(58;63)	(58;64)	(38;54)	(35;45)	(23;36)	(-10;17)	(62;69)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Conditional on test	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
N Observations	28,364	20,148	7,917	28,364	14,236	14,128	17,564
N Households	13,056	8,577	4,311	13,056	8,162	8,898	10,627

Notes: This table provides VE estimates from the same model as Table 2, controlling for the sample Ct value of the primary case. The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model. VES for primary cases fully vaccinated only includes primary cases with a sample Ct value >20.

Table 9: Vaccine effectiveness, controlling for primary case Ct values, conditional on potential secondary case having a test result

	Susceptibility			Transmissibility			Combined
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully	
Primary cases vaccinated							
Potential secondary cases vaccinated							
Estimator	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/N,V}$	$VET_{V.,/.,N}$	$VEC_{V,V/N,N}$
VE (%)	65	62	62	49	34	24	71
(95%-CI)	(63;67)	(59;65)	(56;68)	(45;52)	(27;39)	(12;34)	(68;73)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Conditional on test	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
N Observations	22,638	15,767	6,627	22,638	10,802	11,836	13,865
N Households	11,253	7,241	3,861	11,253	6,757	7,753	9,158

Notes: This table provides VE estimates from the same model as Table 2, controlling for the sample Ct value of the primary case, conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result. The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model. VES for primary cases fully vaccinated only includes primary cases with a sample Ct value >20.

Table 10: Vaccine effectiveness by time since vaccination

Primary cases vaccinated Potential secondary cases vaccinated Estimator	Susceptibility			Transmissibility		
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully
Time since vaccination	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/N,V}$	$VET_{V.,/N.,}$
0-1 months	71 (69;72)	69 (67;71)	59 (53;64)	57 (53;61)	42 (34;48)	36 (26;44)
2-3 months	49 (46;52)	50 (45;54)	32 (23;39)	35 (30;39)	26 (19;33)	-8 (-21;4)
4-5 months	38 (32;43)	42 (32;51)	26 (14;37)	28 (20;35)	22 (6;36)	-8 (-25;7)
5-6 months	27 (18;35)	24 (11;36)	11 (-8;27)	23 (13;32)	16 (-2;31)	-29 (-52;-9)
7-8 months	32 (16;45)	26 (1;45)	28 (1;48)	29 (14;41)	17 (-6;35)	-18 (-50;7)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Conditional on test	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
N Observations	53,584	38,336	15,248	53,584	27,486	26,098
N Households	24,693	16,431	8,262	24,693	15,559	16,493

Notes: This table provides VE estimates from the same model as Table 2 by time since vaccination (bi-monthly). The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model. For VES, the waning immunity is estimated for the potential secondary case. For VET, the waning immunity is estimated for the primary case. Note, the negative VET estimates, when the potential secondary case was fully vaccinated, suggest that there is bias in the comparison of the vaccinated and unvaccinated population that we do not fully control for. We did not find negative VET estimates, when we conditioned on the potential secondary case having a test result (Appendix Table 11), indicating that differences in the probability of being tested across unvaccinated and fully vaccinated potential secondary cases is a bias in our model (Appendix 7.4). Other behavioral biases across unvaccinated and fully vaccinated are also likely. Thus it is most likely that there is a waning effect of vaccination, but it is very unlikely that the effect is negative.

Table 11: Vaccine effectiveness by time since vaccination, conditional on potential secondary case having a test result

Primary cases vaccinated Potential secondary cases vaccinated Estimator	Susceptibility			Transmissibility		
	Pool	Not	Fully	Pool	Not	Fully
	$VES_{N,V/N,N}$	$VES_{V,V/V,N}$	$VES_{.,V/.,N}$	$VET_{V,N/N,N}$	$VET_{V,V/V,N}$	$VET_{V.,/N.,}$
Time since vaccination						
0-1 months	73 (71;75)	69 (67;71)	69 (65;73)	63 (59;66)	45 (38;51)	49 (41;56)
2-3 months	55 (52;58)	50 (46;54)	50 (43;56)	45 (41;48)	30 (24;37)	14 (3;23)
4-5 months	49 (44;53)	45 (36;53)	48 (39;55)	41 (35;46)	29 (15;41)	15 (2;27)
5-6 months	39 (31;46)	29 (17;40)	37 (24;48)	37 (29;44)	28 (12;40)	0 (-18;15)
7-8 months	43 (29;53)	30 (8;48)	50 (31;63)	42 (31;52)	30 (11;45)	9 (-15;28)
Age FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Week FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Household size	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Female, primary case	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Age, primary case, FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Ct value, primary case, FE	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Conditional on test	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
N Observations	42,170	29,472	12,698	42,170	20,592	21,578
N Households	21,086	13,698	7,388	21,086	12,744	14,201

Notes: This table provides VE estimates from the same model as Table 2 by time since vaccination (bi-monthly), conditional on the potential secondary case having a test result. The estimates of vaccine effectiveness against transmissibility (VET) is given as a pooled estimate and stratified by the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases within the household. The combined vaccine effectiveness (VEC) is defined as both the primary and potential secondary case being vaccinated relative to them both being unvaccinated. Vaccine effectiveness is estimated as one minus the relative risk of vaccinated individuals relative to unvaccinated individuals. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parentheses. FE = included as fixed effects in the model. For VES, the waning immunity is estimated for the potential secondary case. For VET, the waning immunity is estimated for the primary case. Note that the VE estimates across columns are not directly comparable as they are estimated on stratified samples. 95% confidence intervals clustered on the household level in parenthesis.

602 8 Statistical Appendix

603 This section provides more details of the statistical methods used to generate the results
604 presented in the main manuscript.

605 We defined the secondary attack rate (SAR) as the proportion of potential secondary cases
606 that were infected within each household 1-14 days after exposure to a primary case. We
607 only included individuals that were either fully vaccinated (V) or not vaccinated (N), thus
608 excluding individuals that were partially vaccinated.

609 To compare attack rates across different vaccination status of primary cases and potential
610 secondary cases, we estimated the relative risk (RR). The vaccine effectiveness (VE) is
611 given by one minus the relative risk (1-RR) of the SAR of vaccinated individuals compared
612 to the SAR of the unvaccinated individuals. We stratified our analyses in order to separate
613 the effect of susceptibility (VES), the effect of transmissibility (VET), and the combined
614 effect (VEC). In particular, we use the following 7 equations, with underlying estimates
615 for SAR produced using generalized linear models that control for age, sex, household
616 size, and calendar week, with standard errors clustered on the household level.

617 Let SAR_{θ_p, θ_i} denote the SAR, where θ is the vaccination status $\theta \in \{V, N\}$ (*Fully Vacci-*
618 *nated* or *Not vaccinated*) of primary cases (p) and potential secondary cases (i). Let “.”
619 denote the pooled sample of both vaccination statuses. Thus, the pooled SAR is denoted
620 as $SAR_{.,.}$.

621 Vaccine effectiveness of susceptibility (VES)

622 First, we compared the SAR across potential secondary cases that were fully vaccinated
623 and potential secondary cases that were not vaccinated, unconditional of the vaccination
624 status of the primary case.

625 The pooled vaccine effectiveness against susceptibility (VES) is given by:

$$VES_{.,V/.N} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{.,V}}{SAR_{.,N}}, \quad (1)$$

626 i.e., the SAR of vaccinated potential secondary cases relative to the SAR of unvaccinated
627 potential secondary cases.

628 Next, we hold the vaccination status of the primary case fixed, and compare the SAR
629 across potential secondary cases that are fully vaccinated and not vaccinated.

630 Vaccine effectiveness of susceptibility among unvaccinated primary cases is given by:

$$VES_{N,V/N,N} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{N,V}}{SAR_{N,N}} \quad (2)$$

631 Vaccine effectiveness of susceptibility among fully vaccinated primary cases is given by:

$$VES_{V,V/V,N} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{V,V}}{SAR_{V,N}} \quad (3)$$

632 **Vaccine effectiveness of transmissibility (*VET*)**

633 First, we compared the SAR across primary cases that were fully vaccinated and not
634 vaccinated, unconditional of the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases.

635 The pooled vaccine effectiveness of transmissibility (*VET*) is given by:

$$VET_{V,./N,.} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{V,.}}{SAR_{N,.}} \quad (4)$$

636 Next, we hold the vaccination status of the potential secondary cases fixed, and compare
637 the SAR across primary cases that are fully vaccinated and not vaccinated.

638 Vaccine effectiveness of transmissibility among unvaccinated potential secondary cases is
639 given by:

$$VET_{V,N/N,N} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{V,N}}{SAR_{N,N}} \quad (5)$$

640 Vaccine effectiveness of transmissibility among fully vaccinated potential secondary cases
641 is given by:

$$VET_{V,V/V,N,V} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{V,V}}{SAR_{N,V}} \quad (6)$$

642 Combined effectiveness (*VEC*)

643 Finally, we compared the SAR, where both the primary and potential secondary cases
644 were fully vaccinated, with the SAR, where both the primary and potential secondary
645 cases were unvaccinated.

646 The combined vaccine effectiveness is given by:

$$VEC_{V,V/N,N} = 1 - \frac{SAR_{V,V}}{SAR_{N,N}}, \quad (7)$$

647 Estimation

648 We estimated the relative risks for VES, VET and VEC using the following generalized
649 linear model, with a Poisson distribution response and log link function:

$$y_{i,p} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{i,p}) \quad (8)$$
$$\log(\lambda_{i,p}) = Vacc + Age_i + Age_p + Sex_i + Sex_p + HouseholdSize_p + Week_t,$$

650 where *Vacc* is a binary fixed effect representing one of the following explanatory variables
651 for each model:

652 - For VES, *Vacc* refers to vaccination status of the potential secondary case *i*.

653 - For VET, *Vacc* refers to vaccination status of the primary case *p*.

654 - For VEC, *Vacc* refers to vaccination status of both the primary and potential secondary
655 case *p, i*.

656 *Age* denotes categorical fixed effects of age group in 10 year intervals, *Sex* is a binary
657 fixed effect controlling for sex, *HouseholdSize* denotes categorical fixed effects of the
658 number of household members, and *Week* is a categorical fixed effect of the calendar
659 week *t*. Standard errors were clustered on the household level in order to control for
660 within-household correlation in risk.

661 Note that the Poisson distribution is used with binary outcome in order to facilitate the
662 calculation of relative risks.