1	Title: Impact of COVID-19 and Effects of Vaccination with BNT162b2 on Patient-Reported
2	Health-Related Quality of Life, Symptoms, and Work Productivity Among US Adult Outpatients
3	with SARS-CoV-2
4	
5	Authors: Manuela Di Fusco ^{1*} , Xiaowu Sun ² , Mary M. Moran ³ , Henriette Coetzer ² , Joann M.
6	Zamparo ³ , Laura Puzniak ³ , Mary B. Alvarez ⁴ , Ying P. Tabak ² , Joseph C. Cappelleri ⁵
7	
8	Affiliations:
9	¹ Pfizer Inc., Health Economics and Outcomes Research, New York, NY, USA
10	² CVS Health, Woonsocket, RI, USA
11	³ Pfizer Inc., MDSCA Vaccines, Collegeville, PA, USA
12	⁴ Pfizer Inc., Field Medical Outcomes and Analytics, New York, NY, USA
13	⁵ Pfizer Inc., Statistical Research and Data Science Center, Groton, CT, USA
14	
15	*Corresponding author:
16	Manuela Di Fusco
17	Health Economics and Outcomes Research
18	Pfizer, Inc., New York, NY, USA
19	Manuela.difusco@pfizer.com
20	
21	
22	
23	

24 ABSTRACT

25 Background: Although there is extensive literature on the clinical benefits of COVID-19 26 vaccination, data on humanistic effects are limited. This study evaluated the impact of SARS-27 CoV-2 infection on symptoms, Health Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) and Work Productivity 28 and Impairment (WPAI) prior to and one month following infection, and compared results 29 between individuals vaccinated with BNT162b2 and those unvaccinated. 30 **Methods:** Subjects with ≥ 1 self-reported symptom and positive RT-PCR for SARS-CoV-2 at 31 CVS Health US test sites were recruited between 01/31/2022-04/30/2022. Socio-demographics, 32 clinical characteristics and vaccination status were evaluated. Self-reported symptoms, HRQoL, 33 and WPAI outcomes were assessed using questionnaires and validated instruments (EQ-5D-5L, 34 WPAI-GH) across acute COVID time points from pre-COVID to Week 4, and between 35 vaccination groups. Mixed models for repeated measures were conducted for multivariable 36 analyses, adjusting for several covariates. Effect size (ES) of Cohen's d was calculated to quantify the magnitude of outcome changes within and between vaccination groups. 37 38 Results: The study population included 430 subjects: 197 unvaccinated and 233 vaccinated with 39 BNT162b2. Mean (SD) age was 42.4 years (14.3), 76.0% were female, 38.8% reported prior 40 infection and 24.2% at least one comorbidity. Statistically significant differences in outcomes 41 were observed compared with baseline and between groups. The EQ-Visual analogue scale 42 scores and Utility Index dropped in both cohorts at Day 3 and increased by Week 4, but did not 43 return to pre-COVID levels. The mean changes were statistically lower in the BNT162b2 cohort 44 at Day 3 and Week 4. The BNT162b2 cohort reported lower prevalence and fewer symptoms at 45 index date and Week 4. At Week 1, COVID-19 had a large impact on all WPAI-GH domains: 46 the work productivity time loss among unvaccinated and vaccinated was 65.0% and 53.8%, and

2

- 47 the mean activity impairment was 50.2% and 43.9%, respectively. With the exception of
- 48 absenteeism at Week 4, the BNT162b2 cohort was associated with statistically significant less
- 49 worsening in all WPAI-GH scores at both Week 1 and 4.
- 50 Conclusions: COVID-19 negatively impacted HRQoL and work productivity among mildly
- 51 symptomatic outpatients. Compared with unvaccinated, those vaccinated with BNT162b2 were
- 52 less impacted by COVID-19 infection and recovered faster.
- 53
- 54 Keywords: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, HRQoL, WPAI, Quality of Life, COVID-19 symptoms,
- 55 BNT162b2, humanistic

56 BACKGROUND

57 The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the sustainability of quality of life of patients has 58 been reported globally [1-4]. The prolonged multisystem symptoms associated to SARS-CoV-2 59 infection can negatively affect daily activities, ability to work, and social interactions, leading to 60 poor health-related quality of life (HRQoL) [1-4].

61 The introduction of COVID-19 vaccination has significantly impacted the COVID-19 response,

62 and evidence regarding the efficacy, safety and effectiveness of vaccination is extensive [5].

63 However, there is limited research on the potential benefits of vaccination on physical, mental,

64 social, emotional functioning and economic well-being. Most of the studies assessing humanistic

65 outcomes of COVID-19 infection have been limited to inpatients [1, 2, 6] were conducted

outside of the US or focused on specific disease states and organ-specific functions [7-9].

67 Leveraging a US national retail pharmacy SARS-CoV-2 test database and using validated

68 patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs), this study assessed COVID-19 symptoms,

69 HRQoL and WPAI prior to through one month following SARS-CoV-2 infection in outpatients,

and compared results between unvaccinated individuals and those vaccinated with BNT162b2.

71

72 **METHODS**

73 Study Design and Participants

The source population consisted of individuals testing for SARS-CoV-2 at one of ~5,000 CVS
Health test sites across the US. As part of the registration process for scheduling a SARS-CoV-2
test at CVS Health, individuals are required to complete a screening questionnaire including
demographics, symptoms, comorbidities, and vaccination status. The screening variables and

78	RT-PCR test results are loaded in an analytic dataset, where ~80-90% of test results are reported
79	within 2-3 days. Leveraging this analytic platform, this study was designed as a prospective
80	survey-based patient-reported outcomes study targeting adults ≥ 18 with a positive RT-PCR test
81	result and self-reporting at least one symptom. These individuals were emailed an invitation as
82	soon as the test results became available, no later than 4 days from testing. The email invitation
83	directed the potential participants to an e-consent website to learn about the study, survey
84	schedule and informed consent. Figure 1 summarizes the study design. Recruitment of
85	participants was carried out between 01/31/2022 and 04/30/2022 (Ct.gov NCT05160636).
86	
87	Data Sources and Variables
88	Baseline characteristics and symptoms
89	Baseline characteristics of the participants were obtained via the CVS Health pre-test screening
90	questionnaire. These included self-reported demographics, comorbidities (including
91	immunocompromised status), COVID-19 vaccination history, social determinants of health
92	including the Social Vulnerability Index (SVI), work and/or residency in a high-risk or
93	healthcare setting, and symptoms. The list of baseline COVID-19 symptoms was based on the
94	CDC [10].
95	
96	Exposure groups
97	Immunocompetent participants were considered fully vaccinated with BNT162b2 if they self-
98	reported receipt of 2 doses of BNT162b2 \geq 14 days of SARS-CoV-2 testing. They were
99	considered partially vaccinated if reporting receipt of a single dose and boosted if reporting
100	receipt of 3 doses. Participants self-reporting an immunocompromising condition and receipt of

101	3 doses were considered fully vaccinated (i.e., 3-dose primary series completion); if reporting 4
102	doses, they were considered boosted. Participants were considered unvaccinated if they did not
103	report any COVID-19 vaccine dose prior to testing. Heterologous schedules were excluded.
104	
105	HRQoL

- 106 To assess HRQoL, we used the validated EQ-5D-5L questionnaire [11, 12]. On the day of
- 107 enrollment, consented participants completed the EQ-5D-5L questionnaire twice, using two

108 versions: a modified version where all the questions were past tense to retrospectively assess pre-

109 COVID-19 baseline QoL, and the standard version in present tense to assess current QoL. To

110 minimize responder bias, the order of administration of the two versions was random.

111 Subsequent completion was requested at one month (short-term study design in Figure 1). The

112 EQ-5D-5L results at each time point were converted into the Utility Index (UI) using the US-

113 based weights by Pickard et al [12, 13].

114

115 Work Productivity and Activity Impairment

To measure impairments in both paid work and unpaid work, we used the Work Productivity and Activity Impairment General Health V2.0 (WPAI:GH) measure [14, 15]. Participants were asked to complete this questionnaire twice, seven days after their RT-PCR test: once referencing seven days prior to COVID-19 symptom onset and an additional assessment referencing the past seven days. Similar to the EQ-5D-5L, subsequent completion of the WPAI was requested at one month (Figure 1). Four WPAI scores were computed at each time point: percent of worktime missed

122 (absenteeism), percent of impairment while working (presenteeism), percent of work

- 123 productivity loss (considering both absenteeism and presenteeism), and percent of activity
- 124 impairment. Only employed subjects were included for work productivity analyses.
- 125

126 Post-COVID 19 Symptoms and Vaccination Status Update

127 To supplement the pre-test screening questionnaire and enable the collection of on-going or new

128 symptoms after the acute phase, participants were sent an additional survey four weeks following

129 the test asking to complete a checklist of COVID-19 related symptoms based on the CDC list

130 [16], To confirm vaccination status, participants' subsequent responses to vaccination date

131 questions were compared with their index responses; if responses did not match, the information

132 was queried and adjudicated, and the latest information was typically used.

133

134 Statistical Analysis

135 Descriptive statistics were used to analyze participant characteristics at baseline. Continuous 136 variables were described using means and standard deviations. Categorical variables were 137 reported using number and percentage distributions. For continuous variables, t-tests were used 138 to test difference in means and Wilcoxon tests were used to test difference in medians. For 139 categorical variables, chi-square tests were used to test differences between groups When cell 140 frequency was less than 5, Fisher's exact tests were used for 2-by-2 tables and Freeman-Halton 141 tests for r-by-c tables [17, 18]. P values were all two-sided and not adjusted for multiplicity. 142 Mixed models for repeated measures (MMRM) [19] were used to estimate the magnitude of 143 COVID-19 impact on HRQoL and WPAI over time. Models included variables of time, self-144 reported SARS-CoV-2 vaccination status, and interaction of time by vaccination status, as well 145 as covariates of participant pre-COVID-19 symptom onset score, sociodemographic

146	characteristics (age, sex, regions, social vulnerability, race/ethnicity, high risk occupations),
147	previously tested positive for COVID-19, severity of acute illness (number of symptoms reported
148	on index date), and immunocompromised status. Assessment time was fitted as a categorical
149	covariate and a repeated effect (repeated by subject). Least squares mean (LS mean) and
150	standard errors of PRO scores for each time point of assessment were calculated. Per guidelines,
151	no adjustment was made for missing data when scoring the EQ-5D-5L UI and WPAI [11, 15].
152	Missing data at each time were not imputed. All available data were included in the analysis.
153	
154	Cohen's d, or a variation of it, was calculated to assess the magnitude of score change from
155	baseline within the BNT162b2 vaccinated cohort and, separately, the unvaccinated cohort, as
156	well as the difference between BNT162b2 and unvaccinated cohorts [20, 21]. Specifically,
157	within-cohort effect size (ES) was calculated as mean change from baseline to follow-up, divided
158	by the standard deviation of change scores from baseline to follow-up. Between-cohort ES was
159	calculated as the difference in mean changes from baseline between cohorts, divided by the
160	pooled standard deviation of change scores. When calculating model based ESs, the numerators
161	were the predicted mean change from the model for within-cohort ESs, and predicted differences
162	from the model for between-cohort ESs. Denominators were the corresponding observed
163	standard deviations. Values of 0.2, 0.5, and 0.8 standard deviation (SD) units represent small,
164	medium, and large ES, respectively. These cut-off estimates have been widely used to establish
165	important differences in HRQoL studies [22]. As such, we considered the magnitude of
166	(standardized) effect sizes of at least 0.20 SD units as important or meaningful differences in
167	gauging the magnitude of within-patient change and between-group differences. All data
168	obtained were collected and analyzed with SAS Version 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). The

8

169 study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology

- 170 (STROBE) reporting guideline [23].
- 171

172 **RESULTS**

173 **Baseline characteristics**

- 174 A total of 39,889 eligible candidates were outreached. Of those, 676 consented and completed
- the first survey, for a consent rate of 1.7%. Compared with individuals in the CVS Health
- analytic dataset who did not participate in our study, the study sample was over-represented by
- 177 women and Caucasians, with slightly more individuals vaccinated and with comorbidities

178 (Supplemental Table 1). The final study population included 430 subjects (Figure 2). 100%

- 179 completed the EQ-5D-5L questionnaire at pre-COVID-19 baseline and at Day 3, and 77.0%
- 180 completed it at Week 4. The WPAI-GH questionnaire was completed by 88.1% of the
- 181 participants at pre-COVID-19 baseline, 88.1% at Week 1 and 76.9% at Week 4.
- 182 The sociodemographic characteristics of the baseline participants are shown in Table 1. Overall,

183 the mean (SD) age was 42.4 (14.3), 76% were female, 68.6% Caucasian, 58.7% from Southern

184 US. There were 24.2% participants who reported ≥ 1 comorbidities, including 4.4% with

185 immunocompromising conditions and 39% reported a previous COVID-19 infection.

About 46% (197) were unvaccinated and 54% (233) were vaccinated with BNT162b2; of those,

respectively 140 (60%) and 93 (40%) received 2 and 3 doses. Compared with unvaccinated,

188 BNT162b2 participants were comparable with respect to gender, working and living settings, and

- 189 comorbidities, slight older with mean age 43.7 vs. 40.9 (p=0.049); living in less vulnerable area
- 190 with lower mean social vulnerability index (0.40 vs. 0.49, P<<0.001); and slight differences in

race/ethnicity and region. In the vaccinated group, mean (SD) time since vaccination beforeinfection was 186 (105) days.

- 193 At index date, the most reported acute symptoms were respiratory and systemic. BNT162b2
- 194 vaccinated participants reported fewer overall acute COVID-19 symptoms on average than
- 195 unvaccinated participants, mean 5.1 vs. 5.6, P=0.034 (Table 1). Directionally, the proportions of
- all systemic and GI-related symptoms were numerically lower in the BNT162b2 cohort. Relative
- 197 to unvaccinated, those vaccinated with BNT162b2 reported significantly fewer symptoms of
- 198 fever (30.5% vs. 47.2% P<0.001), chills (42.9% vs. 57.4%, P=0.003), muscle or body aches
- 199 (49.4% vs. 59.4%, P=0.038), and diarrhea (15.9% vs. 25.9%, P=0.010), but more congestion or
- 200 runny nose (80.7% vs. 68.0%, P=0.003).
- 201

202 **Post-COVID-19 symptoms**

At Week 4, the mean number of symptoms was statistically lower in the BNT162B2 cohort (2.5

vs. 3.7, p=0.002). The overall prevalence decreased over time too, especially fever, cough,

205 headache, fatigue, diarrhea, muscle pain; however, ~70% of participants still reported at least 1

- 206 post-COVID-19 symptom. Directionally, the proportions of all symptoms were numerically
- 207 lower in the BNT162b2 cohort. Symptoms of worsening after physical or mental activities
- 208 (10.3% vs. 20.6%), general pain/discomfort (11.4% vs. 19.4%), change in smell or taste (10.9%
- 209 vs. 20.6%), headache (16.0% vs. 25.2%), sleep problems (20.0% vs. 29.7%), mood changes
- 210 (7.4% vs. 14.8%), memory loss (6.3% vs. 17.4%) and diarrhea (3.4% vs. 11.0%) were
- 211 statistically significant (P < 0.05) (Table 2).
- 212

213 Health-Related Quality of life

214 Utility Index scores

- 215 Mean pre-COVID-19 baseline UIs did not differ between the BNT162b2 and unvaccinated
- cohorts, respectively 0.924 and 0.918 (P=0.547). COVID-19 infection had a detrimental effect
- 217 on the HRQoL of participants, especially during the acute episode (Day 3). In both the
- 218 BNT162b2 and the unvaccinated cohorts, UIs were lower at Day 3 and Week 4 relative to pre-
- 219 COVID-19. While UIs improvement was observed over time, the UI did not return to pre-
- 220 COVID levels at Week 4 (Table 3).
- 221 The BNT162B2 cohort was less impacted than the unvaccinated cohort, at both Day 3 and Week
- 4. After controlling for pre-COVID baseline score and other covariates, the least-square estimate
- 223 UI scores at Day 3 were, respectively 0.77 and 0.84 in the unvaccinated and BNT162B2 cohorts
- (Table 4). Moderate ESs of, respectively, 0.64 and 0.49 were observed from baseline. At Week
- 4, the least-square estimate UI scores were, respectively, 0.86 and 0.90. Small-to-moderate ESs
- of, respectively, 0.38 and 0.13 were observed from baseline. The differences between the two
- 227 groups were statistically significant (P<0.05). (Table 4) Small-to-medium ESs between cohorts
- were observed and were 0.36 and 0.32 for Day 3 and Week 4, respectively. (Table 4,

229 Supplemental Figure 1 and 2)

230

231 *EQ-VAS*

232 The pattern of EQ-VAS scores was similar to that observed for UIs. Mean pre-COVID-19

baseline EQ-VAS were similar for the BNT162b2 and unvaccinated cohorts, respectively 86.9

- and 87.8 (P=0.414) (Table 3). Similar to the UIs, the pre-COVID EQ-VAS were rated relatively
- high by the participants, indicating a generally healthy cohort. The least-square estimate EQ-
- VAS scores for the BNT162b2 and unvaccinated cohorts were, respectively, 76.2 and 72.6 at

237	Day 3 and 85.0 and 81.6 at Week 4. After controlling for pre-COVID-19 baseline score and
238	other covariates, the least-square estimates of change from pre-COVID-19 baseline in EQ VAS
239	for the BNT162B2 and the unvaccinated cohort were -11.1 and -14.8, respectively on Day 3, and
240	-2.3 and -5.7, respectively at Week 4. COVID-19 had a large adverse impact on EQ-VAS with
241	an ES of -0.89 for BNT162B2 cohort and -0.86 for Unvaccinated cohort on Day 3, and small ES
242	(-0.22) for BNT162B2 cohort and approaching medium ES (-0.42) for Unvaccinated cohort at
243	Week 4. BNT162B2 cohort was associated with 3.6 (P=0.013) on Day 3 and 3.4 (P=0.016) at
244	Week 4 less drop in EQ VAS than the Unvaccinated cohort. The ESs between cohorts were
245	small yet relevant, being 0.25 and 0.28 for Day 3 and Week 4, respectively (Table 4,
246	Supplemental Figure 1 and 2).
247	
248	EQ-5D-5L dimensions
249	The health status of the study participants according to the dimensions of EQ-5D-5L is reported
250	in Figure 3 and Supplemental Table 2. In both groups, at Day 3, over half of the cohort reported
251	problems in usual activities, pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression, while the vast majority
252	reported no or slight problems in mobility and self-care. At Week 4, the vast majority continued
253	to report no or slight problems with mobility, self-care, as well as for usual activities; most
254	reported no, slight or moderate problems with pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression.
255	BNT162b2 cohort had lower mean responses across all 5 domains at both Day 3 and Week 4
256	relative to unvaccinated.
257	

258 Work Productivity and Activity Impairment

259	Approximately 65% of participants reported being currently employed at baseline (155 in the
260	BNT162b2 cohort and 129 unvaccinated), and were eligible to complete the absenteeism,
261	presenteeism and work-productivity loss questions. At Week 1, COVID-19 had a large impact on
262	all four WPAI-GH domains for both the unvaccinated and BNT162b2cohort. The mean time loss
263	due to absenteeism was, respectively, 65.0% and 45.6%; the mean time loss due to presenteeism
264	was, respectively, 46.8% and 38.4%; the mean time of work productivity loss was 65.0% and
265	53.8%, and the mean time of activity impairment was 50.2% and 43.9%. All within-cohort ESs
266	were > 0.8, which are considered large effects (Table 3). After controlling for pre-COVID-19
267	baseline score, and other covariates, the BNT162b2 cohort was associated with less worsening in
268	WPAI-GH scores. Small-to-medium ESs were observed for work-related scores (absenteeism -
269	0.50, presenteeism -0.26, and work productivity loss -0.32) between the BNT162b2 cohort and
270	the unvaccinated cohort (Table 4). At Week 4, the mean time loss dropped across all four
271	domains. The time loss due to absenteeism dropped substantially; the change from baseline in
272	absenteeism was not found to be statistically significant between the BNT162b2 cohort and the
273	unvaccinated cohort. Small-to-medium ESs were observed for presenteeism (-0.38) work
274	productivity loss (-0.29), and activity impairment (-0.34) between the BNT162b2 cohort and the
275	unvaccinated cohort (Table 4, Supplemental Figure 3 and 4).

276

277 **DISCUSSION**

278 The impacts of SARS-CoV-2 infection go beyond its clinical outcomes.

279 We found that mild acute infection can negatively impact the humanistic outcomes for up to four

280 weeks post infection. Shortly after infection, the UI and EQ-VAS HRQoL scores dropped from

281 pre-COVID, and over half of the study population reported problems in usual activities,

282 pain/discomfort and anxiety/depression. At Week 1, the work productivity and activity 283 impairment time loss were over 50%. At Week 4, both the HRQoL and WPAI scores improved, 284 although they did not return to pre-COVID levels. Individuals vaccinated with BNT162b2 were 285 less impacted and recovered faster than unvaccinated individuals. Multivariable analyses showed 286 that BNT162b2 was significantly associated with higher EQ-VAS and UI scores, less symptoms 287 and better WPAI scores, except for absenteeism at Week 4. 288 There is limited evidence measuring the health-related wellbeing of non-hospitalized individuals 289 affected by COVID-19 [1-4]. To our knowledge, this is the first report measuring the impact of 290 COVID-19 on the HRQoL and WPAI among a national sample of outpatients in the United 291 States. In contrast to our study, previous research that used EQ-5D scales to measure COVID-19 292 impact on the HRQoL reported mean UI scores ranging from 0.61 to 0.86 depending on the 293 hospitalization treatment and time since discharge [1, 2]. The EQ-VAS scores ranged from 50.7 294 to 70.3 [1, 2]. In our study, the HRQoL scores at Day 3 and Week 4 among outpatients with mild 295 disease are higher than those, likely due to the different study populations and periods. In a small 296 US study assessing the impact of COVID-19 on WPAI ~4 months post-infection among subjects 297 enrolled in clinical trials before the introduction of vaccines, 46% of the non-hospitalized 298 patients reported health-related impairment in daily activities [24]. Among the employed, 11.5% 299 missed work and 38.9% reported impairment at work due to health. In our study, all the WPAI 300 scores among unvaccinated at Week 1 are higher, and those at Week 4 similar or lower than 301 those, likely due to the different cut-off, study populations, periods and design. 302 HRQoL and WPAI studies are scarce in COVID-19 related vaccination research. To our 303 knowledge, this is the first report on the effects of BNT162b2 on these patient-centric outcomes.

These results indicate an additive benefit beyond vaccine effectiveness that should be exploredfurther.

306 Strengths of this study include the nationally representative real-world source population of

- 307 mildly symptomatic outpatients, the prospective collection of the primary outcomes via validated
- 308 instruments, and the representativeness of the employed population for work productivity
- analyses (~65% of the cohort). The age distribution of study participants was comparable with
- 310 the non-enrolled tested population (p=0.076 for mean age, Supplemental Table 1) and with CDC
- research in non-hospitalized adults: 91.6% were between 18 and 64 and 8.4% were 65 or older,
- 312 which was quite similar to Hernandez-Romieu [25], 92.7% and 7.3%, respectively. In the
- 313 vaccinated group, the time between vaccination and breakthrough infection (mean: ~6 months)
- 314 was consistent with literature on vaccine-induced duration of protection [5].

315 The study findings are subject to limitations. All the data analyzed was self-reported and may be

316 subject to error, missingness, recall bias, social desirability bias, and selection bias associated

317 with survey drop-out. Out of 430 participants completing Day 3 survey, 12% (51/430) missed

318 Week 1 and 23% (99/430) missed Week 4 survey. The drop in responses may partly be the result

319 of responders' fatigue, and/or recovered cases not returning to follow-up surveys. Female and

older age (\geq 30 years) were found to be more likely to miss follow-up surveys. However, after

taking into account several variables, the model predicting missingness indicated that

322 missingness was not associated with vaccination status, nor with HRQoL in terms of EQ VAS on

323 Day 3 and its change from pre-COVID-19 baseline (

324 Supplemental Table 4).

325	The study population differed from non-enrolled tested outpatients in being predominantly
326	female, white, with a higher vaccination uptake, and slightly more comorbidities (Supplemental
327	Table 1). The female over-representation is in line with prior research indicating that women are
328	more likely to contribute to health research surveys [2]. In our study, ~24% of participants
329	reported at least one comorbidity, in contrast to 20% among the non-enrolled tested and \sim 35% in
330	Hernandez-Romieu (2021) [25]. Various models were fit to account for potential effects due to
331	sociodemographic factors and comorbidities. These adjusted effect sizes between BNT162b2 and
332	unvaccinated cohorts were similar and consistent with those calculated from observed data
333	(unadjusted effect sizes).
334	The pre-COVID baseline scores were slightly higher than US population norms. The mean EQ-
335	VAS and UI were 86.9 and 0.924 for the BNT162b2 cohort, and 87.8 and 0.918 for the
336	unvaccinated cohort, respectively. Cha et al (2019) reported a mean EQ-VAS of 84.6 for the U.S.
337	general population [12]. Jiang et al (2021) reported the US population norm of EQ-VAS as 80.4
338	and the mean EQ-5D-5L UI as 0.851 [26]. The healthy pre-infection status of the study
339	population and the potential for retrospective recall bias may partially explain the differences. A
340	modified EQ-5D-5L questionnaire was used to retrospectively measure pre-COVID-19 baseline
341	data; despite literature suggesting concordance between prospective and retrospective
342	measurements of EQ-5D-5L [27, 28], and a good correlation between assessment of baseline
343	before the index date and recall assessment of the baseline after index date, there is currently no
344	information regarding the recall application of the EQ-5D-5L for COVID-related studies.
345	The pre-COVID-19 values for absenteism and presenteeism were 3.1% and 9.5% in the
346	BNT162b2 cohort, and were generally in line with Tundia et al (2015) [29], whom reported 4%

absenteeism and 10% presenteeism for the US general population. The reported values wereslightly higher among unvaccinated, respectively 11.7% and 9.4%.

349

350 There is currently no standard definition of minimal clinically important difference of PROs in 351 COVID-19 research. We used effect size (ES) of Cohen's d to quantify the magnitude of score 352 change from baseline within the BNT162b2 vaccinated cohort and the unvaccinated cohort, as 353 well the difference between these two cohorts [20]. An effect size ES of 0 between groups 354 indicates that the average (typical) treated vaccinated person has a score that is no different from 355 the typical control person; equivalently, scores of the typical treated person are more favorable 356 than 50% of the individual scores in the control group, meaning no incremental benefit (a coin 357 toss as to which intervention is better). If the vaccinated cohort is presumed more effective than 358 the unvaccinated cohort, effect sizes thresholds of 0.2, 0.3, 0.5, and 0.8 (in absolute value) 359 indicate that, based on the standardized normal distribution, the score of the typical person in the 360 vaccinated cohort is more favorable than 58% (8% incremental benefit), 62% (12% incremental 361 benefit), 69% (19% incremental benefit), and 70% (29% increment benefit) of the scores from 362 individuals in the unvaccinated cohort. For example, from baseline to Week 1, the increase in the 363 absenteeism WPAI score of the typical person in the vaccinated cohort was less (more favorable) 364 than the corresponding change in 69% of individuals in the unvaccinated group (effect size = -365 0.5). Depending on the type of outcome, the same type of effect size interpretation for between 366 cohorts can be given within cohort. For instance, from baseline to Week 4, the quality of life EQ-367 VAS score of the typical person in the vaccine cohort at Week 4 was less (worse) than 59% of 368 the individual scores in the vaccine cohort at baseline (effect size = -0.22); the quality of life EQ-

369 VAS score of the typical person in the unvaccinated cohort at Week 4 was less (worse) than 66%
370 of the individual scores in the unvaccinated cohort at baseline (effect size = -0.42).

371

372 The study did not assess the impact on pediatrics, caregivers, long-term outcomes (e.g., "Long 373 COVID"), and the data was collected during Omicron predominance in the US. Therefore, these 374 findings may not be generalizable to prior or future variants, other countries, time periods and 375 populations that were excluded. COVID-19 sequalae can affect a substantial portion of patients, 376 with long-term consequences for their health, continuity of care and ability to work [1, 2]. 377 Persistent symptoms and work impairment were reported ~4 months after infection among non-378 hospitalized US patients enrolled in clinical trials [24]. Continued follow-up studies covering 379 longer time periods may inform whether the protection provided by COVID-19 vaccination 380 extends beyond the acute phase. Only generic PROMs were used in this study; COVID-19 381 disease-specific instruments are under development [30, 31], warranting research on their 382 implementation. The PROMs omitted questions on vaccine adverse events. The mean 6-month 383 interval between vaccination and breakthrough infection and a medical review ruled out cases of 384 residual symptoms from vaccination. Research on the impact of vaccine adverse events on 385 HRQoL is warranted. 386 Lastly, the study adopted an observational design, which is limited in establishing causal

relationships. Future studies using different data collection methods could corroborate the studyfindings, including those with more rigorous study design.

389 Consistent with literature, our study found that COVID-19 is detrimental to mildly symptomatic

390 COVID-19 patients. The findings provide a meaningful contribution suggesting that the ability

18

391	of BNT162b2 to reduce adverse outcomes from COVID-19 disease can translate to lessening the
392	broad impact of COVID-19 and improvements in quality of life, work productivity and activity.
393	

394 CONCLUSION

This study found that mild COVID-19 infection at a time of Omicron predominance adversely
impacted the HRQoL, daily activity and work productivity of patients. This detrimental effect

improved over time, although it persisted for at least one month post infection. Compared with

398 unvaccinated, those vaccinated with BNT162b2 were less impacted and recovered faster. These

399 findings advance research on COVID-19 associated humanistic outcomes and the potential effect

400 of BNT162b2 in lessening the loss of HRQoL, daily activity and work productivity due to

401 COVID-19. The results can inform the estimation of quality-adjusted life years and indirect cost

402 savings in health economic studies.

403

404 List of Abbreviations

405 CDC: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CI: Confidence interval; EQ-5D-5L:

406 EuroQoL Group 5 dimension and 5 level questionnaire; ES: Effect size; GH: General Health;

407 HRQoL: Health Related Quality of Life; MMRM: Mixed models for repeated measures; SD:

408 standard deviation; SE: standard error; STROBE: the Strengthening the Reporting of

409 Observational Studies in Epidemiology; UI: utility index; VAS: Visual analogue scale; WPAI:

410 Work Productivity and Impairment.

411

412 **DECLARATIONS:**

413 Ethics Approval and consent to participate

- 414 This study was approved by the Sterling IRB, Protocol #C4591034. Participation in the study
- 415 was voluntary and anonymous. Consent was obtained electronically via the CVS Health E-
- 416 Consent platform. Participants were informed of their right to refuse or withdraw from the study
- 417 at any time. Participants were compensated for their time.

418 **Consent for publication**

419 All authors have given their approval for this manuscript version to be published.

420 Availability of data and material

- 421 Aggregated data that support the findings of this study are available upon reasonable request
- 422 from the corresponding author MDF, subject to review. These data are not publicly available due
- 423 to them containing information that could compromise research participant privacy/consent.

424 Competing interests

- 425 MDF, MMM, JMZ, LP, MBA and JCC are employees of Pfizer and may hold stock or stock
- 426 options of Pfizer. XS and HC are employees of CVS Health and may hold stock of CVS health.
- 427 YPT was employee of CVS Health when current study was conducted.

428 Funding

429 This study was sponsored by Pfizer Inc.

430 Authors' contributions

- 431 All named authors meet the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE) criteria
- 432 for authorship for this article. All authors contributed to study conception and design, data
- 433 acquisition, analysis, and interpretation, drafting and revising of the manuscript.

434 Acknowledgements

- 435 The authors acknowledge Alejandro Cane, Deepa Malhotra and Nancy Gifford (Pfizer
- 436 employees), Joseph Ferenchick, Shiyu Lin and Shawn Edmonds (CVS Health employees) for

- 437 specific contributions to this research project. Editorial support was provided by Laura Anatale-
- 438 Tardiff and Leena Samuel at CVS Health and was funded by Pfizer.

439

440 **REFERENCES**

Poudel AN, Zhu S, Cooper N, Roderick P, Alwan N, Tarrant C, Ziauddeen N, Yao GL
 (2021) Impact of Covid-19 on health-related quality of life of patients: A structured
 review. PLoS One. 16(10):e0259164.

- Augusta 2. Nandasena H, Pathirathna M, Atapattu A, Prasanga P (2022) Quality of life of COVID 19
 patients after discharge: Systematic review. PloS one. 17(2):e0263941.
- 446 3. Figueiredo EAB, Silva WT, Tsopanoglou SP, Vitorino DFdM, Oliveira LFLd, Silva
- 447 KLS, Luz HDH, Ávila MR, Oliveira LFFd, Lacerda ACR (2022) The health-related
 448 quality of life in patients with post-COVID-19 after hospitalization: a systematic review.
 449 Revista da Sociedade Brasileira de Medicina Tropical. 55.
- 4. Amdal CD, Pe M, Falk RS, Piccinin C, Bottomley A, Arraras JI, Darlington AS, Hofsø
 451 K, Holzner B, Jørgensen NMH (2021) Health-related quality of life issues, including
 452 symptoms, in patients with active COVID-19 or post COVID-19; a systematic literature
 453 review. Quality of Life Research. 30(12):3367-81.
- 454 5. International Vaccine Access Center, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
 455 World Health Organization. Results of COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness & Impact
 456 Studies: An Ongoing Systematic Review. <u>https://view-hub.org/sites/default/files/2022-</u>
- 457 <u>04/COVID19_VE_and_Impact_Lit_Review_Methods.pdf</u> Accessed August 15, 2022.
 458 6. Arab-Zozani M, Hashemi F, Safari H, Yousefi M, Ameri H (2020) Health-related quality
 459 of life and its associated factors in COVID-19 patients. Osong public health and research
- 460 perspectives. 11(5):296.
 461 7. Petersen EL, Goßling A, Adam G, Aepfelbacher M, Behrendt C-A, Cavus E, Cheng B,
 462 Fischer N, Gallinat J, Kühn S (2022) Multi-organ assessment in mainly non-hospitalized
- 462 Fischer N, Gannat J, Kunn S (2022) Multi-organ assessment in manny non-nospitaliz
 463 individuals after SARS-CoV-2 infection: the Hamburg City Health Study COVID
 464 programme. European Heart Journal. 43(11):1124-37.
- 465 8. McKay SC, Lembach H, Hann A, Okoth K, Anderton J, Nirantharakumar K, Magill L,
- 466 Torlinska B, Armstrong M, Mascaro J (2021) Health related quality of life, uncertainty
- 467 and coping strategies in solid organ transplant recipients during shielding for the
- 468 COVID 19 pandemic. Transplant International. 34(11):2122-37.
- 469 9. Talman S, Boonman-de Winter L, De Mol M, Hoefman E, Van Etten R, De Backer I
 470 (2021) Pulmonary function and health-related quality of life after COVID-19 pneumonia.
 471 Respiratory Medicine. 176:106272.
- 472 10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Updates Symptoms of COVID-19.
 473 <u>https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/symptoms-testing/symptoms.html</u> Accessed
 474 August 1 2021.
- 475 11. EuroQol Research Foundation. (2019) EQ-5D-5L User Guide, Version 3.0.
 476 <u>https://euroqol.org/publications/user-guides</u> Accessed August 5, 2021.

477	12.	Cha AS, Law EH, Shaw JW, Pickard AS (2019) A comparison of self-rated health using
478		EQ-5D VAS in the United States in 2002 and 2017. Quality of Life Research.
479		28(11):3065-9.
480	13.	Pickard AS, Law EH, Jiang R, Pullenayegum E, Shaw JW, Xie F, Oppe M, Boye KS,
481		Chapman RH, Gong CL (2019) United States valuation of EQ-5D-5L health states using
482		an international protocol. Value in Health. 22(8):931-41.
483	14.	Reilly MC, Zbrozek AS, Dukes EM (1993) The validity and reproducibility of a work
484		productivity and activity impairment instrument. Pharmacoeconomics. 4(5):353-65.
485	15.	Reilly Associates. (2002) WPAI Scoring.
486		http://www.reillvassociates.net/WPAI Scoring.html Accessed August 5, 2021.
487	16.	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Long COVID or Post-COVID Conditions.
488	101	https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/long-term-effects/index.html Accessed
489		August 15, 2022
490	17	Rosner B (2015) Fundamentals of biostatistics Fighth ed Cengage learning Boston MA
491	18	Freeman G Halton IH (1951) Note on an exact treatment of contingency goodness of fit
492	10.	and other problems of significance Biometrika 38(1/2):141-9
493	19	Fitzmaurice GM Laird NM Ware IH (2012) Applied longitudinal analysis John Wiley
494	17.	& Sons Hoboken NI
495	20	Cohen I (1988) Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences 2nd ed Lawrence
496	20.	Erlbaum Assoc Hillsdale NI
497	21.	McLeod LD. Cappelleri JC. Hays RD (2016) Best (but off-forgotten) practices:
498	21.	expressing and interpreting associations and effect sizes in clinical outcome assessments.
499		The American journal of clinical nutrition, 103(3):685-93. Erratum:
500		https://doi.org/10.3945/aicn.116.148593.
501	22.	Mouelhi Y. Jouve E. Castelli C. Gentile S (2020) How is the minimal clinically important
502		difference established in health-related quality of life instruments? Review of anchors
503		and methods. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes. 18(1):1-17.
504	23.	STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of cohort
505	20.	studies https://www.strobe-statement.org/download/strobe-checklist-cohort-studies-pdf
506		Accessed August 5, 2022
507	24	Jacobson KB Rao M Bonilla H Subramanian A Hack I Madrigal M Singh U
508	21.	Iagannathan P. Grant P (2021) Patients with uncomplicated COVID-19 have long-term
509		nersistent symptoms and functional impairment similar to patients with severe COVID-
510		19: a cautionary tale during a global pandemic. Clinical Infectious Diseases
511		10 1093/cid/ciab103
512	25	Hernandez-Romieu AC Leung S Mhanya A Jackson BR Cope IR Bushman D Dixon
512	23.	M Brown I McLeod T Savdah S (2021) Health care utilization and clinical
514		characteristics of nonhospitalized adults in an integrated health care system 28–180 days
515		after COVID-19 diagnosis—Georgia May 2020–March 2021 Morbidity and Mortality
516		Weekly Report 70(17):644
517	26	Liang R Janssen M Pickard AS (2021) US population norms for the EO-5D-5L and
518	20.	comparison of norms from face to face and online samples. Quality of Life Descarch
510		20(3).803_16
520	27	July 2003-10. Lawson A. Tan A.C. Navlor I. Harris IA (2020). Is retrograptive assessment of health
520 521	41.	related quality of life valid? PMC Musculoskeletel Disorders (21(1)),1,10
J∠1		related quality of the valid? Divic iviusculoskeletal Disorders. 21(1):1-10.

- Rajan SS, Wang M, Singh N, Jacob AP, Parker SA, Czap AL, Bowry R, Grotta JC,
 Yamal JM (2021) Retrospectively Collected EQ-5D-5L Data as Valid Proxies for
 Imputing Missing Information in Longitudinal Studies. Value Health. 24(12):1720-7.
 10.1016/j.jval.2021.07.007.
- 526 29. Tundia N, Hass S, Fuldeore M, Wang LL, Cavanaugh T, Boone J, Heaton P (2015)
 527 Validation and US population norms of health-related productivity questionnaire. Value
 528 in Health. 18(3):A24.
- 30. Romano C, Fehnel S, Stoddard J, Sadoff J, Lewis S, McNulty P, Chan EK, Evans E,
 Jamieson C, Slagle AF (2022) Development of a novel patient-reported outcome measure
 to assess signs and symptoms of COVID-19. Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes.
 6(1):1-12.
- 533 31. Hughes SE, Haroon S, Subramanian A, McMullan C, Aiyegbusi OL, Turner GM,
 534 Jackson L, Davies EH, Frost C, McNamara G (2022) Development and validation of the
 535 symptom burden questionnaire for long covid (SBQ-LC): Rasch analysis. BMJ. 377.
- 536

537 Figure 1. Study design ^a



^a QoL refers to the EQ-5D-5L survey

540

541 Figure 2. Study flow diagram



542 543

	All	BNT162b2	Unvaccinated	P-value ^a
Total, n	430	233	197	
Age, years				
Mean, SD	42.4 (14.3)	43.7 (15.3)	40.9 (12.9)	0.049
18-29	87 (20.2%)	49 (21.0%)	38 (19.3%)	0.011
30-49	213 (49.5%)	100 (42.9%)	113 (57.4%)	
50-64	94 (21.9%)	60 (25.8%)	34 (17.3%)	
≥65	36 (8.4%)	24 (10.3%)	12 (6.1%)	
Gender				0.966
Female	327 (76.0%)	177 (76.0%)	150 (76.1%)	
Male	103 (24.0%)	56 (24.0%)	47 (23.9%)	
Race / Ethnicity				0.026
White or Caucasian (not Hispanic or Latino)	295 (68.6%)	166 (71.2%)	129 (65.5%)	
Black or African American	20 (4.7%)	7 (3.0%)	13 (6.6%)	
Hispanic	61 (14.2%)	35 (15.0%)	26 (13.2%)	
Asian	22 (5.1%)	15 (6.4%)	7 (3.6%)	
Patient Refused	13 (3.0%)	5 (2.2%)	8 (4.1%)	
Other	19 (4.4%)	5 (2.2%)	14 (7.1%)	
CMS Geographic Region (n, %)				0.009
Region 1: ME, NH, VT, MA, CT, RI	19 (4.4%)	10 (4.3%)	9 (4.6%)	
Region 2: NY, NJ, PR, VI	11 (2.6%)	7 (3.0%)	4 (2.0%)	
Region 3: PA, DE, MD, DC, WV, VA	37 (8.6%)	22 (9.4%)	15 (7.6%)	
Region 4: KY, TN, NC, SC, GA, MS, AL, FL	156 (36.3%)	81 (34.8%)	75 (38.1%)	
Region 5: MN, WI, IL, MI, IN, OH	58 (13.5%)	31 (13.3%)	27 (13.7%)	
Region 6: NM, OK, AR, TX, LA	82 (19.1%)	56 (24.0%)	26 (13.2%)	
Region 7: NE, IA, KS, MO	19 (4.4%)	11 (4.7%)	8 (4.1%)	
Region 8 : MT, ND, SD, WY, UT, CO	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	
Region 9: CA, NV, AZ, GU	46 (10.7%)	13 (5.6%)	33 (16.8%)	
Region 10: AK, WA, OR, ID	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	
U.S. Geographic Region				0.005
Northeast	53 (12.2%)	29 (12.3%)	24 (12.2%)	
South	254 (58.7%)	150 (63.6%)	104 (52.8%)	
Midwest	77 (17.8%)	42 (17.8%)	35 (17.8%)	
West	49 (11.3%)	15 (6.4%)	34 (17.3%)	
Previously Tested Positive	167 (38.8%)	89 (38.2%)	78 (39.6%)	0.589

544 **Table 1** Patient Characteristics on Index Day

	All	BNT162b2	Unvaccinated	P-value ^a
Work in healthcare	47 (10.9%)	29 (12.4%)	18 (9.1%)	0.309
Work in high-risk setting	44 (10.2%)	30 (12.9%)	14 (7.1%)	0.158
Live in high-risk setting	22 (5.1%)	12 (5.2%)	10 (5.1%)	0.553
Social vulnerability index			× ,	
Mean (SD)	0.44 (0.22)	0.40 (0.22)	0.49 (0.21)	< 0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.41 (0.27, 0.59)	0.37 (0.23, 0.55)	0.47 (0.31, 0.63)	< 0.001
Self-Reported Comorbidity				
Asthma or Chronic Lung Disease	34 (7.9%)	21 (9.0%)	13 (6.6%)	0.355
Cirrhosis of the liver	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	1.0000
Immunocompromised Conditions or Weakened Immune System ^c	19 (4.4%)	12 (5.2%)	7 (3.6%)	0.422
Diabetes	20 (4.7%)	13 (5.6%)	7 (3.6%)	0.320
Heart Conditions or Hypertension	52 (12.1%)	30 (12.9%)	22 (11.2%)	0.588
Overweight or obesity	19 (4.4%)	12 (5.2%)	7 (3.6%)	0.422
At least 1 comorbidity	104 (24.2%)	61 (26.2%)	43 (21.8%)	0.294
Number of comorbidities, Mean (SD)	0.34 (0.68)	0.38 (0.75)	0.28 (0.58)	0.138
Index day ^b acute COVID-19 symp	otoms			
Systemic symptoms				
Fever	164 (38.1%)	71 (30.5%)	93 (47.2%)	< 0.001
Chills	213 (49.5%)	100 (42.9%)	113 (57.4%)	0.003
Muscle or Body Aches	232 (54.0%)	115 (49.4%)	117 (59.4%)	0.038
Headache	293 (68.1%)	153 (65.7%)	140 (71.1%)	0.231
Fatigue	266 (61.9%)	141 (60.5%)	125 (63.5%)	0.532
Respiratory symptoms				
Shortness of Breath or Difficulty Breathing	54 (12.6%)	25 (10.7%)	29 (14.7%)	0.213
Cough	309 (71.9%)	168 (72.1%)	141 (71.6%)	0.903
Sore Throat	238 (55.3%)	134 (57.5%)	104 (52.8%)	0.327
New/Recent Loss of Taste or Smell	45 (10.5%)	23 (9.9%)	22 (11.2%)	0.662
Congestion or Runny Nose	322 (74.9%)	188 (80.7%)	134 (68.0%)	0.003
GI symptoms				
Nausea or Vomiting	55 (12.8%)	24 (10.3%)	31 (15.7%)	0.093
Diarrhea	88 (20.5%)	37 (15.9%)	51 (25.9%)	0.010
Number of acute COVID-19 symptoms, Mean (SD)	5.3 (2.6)	5.1 (2.4)	5.6 (2.7)	0.034

^a P value refers to the comparison between BNT162B2 and Unvaccinated.

546 ^b COVID-19 test nasal swab day

- ^c Immunocompromised conditions includes compromised immune system (such as from
- 548 immuno-compromising drugs, solid organ or blood stem cell transplant, HIV, or other
- 549 conditions), conditions that result in a weakened immune system, including cancer treatment,
- 550 and kidney failure or end stage renal disease

551 Table 2 Post-COVID-19 Symptoms at Week 4

Symptom	All	BNT162b2	Unvaccinated	P-value ^a
General symptoms				
Tiredness or fatigue	136 (41.2%)	71 (40.6%)	65 (41.9%)	0.802
Symptoms that get worse after physical or mental activities	50 (15.2%)	18 (10.3%)	32 (20.6%)	0.009
Fever	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0.470
General pain/discomfort	50 (15.2%)	20 (11.4%)	30 (19.4%)	0.045
Respiratory and cardiac				
Difficulty breathing or shortness of breath	58 (17.6%)	26 (14.9%)	32 (20.6%)	0.168
Cough	86 (26.1%)	40 (22.9%)	46 (29.7%)	0.159
Chest or stomach pain	32 (9.7%)	14 (8.0%)	18 (11.6%)	0.268
Fast-beating or pounding heart (also known as heart palpitations)	38 (11.5%)	17 (9.7%)	21 (13.5%)	0.276
Neurologic				
Change in smell or taste	51 (15.5%)	19 (10.9%)	32 (20.6%)	0.014
Headache	67 (20.3%)	28 (16.0%)	39 (25.2%)	0.039
Dizziness on standing (lightheadedness)	45 (13.6%)	20 (11.4%)	25 (16.1%)	0.214
Difficulty thinking or concentrating (sometimes referred to as "brain fog")	86 (26.1%)	43 (24.6%)	43 (27.7%)	0.513
Pins-and-needles feeling	24 (7.3%)	10 (5.7%)	14 (9.0%)	0.247
Sleep problems	81 (24.5%)	35 (20.0%)	46 (29.7%)	0.042
Mood changes	36 (10.9%)	13 (7.4%)	23 (14.8%)	0.031
Memory loss	38 (11.5%)	11 (6.3%)	27 (17.4%)	0.002
Other				
Diarrhea	23 (7.0%)	6 (3.4%)	17 (11.0%)	0.007
Joint or muscle pain	67 (20.3%)	29 (16.6%)	38 (24.5%)	0.073
Rash	11 (3.3%)	3 (1.7%)	8 (5.2%)	0.082
Changes in period cycles	28 (11.5%)	12 (9.4%)	16 (13.8%)	0.280
Number of post-COVID-19 symptoms, Mean (SD)	3.1 (3.6)	2.5 (3.0)	3.7 (4.1)	0.002
	100 (30.3%)	54 (30.9%)	46 (29.7%)	0.001
1-2	100 (30.3%)	59 (33.7%)	41 (26.5%)	
3-5	61 (18.5%)	40 (22.9%)	21 (13.5%)	
6-8	32 (9.7%)	9 (5.1%)	23 (14.8%)	
≥9	37 (11.2%)	13 (7.4%)	24 (15.5%)	

552

^a P-values of t-test for number of symptoms, chi-square or Fisher's exact tests when any one cell

has an expected frequency less than 5 for individual symptoms and number of symptom

554 category comparing the BNT162b2 cohort and the unvaccinated cohort.

Table 3 Summary of EQ-5D-5L and WPAI-GH Scores^a and Their Changes from Baseline by Assessment Time

5	5	6
J	J	υ

			BNT	T162b2 Cohor	rt		Unvaccinated Cohort						Difference in Change from		
		Score		Change from	n Baseline	b		Score		Change from	n Baseline	;	Baseline B	etween Co	ohorts
	n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	P-value ^c	$\mathrm{ES_w}^d$	n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	P-value ^c	ESwd	Mean (SD)	P-value ^e	ES_b^{f}
EQ-5D-5L															
Visual analogue scale (VAS)															
Baseline ^g	233	86.9 (10.7)					197	87.8 (11.0)						0.414 ^h	
Day 3	233	73.9 (15.6)	233	-13.0 (12.5)	< 0.001	-1.04	194	71.8 (19.6)	194	-16.1 (17.1)	< 0.001	-0.94	3.1 (14.8)	0.033	0.21
Week 4	171	82.9 (13.8)	171	-3.7 (10.7)	< 0.001	-0.35	151	80.9 (15.7)	151	-7.2 (13.7)	< 0.001	-0.53	3.5 (12.2)	0.011	0.28
Utility Index (US weight)															
Baseline ^e	233	0.924 (0.117)					197	0.918 (0.117)						0.547 ^h	
Day 3	233	0.820 (0.193)	233	-0.105 (0.159)	< 0.001	-0.66	197	0.762 (0.252)	197	-0.155 (0.228)	< 0.001	-0.68	0.050 (0.194)	0.007	0.26
Week 4	176	0.882 (0.145)	176	-0.039 (0.120)	< 0.001	-0.33	155	0.838 (0.197)	155	-0.074 (0.156)	< 0.001	-0.47	0.035 (0.138)	0.023	0.25
WPAI-GH															
Absenteeism															
Baseline ^e	153	2.8 (11.8)					129	11.7 (26.4)						<0.001 ^h	
Week 1	153	44.9 (38.3)	147	42.5 (38.8)	< 0.001	1.09	129	66.7 (37.0)	127	55.5 (39.2)	< 0.001	1.42	-13.0 (39.0)	0.006	-0.33
Week 4	128	4.6 (17.2)	122	1.4 (20.1)	0.460	0.07	106	3.3 (12.2)	102	-7.7 (28.1)	0.007	-0.27	9.0 (24.1)	0.006	0.37
Presenteeism															
Baseline ^e	153	9.5 (18.5)					124	9.4 (20.4)						0.958 ^h	
Week 1	123	41.7 (27.4)	119	33.0 (29.1)	< 0.001	1.13	82	47.8 (34.2)	81	38.2 (35.9)	< 0.001	1.06	-5.1 (32.1)	0.268	-0.16
Week 4	125	11.7 (18.8)	119	1.4 (24.5)	0.527	0.06	105	18.7 (23.4)	96	10.7 (24.1)	< 0.001	0.45	-9.3 (24.3)	0.006	-0.38
Work productivity loss															
Baseline ^e	152	10.5 (20.0)					123	14.2 (24.7)						0.175 ^h	
Week 1	123	56.6 (31.5)	118	46.7 (34.5)	< 0.001	1.35	82	66.9 (32.4)	80	53.2 (35.3)	< 0.001	1.51	-6.4 (34.9)	0.203	-0.18

Week 4	125	12.9 (20.7)	118	1.4 (27.5)	0.589	0.05	105	19.8 (24.6)	96	7.7 (30.6)	0.016	0.25	-6.3 (29.0)	0.113	-0.22
Activity															
impairment															
Baseline ^e	203	12.5 (22.2)					176	17.2 (27.2)						0.065^{h}	
Week 1	202	48.6 (29.8)	202	36.1 (31.9)	< 0.001	1.13	176	54.2 (32.7)	176	37.0 (37.5)	< 0.001	0.99	-0.9 (34.6)	0.801	-0.03
Week 4	175	15.5 (21.7)	175	2.3 (26.3)	0.242	0.09	155	25.9 (28.5)	155	8.8 (33.8)	0.002	0.26	-6.4 (30.1)	0.053	-0.21

^a Score ranges: EQ-5D-5L VAS 0 to 100, EQ-5D-5L UI (the United States weights) -0.573 to 1; WPAI-GH (absenteeism, presenteeism, work productivity loss, and activity impairment) 0 to 100 percent.

^b Baseline refers to pre-COVID-19 symptom onset.

⁶ ⁶ P-value of t-test comparing mean score changes from baseline and 0 within BNT162b2 or Unvaccinated cohorts.

^d ES_w refers to effect size for score changes from baseline within BNT162b2 or Unvaccinated cohorts.

⁶ P-value of t-test comparing mean score changes from baseline between BNT162b2 and Unvaccinated cohorts.

^f ES_b refers to effect size for score changes from baseline between BNT162b2 and Unvaccinated cohorts.

^g Prior to symptom onset (pre-COVID).

⁵⁶⁵ ^h P-values of t-tests comparing pre-COVID-19 baseline mean scores between BNT162b2 and Unvaccinated cohorts.

566

	BN	T162b2 Cohort			U	Invaccinated Cohor		Between Cohort Difference			
	Score	Change from	m Baseli	ne	Score	Change from	Baseline	e	Between Co	nort Diller	ence
Variable	LSE (95% CI)	LSE (95% CI)	P-	ESwc	LSE (95% CI)	LSE (95% CI)	P-	ESwc	LSE (95% CI)	P-value ^d	$\mathrm{ES}_{\mathrm{b}}^{\mathrm{e}}$
variable			value ^b				value ^b				
EQ-5D-5	L										
Visual an	alogue scale (VAS))									
Day 3	76.2 (73.3, 79.2)	-11.1 (-14.1, - 8.2)	< 0.001	-0.89	72.6 (69.7, 75.4)	-14.8 (-17.6, - 11.9)	< 0.001	-0.86	3.6 (0.8, 6.5)	0.013	0.25
Week 4	85.0 (82.1, 87.9)	-2.3 (-5.2, 0.6)	0.119	-0.22	81.6 (78.8, 84.4)	-5.7 (-8.5, -2.9)	< 0.001	-0.42	3.4 (0.6, 6.2)	0.016	0.28
Utility In	dex (US weight)										
Day 3	0.842 (0.805, 0.879)	-0.077 (-0.115, -0.040)	< 0.001	-0.49	0.773 (0.736, 0.809)	-0.147 (-0.183, - 0.110)	< 0.001	-0.64	0.069 (0.032, 0.107)	< 0.001	0.36
Week 4	0.903 (0.868, 0.938)	-0.016 (-0.051, 0.019)	0.369	-0.13	0.859 (0.826, 0.892)	-0.060 (-0.093, - 0.027)	< 0.001	-0.38	0.044 (0.013, 0.075)	0.005	0.32
WPAI-G	Н										
Absentee	ism										
Week 1	45.6 (38.0, 53.1)	39.1 (31.6, 46.7)	< 0.001	1.01	65.0 (57.5, 72.5)	58.6 (51.1, 66.0)	< 0.001	1.49	-19.4 (-28.3, -10.6)	< 0.001	-0.50
Week 4	5.3 (0.0, 10.7)	-1.1 (-6.5, 4.2)	0.676	-0.06	2.2 (0.0, 7.1) ^f	-4.3 (-9.2, 0.6)	0.086	-0.15	3.2 (-1.1, 7.4)	0.145	0.13
Presentee	eism				·						
Week 1	38.4 (30.3, 46.5)	29.0 (20.8, 37.1)	< 0.001	1.00	46.8 (38.6, 55.1)	37.4 (29.1, 45.6)	< 0.001	1.04	-8.4 (-16.7, -0.1)	0.047	-0.26
Week 4	6.8 (0, 13.9) ^f	-2.7 (-9.7, 4.4)	0.458	-0.11	16.0 (9.4, 22.5)	6.5 (0.0, 13.0)	0.050	0.27	-9.2 (-14.7, -3.6)	0.001	-0.38
Work pro	oductivity loss				·						
Week 1	53.8 (45.1, 62.4)	42.4 (33.8, 51.0)	< 0.001	1.23	65.0 (56.2, 73.7)	53.6 (44.8, 62.4)	< 0.001	1.52	-11.2 (-19.9, -2.5)	0.012	-0.32
Week 4	8.6 (0.9, 16.2)	-2.8 (-10.4, 4.9)	0.476	-0.10	17.0 (9.9, 24.0)	5.7 (-1.4, 12.7)	0.116	0.18	-8.4 (-14.5, -2.3)	0.007	-0.29
Activity i	impairment										
Week 1	43.9 (37.7, 50.1)	2 9.0 (22.8, 35.3)	< 0.001	0.91	50.2 (44.2, 56.2)	35.4 (29.3, 41.4)	< 0.001	0.94	-6.3 (-12.4, -0.2)	0.044	-0.18

Table 4 Least-Square Mean Estimate and 95% Confidence Interval for EQ-5D-5L and WPAI-GH Scores ^a

,	Week 4	11.0 (5.1, 16.9)	-3.9 (-9.7, 2.0)	0.194	-0.15	21.3 (15.7, 26.9)	6.4 (0.8, 12.0)	0.025	0.19	-10.3 (-15.6, -5.0)	< 0.001	-0.34
568	Ab	breviations: LSE =	Least-Square N	Aean Est	timate;	CI = Confiden	ce Interval.	•				
569	^a M	lultivariate models	include variable	es for tin	ne, vac	ccination status	and interaction of	time by	vacci	nation status, as we	ell as cova	riates
570	0	f participant pre-CO	OVID-19 sympt	om onse	et score	e, sociodemogra	aphic characteristic	cs (age,	sex, re	gions, social vulne	rability,	
571	race/ethnicity, high risk occupations), previously tested positive for COVID-19, severity of acute illness (number of symptoms											
572	reported on index date), and immunocompromised status. Parameter estimates are presented in Supplemental Table 3.											
573	^b P-value refers to the comparison of lease-square mean estimates score changes from baseline and 0 within BNT162b2 or											
574	Unvaccinated cohorts											
575	^c ES _w , within-cohort effect size, was calculated as the least square estimate of mean change from divided by the observed standard											
576	deviation of change scores from baseline to follow-up.											
577	^d ES _b , between-cohort effect size, was calculated as the difference in least square estimates of mean changes from baseline between											
578	C	ohorts, divided by 1	the observed po	oled star	ndard d	leviation of cha	nge scores					
579	°P-	value refers to the	difference in lea	ase-squa	re mea	in estimates bet	ween BNT162b2	and Unv	vaccina	ited cohorts.		
580	L'L	ower limit of 95%	CI was truncate	d from -	2.7 to	0 for absentees	m and -0.3 to 0 fo	or presen	teeism	at Week 4 becaus	e the value	d range
581	18	0 to 100.										
382												
303												
585												
586												
587												
588												
589												
590												
591												
592												
593												
594												
595												
596												
597												
598												

599 Figure 3 Mean Responses of EQ-5D-5L Dimensions by Timepoint



601

600

602

- 603 Mean dimension scores range from 1 for no problem to 5 for extreme / unable. The blue and red solid lines indicate that vaccinated
- and unvaccinated were similar at the pre-COVID baseline. At Day 3 and Week 4 post-index date, vaccinated cohort was less impacted
- 605 (lower scores) than unvaccinated by COVID on anxiety/depression, pain/discomfort, and usual activities (dotted lines for Day 3,
- 606 dashed lines for Week 4).
- 607

	1		
Patient characteristics	Enrolled N=676	Not-Enrolled N=39,213	P value
Vaccinated			< 0.001
Yes	465 (68.8%)	22,125 (56.4%)	
No	211 (31.2%)	17,087 (43.6%)	
Missing			
Age, years			
Mean, SD	43.2 (14.7)	42.1 (15.5)	0.076
Median, Q1, Q3	41 (3155)	40 (2954)	0.010
Age Category			
18-29	134 (19.8%)	10,095 (25.7%)	0.005
30-49	317 (46.9%)	16,706 (42.6%)	
50-64	156 (23.1%)	8,561 (21.8%)	
≥65	69 (10.2%)	3,850 (9.8%)	
Gender, n (%)			< 0.001
Male	181 (26.8%)	17,843 (45.5%)	
Female	495 (73.2%)	21,370 (54.5%)	
Race / Ethnicity, n (%)			< 0.001
White or Caucasian (non-Hispanic or Latino)	486 (71.9%)	22,647 (57.8%)	
Black or African American	32 (4.7%)	4,162 (10.6%)	
Hispanic or Latino	85 (12.6%)	6,878 (17.5%)	
Asian	35 (5.2%)	2,551 (6.5%)	
Patient Refused	16 (2.4%)	1,535 (3.9%)	
Other	22 (3.3%)	1,439 (3.7%)	
US Geographic Region			0.258
Northeast	92 (13.6%)	4,387 (11.2%)	
South	402 (59.5%)	24,305 (62.0%)	
Midwest	118 (17.5%)	6,414 (16.4%)	
West	64 (9.5%)	4,105 (10.5%)	
Number of acute COVID-19 symptoms, Mean (SD)	5.2 (2.5)	5.1 (2.5)	0.732
Number of comorbidities, Mean (SD)	0.3 (0.7)	0.3 (0.6)	0.021
≥1 comorbidity	164 (24.3%)	7,677 (19.6%)	0.002

Supplemental Table 1 Patient Characteristics by Enrollment Status

Dimension	All	BNT162b2	Unvaccinated	P-value ^a
Pre-COVID-19 Baseline				
Mobility				0.841
No problems	396 (92.1%)	213 (91.4%)	183 (92.9%)	
Slight problems	30 (7.0%)	18 (7.7%)	12 (6.1%)	
Moderate problems	4 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	2 (1.0%)	
Severe problems	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Self-Care				0.560
No problems	419 (97.4%)	226 (97.0%)	193 (98.0%)	
Slight problems	11 (2.6%)	7 (3.0%)	4 (2.0%)	
Moderate problems	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Severe problems	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Usual Activities				0.904
No problems	394 (91.6%)	214 (91.8%)	180 (91.4%)	
Slight problems	23 (5.4%)	11 (4.7%)	12 (6.1%)	
Moderate problems	12 (2.8%)	7 (3.0%)	5 (2.5%)	
Severe problems	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.4%)	0 (0.0%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Pain / Discomfort				0.614
No	307 (71.4%)	172 (73.8%)	135 (68.5%)	
Slight	93 (21.6%)	46 (19.7%)	47 (23.9%)	
Moderate	27 (6.3%)	13 (5.6%)	14 (7.1%)	
Severe	3 (0.7%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)	
Extreme	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Anxiety / Depression				0.395
No	230 (53.5%)	124 (53.2%)	106 (53.8%)	
Slightly	140 (32.6%)	80 (34.3%)	60 (30.5%)	
Moderately	49 (11.4%)	26 (11.2%)	23 (11.7%)	
Severely	10 (2.3%)	3 (1.3%)	7 (3.6%)	
Extremely	1 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.5%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Days 3				
Mobility				0.131

Supplemental Table 2 Summary of EQ-5D-5L Dimensions

NI 11	242 (70.00/)	102 (02 00/)	150(7(10/))	
No problems	343 (/9.8%)	193 (82.8%)	150 (76.1%)	
Slight problems	68 (15.8%)	31 (13.3%)	3/(18.8%)	
Moderate problems	17 (4.0%)	7 (3.0%)	10 (5.1%)	
Severe problems	2 (0.5%)	2 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Self-Care				0.571
No problems	370 (86.0%)	205 (88.0%)	165 (83.8%)	
Slight problems	47 (10.9%)	21 (9.0%)	26 (13.2%)	
Moderate problems	11 (2.6%)	6 (2.6%)	5 (2.5%)	
Severe problems	2 (0.5%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.5%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Usual Activities				0.361
No problems	207 (48.1%)	117 (50.2%)	90 (45.7%)	
Slight problems	132 (30.7%)	75 (32.2%)	57 (28.9%)	
Moderate problems	64 (14.9%)	30 (12.9%)	34 (17.3%)	
Severe problems	21 (4.9%)	9 (3.9%)	12 (6.1%)	
Unable	6 (1.4%)	2 (0.9%)	4 (2.0%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Pain / Discomfort				0.080
No	145 (33.7%)	85 (36.5%)	60 (30.5%)	
Slight	183 (42.6%)	99 (42.5%)	84 (42.6%)	
Moderate	82 (19.1%)	43 (18.5%)	39 (19.8%)	
Severe	17 (4.0%)	4 (1.7%)	13 (6.6%)	
Extreme	3 (0.7%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.5%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Anxiety / Depression				0.047
No	190 (44.2%)	108 (46.4%)	82 (41.6%)	
Slightly	135 (31.4%)	79 (33.9%)	56 (28.4%)	
Moderately	75 (17.4%)	37 (15.9%)	38 (19.3%)	
Severely	26 (6.1%)	8 (3.4%)	18 (9.1%)	
Extremely	4 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.5%)	
Missing	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Week 4				
Mobility				0.278
No problems	270 (81.3%)	149 (84.7%)	121 (77.6%)	
Slight problems	49 (14.8%)	22 (12.5%)	27 (17.3%)	
Moderate problems	12 (3.6%)	5 (2.8%)	7 (4.5%)	
Severe problems	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
	N /	× /	× /	1

Missing	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Self-Care				0.068
No problems	308 (93.1%)	167 (94.9%)	141 (91.0%)	
Slight problems	17 (5.1%)	5 (2.8%)	12 (7.7%)	
Moderate problems	5 (1.5%)	4 (2.3%)	1 (0.7%)	
Severe problems	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	2 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	
Usual Activities				0.152
No problems	232 (70.1%)	132 (75.0%)	100 (64.5%)	
Slight problems	75 (22.7%)	35 (19.9%)	40 (25.8%)	
Moderate problems	20 (6.0%)	8 (4.6%)	12 (7.7%)	
Severe problems	4 (1.2%)	1 (0.6%)	3 (1.9%)	
Unable	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Missing	2 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	
Pain / Discomfort				0.097
No	170 (51.4%)	95 (54.0%)	75 (48.4%)	
Slight	118 (35.6%)	66 (37.5%)	52 (33.5%)	
Moderate	37 (11.2%)	13 (7.4%)	24 (15.5%)	
Severe	5 (1.5%)	2 (1.1%)	3 (1.9%)	
Extreme	1 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)	
Missing	2 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	
Anxiety / Depression				0.605
No	167 (50.5%)	92 (52.3%)	75 (48.4%)	
Slightly	98 (29.6%)	53 (30.1%)	45 (29.0%)	
Moderately	51 (15.4%)	25 (14.2%)	26 (16.8%)	
Severely	10 (3.0%)	5 (2.8%)	5 (3.2%)	
Extremely	5 (1.5%)	1 (0.6%)	4 (2.6%)	
Missing	2 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	1 (0.0%)	

^a P values of Freeman-Halton tests comparing BNT162b2 cohort and unvaccinated cohort, excluding category of missing.

	EQ VA	AS	EQ-5D-5L Util (U.S. weig	ity Index (hts)	Absente	eism	Presente	eism	Work prod loss	uctivity	Activity imp	airment
	Coeff (SE)	P value	Coeff (SE)	P value	Coeff (SE)	P value	Coeff (SE)	P value	Coeff (SE)	P value	Coeff (SE)	P value
Intercept	4.51 (5.36)	0.401	0.038 (0.062)	0.546	53.6 (4.9)	< 0.001	41.4 (5.7)	< 0.001	57.7 (6.0)	< 0.001	41.2 (4.9)	< 0.001
Vaccinated												
BNT162B2BNT162b2	3.65 (1.46)	0.013	0.069 (0.019)	< 0.001	-19.4 (4.5)	< 0.001	-8.4 (4.2)	0.047	-11.2 (4.4)	0.012	-6.3 (3.1)	0.044
No	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Assessment Time												
Day 2-4 / Week 1	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Week 4	9.04 (1.23)	< 0.001	0.086 (0.014)	< 0.001	-62.9 (3.4)	< 0.001	-30.9 (3.3)	< 0.001	-48.0 (3.6)	< 0.001	-28.9 (2.5)	< 0.001
Assessment Time * Vacc	inated		· · · ·									
Day 2-4 / Week 1 * BNT162b2	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Week 4 * BNT162B2	-0.25 (1.69)	0.884	-0.025 (0.020)	0.209	22.6 (4.8)	< 0.001	-0.8 (4.4)	0.863	2.8 (4.8)	0.561	-4.0 (3.5)	0.257
Pre-COVID-19 Baseline Score	-0.22 (0.05)	< 0.001	-0.177 (0.057)	0.002	-0.8 (0.0)	< 0.001	-0.7 (0.1)	< 0.001	-0.8 (0.1)	< 0.001	-0.7 (0.0)	< 0.001
Age, years												
18-29	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
30-49	-1.82 (1.45)	0.211	-0.011 (0.018)	0.532	3.9 (2.4)	0.102	5.6 (3.0)	0.065	4.1 (3.2)	0.204	7.8 (2.9)	0.006
50-64	-2.84 (1.74)	0.102	-0.048 (0.021)	0.025	10.8 (2.9)	< 0.001	6.8 (3.8)	0.074	7.3 (4.1)	0.075	13.7 (3.5)	< 0.001
≥65	-1.86 (2.29)	0.417	-0.025 (0.028)	0.367	1.7 (5.5)	0.760	0.3 (7.4)	0.964	-1.4 (7.9)	0.863	6.9 (4.7)	0.139
Gender												
Male	4.07 (1.30)	0.002	0.028 (0.016)	0.080	-2.1 (2.2)	0.360	-6.8 (2.9)	0.019	-5.8 (3.1)	0.057	-9.8 (2.6)	< 0.001
Female	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Race / Ethnicity												
White (non-Hispanic)	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
Black/African American	2.17 (2.73)	0.428	0.017 (0.033)	0.613	-1.8 (5.1)	0.726	0.8 (6.4)	0.899	0.1 (7.1)	0.994	-1.9 (5.6)	0.730
Hispanic or Latino	0.65 (1.68)	0.701	0.005 (0.021)	0.818	-1.9 (3.0)	0.530	4.3 (3.9)	0.268	4.8 (4.1)	0.243	-2.3 (3.4)	0.494

Supplemental Table 3 Mixed Models for Repeated Measurements EQ-5D-5L and WPAI-GH Scores

Asian	4.24 (2.54)	0.096	0.032 (0.031)	0.316	-1.7 (4.7)	0.713	1.4 (5.8)	0.807	2.4 (6.3)	0.705	0.9 (5.2)	0.858
Patient refused	-0.30 (3.26)	0.927	0.031 (0.040)	0.438	-3.3 (6.1)	0.589	1.1 (8.4)	0.897	-2.3 (9.0)	0.800	-6.4 (7.0)	0.359
Other	2.90 (2.81)	0.303	0.019 (0.035)	0.582	3.9 (4.8)	0.418	-6.9 (6.5)	0.288	-3.1 (6.9)	0.661	-7.5 (5.8)	0.198
Region												
Northeast	1.91 (2.00)	0.341	0.015 (0.025)	0.534	6.2 (3.3)	0.057	-1.9 (4.2)	0.648	-0.5 (4.5)	0.908	-2.3 (3.9)	0.551
South	0.87 (1.51)	0.568	-0.002 (0.019)	0.905	-1.0 (2.6)	0.698	-2.4 (3.3)	0.466	-2.4 (3.5)	0.507	-2.9 (3.0)	0.328
Midwest	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
West	0.49 (2.08)	0.815	0.019 (0.026)	0.448	-0.7 (3.4)	0.830	-0.8 (4.5)	0.857	-1.3 (4.8)	0.793	-3.7 (4.2)	0.374
Social Vulnerability Inde	X											
<0.25	Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference		Reference	
≥ 0.25 and < 0.5	1.21 (1.45)	0.403	0.034 (0.018)	0.060	1.3 (2.4)	0.579	-3.9 (3.0)	0.196	-4.6 (3.3)	0.158	-5.2 (2.9)	0.076
≥ 0.5 and < 0.75	0.93 (1.62)	0.568	0.020 (0.020)	0.321	4.7 (2.8)	0.090	-4.8 (3.6)	0.180	-6.0 (3.9)	0.124	-3.6 (3.3)	0.276
≥0.75	-2.80 (2.14)	0.192	0.009 (0.026)	0.740	2.3 (3.7)	0.531	-9.3 (4.7)	0.048	-7.8 (5.0)	0.121	-5.0 (4.3)	0.247
Previously tested positive	0.99 (1.13)	0.381	0.003 (0.014)	0.816	-1.9 (2.0)	0.333	-0.5 (2.6)	0.851	-2.7 (2.8)	0.329	-1.2 (2.3)	0.591
Work in healthcare	-0.90 (1.80)	0.616	-0.018 (0.022)	0.424	3.1 (2.8)	0.272	0.8 (3.6)	0.818	-0.7 (4.0)	0.851	3.7 (3.6)	0.300
Work in high-risk setting	-2.83 (1.96)	0.150	-0.006 (0.024)	0.790	4.7 (3.4)	0.166	10.3 (4.3)	0.017	13.3 (4.6)	0.004	5.7 (4.0)	0.155
Live in high-risk setting	1.36 (2.53)	0.591	-0.028 (0.031)	0.370	3.2 (4.7)	0.502	4.8 (6.0)	0.431	7.2 (6.5)	0.268	12.1 (5.0)	0.017
Immunocompromised	1.22 (2.61)	0.639	-0.018 (0.032)	0.560	13.1 (6.1)	0.033	9.9 (8.4)	0.243	7.9 (9.1)	0.385	5.5 (5.1)	0.282
Number of Symptoms on index day	-0.59 (0.23)	0.009	-0.010 (0.003)	0.001	0.8 (0.4)	0.048	1.3 (0.5)	0.008	1.9 (0.5)	0.001	1.8 (0.4)	< 0.001



Supplemental Figure 1 Least-Square Estimates and 95% Confidence Intervals of EQ-5D-5L Scores ^a

^a Score ranges: EQ-5D-5L VAS 0 to 100, EQ-5D-5L UI (the United States weights) -0.573 to 1.



Supplemental Figure 2 Summary Results of EQ-5D-5L scores across time periods ^a

^a Score ranges: EQ-5D-5L VAS 0 to 100, EQ-5D-5L UI (the United States weights) -0.573 to 1. Dots are the mean values and whiskers are the 95% Confidence Intervals. The Pre-COVID values represent the pooled means with 95% Confidence Internals. The Day 3 and Week 4 values are the least square estimate scores.



Supplemental Figure 3 Least-Square Estimates and 95% Confidence Intervals of WPAI-GH Scores ^a

^a WPAI-GH score (absenteeism, presenteeism, work productivity loss, and activity impairment) ranges from 0 to 100 percent.



Supplemental Figure 4 Summary Results of WPAI-GH scores across time periods^a

^a WPAI-GH score (absenteeism, presenteeism, work productivity loss, and activity impairment) ranges from 0 to 100 percent. Dots are the mean values and whiskers are the 95% Confidence Intervals. The Pre-COVID values represent the pooled means with 95% Confidence Internals. The Week 1 and Week 4 values are the least square estimate scores.

	S	ummary: % (n) / M	ean (SD)	Model				
	Total	Week 1 Missing	Week 4 Missing	Coeff (SE)	P value	Odds Ratio		
Intercept	430	11.9% (51)	23.0% (99)	-3.14 (1.19)	0.009			
Assessment Time								
Week 4	430		23.0% (99)	0.85 (0.12)	< 0.001	2.3 (1.9, 2.9)		
Week 1	430	11.9% (51)		Reference	•	1.0		
Vaccination status								
BNT162b2	233	12.9% (30)	24.5% (57)	0.36 (0.26)	0.166	1.4 (0.9, 2.4)		
Unvaccinated	197	10.7% (21)	21.3% (42)	Reference	•	1.0		
EQ VAS on Day 3	72.9			0.00 (0.01)	0.967	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)		
	(17.5)	68.9 (19.1)	71.7 (17.3)					
EQ VAS change from pre-	-14.4	-18.2 (18.9)	-16.0 (16.6)	-0.01 (0.01)	0.311	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)		
COVID-19 baseline to Day 3	(14.8)							
Age, years								
18-29	87	8.0% (7)	16.1% (14)	Reference	•	1.0		
30-49	213	10.3% (22)	23.9% (51)	0.69 (0.36)	0.052	2.0 (1.0, 4.0)		
50-64	94	16.0% (15)	27.7% (26)	0.94 (0.40)	0.019	2.6 (1.2, 5.6)		
≥65	36	19.4% (7)	22.2% (8)	0.72 (0.52)	0.161	2.1 (0.8, 5.6)		
Gender								
Male	103	4.9% (5)	16.5% (17)	-0.80 (0.32)	0.013	0.4 (0.2, 0.8)		
Female	327	14.1% (46)	25.1% (82)	Reference	•	1.0		
Race / Ethnicity								
White (non-Hispanic)	295	9.8% (29)	19.7% (58)	Reference	•	1.0		
Black/African American	20	20.0% (4)	35.0% (7)	0.67 (0.50)	0.184	2.0 (0.7, 5.3)		
Hispanic or Latino	61	11.5% (7)	27.9% (17)	0.21 (0.36)	0.565	1.2 (0.6, 2.5)		
Asian	22	18.2% (4)	27.3% (6)	0.37 (0.52)	0.480	1.4 (0.5, 4.0)		
Patient refused	13	30.8% (4)	30.8% (4)	0.94 (0.62)	0.128	$2.\overline{6(0.8, 8.6)}$		

Supplemental Table 4 Model Predicting the Missingness at Week 1 and Week 4

Other	19	15.8% (3)	36.8% (7)	1.22 (0.54)	0.024	3.4 (1.2, 9.8)
Region						
Northeast	52	7.7% (4)	21.2% (11)	0.50 (0.48)	0.295	1.7 (0.6, 4.2)
South	252	13.5% (34)	24.6% (62)	0.32 (0.37)	0.378	1.4 (0.7, 2.8)
Midwest	77	6.5% (5)	16.9% (13)	Reference	•	1.0
West	49	16.3% (8)	26.5% (13)	0.44 (0.47)	0.343	1.6 (0.6, 3.9)
Social Vulnerability Index						
<0.25	98	12.2% (12)	22.4% (22)	Reference	•	1.0
≥ 0.25 and < 0.5	164	9.8% (16)	19.5% (32)	-0.22 (0.33)	0.496	0.8 (0.4, 1.5)
≥ 0.5 and < 0.75	120	12.5% (15)	25.0% (30)	0.07 (0.35)	0.850	1.1 (0.5, 2.1)
≥0.75	48	16.7% (8)	31.3% (15)	0.38 (0.45)	0.397	1.5 (0.6, 3.5)
Previously tested positive	167	15.6% (26)	26.9% (45)	0.45 (0.25)	0.069	1.6 (1.0, 2.5)
Work in healthcare	47	12.8% (6)	19.1% (9)	-0.24 (0.42)	0.567	0.8 (0.3, 1.8)
Work in high-risk setting	44	13.6% (6)	22.7% (10)	-0.25 (0.43)	0.559	0.8 (0.3, 1.8)
Live in high-risk setting	22	9.1% (2)	27.3% (6)	0.38 (0.54)	0.484	1.5 (0.5, 4.3)
Immunocompromised	19	10.5% (2)	15.8% (3)	-0.33 (0.67)	0.623	0.7 (0.2, 2.7)
Number of Symptoms on index						
day	5.3 (2.6)	5.4 (2.6)	5.0 (2.5)	-0.07 (0.05)	0.188	0.9 (0.8, 1.0)