

1 The potential contribution of vaccination  
2 uptake to occupational differences in risk  
3 of SARS-CoV-2: Analysis of the ONS  
4 COVID-19 Infection Survey

5

6 Jack Wilkinson<sup>1</sup>, Evangelia Demou<sup>2</sup>, Mark Cherrie<sup>3</sup>, Rhiannon Edge<sup>4</sup>, Matthew Gittins<sup>1</sup>, S Vittal  
7 Katikireddi<sup>3</sup>, Theocharis Kromydas<sup>3</sup>, William Mueller<sup>2</sup>, Neil Pearce<sup>5,6</sup>, Martie van Tongeren<sup>7</sup>, Sarah  
8 Rhodes<sup>1</sup>.

9 <sup>1</sup>Centre for Biostatistics, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, School of Health Sciences, The  
10 University of Manchester, Manchester, Manchester, UK

11 <sup>2</sup>MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

12 <sup>3</sup>Institute of Occupational Medicine, Edinburgh, UK

13 <sup>4</sup>Lancaster Medical School, University of Lancaster, Lancaster, UK

14 <sup>5</sup>Faculty of Public Health, Environment and Society, LSHTM, London, UK

15 <sup>6</sup>Department of Medical Statistics, LSHTM, London, UK

16 <sup>7</sup>Thomas Ashton Institute, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

17

18 Corresponding author:

19 Dr Jack Wilkinson

20 Centre for Biostatistics

21 University of Manchester

22 Email: [jack.wilkinson@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:jack.wilkinson@manchester.ac.uk)

23 2765 words

24

## 25 **Abstract**

26

### 27 **Objectives**

28 To assess variation in vaccination uptake across occupational groups as a potential explanation for  
29 variation in risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

30

### 31 **Design**

32 We analysed data from the UK Office of National Statistics COVID-19 Infection Survey linked to  
33 vaccination data from the National Immunisation Management System in England from December  
34 1<sup>st</sup> 2020 to 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022. We analysed vaccination uptake and SARS-CoV-2 infection risk by  
35 occupational group and assessed whether adjustment for vaccination reduced the variation in risk  
36 between occupational groups.

### 37 **Setting**

38

### 39 **Results**

40 Estimated rates of triple-vaccination were high across all occupational groups (80% or above), but  
41 were lowest for food processing (80%), personal care (82%), hospitality (83%), manual occupations  
42 (84%), and retail (85%). High rates were observed for individuals working in health (95% for office-  
43 based, 92% for those in patient-facing roles) and education (91%) and office-based workers not  
44 included in other categories (90%). The impact of adjusting for vaccination when estimating relative  
45 risks of infection was generally modest (ratio of hazard ratios reduced from 1.38 to 1.32), but was  
46 consistent with the hypothesis that low vaccination rates contribute to elevated risk in some groups.  
47 Conversely, estimated relative risk for some occupational groups, such as people working in  
48 education, remained high despite high vaccine coverage.

### 49 **Conclusions**

50 Variation in vaccination coverage might account for a modest proportion of occupational differences  
51 in infection risk. Vaccination rates were uniformly very high in this cohort, which may suggest that

52 the participants are not representative of the general population. Accordingly, these results should  
53 be considered tentative pending the accumulation of additional evidence.

54

## 55 **Background**

56 SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 mortality risks in the United Kingdom have been reported to  
57 differ across occupational groups, with variation seen over time (1-5). Some of this variation appears  
58 to be driven by workplace factors, such as the number of people in the workplace, ability to socially  
59 distance from others, and whether the work is located in an indoor or outdoor environment (6-8).  
60 However, uncertainty remains regarding the extent to which occupational differences are driven by  
61 these characteristics compared to non-workplace factors.

62 One plausible contributor to the observed variation in risk may be occupational differences in rates  
63 of vaccination uptake against COVID-19. Vaccination appears to reduce the risk of SARS-CoV-2  
64 infection as well as associated morbidity and mortality (9, 10), although effects appear to strongly  
65 depend on the time since last vaccination (11). In the UK, vaccine delivery was not mandated but  
66 was initially prioritised for certain high-risk occupational groups, such as healthcare workers.  
67 Identifying groups with low vaccination is important for informing future vaccine delivery strategy,  
68 as it may be necessary to offer specific, targeted encouragement to improve uptake. This would be  
69 particularly important if there are groups where low vaccination rates contribute to a higher risk of  
70 SARS-CoV-2 transmission in the workplace. Recent studies have highlighted considerable variation in  
71 vaccine uptake across occupations (12-14), with low levels observed in people working in  
72 elementary trades. However, different data sources have different limitations, such as the possibility  
73 of non-random missing data (14). It is therefore crucial to investigate the replicability of findings  
74 relating to vaccination uptake across a variety of data sources, to permit triangulation of results (15).  
75 Moreover, estimating the variation in risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection across occupations with and  
76 without adjustment for vaccination status might indicate whether vaccination uptake is an  
77 important factor explaining these occupational differences. We therefore analysed data from the  
78 Office for National Statistics (ONS) Coronavirus Infection Survey (CIS) to characterise vaccine uptake  
79 across occupational groups and to examine vaccination uptake as a possible explanation for  
80 occupational variations in SARS-CoV-2 infection.

## 81 **Methods**

### 82 **Datasets**

83 The CIS has been described elsewhere (2, 16). It is a randomly sampled panel survey of households,  
84 including participants aged two years and older, that aims to be representative of the UK population.  
85 It began recruitment in April 2020 and has added new participants monthly until January 2022(17).  
86 Participants were visited weekly for the five weeks following their recruitment, and monthly  
87 thereafter. Survey responses were collected at in-person visits until April 2022, with each visit  
88 incorporating a PCR test for SARS-CoV-2, to enable estimation of prevalence. From April 2022  
89 onwards the CIS phased out in-person visits and started using a more flexible data collection  
90 approach using online, telephone and postal methods. Recruitment rates were initially high (51%)  
91 but eventually dropped to around 12% (18). Rate of attrition was very low (less than 1% in 2021,  
92 (18)).

93 For participants in England, vaccination information (doses received, dates received, vaccine type) is  
94 available from the National Immunisation Management System (NIMS)(19). ONS supplied a dataset  
95 containing NIMS data, which was bolstered using self-report data from CIS. Because NIMS does not  
96 cover Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland, only self-report data are available for these countries.  
97 This represented a fundamental difference in measurement of vaccination in England compared to  
98 the other countries, as any vaccinations taking place after an individual's most recent CIS response  
99 could be accounted for in England, but not for the other countries. This would lead to considerable  
100 undercounting outside of England. We therefore restricted analyses to participants resident in  
101 England. We used data (from CIS and NIMS) from 1st December 2020, roughly coinciding with the  
102 start of the vaccination programme in the UK, and included all survey visits up to 11th May 2022,  
103 which was the most recent available data at the time of the analysis.

104

#### 105 **Inclusion criteria**

106 Analyses were conducted on working-age participants in England, which we defined as being aged  
107 20-64 years at their first CIS visit. The definition was selected to allow direct comparison with  
108 previous studies (2).

109

#### 110 **Classification of occupation**

111 Occupational groupings were derived using 4-digit standard occupational codes (SOC). We used a  
112 bespoke categorisation system to allow us to distinguish occupations likely to be at high risk of SARS-  
113 CoV-2 infection, informed by our previous work on this topic (Supplementary Table 1). We defined  
114 the following occupational categories: education; food processing; healthcare (office-based);

115 healthcare (patient contact); hospitality; manual; other workers (non-office-based); other workers  
116 (office-based); personal care; police and protective services; retail; sanitation services; social care;  
117 transport (non-public-facing); transport (public-facing); not working/ student. Rather than exclude  
118 individuals with missing occupation data, we created a 'missing' category, distinct from 'not  
119 employed'. The classification scheme is presented in Supplementary Table 1.

120

## 121 **Outcome definition**

122 The outcome variable was SARS-CoV-2 infection, defined as a positive PCR test obtained from a CIS  
123 visit. Individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 may test positive on PCR for an extended duration,  
124 including on consecutive CIS visits. This makes it difficult to distinguish repeated positive tests due to  
125 a single infection from repeated infections. We dealt with this issue by sensitivity analysis.  
126 Specifically, we conducted the analysis using two different definitions for a repeat infection. In the  
127 first, any new positive PCR test was treated as a new infection, provided that there was at least one  
128 negative PCR test since the previous positive test. In the second, we required a gap of 6 months  
129 between positive PCR tests, with at least one negative PCR test in between, to consider a  
130 subsequent positive PCR test to represent a new infection. This latter criterion was in line with UK  
131 government guidance concerning immunity following infection(20). If results did not substantially  
132 differ between these two scenarios, it would indicate that findings were robust to handling of this  
133 issue.

134

## 135 **Statistical analysis**

136 We created descriptive summaries of participant characteristics. We summarised vaccination details  
137 (number of doses received, type of each dose) by occupation group. We then conducted analyses  
138 looking at how risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection varied across occupational groups in the period 1st  
139 December 2020 to 11th May 2022, and how adjustment for vaccination status affected these  
140 estimates.

141 We used time-to-event methods, with calendar time as the timescale for analysis. Specifically, we  
142 set 1st December 2020 as the time origin, and considered participants to be left-censored prior to  
143 their first survey visit after this date. We incorporated multiple infections per individual using a  
144 Prentice, Williams, Peterson Total Time approach, which estimates hazard ratios with stratification  
145 by event number (21, 22). We included COVID-19 vaccination status as a categorical variable,  
146 measuring the number of vaccines received (0,1,2,3). The count of vaccines for each individual was

147 not updated until 14 days after the vaccination date, to allow for a delay in conferred protection  
148 from the vaccine. The longitudinal nature of the survey means that repeated measurements are  
149 available for participants over time. We allowed all variables to be time-varying in the analysis.  
150 These analyses assume that the adjustment set, described below, was sufficient to account for any  
151 confounding of the occupational-infection relationship and of the vaccination-infection relationship.

152 We fitted models sequentially, with the adjustment variables selected using a previously-derived  
153 DAG (an interactive version is available at [http://dagitty.net/dags.html?id=5J\\_Tek](http://dagitty.net/dags.html?id=5J_Tek) presented in (2).  
154 The DAG was constructed with the aim of identifying short-term effects of attending the workplace,  
155 rather than the effects of extended tenure in an occupation. Accordingly, we considered variables  
156 relating to health and living conditions to be confounders, rather than mediators, of the occupation  
157 effect. We first fitted models with occupation category as the exposure variable, adjusted for age  
158 and sex (Model 1). We then additionally adjusted for ethnic group, Index of Multiple Deprivation  
159 (IMD, categorised by quartiles), geographic region, household size, urban or rural location and  
160 presence of a health condition (Model 2). We then added vaccination status, as described above  
161 (Model 3). We present hazard ratios (95% CIs) for each adjustment set. We calculated the ‘ratio of  
162 hazard ratios’ as the ratio of the We used ‘other office-based workers’ as the reference category for  
163 the occupation variable, as this was considered to be a large, low-risk group. We also present hazard  
164 ratios (95% CIs) corresponding to number of vaccines received.

165

## 166 **Results**

167 Our analyses included 256,598 working age adults. Characteristics of the sample are shown in Table  
168 1.

169

### 170 **Number of vaccines by occupation**

171 Figure 1 shows the proportion of survey participants in each occupation category who had zero, one,  
172 two, or three (or more) vaccines by May 11<sup>th</sup> 2022. The overwhelming majority of individuals in all  
173 categories had had three vaccines. The proportion of individuals who had had three vaccines was  
174 lowest for food processing. Results for office-based healthcare workers, personal care workers, and  
175 public-facing transport workers cannot be fully displayed due to disclosure rules. However, office-  
176 based healthcare workers had the highest proportion with triple-vaccination (95%). Proportions of  
177 individuals who had received three vaccinations were 80% in personal care and 87% in public-facing  
178 transport roles.

179 Supplementary Tables 2, 3, and 4 show the type of vaccine received for first, second, and third doses  
180 by occupation group.

181

## 182 **Relationship with infection risk**

183 Supplementary Table 5 shows the estimated hazard ratios for number of vaccines received in  
184 relation to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Infection risk decreased with increasing numbers of vaccinations.  
185 Supplementary Table 6 shows the number of infections by occupational group, although this is  
186 heavily redacted due to disclosure rules. Figure 2 shows risk of infection (at least 1) and proportion  
187 of individuals with three vaccinations by occupational group. Risk of infection in this period was not  
188 highly variable across groups. Individuals working in personal care and food processing had relatively  
189 low rates of triple-vaccination and relatively high rates of infection. People working in education had  
190 the highest risk of infection, and high rates of triple-vaccination. People working in healthcare had  
191 the highest rates of triple-vaccination, whereas risk of infection was not notably elevated compared  
192 to other occupational groups, including those who had regular contact with patients.

193

194 Estimated hazard ratios (95% CIs) from PWP models are shown in Figure 3 and Supplementary Table  
195 7. Risk of infection during this period remained relatively high for education workers, people  
196 working in hospitality, personal care, police and protective services, social care, and potentially  
197 public-facing transport roles, compared to other office-based workers. Adjustment for non-vaccine  
198 covariates had little impact on estimates. The impact of adjustment for number of vaccines received  
199 was negligible for some groups, such as education, social care, and police and protective services. It  
200 was more pronounced for others; estimates for individuals employed in food processing, hospitality,  
201 manual professions, personal care, retail, sanitation services, and non-public facing transport roles  
202 were all noticeably reduced after adjustment for vaccination, albeit with considerable imprecision in  
203 estimates. Adjusting for vaccination substantially increased the estimate for healthcare roles with  
204 patient-contact, and to a lesser extent office-based healthcare workers. The ratio of hazard ratios  
205 reduced from 1.38 prior to adjustment for vaccination (Model 2) to 1.32 following adjustment  
206 (Model 3).

207 Results from the sensitivity analysis where a 6-month gap between positive PCR tests was required  
208 to register a new infection demonstrated a negligible difference in results (Supplementary Figure 1  
209 and Supplementary Table 8).

210

## 211 Discussion

212 The current results suggest that variation in vaccine uptake explains some of the differences in risk  
213 of SARS-CoV-2 infection between occupational groups. While the overwhelming majority of  
214 individuals in all groups had received three vaccines by 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022, there was substantial  
215 variation in the number of vaccines received between occupations. The variation in absolute risk of  
216 infection between occupational groups during the study period was not large.

217 These results are consistent with the findings from the Virus Watch cohort which found that  
218 individuals working in transport, trade, service and sales had the lowest uptake (12), and also with  
219 an analysis based on 2021 Census data which suggested high uptake amongst office-based and  
220 professional workers and low uptake amongst people working in elementary occupations (14).

221 The estimates of relative infection risk for occupational groups with the lowest rates of triple-  
222 vaccination (food processing, hospitality, manual, personal care, retail, and sanitation services) were  
223 all reduced after adjusting for vaccination, which might suggest that relatively low vaccination rates  
224 account for some of the risk in these groups. Conversely, relative risk estimates for the occupational  
225 groups with the highest rates of triple-vaccination were increased after adjustment for vaccination,  
226 suggesting that high vaccination coverage in healthcare workers may have conferred notable  
227 protection in this (high risk) group during the study period. However, there were also occupational  
228 groups with high vaccination coverage for which relative risk estimates were essentially unaffected  
229 after adjusting for vaccination (education, social care). Relative risk of infection remained high for  
230 these groups despite vaccination (although for social care, overall rates of triple-vaccination in the  
231 period was below that observed for the reference group, other office-based workers). The estimated  
232 relative risk for police and protective services remained similar after adjustment for vaccination, and  
233 was elevated. Again, vaccination rates in this group were lower than for the reference group.

234 This is the first study to attempt to reconcile the effect of covid-19 vaccination on the occupational  
235 risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection. There are a number of important limitations to consider in interpreting  
236 the results. Our analyses assume that we have sufficiently controlled for confounding between  
237 occupation and infection, and between vaccination and infection. If the latter condition was not  
238 met, adjusting for vaccination as a purported mediator of the occupation-infection relationship  
239 could induce collider stratification bias. One probable source of unmeasured confounding in the  
240 current study relates to individual behaviour, such as socialising and shopping. However, previous  
241 analyses suggest that whilst occupational differentials in SARS-CoV-2 infection risk vary over time,  
242 they are relatively robust to adjustment for socio-demographic, health-related, and non-workplace  
243 activity-related potential confounders (2, 5). While data on behaviour is captured within the CIS, it is



244 self-reported and subject to substantial rates of missingness. Further investigation of this dataset  
245 using methods for time-varying confounding (23, 24) could prove worthwhile.

246 Another limitation of the dataset is that the relative timing of vaccination and infection is not always  
247 clear. If a participant obtains a positive PCR test at a survey visit, we can say that they became  
248 infected sometime since the previous visit, but whether this occurred prior to or following  
249 vaccination cannot be discerned, since we cannot know the actual date of infection. Another  
250 potential source of bias relates to the representativeness of the CIS. Estimated vaccine uptake  
251 reported here is similar to that observed in the Virus Watch cohort (12) but is considerably higher  
252 compared to some administrative databases, potentially indicating that response rate might be  
253 higher in vaccinated individuals. For example, we estimated the proportion of manual workers who  
254 had received three vaccinations to be over 80% by 11<sup>th</sup> May 2022. By contrast, an analysis based on  
255 2021 Census data estimated the proportion of workers in elementary and related occupations to be  
256 just 58% by 28<sup>th</sup> February 2022 (14). It is unclear however if the observed differences are due to lack  
257 of representativeness in the CIS, due to biases in the Census-based study arising from missing data,  
258 or due to other methodological differences, such as the discrepancy in study periods. Overall, 88% of  
259 the CIS cohort had received three vaccinations by May 11<sup>th</sup> 2022. For comparison, we estimate that  
260 approximately 64% of 18-64 year olds in England had had three vaccinations by this date using  
261 publically-available NIMS (25) and Census 2011 (26) data. Noting the slight difference in age  
262 bandings, it does therefore appear that vaccination rates may be higher in the CIS cohort. It may be,  
263 for example, that participation in the study increases the likelihood of vaccination. If vaccination  
264 rates are consistently overestimated in the CIS data, this could cause us to understate the role of  
265 vaccination in explaining differential risk between occupations, and could plausibly mean that overall  
266 variation in risk between occupations is understated. Consequently, triangulation of the results  
267 relating to vaccination effects will be important, using data sources with different biases, although at  
268 present there is no comparable analysis examining the role of vaccination in explaining differences in  
269 infection risk. These results should be considered preliminary pending the accrual of further relevant  
270 data. We did find that vaccinations rates were lowest amongst several occupational groups involving  
271 substantial public contact, in line with recent work (14).

## 272 **Conclusions**

273 The present results suggest that differences in vaccination uptake between occupations contribute  
274 to some of the difference in infection risk. However, it is not sufficient to explain all of the variation  
275 in risk, and important differences remain. These could be related to workplace factors, work

276 activities, or behaviours outside the workplace. Complementary approaches are therefore likely to  
277 remain necessary, particularly for high-risk occupations.

278

### 279 **Contributors**

280 SR is principal investigator. All authors contributed to the design of the research proposal and study,  
281 including the statistical analysis plan. JW conducted analyses and wrote first draft of the manuscript.  
282 All authors contributed to the interpretation of the results, critically revised the paper and agreed on  
283 the final version for submission.

284

### 285 **Funding**

286 This work was supported with funding from the ONS (ONS Ref PU-22-0205). MG, NP, MvT, JW, SR  
287 acknowledge funding through the National Core Study 'PROTECT' programme, managed by the  
288 Health and Safety Executive on behalf of HM Government. TK, ED and SVK acknowledge funding  
289 from the Medical Research Council (MRC; MC\_UU\_00022/2) and the Chief Scientist Office (CSO;  
290 SPHSU17). SVK also acknowledges funding from a NRS Senior Clinical Fellowship (SCAF/15/02).

291

### 292 **Disclaimer**

293 This work contains statistical data from ONS which is Crown Copyright. The use of the ONS statistical  
294 data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or  
295 analysis of the statistical data. This work uses research datasets which may not exactly reproduce  
296 National Statistics aggregates.

297

### 298 **Competing interests**

299 SVK was co-chair of the Scottish Government's Expert Reference Group on Ethnicity and COVID-19  
300 and a member of the UK Scientific Advisory Group on Emergencies subgroup on ethnicity

301

### 302 **Ethics approval**

303 The COVID-19 Infection Survey received ethical approval from the South-Central Berkshire B  
304 Research Ethics Committee (20/SC/0195). All participants provided informed consent. For use of

305 this data for this project statistics authority self-assessment classified the study as low risk. This  
306 assessment was approved by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) Research Accreditation Panel.

### 307 **Data availability statement**

308 ONS CIS data can be accessed only by researchers who are Office of National Statistics (ONS)  
309 accredited researchers. Researchers can apply for accreditation through the Research Accreditation  
310 Service. Access is through the Secure Research Service (SRS) and approved on a project basis. For  
311 further details see:

312 [https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/statistics/requestingstatistics/approvedresearchersche](https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/statistics/requestingstatistics/approvedresearcherscheme)  
313 [me](https://www.ons.gov.uk/aboutus/whatwedo/statistics/requestingstatistics/approvedresearcherscheme)

### 314 **Patient and public involvement**

315 Participants were not involved in the design and implementation of the study or in setting research  
316 questions and the outcome measures. No participants were asked to advise on interpretation or  
317 writing up of results.

318

### 319 **Acknowledgements**

320 We would like to acknowledge Vahé Nafilyan, Office for National Statistics, for substantial input into  
321 the contents of this manuscript.

322

### 323 **References**

- 324 1. Cherrie M, Rhodes S, Wilkinson J, Mueller W, Nafilyan V, Van Tongeren M, et al. Longitudinal  
325 changes in proportionate mortality due to COVID-19 by occupation in England and Wales. *Scand J*  
326 *Work Environ Health*. 2022;48(8):611-20.
- 327 2. Rhodes S, Wilkinson J, Pearce N, Mueller W, Cherrie M, Stocking K, et al. Occupational  
328 differences in SARS-CoV-2 infection: analysis of the UK ONS COVID-19 infection survey. *J Epidemiol*  
329 *Community Health*. 2022;76(10):841-6.
- 330 3. Mutambudzi M, Niedwiedz C, Macdonald EB, Leyland A, Mair F, Anderson J, et al.  
331 Occupation and risk of severe COVID-19: prospective cohort study of 120 075 UK Biobank  
332 participants. *Occup Environ Med*. 2020;78(5):307-14.
- 333 4. Nafilyan V, Pawelek P, Ayoubkhani D, Rhodes S, Pembrey L, Matz M, et al. Occupation and  
334 COVID-19 mortality in England: a national linked data study of 14.3 million adults. *Occup Environ*  
335 *Med*. 2022;79(7):433-41.
- 336 5. Beale S, Hoskins S, Byrne T, Erica Fong WL, Fragaszy E, Geismar C, et al. Differential Risk of  
337 SARS-CoV-2 Infection by Occupation: Evidence from the Virus Watch prospective cohort study in  
338 England and Wales. *medRxiv*. 2022.

- 339 6. Oude Hengel KM, Burdorf A, Pronk A, Schlunssen V, Stokholm ZA, Kolstad HA, et al. Exposure  
340 to a SARS-CoV-2 infection at work: development of an international job exposure matrix (COVID-19-  
341 JEM). *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2022;48(1):61-70.
- 342 7. Rhodes S, Beale S, Wilkinson J, van Veldhoven K, Basinas I, Mueller W, et al. Exploring the  
343 relationship between job characteristics and infection: Application of a COVID-19 job exposure  
344 matrix to SARS-CoV-2 infection data in the United Kingdom. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2022.
- 345 8. Beale S, Patel P, Rodger A, Braithwaite I, Byrne T, Fong WLE, et al. Occupation, work-related  
346 contact and SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleocapsid serological status: findings from the Virus Watch  
347 prospective cohort study. *Occup Environ Med*. 2022;79(11):729-35.
- 348 9. Xing K, Tu XY, Liu M, Liang ZW, Chen JN, Li JJ, et al. Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccines:  
349 a systematic review. *Zhongguo Dang Dai Er Ke Za Zhi*. 2021;23(3):221-8.
- 350 10. Au WY, Cheung PP. Effectiveness of heterologous and homologous covid-19 vaccine  
351 regimens: living systematic review with network meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2022;377:e069989.
- 352 11. Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, Mitchell PK, DeSilva MB, Irving SA, et al. Waning of vaccine  
353 effectiveness against moderate and severe covid-19 among adults in the US from the VISION  
354 network: test negative, case-control study. *BMJ*. 2022;379:e072141.
- 355 12. Beale S, Burns R, Braithwaite I, Byrne T, Lam Erica Fong W, Fragaszy E, et al. Occupation,  
356 Worker Vulnerability, and COVID-19 Vaccination Uptake: Analysis of the Virus Watch prospective  
357 cohort study. *Vaccine*. 2022;40(52):7646-52.
- 358 13. Dolby T, Nafilyan V, Pawelek P. Coronavirus and vaccination rates in people aged 18 to 64  
359 years by occupation and industry, England: 28 February 2022. Office for National Statistics; 2022.
- 360 14. Nafilyan V, Dolby T, Finning K, Pawelek P, Edge R, Morgan J, et al. Differences in COVID-19  
361 vaccination coverage by occupation in England: a national linked data study. *Occupational and  
362 Environmental Medicine*. 2022;79:758-66.
- 363 15. Lawlor DA, Tilling K, Smith GD. Triangulation in aetiological epidemiology. *International  
364 Journal of Epidemiology*. 2016;45(6):1866-86.
- 365 16. Pouwels KB, House T, Pritchard E, Robotham JV, Birrell PJ, Gelman A, et al. Community  
366 prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in England from April to November, 2020: results from the ONS  
367 Coronavirus Infection Survey. *Lancet Public Health*. 2021;6(1):e30-e8.
- 368 17. Office for National Statistics. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey: quality and  
369 methodology information (QMI) 2023 [Available from:  
370 <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/methodologies/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveyqmi>.  
371
- 372 18. Ayoubkhani D, Bermingham C, Pouwels KB, Glickman M, Nafilyan V, Zaccardi F, et al.  
373 Trajectory of long covid symptoms after covid-19 vaccination: community based cohort study. *BMJ*.  
374 2022;377:e069676.
- 375 19. National Health Service. COVID-19 vaccinations 2022 [Available from:  
376 <https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-vaccinations/>.  
377
- 378 20. UK Health Security Agency. Using the NHS COVID Pass to demonstrate COVID-19 status 2022  
379 [Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/nhs-covid-pass>.  
380
- 381 21. Prentice RL, Williams BJ, Peterson AV. On the regression analysis of multivariate failure time  
382 data. *Biometrika*. 1981;68(2):373-9.
- 383 22. Amorim LD, Cai J. Modelling recurrent events: a tutorial for analysis in epidemiology. *Int J  
384 Epidemiol*. 2015;44(1):324-33.
- 385 23. Daniel RM, De Stavola BL, Cousens SN. gformula: Estimating causal effects in the presence of  
386 time-varying confounding or mediation using the g-computation formula. *The Stata Journal*.  
387 2011;11(4):479-517.
- 386 24. Sterne JA, Tilling K. G-estimation of causal effects, allowing for time-varying confounding.  
387 *The Stata Journal*. 2002;2(2):164-82.

- 388 25. NHS England. COVID-19 vaccinations archive 2023 [Available from:  
 389 [https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-  
 391 vaccinations-archive/](https://www.england.nhs.uk/statistics/statistical-work-areas/covid-19-vaccinations/covid-19-<br/>
    390 vaccinations-archive/).  
 392 26. Office for National Statistics. Age groups 2020 [Available from: [https://www.ethnicity-facts-  
 392 figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest#title](https://www.ethnicity-facts-<br/>
    392 figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/age-groups/latest#title).

393

394

Characteristic	Summary (n = 256,598)
Age (years)	45.3 (12.3)
Sex male	115,904 (45)
Ethnicity	
White	231,868 (90)
Asian	13,973 (5)
Black	3,465 (1)
Mixed	4,298 (2)
Other	2,982 (1)
Missing	12 (0)
Occupation	
Education	12,131 (5)
Food processing	1,080 (0)
Healthcare-office based	777 (0)
Healthcare patient contact	10,970 (4)
Hospitality	2,462 (1)
Manual	10,387 (4)
Other workers non-office based	11,351 (4)
Other workers office based	70,210 (27)
Personal care	732 (0)
Police and protective services	3,076 (1)
Retail	5,875 (2)
Sanitation services	1,610 (1)
Social care	6,533 (3)
Transport non-public facing	2,990 (1)
Transport public facing	1,088 (0)
Student/ not working	65,236 (25)
Missing/ incomplete	50,090 (20)
IMD	
1	40,810 (16)
2	62,239 (24)
3	73,118 (29)
4	80,431 (31)
Urban-rural	
Major urban	106,046 (41)
Urban city town	105,716 (41)
Rural town	23,318 (9)
Rural village	21,518 (8)
Household size	
1	34,764 (14)
2	97,856 (38)

3	52,013 (20)
4	50,666 (20)
5+	21,299 (8)
Health conditions	
Yes	44,599 (17)
Missing	3,084 (1)

395 **Table 1 – Characteristics of the sample. Mean (SD) or n (%)**

396

397 **Figure legends**

398 **Figure 1: Percentage of individuals receiving 0,1,2,3 COVID-19 vaccines in England by occupation**  
399 **group by May 11<sup>th</sup> 2022. Note that disclosure rules mean that results for office-based healthcare**  
400 **workers, personal care workers, and public-facing transport workers cannot be displayed.**

401


402 **Figure 2: Rates of SARS-CoV-2 infection (at least one, red) and triple vaccination (blue) by**  
403 **occupation, between December 1<sup>st</sup> 2020 and May 11<sup>th</sup> 2022.**


404

405 **Figure 3: Hazard ratios (95% CIs) corresponding to occupational group in relation to infection with**  
406 **SARS-CoV-2. Based on n = 256,598 individuals. Model 1: Adjusted for age and sex. Model 2:**  
407 **Additionally adjusted for ethnicity, deprivation, region, urban or rural area, household size, and**  
408 **presence of pre-existing health conditions. Model 3: Additionally adjusted for number of vaccines**  
409 **received. The reference category was ‘other office-based workers’.**

410

411







Hazard ratio (95% CI) SARS-CoV-2. Ref category other office-based workers

