

Comparative Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccines in Immunocompromised Individuals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Using the GRADE Framework

Xuan Wang, MD, MSc,¹ Katrin Haeussler, PhD, MSc,² Anne Spellman, PhD, MSc,³ Leslie E. Phillips, PhD, SM,⁴ Allison Ramiller, MPH,⁴ Mary T. Bausch-Jurken, PhD, MS,⁵ Pawana Sharma, MSc,⁶ Anna Krivelyova, MA,⁶ Sonam Vats, MPH,⁷ Nicolas Van de Velde, PhD^{5*}

¹ICON plc, Stockholm, Sweden; ²ICON plc, Munich, Germany; ³Data Health Ltd, London, United Kingdom; ⁴Data-Driven LLC, Seattle, WA, United States; ⁵Moderna, Inc., Cambridge, MA, United States; ⁶ICON plc, London, United Kingdom; ⁷ICON plc, Bengaluru, India

Address correspondence to: Nicolas Van de Velde, PhD
Moderna, Inc.
200 Technology Square, Cambridge, MA 02139
Phone: (617) 417-3593
Email: Nicolas.VandeVelde@modernatx.com

Running head: COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness: Immunocompromised Individuals

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Despite representing only 3% of the US population, immunocompromised (IC) individuals account for nearly half of the COVID-19 breakthrough hospitalizations. IC individuals generate a lower immune response following vaccination in general, and the US CDC recommended a third dose of either mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines as part of their primary series. Influenza vaccine trials have shown that increasing dosage could improve effectiveness in IC populations. The objective of this systematic literature review and pairwise meta-analysis was to evaluate the clinical effectiveness of mRNA-1273 (50 or 100 mcg/dose) versus BNT162b2 (30 mcg/dose) in IC populations using the GRADE framework.

Methods: The systematic literature search was conducted in the World Health Organization COVID-19 Research Database. Studies were included in the pairwise meta-analysis if they

reported comparisons of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 in IC individuals ≥ 18 years of age; outcomes of interest were SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalization due to COVID-19, and mortality due to COVID-19. Risk ratios (RR) were pooled across studies using random-effects meta-analysis models. Outcomes were also analyzed in subgroups of patients with cancer, autoimmune disease, and solid organ transplant. Risk of bias was assessed for randomized and observational studies using the Risk of Bias 2 tool and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, respectively. Evidence was evaluated using the GRADE framework.

Results: Overall, 22 studies were included in the pairwise meta-analysis. Compared with BNT162b2, mRNA-1273 was associated with significantly reduced risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.79–0.96; $P=0.0054$; $I^2=61.9\%$), COVID-19–associated hospitalization (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.76–0.90; $P<0.0001$; $I^2=0\%$), and COVID-19–associated mortality (RR 0.62, 95% CI 0.43–0.89; $P=0.011$; $I^2=0\%$) in IC populations. Results were consistent across subgroups. Because of sample size limitations, relative effectiveness of COVID-19 mRNA vaccines in IC populations cannot be studied in randomized trials and evidence certainty among comparisons was type 3 (low) and 4 (very low), reflecting potential biases in observational studies.

Conclusion: This GRADE meta-analysis based on a large number of consistent observational studies showed that the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine is associated with improved clinical effectiveness in IC populations compared with BNT162b2.

Keywords: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, mRNA vaccine, mRNA-1273, BNT162b2, immunocompromised, effectiveness

Introduction

The global coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic caused by severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has resulted in 103 million reported infections and 1.1 million deaths to date in the United States (US) (1). In response to the pandemic, mRNA-1273 (Spikevax®, Moderna, Inc., Cambridge, USA) (2) and BNT162b2 (Comirnaty®, Pfizer/BioNTech, New York, USA/Mainz, Germany) (3), each employing novel mRNA technology, were developed and approved for the prevention of COVID-19 (4). Global phase 2/3 studies demonstrated that both mRNA vaccines given in a 2-dose series were highly efficacious at reducing symptomatic infections and hospitalizations in the immunocompetent population (5; 6).

Although immunocompromised (IC) individuals comprise only approximately 3% of the total US population (7), they account for nearly half of the breakthrough COVID-19 hospitalizations (8). While there is a range of severity across conditions at the population level, adults considered immunodeficient had 2.68-fold greater adjusted odds of being hospitalized with COVID-19 compared with immunocompetent individuals due both to the underlying IC condition and therapies used for treatment (9; 10). In 1 study, use of immunosuppression in patients with autoimmune disease resulted in 1.35-fold (95% confidence interval [CI] 1.29–1.40) greater odds of developing life-threatening COVID-19 (11).

Despite being at increased risk of COVID-19–related morbidity and mortality (10; 12-14), IC individuals and patients receiving immunosuppressive medications were excluded from participating in pivotal trials of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 (5; 6). Real-world COVID-19 data indicate that vaccine immune responses are generally impaired in IC populations (9; 15-17) and that vaccine effectiveness, as estimated as the odds of obtaining a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result using multivariate logistic regression models, is lower in IC versus immunocompetent individuals (18). In addition to severe COVID-19, IC populations are at higher risk of prolonged SARS-CoV-2 infection (19-26) and viral evolution (19-22; 24; 27; 28) due to poor humoral

responses. These risks are exacerbated by even lower antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 variants (29-35). IC individuals may also contribute disproportionately to SARS-CoV-2 transmission to household contacts (36). High vaccine effectiveness is therefore critically important for this population and the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended a third dose of either mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines as part of their primary series.

Influenza vaccine trials demonstrated that high dose vaccines led to improved immune responses in IC individuals compared with standard dose vaccines and suggested that a high dose vaccine offers greater effectiveness for IC populations (37-42). Although both mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 employ the mRNA mode of action, the composition of each vaccine is different. For instance, the mRNA dosage and type of lipid nanoparticles used in the delivery system differs between vaccines. The mRNA-1273 primary series contains 100 mcg of mRNA and 50 mcg for the booster (2; 43), whereas BNT162b2 contains 30 mcg of mRNA for each primary and booster dose (3; 44). Observational studies have consistently shown differences between the two mRNA COVID-19 vaccines both in terms of immune response (15) and clinical effectiveness (45-47) in IC populations.

As SARS-CoV-2 transitions from a pandemic to an endemic state, countries are transferring vaccination programs from central government purchasing to their respective national healthcare systems, which is triggering in-depth health technology assessments to recommend the best use of available vaccines in specific populations. Several national immunization technical advisory groups (NITAGs), including the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) in the US, use the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations) framework for identifying questions relevant to healthcare, selecting outcomes of interest and assessing their importance, evaluating the available evidence, and synthesizing evidence to develop recommendations consistent with considerations of values and preferences of patients and the society in which they live (48; 49).

This present analysis follows the GRADE framework to address the following healthcare question: Is the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine (50 or 100 mcg/dose) more clinically effective in IC populations compared with the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine (30 mcg/dose)? Accordingly, we performed a systematic literature review and pairwise meta-analysis to compare COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness outcomes among IC individuals given either mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2.

Methods

Search strategy and study selection

We performed a systematic literature review in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses 2020 framework (50). The main search was conducted in the World Health Organization COVID-19 Research Database on April 14, 2022 and updated on December 19, 2022. Databases searched were MEDLINE, International Clinical Trials Registry Platform, EMBASE, EuropePMC, medRxiv, Web of Science, ProQuest Central, Academic Search Complete, Scopus, and COVIDWHO. The search strategy is presented in

Table S1.

Clinical trials, observational studies, or any real-world evidence published as manuscripts, letters, commentaries, abstracts, or posters were included if they reported efficacy or clinical effectiveness outcomes in IC individuals ≥ 18 years of age vaccinated with mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 within the same study. IC individuals were defined as people with immunocompromising conditions falling into the clinically extremely vulnerable (CEV) groups 1 or 2, which include solid organ transplant, solid and hematological cancers, hemodialysis, poorly controlled human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection, and autoimmune conditions requiring immunosuppressive therapy (51). Outcomes of interest were vaccine efficacy or effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-19–associated hospitalization, and COVID-19–associated death. Recently published systematic literature reviews on the same topic were cross-checked to ensure relevant articles were included. Studies reporting outcomes in

pregnant women, current or former smokers, or physically inactive people; with heterologous vaccination schedule (i.e., mix of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2); with only safety data; or study protocols or economic models were excluded (**Table S2**). Two independent reviewers selected studies following a two-level approach; a third reviewer arbitrated conflicts. Titles and abstracts were screened against inclusion criteria in level 1, followed by full-text appraisal of articles not excluded at level 1 against selection criteria in level 2.

Data extraction and quality assessment

Publication details, study and participant characteristics, vaccine type and vaccination status, at-risk condition, and clinical outcomes were extracted. Risk of bias was assessed in accordance with Cochrane review guidelines (52) using the ROB 2 tool (53) for randomized studies and the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (54) for observational studies. Evidence was evaluated based on GRADE criteria (48; 49).

Statistical analysis

Random-effects meta-analysis models were used to pool risk ratios (RR) and calculate absolute effects as risk difference (RD) per 100,000 individuals across studies. Inverse variance weights were calculated for individual studies with the DerSimonian-Laird method (55). Chi-square testing to evaluate heterogeneity across studies was performed (56). The I^2 statistic was estimated (0–100%, 0% meaning no evidence of heterogeneity). Subgroup analysis was performed for patients with cancer, autoimmune disease, and solid organ transplant.

Results

Overview of included studies

Of 5,745 unique items retrieved, we identified 35 studies reporting COVID-19 clinical efficacy or effectiveness outcomes in IC individuals ≥ 18 years of age who received mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 in the same study (**Figure 1**). Thirteen articles were excluded because the

population did not meet the inclusion criteria (i.e., participants had immunocompromising conditions not included in CEV groups 1 or 2), 1-dose vaccine regimen data were reported, or the outcome of interest data were not reported in sufficient detail for analysis. Characteristics of all nonrandomized (n=21) and randomized (n=1) studies included in the pairwise meta-analysis are shown in **Table 1**. Overall, 190,643 and 187,813 patients received mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2, respectively. Studies included mostly US populations (n=15) (18; 45; 47; 57-68), with the remaining trials reporting data on patients from Spain (n=3) (32; 46; 69), Italy (n=1) (70), Singapore (n=1) (71), Switzerland (n=1) (72), and multiple countries (n=1) (73). Specific at-risk and IC conditions included solid organ transplant (n=6) (45; 46; 57; 67; 68; 72), cancer (n=5) (18; 45; 62; 65; 70), hemodialysis (n=3) (32; 59; 66), rheumatologic disease (n=3) (18; 47; 73), multiple sclerosis or other neurological autoimmune disease (n=2) (61; 71), inflammatory bowel disease (n=1) (63), primary immunodeficiency with functional B cell defects (n=1) (64), hematological disorders (n=1) (69), and HIV infection (n=1) (72). Two studies did not specify the IC condition (58; 60). Individuals received ≥ 2 doses of mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2. Data on 2-dose regimens were considered if reported (n=15) (18; 45; 46; 57; 59; 61; 63-69; 72; 73), otherwise data from 3- or 4-dose regimens (n=7) (32; 47; 58; 60; 62; 70; 71) were used. Of studies reporting data from 2-dose regimens, outcomes were assessed ≥ 14 days after the second dose (n=13), ≥ 7 days after the second dose (n=1) (63), and other timepoints (n=1) (66). Timing of outcome assessment relative to the second dose was not specified in 3 studies. Variants of concern were delta (n=6) (18; 45; 46; 65; 67; 69), delta and omicron (n=2) (62; 71), delta and beta (n=1) (59), pre-omicron variants (n=1) (47), and omicron only (n=1) (58). Eleven studies did not directly specify the variant assessed (32; 57; 60; 61; 63; 64; 66; 68; 70; 72; 73).

Risk of bias assessment found no serious risk of bias for 17 studies (randomized, n=1; nonrandomized, n=16) and serious risk of bias in 5 nonrandomized studies primarily due to the lack of description of comparability between cohorts or adjustment for confounding factors (**Table S3; Table S4**).

SARS-CoV-2 infection (randomized study)

Only 1 and 2 laboratory-confirmed, symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections occurred in the BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 arms, respectively, of a single randomized controlled trial (RCT; RR 2.05, 95% CI 0.19–22.42; RD 499, 95% CI –1,137 to 2,136) (72). The small number of events led to uncertainty around the estimates of effect and no association between mRNA vaccine type and risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection was found in this RCT. Evidence certainty was downgraded from type 1 (high) to type 3 (low) for imprecision and limited evidence (**Table 2; Table S4**).

SARS-CoV-2 infection (nonrandomized studies)

Of the 17 nonrandomized studies reporting SARS-CoV-2 infection, mRNA-1273 was associated with a statistically significant reduction in the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with BNT162b2 (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.79–0.96; $P=0.0054$; **Figure 2**). The RD (95% CI) of mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 was estimated to be 412 fewer SARS-CoV-2 infections (from 665 fewer to 160 fewer). Heterogeneity between studies may be considered substantial ($I^2=61.9\%$). The certainty of evidence was graded as type 4 (very low) for imprecision and indirectness due to varying outcome definitions (**Table 2; Table S3**).

Analysis of 4 studies each reporting SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with cancer (45; 65; 69; 70) found that mRNA-1273 was associated with significantly reduced risk of infection compared with BNT162b2 (RR 0.73, 95% CI 0.57–0.92, $P=0.0088$; RD –346, 95% CI –598 to –94, $P=0.0071$). Similar findings were observed in 4 studies assessing patients with autoimmune diseases (RR 0.67, 95% CI 0.52–0.88; $P=0.0032$; RD –455, 95% CI –1,209 to 298) (47; 61; 63; 71). No association between mRNA vaccine type was found for the 4 studies reporting SARS-CoV-2 infection in solid organ transplant recipients (RR 1.05, 95% CI 0.87–1.26; RD –93, 95% CI –573 to 386) (45; 57; 67; 68). No evidence of heterogeneity was

observed between any of the studies ($I^2=0\%$ for all subgroups). As in the overall analysis of SARS-CoV-2 infection, the certainty of evidence was graded as type 4 (very low; **Table 3**).

Hospitalization due to COVID-19

mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of COVID-19–associated hospitalization versus BNT162b2 in the 9 studies included in the overall analysis (RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.76–0.90; $P<0.0001$; **Figure 2**). The RD (95% CI) of mRNA-1273 compared with BNT162b2 was estimated to be 60 fewer hospitalizations due to COVID-19 (from 140 fewer to 20 more). No evidence of heterogeneity was observed between studies ($I^2 = 0\%$). The certainty of evidence for this outcome was type 3 (low) due to inclusion of nonrandomized studies and imprecision (**Table 2**; **Table S3**).

In 2 studies reporting hospitalization in patients with cancer (18; 45), mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly reduced risk of hospitalization compared with BNT162b2 (RR 0.54, 95% CI 0.37–0.79; $P=0.0013$; RD –585, 95% CI –1,655 to 485). No association between mRNA vaccine type and COVID-19–associated hospitalization was found for the 3 studies each reporting hospitalization in the subgroups of patients with autoimmune diseases (RR 0.97, 95% CI 0.70–1.35; RD –103, 95% CI –1,661 to 1,456) (18; 71; 73) or solid organ transplant (RR 0.91, 95% CI 0.78–1.06; RD –147, 95% CI –816 to 522) (45; 46; 68). No evidence of heterogeneity was observed between any of the studies for the subgroup analysis. The certainty of evidence in all subgroups was graded as type 3 (low; **Table 3**).

Death due to COVID-19

Of the 4 studies reporting COVID-19–associated mortality (46; 57; 66; 67), mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly reduced risk of death compared with BNT162b2 (RR 0.62, 95% CI 0.43–0.89; $P=0.011$; **Figure 2**). mRNA-1273 was estimated to lead to 56 fewer deaths associated with COVID-19 (from 559 fewer to 446 more) compared with BNT162b2. No evidence of heterogeneity was observed between any of the studies ($I^2=0\%$). The certainty of

evidence was rated as type 3 (low) due to inclusion of nonrandomized studies (**Table 2; Table S3**). Grading was reduced for imprecision and increased due to the strong association in RR.

COVID-19–associated death was assessed only in the subgroup of solid organ transplant recipients (46; 57; 67). In these 3 studies, mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly reduced risk of death compared with BNT162b2 (RR 0.56, 95% CI 0.37–0.84; $P=0.0049$; RD $-3,528$, 95% CI $-12,002$ to $4,945$). No evidence of heterogeneity was observed between any of the studies in this subgroup ($I^2=0\%$). The certainty of evidence was type 3 (low) due to inclusion of nonrandomized studies as well as imprecision and limited evidence (**Table 3**).

Discussion

In this systematic review and pairwise meta-analysis of 22 studies, we found that mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalization due to COVID-19, and COVID-19–associated mortality compared with BNT162b2 in adults with a broad spectrum of severe immunocompromising conditions. The certainty of this evidence was type 4 (very low) for the SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome and type 3 (low) for the COVID-19–associated hospitalization and death outcomes (**Table 4**). As all included studies were pairwise comparisons between mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2, the research question was not biased by differences in time period assessed, population, viral variants within each study. When outcomes were assessed in subgroups, mRNA-1273 was associated with significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19–associated hospitalization versus BNT162b2 in patients with cancer. Compared with BNT162b2, mRNA-1273 was also associated with a significantly reduced risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in patients with autoimmune diseases and COVID-19–associated death in solid organ transplant recipients.

IC individuals have a high burden of COVID-19 due to characteristics of their underlying disease or immunosuppressive treatments that impact their ability to mount productive immune

responses as well as increased susceptibility to severe COVID-19 (30). Physicians may seek to optimize COVID-19 vaccine type, timing, and number of doses to improve outcomes in IC patients (32). RCTs are ranked highly in the hierarchy of evidence; however, studying comparative efficacy with adequate power would require enrolling a prohibitive number of IC patients. Therefore, the research question can only be assessed using large real-world databases where individual medical and pharmacy information is available.

Limitations of this systematic literature review were that non-English studies were excluded, and publication bias was not assessed in the meta-analysis. Inherent to the GRADE framework, evidence certainty is initially set to either high if the included studies are randomized studies or low if they are observational studies. As all but 1 of the 22 studies included in the pairwise meta-analysis were nonrandomized, the maximum certainty of evidence achievable in this meta-analysis was low despite the high number of observational studies and consistency of results. The pairwise meta-analysis was also limited by inconsistent outcome definitions across studies as well as differences in covariates between studies. For example, the vaccination scheme (2 vs 3 doses; booster) differed between studies, with a mix of primary series (100 mcg vs 30 mcg) and booster (50 mcg vs 30 mcg) pairwise comparisons included in the meta-analysis. Variants of concern changed over time, with risks of hospitalization and death (74) and vaccine effectiveness differing by variant (75). Vaccine effectiveness of 2-dose regimens could only be shown for the delta variant, whereas the omicron variant required a 3-dose schedule. Other sources of bias inherent to observational studies, such as prescribing differences by risk of severe COVID-19 and ability of patients to choose the mRNA vaccine type, could not be accounted for in this meta-analysis. In addition to differences in mRNA dosage between mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2, other differences such as the lipid nanoparticle delivery system and mRNA translation efficiency may also have impacted clinical effectiveness between vaccines.

Our meta-analysis of observational studies showed that mRNA-1273 (50 or 100 mcg/dose) was associated with a significantly reduced risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, COVID-

19-associated hospitalization, and death due to COVID-19 when compared with BNT162b2 (30 mcg/dose) in IC populations. Based on the findings, vaccinating IC individuals in the United States with mRNA-1273 instead of BNT162b2 would prevent an additional 60 and 56 hospitalizations and deaths per 100,000 individuals, respectively. Considering the limited availability of data from RCTs and to provide needed clinical decision-making guidance, our results showed that mRNA-1273 offers better clinical outcomes compared with BNT162b2 in vulnerable IC populations.

Author Contributions

XW and KH designed and performed the systematic literature review and meta-analysis, and critically evaluated the manuscript. AS, LEP, AR, and AK designed and performed the systematic literature review and critically evaluated the manuscript. PS and SV collected data and critically evaluated the manuscript. MTB-J and NVdV conceptualized the article and provided oversight and critical evaluation of the manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

Disclosures

XW, KH, PS, AK, and SV are employees of ICON plc, a clinical research organization paid by Moderna, Inc., to conduct the study. AS is an independent epidemiology consultant/director of Data Health Ltd, which provides health data consultancy services, and was paid by Moderna, Inc., to conduct aspects of this study. LEP is an employee and owner of Data-Driven LLC and AR is a contractor of Data-Driven LLC, a research organization paid by Moderna, Inc. to conduct aspects of this study. MTB-J and NVdV are employees of Moderna, Inc. and hold stock/stock options in the company.

Acknowledgments

Writing assistance was provided by Erin McClure, PhD, an employee of ICON (Blue Bell, PA, USA) in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP3) guidelines, funded by Moderna, Inc., and under the direction of the authors.

Funding

This study was funded by Moderna, Inc.

References

1. National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD) DoVD. COVID Data Tracker Weekly Review: Interpretative Summary for February 10, 2023 [Online] (2023). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/covid-data/covidview/index.html> [Accessed February 23 2023].
2. SPIKEVAX (mRNA-1273). Full Prescribing Information, ModernaTX, Inc., Cambridge, MA, 2022.
3. COMIRNATY (BNT162b2). Full Prescribing Information, Pfizer/BioNTech, New York, NY, 2022.
4. Chaudhary N, Weissman D, Whitehead KA. mRNA vaccines for infectious diseases: principles, delivery and clinical translation. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* (2021) 20:817-838. doi: 10.1038/s41573-021-00283-5.
5. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* (2020) 383:2603-2615. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2034577.
6. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak R, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* (2021) 384:403-416. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa2035389.
7. Harpaz R, Dahl RM, Dooling KL. Prevalence of Immunosuppression Among US Adults, 2013. *Jama* (2016) 316:2547-2548. doi: 10.1001/jama.2016.16477.
8. Tenforde MW, Patel MM, Ginde AA, Douin DJ, Talbot HK, Casey JD, et al. Effectiveness of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Messenger RNA Vaccines for Preventing Coronavirus Disease 2019 Hospitalizations in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis* (2022) 74:1515-1524. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab687.
9. Ridgway JP, Tideman S, French T, Wright B, Parsons G, Diaz G, et al. Odds of Hospitalization for COVID-19 After 3 vs 2 Doses of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine by Time Since Booster Dose. *Jama* (2022) 328:1559-1561. doi: 10.1001/jama.2022.17811.
10. DeWolf S, Laracy JC, Perales MA, Kamboj M, van den Brink MRM, Vardhana S. SARS-CoV-2 in immunocompromised individuals. *Immunity* (2022) 55:1779-1798. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2022.09.006.
11. Yadaw AS, Afzali B, Hotaling N, Sidky H, Pfaff ER, Sahner DK, et al. Pre-existing autoimmunity is associated with increased severity of COVID-19: A retrospective cohort study using data from the National COVID Cohort Collaborative (N3C). *medRxiv* (2023) 2023.2002.2002.23285353. doi: 10.1101/2023.02.02.23285353.
12. National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases (NCIRD) DoVD. People with Certain Medical Conditions [Online] (2023). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available: <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/need-extra-precautions/people-with-medical-conditions.html> [Accessed February 16 2023].
13. Singson JRC, Kirley PD, Pham H, Rothrock G, Armistead I, Meek J, et al. Factors Associated with Severe Outcomes Among Immunocompromised Adults Hospitalized for COVID-19 - COVID-NET, 10 States, March 2020-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* (2022) 71:878-884. doi: 10.15585/mmwr.mm7127a3.
14. Dandachi D, Geiger G, Montgomery MW, Karmen-Tuohy S, Golzy M, Antar AAR, et al. Characteristics, Comorbidities, and Outcomes in a Multicenter Registry of Patients With Human Immunodeficiency Virus and Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis* (2021) 73:e1964-e1972. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1339.
15. Stumpf J, Siepmann T, Lindner T, Karger C, Schwobel J, Anders L, et al. Humoral and cellular immunity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in renal transplant versus dialysis patients:

- A prospective, multicenter observational study using mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. *Lancet Reg Health Eur* (2021) 9:100178. doi: 10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100178.
16. Shen C, Risk M, Schiopu E, Hayek SS, Xie T, Holevinski L, et al. Efficacy of COVID-19 vaccines in patients taking immunosuppressants. *Ann Rheum Dis* (2022) 81:875-880. doi: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-222045.
 17. Jena A, Mishra S, Deepak P, Kumar MP, Sharma A, Patel YI, et al. Response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in immune mediated inflammatory diseases: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Autoimmun Rev* (2022) 21:102927. doi: 10.1016/j.autrev.2021.102927.
 18. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Naleway AL, Patel P, Gaglani M, Natarajan K, et al. Effectiveness of 2-dose vaccination with mRNA COVID-19 vaccines against COVID-19-associated hospitalizations among immunocompromised adults—nine states, January–September 2021. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (2021) 70:1553.
 19. Truong TT, Ryutov A, Pandey U, Yee R, Goldberg L, Bhojwani D, et al. Increased viral variants in children and young adults with impaired humoral immunity and persistent SARS-CoV-2 infection: A consecutive case series. *EBioMedicine* (2021) 67:103355. doi: 10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103355.
 20. Hensley MK, Bain WG, Jacobs J, Nambulli S, Parikh U, Cillo A, et al. Intractable Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and Prolonged Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Replication in a Chimeric Antigen Receptor-Modified T-Cell Therapy Recipient: A Case Study. *Clin Infect Dis* (2021) 73:e815-e821. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab072.
 21. Baang JH, Smith C, Mirabelli C, Valesano AL, Manthei DM, Bachman MA, et al. Prolonged Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Replication in an Immunocompromised Patient. *J Infect Dis* (2021) 223:23-27. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa666.
 22. Choi B, Choudhary MC, Regan J, Sparks JA, Padera RF, Qiu X, et al. Persistence and Evolution of SARS-CoV-2 in an Immunocompromised Host. *N Engl J Med* (2020) 383:2291-2293. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2031364.
 23. Helleberg M, Niemann CU, Moestrup KS, Kirk O, Lebech AM, Lane C, et al. Persistent COVID-19 in an Immunocompromised Patient Temporarily Responsive to Two Courses of Remdesivir Therapy. *J Infect Dis* (2020) 222:1103-1107. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiaa446.
 24. Khatamzas E, Rehn A, Muenchhoff M, Hellmuth J, Gaitzsch E, Weiglein T, et al. Emergence of multiple SARS-CoV-2 mutations in an immunocompromised host. *medRxiv* (2021) 2021.2001.2010.20248871. doi: 10.1101/2021.01.10.20248871.
 25. Avanzato VA, Matson MJ, Seifert SN, Pryce R, Williamson BN, Anzick SL, et al. Case Study: Prolonged Infectious SARS-CoV-2 Shedding from an Asymptomatic Immunocompromised Individual with Cancer. *Cell* (2020) 183:1901-1912 e1909. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.10.049.
 26. Nakajima Y, Ogai A, Furukawa K, Arai R, Anan R, Nakano Y, et al. Prolonged viral shedding of SARS-CoV-2 in an immunocompromised patient. *Journal of infection and chemotherapy : official journal of the Japan Society of Chemotherapy* (2021) 27:387-389. doi: 10.1016/j.jiac.2020.12.001.
 27. Clark SA, Clark LE, Pan J, Coscia A, McKay LGA, Shankar S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 evolution in an immunocompromised host reveals shared neutralization escape mechanisms. *Cell* (2021) 184:2605-2617 e2618. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2021.03.027.
 28. Kemp SA, Collier DA, Datir RP, Ferreira I, Gayed S, Jahun A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 evolution during treatment of chronic infection. *Nature* (2021) 592:277-282. doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-03291-y.
 29. Kwon JH, Tenforde MW, Gaglani M, Talbot HK, Ginde AA, McNeal T, et al. mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness Against Coronavirus Disease 2019 Hospitalization Among Solid Organ Transplant Recipients. *J Infect Dis* (2022) 226:797-807. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jiac118.

30. Parker EPK, Desai S, Marti M, Nohynek H, Kaslow DC, Kochhar S, et al. Response to additional COVID-19 vaccine doses in people who are immunocompromised: a rapid review. *Lancet Glob Health* (2022) 10:e326-e328. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(21)00593-3.
31. Patyna S, Eckes T, Koch BF, Sudowe S, Oftring A, Kohmer N, et al. Impact of Moderna mRNA-1273 Booster Vaccine on Fully Vaccinated High-Risk Chronic Dialysis Patients after Loss of Humoral Response. *Vaccines* (2022) 10: doi: 10.3390/vaccines10040585.
32. Quiroga B, Soler MJ, Ortiz A, Jaravaca Mantecon CJ, Nava Perez N, Serra Martin M, et al. Anti-Spike antibodies 3 months after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine booster dose in patients on hemodialysis: the prospective SENCOVAC study. *Clin Kidney J* (2022) 15:1856-1864. doi: 10.1093/ckj/sfac169.
33. Risk M, Hayek SS, Schiopu E, Yuan L, Shen C, Shi X, et al. COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against omicron (B.1.1.529) variant infection and hospitalisation in patients taking immunosuppressive medications: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Rheumatology* (2022) 4:e775-e784. doi: 10.1016/s2665-9913(22)00216-8.
34. Wieske L, van Dam KPJ, Steenhuis M, Stalman EW, Kummer LYL, van Kempen ZLE, et al. Humoral responses after second and third SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients with immune-mediated inflammatory disorders on immunosuppressants: a cohort study. *The Lancet. Rheumatology* (2022) 4:e338-e350. doi: 10.1016/S2665-9913(22)00034-0.
35. Yang LM, Costales C, Ramanathan M, Bulterys PL, Murugesan K, Schroers-Martin J, et al. Cellular and humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination and booster dose in immunosuppressed patients: An observational cohort study. *Journal of Clinical Virology* (2022) 153:105217.
36. Lewis NM, Chu VT, Ye D, Connors EE, Gharpure R, Laws RL, et al. Household Transmission of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis* (2021) 73:1805-1813. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa1166.
37. Caldera F, Hillman L, Saha S, Wald A, Grimes I, Zhang Y, et al. Immunogenicity of High Dose Influenza Vaccine for Patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease on Anti-TNF Monotherapy: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Inflammatory bowel diseases* (2020) 26:593-602. doi: 10.1093/ibd/izz164.
38. Colmegna I, Useche ML, Rodriguez K, McCormack D, Alfonso G, Patel A, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of high-dose versus standard-dose inactivated influenza vaccine in rheumatoid arthritis patients: a randomised, double-blind, active-comparator trial. *The Lancet Rheumatology* (2020) 2:e14-e23. doi: 10.1016/S2665-9913(19)30094-3.
39. Hakim H, Allison KJ, Van de Velde LA, Tang L, Sun Y, Flynn PM, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of high-dose trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine compared to standard-dose vaccine in children and young adults with cancer or HIV infection. *Vaccine* (2016) 34:3141-3148. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2016.04.053.
40. Halasa NB, Savani BN, Asokan I, Kassim A, Simons R, Summers C, et al. Randomized Double-Blind Study of the Safety and Immunogenicity of Standard-Dose Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine versus High-Dose Trivalent Inactivated Influenza Vaccine in Adult Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation Patients. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant* (2016) 22:528-535. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.12.003.
41. McKittrick N, Frank I, Jacobson JM, White CJ, Kim D, Kappes R, et al. Improved immunogenicity with high-dose seasonal influenza vaccine in HIV-infected persons: a single-center, parallel, randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med* (2013) 158:19-26. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-158-1-201301010-00005.
42. Natori Y, Shiotsuka M, Slomovic J, Hoschler K, Ferreira V, Ashton P, et al. A Double-Blind, Randomized Trial of High-Dose vs Standard-Dose Influenza Vaccine in Adult Solid-Organ Transplant Recipients. *Clin Infect Dis* (2018) 66:1698-1704. doi: 10.1093/cid/cix1082.

43. Moderna I. Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers Administering Vaccine (Vaccination Providers) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) of the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine to Prevent Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Primary Series for 12 Years and Older [Online] (2022). Cambridge, MA, USA: Moderna, Inc. Available: <https://eua.modernatx.com/covid19vaccine-eua/eua-fact-sheet-providers.pdf> [Accessed March 7 2023].
44. Pfizer/BioNTech. Fact Sheet for Healthcare Providers Administering Vaccine (Vaccination Providers) Emergency Use Authorization (EUA): Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine, Bivalent (Original and Omicron BA.4/BA.5) and Booster Dose for 12 Years of Age and Older [Online] (2022). New York, NY, USA: Pfizer/BioNTech. Available: <https://labeling.pfizer.com/ShowLabeling.aspx?id=17675&format=pdf> [Accessed March 7 2023].
45. Mues KE, Kirk B, Patel DA, Gelman A, Chavers S, Talarico C, et al. Real-world comparative effectiveness of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 vaccines among immunocompromised adults in the United States. (2022) doi: 10.1101/2022.05.13.22274960.
46. Mazuecos A, Villanego F, Zarraga S, López V, Oppenheimer F, Llinàs-Mallol L, et al. Breakthrough Infections Following mRNA SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination in Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Transplantation* (2022) 106:1430-1439. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000004119.
47. Patel NJ, Wang X, Fu X, Kawano Y, Cook C, Vanni KMM, et al. Factors associated with COVID-19 breakthrough infection among vaccinated patients with rheumatic diseases: A cohort study. *Seminars in arthritis and rheumatism* (2022) 58:152108. doi: 10.1016/j.semarthrit.2022.152108.
48. Schünemann HB, Jan; Guyatt, Gordon; Oxman, Andrew (ed.). (2013). Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach. The GRADE Working Group.
49. Ahmed F, Temte JL, Campos-Outcalt D, Schünemann HJ. Methods for developing evidence-based recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) of the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Vaccine* (2011) 29:9171-9176. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.08.005.
50. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71.
51. BC COVID Therapeutics Committee. Practice Tool #2 - Definitions of CEV/Immunosuppressed [Online] (2022). British Columbia, Canada: BC Centre for Disease Control. Available: http://www.bccdc.ca/Health-Professionals-Site/Documents/COVID-treatment/PracticeTool2_CEVCriteria.pdf [Accessed February 16 2023].
52. Higgins JPT SJ, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. "Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial," in *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.3 (updated February 2022), ed. Higgins JPT, T.J., Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA. Cochrane (2022).
53. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Bmj* (2019) 366:l4898. doi: 10.1136/bmj.l4898.
54. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses [Online]. Available: https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp [Accessed February 16 2023].

55. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* (1986) 7:177-188. doi: 10.1016/0197-2456(86)90046-2.
56. Deeks JJ, Altman DG. "Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses," in *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.3 (updated February 2022), ed. Higgins JPT, T.J., Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA. Cochrane (2022).
57. Aslam S, Adler E, Mekeel K, Little SJ. Clinical effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccination in solid organ transplant recipients. *Transpl Infect Dis* (2021) 23:e13705. doi: 10.1111/tid.13705.
58. Britton A. Effectiveness of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19–Associated Hospitalizations Among Immunocompromised Adults During SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Predominance—VISION Network, 10 States, December 2021—August 2022. *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (2022) 71:
59. Butt AA, Talisa VB, Yan P, Shaikh OS, Omer SB, Mayr FB. Real-World Effectiveness of the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) mRNA Vaccines in Preventing Confirmed Infection in Patients on Chronic Hemodialysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2022) 75:e617-e622. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciac118.
60. Hause AM, Baggs J, Marquez P, Abara WE, Baumblatt JG, Thompson D, et al. Safety Monitoring of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine First Booster Doses Among Persons Aged ≥ 12 Years with Presumed Immunocompromise Status—United States, January 12, 2022–March 28, 2022. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* (2022) 71:899.
61. Holroyd KB, Healy BC, Conway S, Houtchens M, Bakshi R, Bhattacharyya S, et al. Humoral response to COVID-19 vaccination in MS patients on disease modifying therapy: Immune profiles and clinical outcomes. *Multiple sclerosis and related disorders* (2022) 67:104079. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2022.104079.
62. Kelly JD, Leonard S, Hoggatt KJ, Boscardin WJ, Lum EN, Moss-Vazquez TA, et al. Incidence of Severe COVID-19 Illness Following Vaccination and Booster With BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, and Ad26.COV2.S Vaccines. *Jama* (2022) 328:1427-1437. doi: 10.1001/jama.2022.17985.
63. Khan N, Mahmud N. Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination in a Veterans Affairs Cohort of Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease With Diverse Exposure to Immunosuppressive Medications. *Gastroenterology* (2021) 161:827-836. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2021.05.044.
64. Pham MN, Murugesan K, Banaei N, Pinsky BA, Tang M, Hoyte E, et al. Immunogenicity and tolerability of COVID-19 messenger RNA vaccines in primary immunodeficiency patients with functional B-cell defects. *The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology* (2022) 149:907-911.e903. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2021.11.022.
65. Rooney A, Bivona C, Liu B, Streeter D, Gong H, Khan Q. Risk of SARS-CoV-2 Breakthrough Infection in Vaccinated Cancer Patients: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *Journal of Hematology & Oncology* (2022) 15:67. doi: 10.1186/s13045-022-01290-8.
66. Sibbel S, McKeon K, Luo J, Wendt K, Walker AG, Kelley T, et al. Real-World Effectiveness and Immunogenicity of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines in Patients on Hemodialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol* (2022) 33:49-57. doi: 10.1681/ASN.2021060778.
67. Yetmar ZA, Bhaimia E, Bierle DM, Ganesh R, Razonable RR. Breakthrough COVID-19 after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in solid organ transplant recipients: An analysis of symptomatic cases and monoclonal antibody therapy. *Transpl Infect Dis* (2022) 24:e13779. doi: 10.1111/tid.13779.
68. Malinis M, Cohen E, Azar MM. Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in fully vaccinated solid organ transplant recipients. *American journal of transplantation : official*

- journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant Surgeons (2021) 21:2916-2918. doi: 10.1111/ajt.16713.
69. Pinana JL, Lopez-Corral L, Martino R, Vazquez L, Perez A, Martin-Martin G, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine response and rate of breakthrough infection in patients with hematological disorders. *J Hematol Oncol* (2022) 15:54. doi: 10.1186/s13045-022-01275-7.
 70. Pino MS, Cheli S, Perna M, Fabbroni V, Giordano C, Martella F, et al. The national COVID-19 vaccination campaign targeting the extremely vulnerable: the Florence Medical Oncology Unit experience in patients with cancer. *European journal of cancer (Oxford, England : 1990)* (2022) 170:149-157. doi: 10.1016/j.ejca.2022.04.008.
 71. Yeo T, Quek AML, Yong KP, Tye JSN, Ratnagopal P, Soon DTL, et al. COVID-19 infection after two doses of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine in multiple sclerosis, AQP4-antibody NMOSD and MOGAD. *Multiple sclerosis and related disorders* (2022) 65:104003. doi: 10.1016/j.msard.2022.104003.
 72. Speich B, Chammartin F, Abela IA, Amico P, Stoeckle MP, Eichenberger AL, et al. Antibody Response in Immunocompromised Patients After the Administration of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Vaccine BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Clin Infect Dis* (2022) 75:e585-e593. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciac169.
 73. Liew J, Gianfrancesco M, Harrison C, Izadi Z, Rush S, Lawson-Tovey S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections among vaccinated individuals with rheumatic disease: results from the COVID-19 Global Rheumatology Alliance provider registry. *RMD Open* (2022) 8:e002187. doi: 10.1136/rmdopen-2021-002187.
 74. Sigal A, Milo R, Jassat W. Estimating disease severity of Omicron and Delta SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Rev Immunol* (2022) 22:267-269. doi: 10.1038/s41577-022-00720-5.
 75. Zeng B, Gao L, Zhou Q, Yu K, Sun F. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Med* (2022) 20:200. doi: 10.1186/s12916-022-02397-y.

TABLES

Table 1. Characteristics of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis

Author, year	Study Characteristics						Outcomes Reported		
	Design	Data source	Population	Vaccine	Study period	Vaccinated, n	Infection	Hospitalization	Death
Aslam, 2021 (57)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective single-center cohort 	Transplant registry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Solid organ transplant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	01 Jan 2021 – Feb 2021	mRNA-1273: 632 BNT162b2: 375	Y	N	Y
Britton, 2022 (58)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test-negative design 	VISION Network, a collaboration between CDC and seven U.S. health care systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA IC individuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 doses (MMMM vs. PPPP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg and booster 50mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Dec 2021 – Aug 2022	mRNA-1273: 9,555 BNT162b2: 14,769	Y	N	N
Butt, 2022 (59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test-negative design 1:1 Propensity-score matched analysis of 	Veterans Affairs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Chronic hemodialysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 	Jan 2021 – Aug 2021	mRNA-1273: 630 BNT162b2: 719	Y	N	N

	cases and controls			(100mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)					
Embi, 2021 (18)	• Test-negative design	VISION Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USA • IC and immunocompetent vaccine recipients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 doses (MM vs. PP) • mRNA-1273 (100mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg) 		<p>IC and vaccinated</p> <p>mRNA-1273: 4,337</p> <p>BNT162b2: 6,227</p> <p>Solid malignancy</p> <p>mRNA-1273: 2,053</p> <p>BNT162b2: 2,848</p> <p>Rheumatologic or inflammatory disorder</p> <p>mRNA-1273: 1,053</p> <p>BNT162b2: 1,591</p>	N	Y	N
Hause, 2022 (60)	• Health survey	VEARS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USA • “Presumed IC patients” as stated in the paper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 doses (MMMM vs. PPPP) • mRNA-1273 (100mcg) 	v-safe Data: 12 Jan 2022–28 Mar 2022	<p>mRNA-1273: 2,194</p> <p>BNT162b2: 1,821</p>	N	Y	N

				and booster 50mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)					
Holroyd, 2022 (61)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective single-center study 	CLIMB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Patients with MS on disease modifying therapies vaccinated vs. healthy controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Jun 2021 – Dec 2021	mRNA-1273: 110 BNT162b2: 133	Y	N	N
Kelly, 2022 (62)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective cohort study 	US VHA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA IC patients including cancer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> mRNA-1273 (100mcg and booster 50mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Jul 2021 – May 2022	mRNA-1273: 79,517 BNT162b2: 67,780	Y	Y	N
Khan, 2021 (63)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective cohort study 	US VHA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Patients with inflammatory bowel disease exposed to various conventional and advanced immunosuppressive therapies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 or 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	18 Dec 2020 (index date) – 20 Apr 2021	Fully vaccinated mRNA-1273: n=3,380 BNT162b2: n=2,873	Y	N	N

Liew, 2022 (73)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective registry study 	REDCap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-country with 65% of the patient population from North America Rheumatic disease 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Jan 2021 – Sep 2021	mRNA-1273: 45 BNT162b2: 21	N	Y	N
Malinis, 2021 (68)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective observational study 	Yale New Haven chart review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Solid organ transplant recipients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs PP) mRNA-1273 (100 mcg) BNT162b2 (30 mcg) 	As of May 18, 2011 (start date not reported)	mRNA-1273: 157 BNT162b2: 275	Y	N	N
Mazuecos, 2022 (46)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective national cohort study 	National registry of patients with kidney transplantation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spain Kidney transplant recipients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Apr 2021 – Oct 2021	mRNA-1273: 213 BNT162b2: 121	N	Y	Y
Mues, 2022 (45)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observational comparative effectiveness study 1:1 propensity- 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA IC individuals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 	11 Dec 2020 – 10 Jan 2022	IC mRNA-1273: 57,000 BNT162b2: 66,757	Y	Y	N

	score matched on age, sex, payer type, state of residence, previous healthcare utilization, comorbidities, frailty score and immunocompromised group			(100mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)		Solid organ transplant mRNA-1273: 4,029 BNT162b2: 5,043 Active cancer mRNA-1273: 7,186 BNT162b2: 8,277			
Patel, 2022 (47)	• Retrospective cohort study	MGB healthcare system	• USA • Rheumatic disease	• ≥2 doses (MMM vs. PPP) • mRNA-1273 (100mcg and booster 50mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)	Nov 2021 – Dec 2022	mRNA-1273: 4,588 BNT162b2: 6,080	Y	N	N
Pham, 2022 (64)	• Retrospective cohort study		• USA • Primary immunodeficiency patients with functional B-cell defects	• 2 doses (MM vs. PP) • mRNA-1273 (100mcg) • BNT162b2		mRNA-1273: 10 BNT162b2: 23	Y	N	N

				(30mcg)					
Piñana, 2022 (69)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prospective multicenter registry-based cohort study 	GRUCINI with SEHH	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spain Patients with hematological disorders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Dec 2020 – Dec 2021	mRNA-1273: 982 BNT162b2: 362	Y	N	N
Pino, 2022 (70)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective cohort study 	Patients followed at the Medical Oncology Unit in Florence at Santa Maria Annunziata, Serristori and Borgo San Lorenzo Hospitals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Italy Extremely vulnerable individuals, patients with cancer on systemic antitumor treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 doses (MMM vs. PPP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg and booster 50mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	26 Mar 2021 – 04 Apr 2021	mRNA-1273: 527 BNT162b2: 96	Y	N	N
Quiroga, 2022 (32)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prospective real-world study 	SENCOVAC (multicentric study by the Spanish Society of Nephrology)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spain Patients on hemodialysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Booster dose (primary vaccination BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 or 		mRNA-1273: 481 BNT162b2: 230	Y	N	N

				ChAdOx1-S) • mRNA-1273 (booster 50mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)					
Rooney, 2022 (65)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective study 	The University of Kansas Cancer Center Curated Cancer Clinical Outcomes Database was queried	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Patients with cancer receiving antineoplastic therapy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Feb 2021 – Oct 2021	mRNA-1273: 2,993 BNT162b2: 6,423	Y	N	N
Sibbel, 2021 (66)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retrospective observational study 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA Hemodialysis patients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 or 2 doses (MM vs. PP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 	Study duration: 4 months	mRNA-1273: 23,037 BNT162b2: 12,169	Y	Y	Y
Speich,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parallel, 2-arm 	Swiss HIV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Switzerland 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 doses 		mRNA-1273:	Y*	N	N

2022 (72)	(allocation 1:1), open-label, noninferiority RCT nested into the Swiss HIV Cohort Study and the Swiss Transplant Cohort Study, all outcomes were assessed 12 weeks (± 7 days) after the first vaccination. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cohorts were stratified by study center, age group, sex, and presence of comorbidities 	Cohort, Swiss Transplant Cohort	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IC individuals (HIV and transplant) 	(MM vs. PP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mRNA-1273 (100mcg) BNT162b2 (30mcg) 		205 BNT162b2: 210			
Yeo, 2022 (71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prospective, observational study 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Singapore Patients with MS, AQP4-NMOSD, and MOGAD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2-3 doses (MMM vs. PPP) mRNA-1273 (100mcg and booster) 	Study cut-off date: 31 Dec 2022	mRNA-1273: 38 BNT162b2: 327	Y	Y	N

				50mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)					
Yetmar, 2022 (67)	• Retrospective cohort	From 1 US center	• USA • Solid organ transplant recipients	• 2 doses (MM vs. PP) • mRNA- 1273 (100mcg) • BNT162b2 (30mcg)	Aug 2021 – Sep 2021	mRNA-1273: 12 BNT162b2: 22	Y	N	Y

Vaccine dosing was abbreviated as 'MM,' 'MMM,' or 'MMMM' for 2, 3, or 4 doses of mRNA-1273, respectively, and as 'PP,' 'PPP,' or 'PPPP' for 2, 3, or 4 doses of BNT162b2, respectively. * Laboratory-confirmed, symptomatic infection. AQP4-NMSOD, aquaporin-4-antibody neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder; CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; CLIMB, Comprehensive Longitudinal Investigation of Multiple Sclerosis at Brigham and Women's Hospital; GRUCINI, Infectious Complications Subcommittee of the Spanish Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation and Cell Therapy Group; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; IC, immunocompromised; MGB, Mass General Brigham; MOGAD, myelin oligodendrocyte glycoprotein-antibody associated disease; MS, multiple sclerosis; SEHH, Spanish Society of Hematology and Hemotherapy; VAERS, Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System; VHA, Veterans Health Administration.

Table 2. GRADE Summary of Findings Overall

Certainty assessment							mRNA-1273, n/N, (%)	BNT162b2, n/N, (%)	Effect Relative (95% CI)	Effect Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Studies, n	Study design	ROB	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations					
SARS-CoV-2 infection (randomized study)											
1	R	not serious	not serious	not serious	very serious ^a	only 1 study, limited evidence	2/205 (1.0%)	1/210 (0.5%)	RR 2.05 (0.19 to 22.42)	499 more per 100,000 (from 1,137 fewer to 2,136 more)	Type 3 ^b
SARS-CoV-2 infection (nonrandomized studies)											
17	NR	not serious	serious ^c	serious ^d	serious ^e	strong association	4,213.5/184,194 (2.3%)	5,563.5/180,221 (3.1%)	RR 0.87** (0.79 to 0.96)	412 fewer per 100,000** (from 665 fewer to 160 fewer)	Type 4 ^f
Hospitalization due to COVID-19											
9	NR	not serious	not serious ^g	not serious ^h	very serious ⁱ	none	755/166,563 (0.5%)	871/155,571 (0.6%)	RR 0.83*** (0.76 to 0.90)	60 fewer per 100,000 (from 140 fewer to 20 more)	Type 3 ^j
Death due to COVID-19											
4	NR	not serious	not serious ^k	not serious ^h	very serious ^l	none	51/23,896 (0.2%)	45/12,689 (0.4%)	RR 0.62* (0.43 to 0.89)	56 fewer per 100,000 (from 559 fewer to 446 more)	Type 3 ^m

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.

^aIn Speich 2022, only 2 events occurred in mRNA-1273 arm and 1 event in BNT162b2 arm, therefore wide 95% CI.

^bLower grading due to imprecision and limited evidence, higher grading due to RCT evidence.

^c $I^2=61.9\%$, $X^2=42.01$, $p(Q)<0.0001$, substantial heterogeneity

^dOutcome definitions rather heterogeneous (test-positive cases and symptomatic cases)

^eIn Holroyd 2022, Malinis 2021, and Yeo 2022, only 1 event in mRNA-1273 arm; in Pham 2022, 0 events in both arms; in Pino 2022, only 1 event in BNT162b2 arm. Small number of events results in wider 95% CI.

^fLower grading due to imprecision and indirectness due to varying outcome definitions (symptomatic and not further described COVID-19 infection)

^g $I^2=0\%$, $X^2=5.24$, $p(Q)=0.73$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^hNo indirect comparisons, outcome definitions in line.

ⁱIn Hause 2022, only 1 event per arm; in Malinis 2021 and Yeo 2022, only 1 event in mRNA-1273 arm. Small number of events results in wider 95% CI.

^jLower grading due to imprecision. Type 3 due to nonrandomized studies.

^k $I^2=0\%$, $X^2=1.74$, $p(Q)=0.63$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^lIn Yetmar 2022, sample size rather low and 0 events in both arms, therefore continuity correction of 0.5 was necessary. Continuity correction was also necessary in Aslam 2021 due to 0 events in both arms. This results in wide 95% CI.

^mLower grading due to imprecision, higher grading due to strong association in RR. Type 3 due to nonrandomized studies.

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations; NR, nonrandomized studies; R, randomized studies; ROB, risk of bias; RR, risk ratio; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

Table 3. GRADE Summary of Findings by Population Subgroup

Certainty assessment							mRNA -1273, n/N, (%)	BNT162b2, n/N, (%)	Effect Relative (95% CI)	Effect Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty
Studies, n	Study design	ROB	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations					
SARS-CoV-2 infection											
Solid organ transplant											
4	R	not serious	not serious ^a	serious ^e	very serious ^b	none	106/ 4,830 (2.2%)	139/5,715 (2.4%)	RR 1.05 (0.87 to 1.26)	93 fewer per 100,000 (from 573 fewer to 386 more)	Type 4 ^c
Cancer											
4	NR	not serious	not serious ^d	serious ^e	very serious ^f	strong association	116/ 11,688 (1.0%)	190/15,158 (1.3%)	RR 0.73** (0.57 to 0.92)	346 fewer per 100,000** (from 598 fewer to 94 fewer)	Type 4 ^c
Autoimmune disease											
4	NR	not serious	not serious ^g	serious ^e	very serious ^h	strong association	83/ 8,116 (1.0%)	176/9,413 (1.9%)	RR 0.67** (0.52 to 0.88)	455 fewer per 100,000 (from 1,209 fewer to 298 fewer)	Type 4 ^c
Hospitalization due to COVID-19											
Solid organ transplant											
3	NR	not serious	not serious ⁱ	not serious ^j	not serious ^k	none	163/ 4,448 (3.7%)	123/5,488 (2.2%)	RR 0.91 (0.78 to 1.06)	147 fewer per 100,000 (from 816 fewer to 522 more)	Type 3 ⁱ
Cancer											
2	NR	not serious	not serious ^m	not serious ^j	very serious ⁿ	none	38/ 9,239 (0.4%)	94/11,125 (0.8%)	RR 0.54** (0.37 to 0.79)	585 fewer per 100,000 (from 1,655 fewer to 485 more)	Type 3 ⁱ

Autoimmune disease											
3	NR	not serious	not serious ^o	not serious ^j	very serious ^p	none	54/1,112 (4.9%)	93/1,963 (4.7%)	RR 0.97 (0.70 to 1.35)	103 fewer per 100,000 (from 1,661 fewer to 1,456 more)	Type 3 ^l
Death due to COVID-19											
Solid organ transplant											
3	NR	not serious	not serious ^q	not serious ^j	very serious ^r	strong association	36/859 (4.2%)	37/520 (7.1%)	RR 0.56** (0.37 to 0.84)	3,528 fewer per 100,000 (from 12,002 fewer to 4,945 more)	Type 3 ^s

* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$.

^a $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.78$, $p(Q) = 0.61$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^b In Aslam 2021, only 2 events in mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 arms; in Malinis 2021, only 1 event in mRNA-1273 and 2 events in the BNT162b2 arms. Small number of events results in a wide 95% CI.

^c Lower grading due to imprecision, limited evidence and indirectness due to varying outcome definitions (symptomatic and not further described COVID-19 infection)

^d $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.13$, $p(Q) = 0.99$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^e Outcome definitions rather heterogeneous (test-positive cases and symptomatic cases)

^f In Pino 2022, only 1 event in BNT162b2 arm; this results in wider 95% CI.

^g $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.78$, $p(Q) = 0.85$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^h In Holroyd 2022 and Yeo 2022, only 1 event in mRNA-1273 arm; this results in wider 95% CI.

ⁱ $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.71$, $p(Q) = 0.70$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^j No indirect comparisons, outcome definitions in line.

^k No issues with low numbers of events apart from 1 event in the mRNA-1273 arm of Malinis 2021.

^l Lower grading due to limited evidence. Type 3 due to nonrandomized studies.

^m $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.02$, $p(Q) = 0.89$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

ⁿ Only two studies available, therefore uncertainty in analysis.

^o $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.05$, $p(Q) = 0.98$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^p Only data of 3 studies available, only 1 event in mRNA-1273 arm of Yeo 2022, therefore wide 95% CI.

^q $I^2 = 0\%$, $X^2 = 0.35$, $p(Q) = 0.84$, no issues of heterogeneity and inconsistency.

^r In Aslam 2021 and Yetmar 2022, 0 events in mRNA-1273 and BNT162b arms, therefore wide 95% CI.

^s Lower grading due to imprecision and limited evidence. Type 3 due to nonrandomized studies.

COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development and Evaluations; NR, nonrandomized studies; R, randomized studies; ROB, risk of bias; RR, risk ratio; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

Table 4. Summary of Evidence for Outcomes of Interest

Outcome	Outcome Importance^a	Included in evidence profile	Certainty
SARS-CoV-2 infection (randomized study)	Limited evidence	Yes	Type 3 (low)
SARS-CoV-2 infection (nonrandomized studies)	Critical	Yes	Type 4 (very low)
Hospitalization due to COVID-19	Critical	Yes	Type 3 (low)
Death due to COVID-19	Critical	Yes	Type 3 (low)

^a Relative importance of outcomes assessed and ranked per the GRADE framework. COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluations; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

FIGURE LEGENDS

- Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram.** Searches were first performed on April 14, 2022 followed by an update on December 19, 2022. * Databases searched include ICTRP, EMBASE, EuropePMC, medRxiv, Web of Science, ProQuest Central, Academic Search Complete, Scopus, and COVIDWHO. ** Includes internal documents from Moderna and recently published SLRs. COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; PRISMA, Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; SLR, systematic literature review; WHO, World Health Organization.
- Figure 2. Summary of the Clinical Effectiveness Meta-Analysis.** Relative risks of clinical effectiveness outcomes for mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines in IC populations are shown. CI, confidence interval; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; IC, immunocompromised; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram





Figure 2. Summary of the Clinical Effectiveness Meta-Analysis



SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

Comparative Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccines in Immunocompromised Individuals: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Using the GRADE Framework

Xuan Wang, Katrin Haeussler, Anne Spellman, Leslie E. Phillips, Allison Ramiller, Mary T.

Bausch-Jurken, Pawana Sharma, Anna Krivelyova, Sonam Vats, Nicolas Van de Velde

Table S1. Databases and Strategies Used for the Systematic Literature Review

Database	WHO COVID-19 Global literature on coronavirus disease including MEDLINE (PubMed)	
URL	https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/	
No	Query scope	Query script
1	All COVID-19	Not applicable
2	Major focus on COVID-19 vaccine(s) or vaccination	mj: Covid-19 vacc*
3	Vaccine efficacy, effectiveness, related research types and terms	("vaccine effectiveness" OR "vaccine efficacy" OR "vaccine research" OR "vaccine study" OR "vaccine trial" OR "vaccine control" ~2 OR "vaccine comparison"~2 OR "vaccine response" OR "IgM" OR "IgG" OR Ig* OR antibod* OR "anti-body" OR immunoglob* OR "immuno-globulin" OR immunogen* OR "immuno-genicity" OR sero* OR "immune response"~2)
4	At-risk medical conditions	("risk condition"~2 OR "risk disorder"~2 OR "at-risk" ~2 OR "at risk" ~2 OR " high risk" OR "high-risk" OR "risk disease" ~2 OR "risk comorbidity" OR "risk disability" OR "long term condition"~2 OR "long-term condition"~2 OR underlying* OR pre-existing* OR preexisting* OR "medical condition" OR comorbid* OR immunocompr* OR immunodef* OR immunosupp* OR "immuno-compromised" OR "immuno-deficiency" OR "immuno-suppression" OR cancer* OR carcinoma* OR malignan* OR neoplasm* OR "solid organ" OR chemotherap* OR antineoplastic OR "anti-neoplastic" OR "cytotoxic therapy"~2 OR "anti-cancer" OR anticancer OR transplant* OR "stem cell" OR "SCT" OR "HSCT" OR "BMT" OR "chronic kidney" OR "CKD" OR "chronic liver" OR "CLD" OR cirrho* OR "chronic hepatitis" ~2 OR "HCC" OR haemochromatosis OR hemochromatosis OR "metabolic liver" OR "genetic liver" ~2 OR "chronic nephrotic"~2 OR "chronic

		<p> hepatic"~2 OR asthma* OR "bronchiectasis" OR "bronchopulmonary dysplasia" OR "chronic lung" OR "chronic pulmonary" OR "chronic obstructive" OR "COPD" OR emphysema OR "chronic bronchitis" OR "interstitial lung disease" OR "idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis" OR "pulmonary embolism" OR "pulmonary hypertension" OR "cystic fibrosis" OR diabet* OR "IDDM" OR "NIDDM" OR "overweight" OR obes* OR dementia OR Alzheimer* OR "degenerative brain"~2 OR "degenerative mental"~2 OR neurolog* OR neurodegen* OR schizo* OR "psychosis" OR "psychotic" OR "severe mood disorder" OR "clinical depression" OR "substance use" OR "substance abuse" OR "attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder" OR "attention disorder"~2 OR "ADHD" OR "spinal cord injury" OR "cerebral palsy" OR "birth defect" ~2 OR "birth anomaly" OR "intellectual and developmental disability" OR "IDD" OR "learning disability" OR "Down syndrome" OR "inborn error" OR congenital OR inborn OR "inherited abnormality" OR "inherited disorder" OR "genetic abnormality"~2 OR "genetic disorder" ~2 OR heart OR cardiac OR coronary OR cardio* OR "CHD" OR "high blood pressure" OR "hypertension" OR myocard* OR cardiovasc* OR "HIV" OR "AIDS" OR "inherited red blood cell disorders" ~3 OR haemoglobinopath* OR hemoglobinopath* OR hemolytic OR haemolytic OR hematologic* OR haematologic* OR "stroke" OR "cerebrovascular" OR "CVD" OR "tuberculosis" OR "TB") </p>
5	<p> Without filtering for vaccine efficacy etc. (#2 AND #4) Major focus on COVID-19 </p>	<p> (mj: Covid-19 vacc*) AND ("risk condition"~2 OR "risk disorder"~2 OR "at-risk" ~2 OR "at risk" ~2 OR " high risk" OR "high-risk" OR "risk disease" ~2 OR "risk comorbidity" OR "risk disability" OR "long term condition"~2 OR "long-term condition"~2 OR underlying* OR pre-existing* OR preexisting* OR "medical </p>

<p>vaccine(s) or vaccination AND At-risk medical conditions</p>	<p>condition" OR comorbid* OR immunocompr* OR immunodef* OR immunosupp* OR "immuno-compromised" OR "immuno-deficiency" OR "immuno-suppression" OR cancer* OR carcinoma* OR malignan* OR neoplasm* OR "solid organ" OR chemotherap* OR antineoplastic OR "anti-neoplastic" OR "cytotoxic therapy"~2 OR "anti-cancer" OR anticancer OR transplant* OR "stem cell" OR "SCT" OR "HSCT" OR "BMT" OR "chronic kidney" OR "CKD" OR "chronic liver" OR "CLD" OR cirrho* OR "chronic hepatitis" ~2 OR "HCC" OR haemochromatosis OR hemochromatosis OR "metabolic liver" OR "genetic liver" ~2 OR "chronic nephrotic"~2 OR "chronic hepatic"~2 OR asthma* OR "bronchiectasis" OR "bronchopulmonary dysplasia" OR "chronic lung" OR "chronic pulmonary" OR "chronic obstructive" OR "COPD" OR emphysema OR "chronic bronchitis" OR "interstitial lung disease" OR "idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis" OR "pulmonary embolism" OR "pulmonary hypertension" OR "cystic fibrosis" OR diabet* OR "IDDM" OR "NIDDM" OR "overweight" OR obes* OR dementia OR Alzheimer* OR "degenerative brain"~2 OR "degenerative mental"~2 OR neurolog* OR neurodegen* OR schizo* OR "psychosis" OR "psychotic" OR "severe mood disorder" OR "clinical depression" OR "substance use" OR "substance abuse" OR "attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder" OR "attention disorder"~2 OR "ADHD" OR "spinal cord injury" OR "cerebral palsy" OR "birth defect" ~2 OR "birth anomaly" OR "intellectual and developmental disability" OR "IDD" OR "learning disability" OR "Down syndrome" OR "inborn error" OR congenital OR inborn OR "inherited abnormality" OR "inherited disorder" OR "genetic abnormality"~2 OR "genetic disorder" ~2 OR heart OR cardiac OR coronary OR cardio* OR "CHD" OR "high blood pressure" OR "hypertension" OR myocard*</p>
---	---

		<p>OR cardiovasc* OR "HIV" OR "AIDS" OR "inherited red blood cell disorders" ~3 OR haemoglobinopath* OR hemoglobinopath* OR hemolytic OR haemolytic OR hematologic* OR haematologic* OR "stroke" OR "cerebrovascular" OR "CVD" OR "tuberculosis" OR "TB")</p>
6	<p>Full query (#2 AND #3 AND #4) Major focus on COVID-19 vaccine(s) or vaccination AND Vaccine efficacy, effectiveness, related research types and terms AND At-risk medical conditions</p>	<p>(mj: Covid-19 vacc*) AND ("vaccine effectiveness" OR "vaccine efficacy" OR "vaccine research" OR "vaccine study" OR "vaccine trial" OR "vaccine control" ~2 OR "vaccine comparison"~2 OR "vaccine response" OR "IgM" OR "IgG" OR Ig* OR antibod* OR "anti-body" OR immunoglob* OR "immuno-globulin" OR immunogen* OR "immuno-genicity" OR sero* OR "immune response"~2) AND ("risk condition"~2 OR "risk disorder"~2 OR "at-risk" ~2 OR "at risk" ~2 OR " high risk" OR "high-risk" OR "risk disease" ~2 OR "risk comorbidity" OR "risk disability" OR "long term condition"~2 OR "long-term condition"~2 OR underlying* OR pre- existing* OR preexisting* OR "medical condition" OR comorbid* OR immunocompr* OR immunodef* OR immunosupp* OR "immuno-compromised" OR "immuno-deficiency" OR "immuno-suppression" OR cancer* OR carcinoma* OR malignan* OR neoplasm* OR "solid organ" OR chemotherap* OR antineoplastic OR "anti-neoplastic" OR "cytotoxic therapy"~2 OR "anti-cancer" OR anticancer OR transplant* OR "stem cell" OR "SCT" OR "HSCT" OR "BMT" OR "chronic kidney" OR "CKD" OR "chronic liver" OR "CLD" OR cirrho* OR "chronic hepatitis" ~2 OR "HCC" OR haemochromatosis OR hemochromatosis OR "metabolic liver" OR "genetic liver" ~2 OR "chronic nephrotic"~2 OR "chronic hepatic"~2 OR asthma* OR "bronchiectasis" OR "bronchopulmonary dysplasia" OR "chronic lung" OR "chronic pulmonary" OR "chronic obstructive" OR "COPD" OR emphysema OR "chronic bronchitis" OR "interstitial lung disease" OR</p>

		<p> "idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis" OR "pulmonary embolism" OR "pulmonary hypertension" OR "cystic fibrosis" OR diabet* OR "IDDM" OR "NIDDM" OR "overweight" OR obes* OR dementia OR Alzheimer* OR "degenerative brain"~2 OR "degenerative mental"~2 OR neurolog* OR neurodegen* OR schizo* OR "psychosis" OR "psychotic" OR "severe mood disorder" OR "clinical depression" OR "substance use" OR "substance abuse" OR "attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder" OR "attention disorder"~2 OR "ADHD" OR "spinal cord injury" OR "cerebral palsy" OR "birth defect" ~2 OR "birth anomaly" OR "intellectual and developmental disability" OR "IDD" OR "learning disability" OR "Down syndrome" OR "inborn error" OR congenital OR inborn OR "inherited abnormality" OR "inherited disorder" OR "genetic abnormality"~2 OR "genetic disorder" ~2 OR heart OR cardiac OR coronary OR cardio* OR "CHD" OR "high blood pressure" OR "hypertension" OR myocard* OR cardiovasc* OR "HIV" OR "AIDS" OR "inherited red blood cell disorders" ~3 OR haemoglobinopath* OR hemoglobinopath* OR hemolytic OR haemolytic OR hematologic* OR haematologic* OR "stroke" OR "cerebrovascular" OR "CVD" OR "tuberculosis" OR "TB") </p>
7	<p> Full query (#2 AND #3 AND #4) Major focus on COVID-19 vaccine(s) or vaccination AND Vaccine efficacy, effectiveness, related research types and terms AND </p>	<p> (mj: covid-19 vacc*) AND ("vaccine effectiveness" OR "vaccine efficacy" OR "vaccine research" OR "vaccine study" OR "vaccine trial" OR "vaccine control" ~2 OR "vaccine comparison"~2 OR "vaccine response" OR "IgM" OR "IgG" OR ig* OR antibod* OR "anti-body" OR immunoglob* OR "immuno-globulin" OR immunogen* OR "immuno-genicity" OR sero* OR "immune response"~2) AND ("risk condition"~2 OR "risk disorder"~2 OR "at-risk" ~2 OR "at risk" ~2 OR " high risk" OR "high-risk" OR "risk disease" ~2 OR "risk comorbidity" OR "risk disability" </p>

	<p>At-risk medical conditions</p> <p>English publications</p>	<p>OR "long term condition"~2 OR "long-term condition"~2 OR underlying* OR pre-existing* OR preexisting* OR "medical condition" OR comorbid* OR immunocompr* OR immunodef* OR immunosupp* OR "immuno-compromised" OR "immuno-deficiency" OR "immuno-suppression" OR cancer* OR carcinoma* OR malignan* OR neoplasm* OR "solid organ" OR chemotherap* OR antineoplastic OR "anti-neoplastic" OR "cytotoxic therapy"~2 OR "anti-cancer" OR anticancer OR transplant* OR "stem cell" OR "SCT" OR "HSCT" OR "BMT" OR "chronic kidney" OR "CKD" OR "chronic liver" OR "CLD" OR cirrho* OR "chronic hepatitis" ~2 OR "HCC" OR haemochromatosis OR hemochromatosis OR "metabolic liver" OR "genetic liver" ~2 OR "chronic nephrotic"~2 OR "chronic hepatic"~2 OR asthma* OR "bronchiectasis" OR "bronchopulmonary dysplasia" OR "chronic lung" OR "chronic pulmonary" OR "chronic obstructive" OR "COPD" OR emphysema OR "chronic bronchitis" OR "interstitial lung disease" OR "idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis" OR "pulmonary embolism" OR "pulmonary hypertension" OR "cystic fibrosis" OR diabet* OR "IDDM" OR "NIDDM" OR "overweight" OR obes* OR dementia OR alzheimer* OR "degenerative brain"~2 OR "degenerative mental"~2 OR neurolog* OR neurodegen* OR schizo* OR "psychosis" OR "psychotic" OR "severe mood disorder" OR "clinical depression" OR "substance use" OR "substance abuse" OR "attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder" OR "attention disorder"~2 OR "ADHD" OR "spinal cord injury" OR "cerebral palsy" OR "birth defect" ~2 OR "birth anomaly" OR "intellectual and developmental disability" OR "IDD" OR "learning disability" OR "Down syndrome" OR "inborn error" OR congenital OR inborn OR "inherited abnormality" OR "inherited disorder" OR "genetic abnormality"~2 OR "genetic disorder" ~2 OR</p>
--	---	---

		heart OR cardiac OR coronary OR cardio* OR "CHD" OR "high blood pressure" OR "hypertension" OR myocard* OR cardiovasc* OR "HIV" OR "AIDS" OR "inherited red blood cell disorders" ~3 OR haemoglobinopath* OR hemoglobinopath* OR hemolytic OR haemolytic OR hematologic* OR haematologic* OR "stroke" OR "cerebrovascular" OR "CVD" OR "tuberculosis" OR "TB") AND la:("en")
Database	WHO COVID-19 Global literature on coronavirus disease excluding MEDLINE (Pubmed); including other reference sources in the WHO COVID-19 database (ICTRP; EMBASE; EuropePMC; PREPRINT-MEDRXIV; Web of Science; ProQuest Central; Academic Search Complete; Scopus; COVIDWHO)– full query #3	
URL	https://search.bvsalud.org/global-literature-on-novel-coronavirus-2019-ncov/	
No	Query scope	Query script
1	All COVID-19	Not applicable
2	WHO accessed databases other than MEDLINE (PubMed)	db:(("ICTRP" OR "EMBASE" OR "EuropePMC" OR "PREPRINT-MEDRXIV" OR "Web of Science" OR "ProQuest Central" OR "Academic Search Complete" OR "Scopus" OR "COVIDWHO"))
3	COVID-19 vaccine(s) or vaccination AND vaccine efficacy, effectiveness, related research types and terms AND At-risk medical conditions AND WHO accessed databases other than MEDLINE (PubMed)	("covid19 vaccine" ~2 OR "covid-19 vaccine"~2 OR "covid-19 vaccines"~2 OR "covid19 vaccines" ~2 OR "covid-19 vaccination"~2 OR "Covid19 vaccination"~2) AND ("vaccine effectiveness" OR "vaccine efficacy" OR "vaccine research" OR "vaccine study" OR "vaccine trial" OR "vaccine control" ~2 OR "vaccine comparison"~2 OR "vaccine response" OR "IgM" OR "IgG" OR Ig* OR antibod* OR "anti-body" OR immunoglob* OR "immuno-globulin" OR immunogen* OR "immuno-genicity" OR sero* OR "immune response"~2) AND ("risk condition"~2 OR "risk disorder"~2 OR "risk disease" ~2 OR "risk comorbidity" OR "risk disability" or "long term condition"~2 OR "long-term condition"~2 OR underlying*

		<p>OR pre-existing* OR preexisting* OR "medical condition" OR comorbid* OR immunocompr* OR immunodef* or immunosupp* OR "immuno-compromised" OR "immuno-deficiency" OR "immuno-suppression" or cancer* OR carcinoma* OR malignan* OR neoplasm* OR "solid organ" OR chemotherap* OR antineoplastic OR "anti-neoplastic" OR "cytotoxic therapy"~2 OR "anti-cancer" OR anticancer or transplant* OR "stem cell" OR "SCT" OR "HSCT" OR "BMT" OR "chronic kidney" OR "CKD" OR "chronic liver" OR "CLD" OR cirrho* OR "chronic hepatitis" ~2 OR "HCC" OR haemochromatosis OR hemochromatosis or "metabolic liver" OR "genetic liver" ~2 OR "chronic nephrotic"~2 OR "chronic hepatic"~2 OR asthma* OR "bronchiectasis" OR "bronchopulmonary dysplasia" OR "chronic lung" OR "chronic pulmonary" or "chronic obstructive" OR "COPD" OR emphysema OR "chronic bronchitis" OR "interstitial lung disease" OR "idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis" OR "pulmonary embolism" OR "pulmonary hypertension" OR "cystic fibrosis" OR diabet* OR "IDDM" OR "NIDDM" OR "overweight" OR obes* OR dementia OR alzheimer* OR "degenerative mental"~2 OR neurolog* OR neurodegen* OR schizo* or "psychosis" OR "psychotic" OR "severe mood disorder" OR "clinical depression" OR "substance use" OR "substance abuse" OR "attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder" OR "attention disorder"~2 or "ADHD" OR "spinal cord injury" OR "cerebral palsy" OR "birth defect" ~2 OR "birth anomaly" OR "intellectual and developmental disability" OR "IDD" OR "learning disability" OR "Down syndrome" or "inborn error" OR congenital OR inborn OR "inherited abnormality" OR "inherited disorder" OR "genetic abnormality"~2 OR "genetic disorder" ~2 OR heart OR cardiac OR coronary OR cardio* OR "CHD" or "high blood pressure" OR "hypertension" OR myocard* OR cardiovasc* OR "HIV"</p>
--	--	--

		<p>OR "AIDS" OR "inherited red blood cell disorders" ~3 OR haemoglobinopath* OR hemoglobinopath* OR hemolytic OR haemolytic OR hematologic* OR haematologic* OR "stroke" OR "cerebrovascular" OR "CVD" OR "tuberculosis" OR "TB") AND db:(("ICTRP" OR "EMBASE" OR "EuropePMC" OR "PREPRINT-MEDRXIV" OR "Web of Science" OR "ProQuest Central" OR "Academic Search Complete" OR "Scopus" OR "COVIDWHO"))</p>
--	--	---

Table S2. Research Question and PICOS

Research question	Is the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine (50 or 100 mcg/dose) more clinically effective in IC populations compared with the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine (30 mcg/dose)?	
	Include	Exclude
Population	IC individuals ≥ 18 years of age defined as people with CEV groups 1 and 2 medical conditions (51)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pregnant women, current/former smokers, physically inactive • Studies on only healthy individuals or individuals not categorized as CEV
Intervention	mRNA-1273	Studies with heterologous vaccination schedule (i.e., data on mixed mRNA-1273, BNT162b2, or other vaccines)
Comparison	BNT162b2	
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vaccine efficacy/effectiveness against COVID-19 infection • Vaccine efficacy/effectiveness against symptomatic COVID-19 • Vaccine efficacy/effectiveness against severe COVID-19 • Vaccine efficacy/effectiveness against hospitalization • Vaccine efficacy/effectiveness against death • SARS-CoV2 positivity (symptomatic or asymptomatic) • Symptomatic laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 infection • Severe COVID-19 infection (hospitalization or death) • Breakthrough infection • Hospitalization due to COVID-19 (ICU, ER, or ventilation etc.) 	Studies only with safety results

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Death due to COVID-19 	
Study design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clinical trials • Observational studies • Any kind of real-world evidence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study protocol (no results) • Economic models
Other limits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any publication type (including letters, commentary, abstract, full text, poster) • Publication in English 	

CEV, clinically extremely vulnerable; COVID-19, coronavirus disease 2019; ER, emergency room; IC, immunocompromised; ICU, intensive care unit; PICOS, population, intervention, comparison, outcomes, and study design; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SLR, systematic literature review.

Table S3. ROB Assessment per the NOS Scale for Cohort and Case-Control Studies

Author, year	Cohort Studies								
	Total Score	Representativeness of exposed cohort ^a	Selection of nonexposed cohort ^b	Ascertainment of exposure ^c	Outcome not present at baseline ^d	Comparability of cohorts ^e	Assessment of outcome ^f	Sufficient follow-up duration ^g	Adequate follow-up ^h
Aslam, 2021 (57)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Britton, 2022 (58)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	2 stars	1 star	1 star	0 star
Embi, 2021 (18)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	2 stars	1 star	0 star	0 star
Hause, 2022 (60)	6 stars	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Holroyd, 2022 (61)	7 stars	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Kelly, 2022 (62)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Khan, 2021 (63)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Liew, 2022 (73)	5 stars	1 star	0 star	1 star	0 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Malinis, 2021 (68)	6 stars	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Mazuecos, 2022 (46)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Mues, 2022 (45)	9 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	2 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Patel, 2022 (47)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Pham, 2022 (64)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star

Piñana, 2022 (69)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Pino, 2022 (70)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Quiroga, 2022 (32)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Rooney, 2022 (65)	6 stars	1 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Sibbel, 2021 (66)	8 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Yeo, 2022 (71)	8 stars	0 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	2 star	1 star	1 star	1 star
Yetmar, 2022 (67)	3 stars	0 star	0 star	1 star	0 star	0 star	1 star	1 star	0 star

Case-control Studies

	Total Score	Adequate case definitionⁱ	Representativeness of cases^j	Selection of controls^k	Definition of controls^l	Comparability^m	Ascertainment of exposure^c	Same ascertainment method for casesⁿ	Non-response rate^o
Butt, 2022 (59)	7 stars	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	1 star	0 star

^aOne star was awarded if the study population was truly or somewhat representative of a community or population. No star was given if the study population was sampled from a special population (e.g., hospitalized patients).

^bOne star was given if the nonexposed cohort (i.e., non-IC cohort) was drawn from the same population as the exposed cohort (i.e., IC cohort). If only 1 cohort of patients was included, no star was awarded.

^cOne star was awarded if secured medical records or a structured interview was used to ascertain the IC condition. No star was awarded if the IC condition was self-reported or not described.

^dOne star was given if the outcomes were assessed at the beginning of the study. No star was given if outcomes were not assessed at the beginning of the study.

^eTwo stars were given if the study was adjusted for the most important factors deliberately. One star was given if the study was adjusted for other important factors. If no adjustment was performed or there was no description of comparability, no star was awarded.

^fOne star was given if the outcome was assessed from medical records or record linkage. No star was given if the outcome was self-reported.

^gOne star was given if the duration of follow-up was >1 month, otherwise, no star was awarded.

^hOne star was given if there was complete follow-up or the lost to follow-up rate was ≤20%. No star was awarded if the follow-up rate was <80% or if the follow-up rate was not reported.

- ⁱOne star was awarded if the case definition was adequate and independently validated. No star was given if the case definition was based on record linkage or self-reported, or not described.
- ^jOne star was awarded if the cases were consecutive or a representative series of cases. No star was given if there was a potential for selection biases or the representativeness of cases was not stated.
- ^kOne star was given if community controls were used. No star was awarded if hospital controls were used or controls were not described.
- ^lOne star was given if the control had no history of disease. No star was given if no description was provided.
- ^mTwo stars were awarded if the study controlled for the most important factor as well as any additional factor.
- ⁿOne star was awarded if the method was the same. If a different method was used to ascertain cases and controls, no star was given.
- ^oOne star was given if the nonresponse rate was the same for both cases and controls. No star was given if the nonresponse rate was different or not described.
- IC, immunocompromised; NOS, Newcastle-Ottawa Scale, ROB, risk of bias.

Table S4. ROB Assessment for RCTs

Study	Speich, 2022 (72)
Domain 1: ROB Arising From the Randomization Process	
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Yes
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	No information
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	No
1.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low
Domain 2: ROB Due to Deviations From the Intended Interventions (Effect of Assignment to Intervention)	
2.1 Were participants aware of their assigned intervention status during the trial?	Yes
2.2 Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of the participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Yes
2.3 If yes, probably yes, or no information to 2.1 or 2.2, were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	No
2.4 If yes or probably yes to 2.3, were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?	NA
2.5 If yes or probably yes to 2.4, were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?	NA
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Yes
2.7 If no, probably no, or no information to 2.6, was there potential for a substantial impact on the result of the failure to analyze participants in the group to which they were randomized?	NA
2.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low
Domain 2: ROB Due to Deviations From the Intended Interventions (Effect of Adhering to Intervention)	
2.1 Were participants aware of their assigned intervention status during the trial?	Yes
2.2 Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of the participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Yes
2.3 If yes, probably yes, or no information to 2.1 or 2.2, were important nonprotocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?	Yes

2.4 If applicable, were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?	No
25. If applicable, was there nonadherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?	Probably no
2.6 If no, probably no, or no information to 2.3 or yes, probably yes, or no information to 2.4 or 2.5, was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?	NA
2.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low

Domain 3: Missing Outcome Data

3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Yes
3.2 If no, probably no, or no information to 3.1, is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?	NA
3.3 If no or probably no, could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?	NA
3.4 If yes, probably yes, or no information to 3.3, is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?	NA
3.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low

Domain 4: Measurement of the Outcome

4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome appropriate?	No
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	No
4.3 If no, probably no, or no information to 4.1 and 4.2, were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by the study participants?	Yes
4.4 If yes, probably yes, or no information to 4.3, could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received?	No
4.5 If yes, probably yes, or no information to 4.4, is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of the intervention received?	NA
4.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low

Domain 5: Selection of the Reported Result

5.1 Were the data that produced this result analyzed in accordance with a prespecified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	Yes
5.2 Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	No
5.3 Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Probably no
5.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low
Domain 6: Overall Bias	
6.0 Algorithm result / Assessor's judgement	Low / low
NA, not applicable; RCT, randomized controlled trial; ROB, risk of bias.	