

**Title:** Durability of protection from original monovalent and bivalent COVID-19 vaccines against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes among adults in the United States — September 2022–August 2023

**Authors and Affiliations:**

- (1) Jennifer DeCuir, MD, PhD  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [geo3@cdc.gov](mailto:geo3@cdc.gov)
- (2) Diya Surie, MD  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [dsurie@cdc.gov](mailto:dsurie@cdc.gov)
- (3) Yuwei Zhu, MD  
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [yuwei.zhu@vumc.org](mailto:yuwei.zhu@vumc.org)
- (4) Adam S. Lauring, MD, PhD  
Departments of Internal Medicine and Microbiology and Immunology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan  
Email: [alauring@med.umich.edu](mailto:alauring@med.umich.edu)
- (5) Manjusha Gaglani, MBBS  
Baylor Scott and White Health, Temple and Dallas, Texas, and Texas A&M University College of Medicine, Temple, Texas  
Email: [manjusha.gaglani@bswhealth.org](mailto:manjusha.gaglani@bswhealth.org)
- (6) Tresa McNeal, MD  
Baylor Scott and White Health, and Baylor College of Medicine, Temple, Texas  
Email: [tresa.mcneal@bswhealth.org](mailto:tresa.mcneal@bswhealth.org)
- (7) Shekhar Ghamande, MD<sup>3</sup>  
Baylor Scott and White Health, Texas A&M University College of Medicine, Temple, Texas  
Email: [shekhar.ghamande@bswhealth.org](mailto:shekhar.ghamande@bswhealth.org)
- (8) Ithan D. Peltan, MD, MSc  
Department of Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, Utah and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Email: [Ithan.Peltan@imail.org](mailto:Ithan.Peltan@imail.org)
- (9) Samuel M. Brown, MD, MS  
Department of Medicine, Intermountain Medical Center, Murray, Utah and University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Email: [Samuel.Brown@imail.org](mailto:Samuel.Brown@imail.org)
- (10) Adit A. Ginde, MD, MPH  
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, Colorado  
Email: [adit.ginde@cuanschutz.edu](mailto:adit.ginde@cuanschutz.edu)
- (11) Aimee Steinwand, BS  
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO

- Email : [aimee.steinwand@cuanschultz.edu](mailto:aimee.steinwand@cuanschultz.edu)
- (12) Nicholas M. Mohr, MD, MS  
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa  
Email: [nicholas-mohr@uiowa.edu](mailto:nicholas-mohr@uiowa.edu)
- (13) Kevin W. Gibbs, MD  
Department of Medicine, Wake Forest School of Medicine, Winston-Salem, North Carolina  
Email: [kgibbs@wakehealth.edu](mailto:kgibbs@wakehealth.edu)
- (14) David N. Hager, MD, PhD  
Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland  
Email: [dhager1@jhmi.edu](mailto:dhager1@jhmi.edu)
- (15) Harith Ali, MBChB  
Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland  
Email: [hali20@jhmi.edu](mailto:hali20@jhmi.edu)
- (16) Anne Frosch, MD, MPH  
Department of Emergency Medicine, Hennepin Healthcare Research Institute, Hennepin Healthcare System, Minneapolis, Minnesota  
Email: [anne.frosch@hcmcd.org](mailto:anne.frosch@hcmcd.org)
- (17) Michelle N. Gong, MD, MS  
Department of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York  
Email: [mgong@montefiore.org](mailto:mgong@montefiore.org)
- (18) Amira Mohamed, MD  
Department of Medicine, Montefiore Medical Center, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, Bronx, New York  
Email: [ammohamed@montefiore.org](mailto:ammohamed@montefiore.org)
- (19) Nicholas J. Johnson, MD  
Department of Emergency Medicine and Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care and Sleep Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington  
Email: [nickj45@uw.edu](mailto:nickj45@uw.edu)
- (20) Vasisht Srinivasan, MD  
Department of Emergency Medicine University of Washington, Seattle, Washington  
Email: [vasishts@uw.edu](mailto:vasishts@uw.edu)
- (21) Jay S. Steingrub, MD  
Department of Medicine, Baystate Medical Center, Springfield, Massachusetts  
Email: [Jay.Steingrub@baystatehealth.org](mailto:Jay.Steingrub@baystatehealth.org)
- (22) Akram Khan, MD  
Department of Medicine, Oregon Health and Sciences University, Portland, Oregon  
Email: [khana@ohsu.edu](mailto:khana@ohsu.edu)
- (23) Laurence W. Busse, MD, MBA  
Department of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [laurence.w.busse@emory.edu](mailto:laurence.w.busse@emory.edu)
- (24) Abhijit Duggal, MD, MPH, MSc  
Department of Medicine, Cleveland Clinic, Cleveland, Ohio  
Email: [duggala2@ccf.org](mailto:duggala2@ccf.org)
- (25) Jennifer G. Wilson, MD, MS  
Department of Emergency Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California  
Email: [jennygwilson@stanford.edu](mailto:jennygwilson@stanford.edu)

- (26) Nida Qadir, MD  
Department of Medicine, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California  
Email: [NQadir@mednet.ucla.edu](mailto:NQadir@mednet.ucla.edu)
- (27) Steven Y. Chang, MD, PhD  
Department of Medicine, University of California-Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California  
Email: [sychang@mednet.ucla.edu](mailto:sychang@mednet.ucla.edu)
- (28) Christopher Mallow, MD, MHS  
Department of Medicine, University of Miami, Miami, Florida  
Email: [cmallow@miami.edu](mailto:cmallow@miami.edu)
- (29) Jennie H. Kwon, DO, MSCI  
Department of Medicine, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri  
Email: [j.kwon@wustl.edu](mailto:j.kwon@wustl.edu)
- (30) Matthew C. Exline, MD, MPH  
Department of Medicine, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio  
Email: [Matthew.Exline@osumc.edu](mailto:Matthew.Exline@osumc.edu)
- (31) Nathan I. Shapiro, MD, MPH  
Department of Emergency Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts  
Email: [nshapiro@bidmc.harvard.edu](mailto:nshapiro@bidmc.harvard.edu)
- (32) Cristie Columbus, MD  
Baylor Scott & White Health, Dallas, Texas  
Email: [cristie.columbus@bswhealth.org](mailto:cristie.columbus@bswhealth.org)
- (33) Ivana A. Vaughn, PhD, MPH  
Department of Public Health Sciences, Henry Ford Health, Detroit, Michigan  
Email: [ivaughn2@hfhs.org](mailto:ivaughn2@hfhs.org)
- (34) Mayur Ramesh, MD  
Division of Infectious Diseases, Henry Ford Health, Detroit, Michigan  
Email: [mramesh1@hfhs.org](mailto:mramesh1@hfhs.org)
- (35) Basmah Safdar, MD, MSc  
Department of Emergency Medicine, Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut  
Email: [basmah.safdar@yale.edu](mailto:basmah.safdar@yale.edu)
- (36) Jarrod M. Mosier, MD  
Department of Emergency Medicine, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona  
Email: [jmosier@arizona.edu](mailto:jmosier@arizona.edu)
- (37) Jonathan D. Casey, MD  
Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [jonathan.d.casey@vumc.org](mailto:jonathan.d.casey@vumc.org)
- (38) H. Keipp Talbot, MD  
Departments of Medicine and Health Policy, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [keipp.talbot@vumc.org](mailto:keipp.talbot@vumc.org)
- (39) Todd W. Rice, MD, MSc  
Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [todd.rice@vumc.org](mailto:todd.rice@vumc.org)
- (40) Natasha Halasa, MD, MPH  
Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [natasha.halasa@vumc.org](mailto:natasha.halasa@vumc.org)

- (41) James D. Chappell, MD, PhD  
Department of Pediatrics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [jim.chappell@vumc.org](mailto:jim.chappell@vumc.org)
- (42) Carlos G. Grijalva, MD, MPH  
Department of Health Policy, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [carlos.grijalva@vumc.org](mailto:carlos.grijalva@vumc.org)
- (43) Adrienne Baughman  
Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [adrienne.baughman@vumc.org](mailto:adrienne.baughman@vumc.org)
- (44) Kelsey N. Womack, PhD  
Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [kelsey.womack@vumc.org](mailto:kelsey.womack@vumc.org)
- (45) Jillian P. Rhoads, PhD  
Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [jillian.p.rhoads@vumc.org](mailto:jillian.p.rhoads@vumc.org)
- (46) Sydney A. Swan, MPH  
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [sa.swan@vumc.org](mailto:sa.swan@vumc.org)
- (47) Cassandra Johnson, MS  
Department of Biostatistics, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [cassie.johnson@vumc.org](mailto:cassie.johnson@vumc.org)
- (48) Nathaniel Lewis, PhD  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [pha6@cdc.gov](mailto:pha6@cdc.gov)
- (49) Sascha Ellington, PhD, MSPH  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [frk5@cdc.gov](mailto:frk5@cdc.gov)
- (50) Meredith McMorrow, MD, MPH  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, Georgia  
Email: [bwe3@cdc.gov](mailto:bwe3@cdc.gov)
- (51) Wesley H. Self, MD, MPH  
Vanderbilt Institute for Clinical and Translational Research, and Department of Emergency Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee  
Email: [wesley.self@vumc.org](mailto:wesley.self@vumc.org)

For the Investigating Respiratory Viruses in the Acutely Ill (IVY) Network\*

\* A full list of collaborators in the IVY Network is shown in Appendix A.

**Corresponding Author:**

Jennifer DeCuir, MD-PhD

Coronavirus and Other Respiratory Viruses Division  
National Center for Immunization and Respiratory Diseases  
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention  
1600 Clifton Rd., MS H24-9, Atlanta, GA 30329, United States  
Email: [geo3@cdc.gov](mailto:geo3@cdc.gov)

**Manuscript word count:** 4,275 words

**Abstract:** 393 words

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To evaluate the durability of protection provided by original monovalent and bivalent COVID-19 vaccination against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes.

**Design:** Multicenter case-control design with prospective enrollment

**Setting:** 26 hospitals in 20 US states

**Participants:** Adults aged  $\geq 18$  years admitted to hospital with COVID-19-like illness from 8 September 2022 to 31 August 2023

**Main outcome measures:** The main outcomes were absolute and relative vaccine effectiveness of original monovalent and bivalent COVID-19 vaccines against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes, including advanced respiratory support (defined as receipt of high-flow nasal cannula, non-invasive ventilation, or invasive mechanical ventilation [IMV]) and IMV or death. Vaccine effectiveness was estimated using multivariable logistic regression, in which the odds of vaccination (versus being unvaccinated or receiving original monovalent vaccination only) were compared between COVID-19 case patients and control-patients. Bivalent vaccine effectiveness analyses were stratified by time since dose receipt.

**Results:** Among 7028 adults without immunocompromising conditions, 2924 (41.6%) were COVID-19 case patients and 4104 (58.4%) were control patients. Compared to unvaccinated patients, absolute vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization was 6% (-7% to 17%) for original monovalent doses only (median time since last dose [IQR] = 421 days [304–571]), 52% (39% to 61%) for a bivalent dose received 7–89 days earlier, and 13% (-10% to 31%) for a bivalent dose received 90–179 days earlier. Absolute vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated advanced respiratory support was 31% (15% to 45%) for original monovalent doses only, 66% (47% to 78%) for a bivalent dose received 7–89 days earlier, and 33% (-1% to 55%) for a bivalent dose received 90–179 days earlier. Absolute vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated IMV or death was 51% (34% to 63%) for

original monovalent doses only, 61% (35% to 77%) for a bivalent dose received 7–89 days earlier, and 50% (11% to 71%) for a bivalent dose received 90–179 days earlier.

**Conclusion:** When compared to original monovalent vaccination only, bivalent COVID-19 vaccination provided additional protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and certain severe in-hospital outcomes within 3 months of dose receipt. By 3–6 months, protection from a bivalent dose declined to a level similar to that remaining from original monovalent vaccination only. Although no protection remained from original monovalent vaccination against COVID-19-associated hospitalization, it provided durable protection against severe in-hospital outcomes >1 year after receipt of the last dose, particularly against IMV or death.

## **SUMMARY BOX**

### **What is already known on this topic:**

- On September 1, 2022, bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccination was recommended for US adults who had completed at least an original monovalent COVID-19 primary series.
- Early estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness are available for the period soon after dose receipt; however fewer data exist on their durability of protection and effectiveness against severe outcomes.

### **What this study adds:**

- When compared to original monovalent vaccination only, bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccination provided additional protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and certain severe in-hospital outcomes within 3 months of dose receipt. By 3-6 months, protection from a bivalent dose declined to a level similar to that remaining from original monovalent vaccination only.
- Although no protection remained from original monovalent vaccination against COVID-19-associated hospitalization, it provided durable protection against severe in-hospital outcomes >1 year after receipt of the last dose, particularly against invasive mechanical ventilation or death.



## INTRODUCTION

In December 2020, monovalent COVID-19 vaccines designed against the ancestral strain of SARS-CoV-2 (original monovalent vaccines) were introduced in the United States to prevent COVID-19-associated morbidity and mortality. While these vaccines successfully prevented COVID-19-associated hospitalization and death [1,2], their effectiveness declined over time due to several factors, including waning vaccine-induced immunity and the emergence of the immune evasive Omicron variant [3,4]. To address these factors, on September 1, 2022, the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices at the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended a bivalent mRNA COVID-19 dose, designed to protect against both the ancestral strain and Omicron BA.4/5 lineages, for persons who had completed at least an original monovalent COVID-19 primary series [5]. With implementation of this recommendation, original monovalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccines were no longer recommended for use as booster doses in the US [6]. In April 2023, COVID-19 vaccine recommendations were updated to state that bivalent vaccines should be used for all mRNA COVID-19 vaccine doses [7].

Early estimates showed that bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccines were effective against COVID-19-associated hospitalization shortly after administration [8–11]. However, fewer data exist on their durability of protection and their effectiveness against severe outcomes, particularly in the setting of residual protection remaining from original monovalent vaccination. Numerous Omicron lineages have also emerged in the US since the bivalent vaccine rollout, and the impact of these lineages on vaccine effectiveness is unclear. While neutralization studies suggest that the XBB.1.5 lineage is among the most immune evasive to date, few studies have measured bivalent vaccine effectiveness during the period of XBB.1.5 predominance [12–15].

To address these gaps, we evaluated bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes up to 6 months after dose receipt. Results were stratified by time from bivalent dose receipt to illness onset and Omicron lineage period to better differentiate the impact of waning vaccine-induced immunity and viral immune evasion on bivalent vaccine effectiveness.

## **METHODS**

### **Setting and design**

This case-control analysis was conducted by the Investigating Respiratory Viruses in the Acutely Ill (IVY) Network, comprised of 26 hospitals in 20 US states in collaboration with the CDC. The current analysis included adults admitted to IVY Network hospitals from 8 September 2022 to 31 August 2023. Vaccine effectiveness for the prevention of COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes was estimated for the original monovalent and bivalent COVID-19 vaccines authorized for use in the US during the analysis period. These activities were determined to be public health surveillance with waiver of informed consent by institutional review boards at CDC and each enrolling site, and were conducted in accordance with applicable federal law and CDC policy (45 C.F.R. part 46.102(l)(2), 21 C.F.R. part 56; 42 U.S.C. §241(d); 5 U.S.C. §552a; 44 U.S.C. §3501 et seq).

### **Participants**

Site personnel prospectively enrolled patients aged  $\geq 18$  years admitted to IVY Network hospitals who met a COVID-19-like illness case definition and received SARS-CoV-2 clinical testing. COVID-19-like illness was defined as  $\geq 1$  of the following signs and symptoms: fever, cough, shortness of breath, new or worsening findings on chest imaging consistent with pneumonia, and hypoxemia (defined as an oxygen saturation [ $\text{SpO}_2$ ]  $< 92\%$  or supplemental oxygen use for patients without chronic oxygen needs, or

escalation of oxygen therapy for patients on chronic supplemental oxygen). Case patients tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by nucleic acid amplification test or antigen test within 10 days of illness onset and within 3 days of hospital admission. Control patients tested negative for SARS-CoV-2 by real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) within 10 days of illness onset and within 3 days of hospital admission. Case-control status was determined by results of both clinical SARS-CoV-2 testing at the admitting hospital, as well as standardized, central laboratory testing for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. Patients who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by either clinical testing or central laboratory testing were classified as cases, while patients who tested negative by both clinical and central laboratory testing were classified as controls. Case patients who tested positive for influenza or RSV were excluded from analyses, while control patients who tested positive for influenza were also excluded due to potential correlation between COVID-19 and influenza vaccination behaviors [16]. Case and control patients were enrolled within two weeks of one another at each site in approximately a 1:1 ratio and were not matched on other patient-level characteristics.

### **Data collection**

Trained personnel at enrolling sites collected data on patient demographics, chronic medical conditions, COVID-19 vaccination status, and severe in-hospital outcomes through patient or proxy interview and medical chart abstraction. Chronic medical conditions were grouped into nine categories: cardiovascular, pulmonary, renal, endocrine, gastrointestinal, hematologic, neurologic, autoimmune, and immunocompromising (see supplemental table S1). Verification of COVID-19 vaccination status was performed using hospital electronic medical records, state vaccine registries, and vaccination cards (when available). Patients were followed from admission until discharge, death, or hospital day 28 (whichever occurred first).

### **Classification of vaccination status**

To assess bivalent vaccine effectiveness, patients were classified into four vaccination status groups: 1) unvaccinated (no COVID-19 vaccine doses received), 2) vaccinated with original monovalent doses only (receipt of any combination of 1–4 doses of original monovalent vaccine: mRNA-1273 [Moderna], BNT162b2 [Pfizer-BioNTech], Ad26.COV2.S [Janssen], NVX-CoV2373 [Novavax]), 3) vaccinated with one bivalent mRNA dose 7–89 days before illness onset, and 4) vaccinated with one bivalent mRNA dose 90–179 days before illness onset. Patients were classified as bivalent vaccinated if they received one dose of either mRNA-1273.222 (Moderna) or BNT162b2 bivalent (Pfizer-BioNTech), regardless of the number of previous original monovalent doses received. Patients were excluded if they received >1 bivalent dose, if they received any COVID-19 vaccine dose <7 days before illness onset, or if they received only one dose of original monovalent Moderna, Pfizer, or Novavax vaccine. Estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness  $\geq 180$  days after dose receipt lacked sufficient precision for reporting; therefore, patients who received a bivalent dose  $\geq 180$  days before illness onset were also excluded. The main analysis was restricted to patients without immunocompromising conditions (described in supplementary appendix B). A sub-analysis of bivalent vaccine effectiveness among patients with immunocompromising conditions is available in the supplementary materials (supplemental table 1, supplemental figure 5).

### **Clinical outcomes**

The primary outcome in this analysis was COVID-19-associated hospitalization, defined as hospital admission with COVID-19-like illness and laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection as described above. Secondary outcomes were also included to assess vaccine effectiveness against severe COVID-19-associated disease through hospital day 28. These outcomes were: 1) supplemental oxygen therapy, defined as any receipt of supplemental oxygen for patients with no chronic oxygen use or escalation of oxygen use for patients on chronic supplemental oxygen; 2) advanced respiratory support, defined as

new receipt of high-flow nasal cannula (HFNC), non-invasive ventilation (NIV), or invasive mechanical ventilation (IMV); 3) acute organ failure, defined as either respiratory failure (new receipt of HFNC, NIV, or IMV), cardiovascular failure (receipt of vasopressors), or renal failure (new receipt of renal replacement therapy); 4) intensive care unit (ICU) admission; and 5) IMV or death. Patients on home IMV were not eligible for the supplemental oxygen therapy or advanced respiratory support outcomes (outcomes are fully described in supplementary appendix B).

### **Molecular diagnosis and sequencing**

Nasal swabs were obtained from enrolled patients and tested for SARS-CoV-2, influenza, and RSV by RT-PCR at a central laboratory at Vanderbilt University Medical Center (Nashville, Tennessee). All specimens that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 by central RT-PCR testing were submitted to the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, Michigan) for viral whole genome sequencing. Sequencing was performed using the ARTIC Network protocol on either an Oxford Nanopore Technologies GridION or Illumina Nextseq 1000 instrument. SARS-CoV-2 lineages were reported using the PANGO (phylogenetic assignment of named global outbreak lineages) nomenclature [17]. Detailed laboratory methods are described in Supplementary Appendix B. SARS-CoV-2 lineages were considered predominant if they were detected in  $\geq 50\%$  of sequenced specimens during a given admission week.

### **Statistical analysis**

Bivalent and original monovalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization was calculated using multivariable logistic regression, in which the odds of COVID-19 vaccination were compared between COVID-19 case patients and control patients. Estimates of vaccine effectiveness were generated using two different comparator groups. First, absolute vaccine effectiveness was calculated for both bivalent and original monovalent vaccines using unvaccinated patients as the

reference group. Second, relative vaccine effectiveness was calculated for bivalent vaccines using patients who received original monovalent vaccination only as the reference group. Logistic regression models were adjusted for age (18-49, 50-64, ≥65), sex (male, female), self-reported race and Hispanic ethnicity (non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic Black, Hispanic or Latino, non-Hispanic other race, other), admission date in biweekly intervals, and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services region of the admitting hospital. Post hoc, we evaluated other variables as potential covariates, including number of chronic medical condition categories and known previous Omicron infection, defined as either self-reported or documented SARS-CoV-2 infection on or after 26 December 2021. None of these other variables resulted in an absolute change in the adjusted odds ratio of >5% when added to the prespecified model and were not included in the final models (supplemental table 2) [18]. Vaccine effectiveness was calculated as  $(1 - \text{adjusted odds ratio}) \times 100\%$ .

Overall estimates of bivalent and original monovalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization were stratified by age (18–64, ≥65 years), number of chronic medical condition categories (<3, ≥3), bivalent vaccine product type (Moderna, Pfizer), and Omicron lineage period (BA.4/5, XBB.1.5). Cut-off dates for each Omicron lineage period were determined using IVY Network sequencing data, with BA.4/5 being predominant from 8 September 2022 to 26 November 2022 and XBB.1.5 from 22 January 2023 to 27 May 2023. Analyses assessing bivalent and original monovalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated in-hospital outcomes were conducted using the methods described for COVID-19-associated hospitalization, with cases limited to those who met each severe in-hospital outcome definition. Analyses were conducted using SAS (version 9.4; SAS Institute).

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

Patients were not involved in the original design of this study. Throughout the conduct of the study, patients were routinely engaged in the work via structured interviews with site personnel, which included questions about COVID-19 and COVID-19 vaccines.

## RESULTS

### Description of participants in vaccine effectiveness analyses

Between 8 September 2022 and 31 August 2023, 11797 patients admitted with COVID-19-like illness were enrolled in the IVY Network from 26 hospitals in 20 US states (supplemental figure S1). A total of 2374 (20.1%) patients met exclusion criteria and were removed from the analysis. Among the remaining 9423 patients, there were 7028 without immunocompromising conditions (included in the main analysis) and 2395 with immunocompromising conditions (sub-analysis available in the supplementary materials).

Among the patients without immunocompromising conditions, 2924 (41.6%) were COVID-19 case patients and 4104 (58.4%) were control patients (table 1). The median age was 67 years (interquartile range [IQR] 56–78), 3573 (50.8%) patients were female, 1606 (22.9%) were non-Hispanic Black, and 802 (11.4%) were Hispanic. A total of 1545 (22.0%) patients were unvaccinated, 4191 (59.6%) were vaccinated with original monovalent doses only, 647 (9.2%) were vaccinated with one bivalent dose 7–89 days before illness onset, and 645 (9.2%) were vaccinated with one bivalent dose 90–179 days before illness onset. Compared with patients who received either original monovalent or bivalent vaccine doses, unvaccinated patients were younger ( $p < 0.0001$ ) and more likely to be non-Hispanic Black ( $p = 0.0338$ ) or Hispanic ( $p = 0.0002$ ).

Viral whole genome sequencing was completed for 1779 of the 2924 case patients (60.8%), and a SARS-CoV-2 lineage was successfully identified for 1646 (56.3%), all of whom were infected with an Omicron lineage. Overall, 33 (2.0%) patients were infected with BA.2, 358 (21.7%) with BA.4/5, 346 (21.0%) with BQ.1, 701 (42.6%) with XBB.1.5, and 208 (12.6%) with other XBB lineages (figure 1). BA.4/5 was the predominant lineage from 8 September 2022 until 26 November 2022, and XBB.1.5 was predominant from 22 January 2023 to 27 May 2023.

### **Vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization**

Among patients without immunocompromising conditions, the absolute effectiveness of original monovalent vaccination only against COVID-19-associated hospitalization was 6% (95% CI -7% to 17%), with a median time since last dose of 421 days (IQR 304–571). Bivalent vaccination received 7–89 days before illness onset provided significantly higher protection against hospitalization than original monovalent vaccination only, with an absolute vaccine effectiveness of 52% (39% to 61%) and a relative vaccine effectiveness of 48% (36% to 57%). After 90–179 days, absolute effectiveness waned to 13% (-10% to 31%) and relative effectiveness waned to 17% (-1% to 31%) (figure 2, supplemental figure 2).

Bivalent vaccination provided increased protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization 7–89 days after dose receipt compared to original monovalent vaccination only, followed by a decline in point estimates of vaccine effectiveness by 90–179 days across most subgroups, including patients aged  $\geq 65$  years, patients with comorbidities in  $<3$  and  $\geq 3$  chronic condition categories, Moderna bivalent recipients, and Pfizer bivalent recipients (figure 2, supplemental figure 2). Results were also similar among patients with immunocompromising conditions, although point estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness 90–179 days after dose receipt (absolute effectiveness = 45%, 13% to 65%, relative



effectiveness = 48%, 28% to 62%) were higher than those among patients without immunocompromising conditions (supplemental figure 5).

Analyses stratified by Omicron lineage period showed a decline in the absolute vaccine effectiveness of original monovalent vaccination only against COVID-19-associated hospitalization from the BA.4/5 period (32%, 12% to 47%) to the XBB.1.5 period (-12%, -38% to 9%). However, the additional protection provided by a bivalent dose received within 7–89 days was similar during both lineage periods. Relative vaccine effectiveness of a bivalent dose received within 7–89 days was 50% (25% to 67%) during the BA.4/5 period and 35% (8% to 54%) during the XBB.1.5 period, although median time since dose receipt among patients who received a bivalent dose within 7–89 days during the BA.4/5 period was 64 days versus 29 days during the XBB.1.5 period. Based on the timing of the lineage periods in relation to the availability of bivalent vaccines, evaluation of bivalent vaccine effectiveness 90–179 days after dose receipt was only possible for the XBB.1.5 period, which showed no remaining protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization (absolute effectiveness = -9%, -44% to 18%; relative effectiveness = 6%, -16% to 24%).

### **Vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated severe in-hospital outcomes**

Among 2924 case patients, 632 (21.6%) experienced acute organ failure, 514 (17.8%) were admitted to an ICU, and 281 (9.6%) received IMV or died (table 2). Among 2918 case patients not on home IMV, 1775 (60.8%) received supplemental oxygen therapy and 568 (19.5%) received advanced respiratory support. Compared with case patients who received either original monovalent or bivalent vaccination, unvaccinated case patients were more likely to have advanced respiratory support ( $p=0.0005$ ), acute organ failure ( $p=0.0065$ ), ICU admission ( $p<0.0001$ ), and IMV or death ( $p<0.0001$ ).

The absolute effectiveness of original monovalent vaccination only against COVID-19-associated supplemental oxygen therapy (12%, -2% to 24%) was similar to that against COVID-19-associated hospitalization (6%, -7% to 17%) (figure 4). Point estimates of the absolute effectiveness of original monovalent vaccination only generally increased with outcome severity, up to 51% (34% to 63%) against IMV or death (median time since last dose = 416 days, IQR = 297–564). Compared to the absolute effectiveness of original monovalent doses only, the absolute effectiveness of a bivalent dose received 7–89 days before illness onset was higher against COVID-19-associated supplemental oxygen therapy (original monovalent: 12%, -2% to 24% vs. bivalent: 56%, 42% to 66%), advanced respiratory support (original monovalent: 31%, 15% to 45% vs. bivalent: 66%, 47% to 78%), and acute organ failure (original monovalent: 26%, 8% to 40% vs. bivalent: 61%, 41% to 74%) (figure 4). Estimates of absolute effectiveness for original monovalent vaccination and bivalent vaccination received 7–89 days before illness onset were similar against ICU admission (original monovalent: 36%, 20% to 49% vs. bivalent: 56%, 33% to 71%) and IMV or death (original monovalent: 51%, 34% to 63% vs. bivalent: 61%, 35% to 77%). By 90–179 days after vaccination, point estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness against each severe outcome had declined to a level similar to that for original monovalent vaccination only. Trends were similar when assessing relative bivalent effectiveness (supplemental figure 4).

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Principal findings**

In this analysis of adults admitted to 26 US hospitals between 8 September 2022 and 31 August 2023, no protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization remained from original monovalent vaccination only, for which the median time since last dose was >1 year. In contrast, bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccination provided protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization within 3 months of dose receipt, when compared to both unvaccinated patients and patients who received original monovalent

doses only. However, protection from bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccination waned by 3–6 months after dose receipt. These findings were consistent across key subgroups, including patients aged  $\geq 65$  years and patients with multiple comorbidities. Of note, original monovalent vaccination continued to provide durable protection against the most severe in-hospital outcomes, including IMV or death. Bivalent vaccination increased protection against certain severe in-hospital outcomes within 3 months of dose receipt, before declining to a level of protection similar to that remaining from previous original monovalent vaccination. These results support staying up to date with recommended COVID-19 vaccines to optimize protection against both COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes.

### **Comparison with other studies**

Our findings are consistent with studies from the US, the United Kingdom, and Finland that have shown waning bivalent COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization within 6 months of dose receipt [19–22]. A recent CDC report on US adults without immunocompromising conditions found that the absolute effectiveness of a bivalent vaccine dose against COVID-19-associated hospitalization declined from 62% at 7–59 days after vaccination to 24% after 120–179 days, similar to our results [19]. Declining estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization may be explained by a number of factors, including the emergence of immune evasive lineages and waning vaccine-induced immunity. Our analysis included both the end of the BA.4/5 predominant lineage period and the XBB.1.5 predominant period in the US. While neutralization studies have identified XBB.1.5 as one of the most immune evasive SARS-CoV-2 lineages to date [12–15], evidence on whether bivalent vaccine effectiveness is lower against XBB.1.5 than against BA.4/5 has been mixed [21,23,24]. We found no significant reduction in the relative effectiveness of a bivalent vaccine dose against COVID-19-associated hospitalization within 7–89 days of receipt during the XBB.1.5

(35%, 8% to 54%) period, compared to the BA.4/5 (50%, 25% to 67%) period. Although the point estimate of effectiveness observed during the XBB.1.5 period was lower than that during the BA.4/5 period, this is likely due, at least in part, to a longer median time since dose receipt among patients who received a bivalent dose within 7–89 days during the XBB.1.5 period (median: 64 days) versus the BA.4/5 period (median: 29 days). Disentangling the potential effects of immune evasion and waning vaccine-induced immunity is challenging, given that both phenomena occur contemporaneously. However, analyses stratified by both lineage period and time since dose receipt showed that during the XBB.1.5 period, point estimates of relative bivalent vaccine effectiveness against hospitalization decreased from 7–89 days (35%, 8% to 54%) after vaccination to 90–179 days (6%, -16% to 24%), although confidence intervals overlapped. Together, these results suggest that waning vaccine-induced immunity may be a stronger driver of declining bivalent vaccine effectiveness than immune evasion from the XBB.1.5 lineage.

Among patients with immunocompromising conditions, bivalent vaccination conferred protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization within 7–89 days of dose receipt. However, in contrast to the results described for patients without immunocompromising conditions, estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness did not show evidence of waning by 90–179 days. Few data are available on bivalent vaccine effectiveness among patients with immunocompromising conditions, but existing studies suggest that COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness wanes in this population as well [19,25,26]. The lack of waning observed in our results may be attributable to behavioral and treatment factors for which we were unable to control in our analysis. Patients with immunocompromising conditions who received a bivalent vaccine dose may have been more likely than unvaccinated patients and patients who received original monovalent vaccination only to practice masking and social distancing for the prevention of SARS-CoV-2 exposure, and to receive outpatient antiviral therapy for the treatment of SARS-CoV-2

infection. The preferential use of these interventions by bivalent recipients could have biased estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness away from the null.

Our results also provide important information regarding the effectiveness and durability of COVID-19 vaccination against the most severe in-hospital outcomes. Findings were notable for the long-lasting protection provided by original monovalent COVID-19 vaccination, particularly against ICU admission and IMV or death. In contrast to vaccine-induced immunity against milder infection, which may wane due to decreasing neutralizing antibody levels or immune evasion by emerging variants, immunity against severe outcomes like IMV or death may be mediated by long-lasting memory B- and T-cell responses that are more highly conserved against evolving variants [27–29]. Bivalent vaccination provided additional protection against supplemental oxygen therapy, advanced respiratory support, and acute organ failure within 7–89 days of dose receipt, followed by a decline in protection to a level similar to that remaining from previous original monovalent doses by 90–179 days. However, when compared to original monovalent vaccination only, bivalent vaccination did not significantly increase protection against IMV or death. These results are somewhat in contrast to other studies from Israel, the Nordic countries, and the US demonstrating the effectiveness of bivalent vaccination against death soon after dose receipt [10,11,20,30]. The difference in our results may stem from a combination of high residual protection against IMV or death from original monovalent vaccination and confounding due to prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. Given that prior infection is highly protective against severe outcomes, and may be more likely among patients who are unvaccinated or have a remote history of vaccination compared to recent vaccinees, estimates of vaccine effectiveness against IMV or death may have been biased toward the null [31,32]. Although patient-level data on SARS-CoV-2 infection history were collected for our analysis, these data likely underestimated the prevalence of prior infection in our sample, as many SARS-CoV-2 infections are either undiagnosed or diagnosed through home testing and not reported.

Inclusion of these measures in models of bivalent vaccine effectiveness did not appreciably change our results and were not included in the final models.

### **Strengths and limitations**

This study has several strengths in both its study design and scope. To meet criteria for enrollment, case patients were required to have fever or symptomatic respiratory illness confirmed by either patient interview or electronic health record, limiting the inclusion of case patients who tested positive for SARS-CoV-2, but were hospitalized for reasons other than COVID-19. Ascertainment of vaccination history was also robust, utilizing patient interviews, state registries, and electronic health records to minimize misclassification of vaccination status. Respiratory specimens that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 underwent viral sequencing, enabling the definition of BA.4/5 and XBB.1.5 lineage periods within our data. An extended study period was included to allow for measurement of bivalent vaccine effectiveness over time up to 6 months after dose receipt. Finally, in addition to presenting estimates of bivalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization, this analysis also included a range of severe in-hospital outcomes to describe how bivalent vaccines performed against the most severe manifestations of COVID-19.

As with all observational research, this analysis also had limitations. Measures of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection likely underestimated the proportion of patients with prior infection in our sample and were not included in vaccine effectiveness models, as described above. Although vaccine effectiveness estimates were adjusted for patient-level demographic characteristics, calendar time, and geographic region, residual confounding from other factors, including the receipt of COVID-19 antiviral treatments, is also possible. Sample size limitations resulted in wide confidence intervals for some effectiveness estimates and prevented calculation of bivalent vaccine effectiveness against death alone. Lastly,

although the systematic collection of data from a large multicenter network increases the external validity of our findings, some results may not be directly generalizable to other settings or populations.

### **Policy implications**

In light of waning bivalent vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes, updated monovalent vaccines against COVID-19 were recommended for US adults in September 2023 [33]. These vaccines were designed against the XBB.1.5 subvariant to more closely match circulating Omicron lineages and to overcome the potential effects of immune imprinting against the ancestral strain of SARS-CoV-2. Receipt of an updated monovalent XBB.1.5 vaccine dose may boost waned vaccine-induced immunity against severe COVID-19 outcomes and improve protection against emerging Omicron lineages. Although morbidity and mortality have decreased considerably since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, a substantial number of hospitalizations and deaths attributable to COVID-19 continue to occur. During November 2023, approximately 17,000 new COVID-19-associated hospitalizations and 1,300 deaths occurred each week in the US, primarily among older adults [34]. Future monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 epidemiology, the burden of disease in high-risk groups, and the effectiveness of updated monovalent XBB.1.5 vaccines will be critical to informing policy on the need for regular revaccination against COVID-19.

### **Conclusions**

When compared to original monovalent vaccination only, bivalent mRNA COVID-19 vaccination provided additional protection against COVID-19-associated hospitalization and certain severe in-hospital outcomes within 3 months of dose receipt, after which protection from a bivalent dose declined to a level similar to that remaining from original monovalent vaccination only. Although no residual protection remained from original monovalent vaccination against COVID-19-associated hospitalization,

original monovalent vaccination continued to provide durable protection against the most severe COVID-19-associated outcomes >1 year after receipt of the last dose. These results highlight the importance of staying up to date with recommended COVID-19 vaccines to optimize protection against both hospitalization and severe in-hospital outcomes due to COVID-19.

## NOTES

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

**Contributions:** Guarantors of this work include Dr. Self (protocol and data integrity), Dr. DeCuir (statistical analysis), Dr. Lauring (viral sequencing laboratory methods), and Dr. Chappell (RT-PCR laboratory methods). Contributions of each author include the following. Responsibility for decision to submit the manuscript: DeCuir, Surie, Self. Composed the initial manuscript draft: DeCuir, Surie, Self (the authors only wrote the manuscript without outside assistance). Conceptualization of study methods: DeCuir, Surie, Zhu, Lauring, Martin, Gaglani, McNeal, Ghamande, Peltan, Brown, Ginde, Mohr, Gibbs, Files, Hager, Ali, Prekker, Gong, Mohamed, Johnson, Steingrub, Khan, Busse, Duggal, Wilson, Qadir, Chang, Mallow, Kwon, Exline, Shapiro, Columbus, Vaughn, Ramesh, Safdar, Mosier, Casey, Talbot, Rice, Halasa, Chappell, Grijalva, Baughman, Womack, Rhoads, Swan, Johnson, Lewis, Ellington, McMorrow, Self. Statistical analysis and data management: DeCuir, Zhu, Johnson. Funding acquisition: Self. Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content: DeCuir, Surie, Zhu, Lauring, Martin, Gaglani, McNeal, Ghamande, Peltan, Brown, Ginde, Mohr, Gibbs, Files, Hager, Ali, Prekker, Gong, Mohamed, Johnson, Steingrub, Khan, Busse, Duggal, Wilson, Qadir, Chang, Mallow, Kwon, Exline, Shapiro, Columbus, Vaughn, Ramesh, Safdar, Mosier, Casey, Talbot, Rice, Halasa, Chappell, Grijalva, Baughman, Womack, Rhoads, Swan, Johnson, Lewis, Ellington, McMorrow, Self. The corresponding author attests



that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

**Funding:** Primary funding for this work was provided by the United States Centers Disease Control and Prevention (contract 75D30122C14944 to Dr. Self). Scientists from the funding source, the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, participated in all aspects of this study, including its design, analysis, interpretation of data, writing the report, and the decision to submit the article for publication. Scientists from the United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention are included as authors on this manuscript.

**Competing Interests:** All authors have completed and submitted the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors form for disclosure of potential conflicts of interest. Samuel Brown reports that ReddyPort pays royalties for a patent, outside the submitted work. Steven Chang reports consulting fees from PureTech Health and Kiniksa Pharmaceuticals, outside the submitted work. Abhijit Duggal reports participating on an advisory board for ALung Technologies, outside the submitted work. Manjusha Gaglani reports grants from CDC, CDC-Abt Associates, CDC-Westat, and served as co-chair of the Infectious Diseases and Immunization Committee for the Texas Pediatric Society (TPS) and received an honorarium serving as a TPS Project Firstline webinar speaker panelist for "Respiratory Virus Review: Clinical Considerations and IPC Guidance", outside the submitted work. Michelle N. Gong reports a grant from NHLBI and CDC, fees for serving on Scientific Advisory Panel for Philips Healthcare, travel to ATS conference as board member, outside the submitted work. Carlos Grijalva reports grants from NIH, CDC, AHRQ, FDA, and Syneos Health; receipt of compensation for participation in an advisory board for Merck, outside the submitted work. Natasha Halasa reports receiving grants from Sanofi, Merck, and Quidel, outside the submitted work. Adam Luring reports receiving grants from CDC, FluLab, NIH/National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, and Burroughs Wellcome Fund, and MDHHS, and consulting fees from Roche related to baloxavir, outside the submitted work. Christopher Mallow

reports Medical Legal Consulting, outside the submitted work. Ithan D. Peltan reports grants from NIH, and Janssen Pharmaceuticals and institutional support Regeneron, outside the submitted work. Mayur Ramesh reports participating in a non-branded Speaker Program supported by AstraZeneca and MD Briefcase, and participating on an advisory board for Moderna, Pfizer, and Ferring, outside the submitted work. No other potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

**Patient Consent:** Not applicable.

**Ethical Approval:** This program was approved as a public health surveillance activity with waiver of informed consent by institutional review boards at the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the program's coordinating center at Vanderbilt University Medical Center, and each participating site.

**Data Sharing:** No additional data are available.

**Transparency:** Dr. DeCuir affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned have been explained. Dr. Self led the development of the study protocol and participant enrollment. Dr. DeCuir led statistical analysis. Dr. Luring led viral sequencing work. Dr. Chappell led RT-PCR work. Dr. DeCuir takes responsibility for the work overall.

**Dissemination to participants and related patient and public communities:** Results will be disseminated to relevant communities via public health announcements from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, via press releases in the lay press, and public presentations by the investigators.

**Provenance and peer review:** Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

## REFERENCES

- 1 Steele MK, Couture A, Reed C, *et al.* Estimated Number of COVID-19 Infections, Hospitalizations, and Deaths Prevented Among Vaccinated Persons in the US, December 2020 to September 2021. *JAMA Network Open.* 2022;5:e2220385–e2220385.
- 2 Watson OJ, Barnsley G, Toor J, *et al.* Global impact of the first year of COVID-19 vaccination: a mathematical modelling study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.* 2022;22:1293–302.
- 3 Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, *et al.* Waning of vaccine effectiveness against moderate and severe covid-19 among adults in the US from the VISION network: test negative, case-control study. *BMJ.* 2022;379:e072141.
- 4 Adams K, Rhoads JP, Surie D, *et al.* Vaccine effectiveness of primary series and booster doses against covid-19 associated hospital admissions in the United States: living test negative design study. *BMJ.* 2022;379:e072065.
- 5 Rosenblum HG, Wallace M, Godfrey M, *et al.* Interim Recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices for the Use of Bivalent Booster Doses of COVID-19 Vaccines - United States, October 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71:1436–41.
- 6 Food and Drug Administration. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Authorizes Moderna, Pfizer-BioNTech Bivalent COVID-19 Vaccines for Use as a Booster Dose. 2022.
- 7 Food and Drug Administration. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Authorizes Changes to Simplify Use of Bivalent mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines. 2023.
- 8 Surie D, DeCuir J, Zhu Y, *et al.* Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization Among Immunocompetent Adults Aged  $\geq 65$  Years - IVY Network, 18 States, September 8-November 30, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71:1625–30.
- 9 Tenforde MW, Weber ZA, Natarajan K, *et al.* Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing COVID-19-Associated Emergency Department or Urgent Care Encounters and Hospitalizations Among Immunocompetent Adults - VISION Network, Nine States, September-November 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2023;71:1637–46.
- 10 Andersson NW, Thiesson EM, Baum U, *et al.* Comparative effectiveness of bivalent BA.4-5 and BA.1 mRNA booster vaccines among adults aged  $\geq 50$  years in Nordic countries: nationwide cohort study. *BMJ.* 2023;382:e075286.
- 11 Arbel R, Peretz A, Sergienko R, *et al.* Effectiveness of a bivalent mRNA vaccine booster dose to prevent severe COVID-19 outcomes: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.* 2023;23:914–21.
- 12 Kurhade C, Zou J, Xia H, *et al.* Low neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2.75.2, BQ.1.1 and XBB.1 by parental mRNA vaccine or a BA.5 bivalent booster. *Nature Medicine.* 2023;29:344–7.
- 13 Wang Q, Iketani S, Li Z, *et al.* Alarming antibody evasion properties of rising SARS-CoV-2 BQ and XBB subvariants. *Cell.* 2023;186:279-286.e8.

- 14 Rössler A, Netzl A, Knabl L, *et al.* Characterizing SARS-CoV-2 neutralization profiles after bivalent boosting using antigenic cartography. *Nature Communications*. 2023;14:5224.
- 15 Composition WT on CV. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee June 15, 2023 Meeting Presentation- WHO: TAG on COVID19 Vaccine Composition. 2023. <https://www.fda.gov/media/169543/download>
- 16 Doll MK, Pettigrew SM, Ma J, *et al.* Effects of Confounding Bias in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) and Influenza Vaccine Effectiveness Test-Negative Designs Due to Correlated Influenza and COVID-19 Vaccination Behaviors. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2022;75:e564–71.
- 17 Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O’Toole Á, *et al.* A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. *Nature Microbiology*. 2020;5:1403–7.
- 18 Maldonado G, Greenland S. Simulation Study of Confounder-Selection Strategies. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1993;138:923–36.
- 19 Link-Gelles R, Weber ZA, Reese SE, *et al.* Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Vaccine Durability in Preventing COVID-19-Associated Hospitalization and Critical Illness Among Adults with and Without Immunocompromising Conditions - VISION Network, September 2022-April 2023. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2023;72:579–88.
- 20 Lin DY, Xu Y, Gu Y, *et al.* Durability of Bivalent Boosters against Omicron Subvariants. *N Engl J Med*. 2023;388:1818–20.
- 21 Poukka E, Nohynek H, Goebeler S, *et al.* Bivalent booster effectiveness against severe COVID-19 outcomes in Finland, September 2022 – March 2023. *medRxiv*. 2023;2023.03.02.23286561.
- 22 Kirsebom FCM, Andrews N, Stowe J, *et al.* Duration of protection of ancestral-strain monovalent vaccines and effectiveness of bivalent BA.1 boosters against COVID-19 hospitalisation in England: a test-negative case-control study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Published Online First: 12 July 2023. doi: 10.1016/s1473-3099(23)00365-1
- 23 Link-Gelles R, Ciesla AA, Roper LE, *et al.* Early Estimates of Bivalent mRNA Booster Dose Vaccine Effectiveness in Preventing Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection Attributable to Omicron BA.5- and XBB/XBB.1.5-Related Sublineages Among Immunocompetent Adults - Increasing Community Access to Testing Program, United States, December 2022-January 2023. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2023;72:119–24.
- 24 Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Puzniak L, *et al.* Effectiveness of BNT162b2 BA.4/5 bivalent mRNA vaccine against a range of COVID-19 outcomes in a large health system in the USA: a test-negative case-control study. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. doi: 10.1016/S2213-2600(23)00306-5
- 25 Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Puzniak L, *et al.* Immunocompromise and durability of BNT162b2 vaccine against severe outcomes due to omicron and delta variants. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2022;10:e61–2.
- 26 Britton A, Embi PJ, Levy ME, *et al.* 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 Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71:1335–42.

27 Britton A, Fleming-Dutra KE, Shang N, *et al.* Association of COVID-19 Vaccination With Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infection by Time Since Vaccination and Delta Variant Predominance. *JAMA.* 2022;327:1032–41.

28 Liu J, Chandrashekar A, Sellers D, *et al.* Vaccines elicit highly conserved cellular immunity to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron. *Nature.* 2022;603:493–6.

29 Ferdinands JM, Rao S, Dixon BE, *et al.* Waning 2-Dose and 3-Dose Effectiveness of mRNA Vaccines Against COVID-19-Associated Emergency Department and Urgent Care Encounters and Hospitalizations Among Adults During Periods of Delta and Omicron Variant Predominance - VISION Network, 10 States, August 2021-January 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2022;71:255–63.

30 Tseng HF, Ackerson BK, Sy LS, *et al.* Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 bivalent (Original and Omicron BA.4/BA.5) COVID-19 vaccine in preventing hospitalizations for COVID-19, medically attended SARS-CoV-2 infections, and hospital death in the United States. *medRxiv.* 2023;2023.05.25.23290456.

31 Bobrovitz N, Ware H, Ma X, *et al.* Protective effectiveness of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection and hybrid immunity against the omicron variant and severe disease: a systematic review and meta-regression. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases.* 2023;23:556–67.

32 Jones JM, Manrique IM, Stone MS, *et al.* Estimates of SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Incidence of Primary SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among Blood Donors, by COVID-19 Vaccination Status - United States, April 2021-September 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2023;72:601–5.

33 Regan JJ, Moulia DL, Link-Gelles R, *et al.* Use of Updated COVID-19 Vaccines 2023-2024 Formula for Persons Aged ≥6 Months: Recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices - United States, September 2023. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2023;72:1140–6.

34 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC COVID Data Tracker. 2023. <https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#datatracker-home> (accessed 8 December 2023)

**Table 1.** Characteristics of adults without immunocompromising conditions by vaccination and COVID-19 status admitted to one of 26 hospitals in 20 US states during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023. Values are numbers (column percentages) unless stated otherwise.

Characteristics	Total (n=7028)	Vaccination status				COVID-19 status	
		Unvaccinated (n=1545)	Original monovalent only (n=4191)	Bivalent 7–89 days earlier (n=647)	Bivalent 90– 179 days earlier (n=645)	COVID-19 case patients (n=2924)	Control patients (n=4104)
Median (IQR) age (years)	67 (56–78)	59 (43–72)	68 (57–78)	72 (62–80)	72 (64–81)	70 (58–80)	66 (54–76)
Age group (years)							
18-49	1257 (17.9)	524 (33.9)	649 (15.5)	49 (7.6)	35 (5.4)	482 (16.5)	775 (18.9)
50-64	1759 (25.0)	408 (26.4)	1086 (25.9)	133 (20.6)	132 (20.5)	620 (21.2)	1139 (27.8)
≥65	4012 (57.1)	613 (39.7)	2456 (58.6)	465 (71.9)	478 (74.1)	1822 (62.3)	2190 (53.4)
Female	3573 (50.8)	770 (49.8)	2169 (51.8)	314 (48.5)	320 (49.6)	1500 (51.3)	2073 (50.5)
Race and ethnicity							
White, non-Hispanic	4092 (58.2)	814 (52.7)	2424 (57.8)	415 (64.1)	439 (68.1)	1712 (58.6)	2380 (58.0)
Black or African American, non-Hispanic	1606 (22.9)	384 (24.9)	968 (23.1)	129 (19.9)	125 (19.4)	635 (21.7)	971 (23.7)
Hispanic or Latino, any race	802 (11.4)	218 (14.1)	492 (11.7)	52 (8.0)	40 (6.2)	356 (12.2)	446 (10.9)
Other race, non-Hispanic <sup>a</sup>	237 (3.4)	57 (3.7)	143 (3.4)	18 (2.8)	19 (3.0)	100 (3.4)	137 (3.3)
Other <sup>b</sup>	291 (4.1)	72 (4.7)	164 (3.9)	33 (5.1)	22 (3.4)	121 (4.1)	170 (4.1)
HHS region <sup>c</sup>							
1	1393 (19.8)	225 (14.6)	840 (20.0)	152 (23.5)	176 (27.3)	628 (21.5)	765 (18.6)
2	408 (5.8)	112 (7.3)	252 (6.0)	27 (4.2)	17 (2.6)	156 (5.3)	252 (6.1)
3	236 (3.4)	23 (1.5)	161 (3.8)	22 (3.4)	30 (4.7)	94 (3.2)	142 (3.5)
4	1053 (15.0)	265 (17.2)	650 (15.5)	69 (10.7)	69 (10.7)	444 (15.2)	609 (14.8)
5	1110 (15.8)	242 (15.7)	643 (15.3)	122 (18.9)	103 (16.0)	456 (15.6)	654 (15.9)
6	753 (10.7)	202 (13.1)	475 (11.3)	43 (6.7)	33 (5.1)	339 (11.6)	414 (10.1)
7	420 (6.0)	109 (7.1)	243 (5.8)	35 (5.4)	33 (5.1)	166 (5.7)	254 (6.2)
8	1038 (14.8)	235 (15.2)	574 (13.7)	108 (16.7)	121 (18.8)	382 (13.1)	656 (16.0)
9	389 (5.5)	78 (5.1)	235 (5.6)	35 (5.4)	41 (6.4)	158 (5.4)	231 (5.6)
10	228 (3.2)	54 (3.5)	118 (2.8)	34 (5.3)	22 (3.4)	101 (3.5)	127 (3.1)
No. of chronic medical condition categories, median (IQR) <sup>d</sup>	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)	2 (1–3)

Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection <sup>e</sup>								
Any previous SARS-CoV-2 infection	1445 (20.6)	307 (19.9)	899 (21.5)	117 (18.1)	122 (18.9)	491 (16.8)	954 (23.3)	
Previous Omicron variant infection	929 (13.2)	191 (12.4)	579 (13.8)	74 (11.4)	85 (13.2)	284 (9.7)	645 (15.7)	
COVID-19 status								
Case patients	2924 (41.6)	660 (42.7)	1811 (43.2)	184 (28.4)	269 (41.7)	2924 (100.0)	--	
Control patients	4104 (58.4)	885 (57.3)	2380 (56.8)	463 (71.6)	376 (58.3)	--	4104 (100.0)	
Vaccination status								
Unvaccinated	1545 (22.0)	1545 (100.0)	--	--	--	660 (22.6)	885 (21.6)	
Monovalent only	4191 (59.6)	--	4191 (100.0)	--	--	1811 (61.9)	2380 (58.0)	
Bivalent 7–89 days earlier	647 (9.2)	--	--	647 (100.0)	--	184 (6.3)	463 (11.3)	
Bivalent 90–179 days earlier	645 (9.2)	--	--	--	645 (100.0)	269 (9.2)	376 (9.2)	
Bivalent vaccine product received <sup>f</sup>								
Moderna	396 (30.7)	--	--	190 (29.4)	206 (31.9)	132 (29.1)	264 (31.5)	
Pfizer	896 (69.4)	--	--	457 (70.6)	439 (68.1)	321 (70.9)	575 (68.5)	

Abbreviations: IQR = interquartile range; HHS = U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

<sup>a</sup> “Other race, non-Hispanic” includes Asian, Native American or Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; these groups were combined due to small counts.

<sup>b</sup> “Other” includes patients who self-reported their race and ethnicity as “Other” and those for whom race and ethnicity were unknown.

<sup>c</sup> Hospitals by HHS region included *Region 1*: Baystate Medical Center (Springfield, Massachusetts), Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center (Boston, Massachusetts), and Yale University (New Haven, Connecticut); *Region 2*: Montefiore Medical Center (New York, New York); *Region 3*: Johns Hopkins Hospital (Baltimore, Maryland); *Region 4*: Emory University Medical Center (Atlanta, Georgia), University of Miami Medical Center (Miami, Florida), Vanderbilt University Medical Center (Nashville, Tennessee), and Wake Forest University Baptist Medical Center (Winston-Salem, North Carolina); *Region 5*: Cleveland Clinic (Cleveland, Ohio), Hennepin County Medical Center (Minneapolis, Minnesota), Henry Ford Health (Detroit, Michigan), The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center (Columbus, Ohio), and University of Michigan Hospital (Ann Arbor, Michigan); *Region 6*: Baylor Scott & White Medical Center (Temple, Texas) and Baylor University Medical Center (Dallas, Texas); *Region 7*: Barnes-Jewish Hospital (St. Louis, Missouri) and University of Iowa Hospitals (Iowa City, Iowa); *Region 8*: Intermountain Medical Center (Murray, Utah), UCHealth University of Colorado Hospital (Aurora, Colorado), and University of Utah (Salt Lake City, Utah); *Region 9*: Stanford University Medical Center (Stanford, California), Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center (Los Angeles, California), and University of

Arizona Medical Center (Tucson, Arizona); and *Region 10*: Oregon Health & Science University Hospital (Portland, Oregon) and University of Washington (Seattle, Washington).


<sup>d</sup> Chronic medical condition categories include autoimmune, cardiovascular, endocrine, gastrointestinal, hematologic, neurologic, pulmonary, and renal diseases.

<sup>e</sup> Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection was defined as any self-reported or documented SARS-CoV-2 infection that occurred before the episode of illness for which the patient was enrolled into the IVY Network. Previous Omicron infection was defined as any self-reported or documented SARS-CoV-2 infection that occurred from December 26, 2021 until the episode of illness for which the patient was enrolled into the IVY Network.

<sup>f</sup> Proportion denominators restricted to bivalent recipients only.




Figure 1.



Case counts and sequenced SARS-CoV-2 lineages by admission week among 2924 COVID-19 case patients without immunocompromising conditions during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023. A SARS-CoV-2 lineage was successfully identified for 1646 (56.3%) case patients, all of whom were infected with an Omicron lineage. Overall, 33 (2.0%) patients were infected with BA.2, 358 (21.7%) with BA.4/5, 346 (21.0%) with BQ.1, 701 (42.6%) with XBB.1.5, and 208 (12.6%) with other XBB lineages.


Figure 2.



Absolute COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization among adults without immunocompromising conditions in the United States during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023, including effectiveness of original monovalent vaccines only, bivalent mRNA vaccines received 7–89 days before illness onset, and bivalent mRNA vaccines received 90–179 days before illness onset compared to unvaccinated patients. IQR = interquartile range; CI = confidence interval

<sup>a</sup> Some estimates are imprecise, which might be due to a relatively small number of persons in each level of vaccination or case status. This imprecision indicates that the actual vaccine effectiveness could be substantially different from the point estimate shown, and estimates should therefore be interpreted with caution.

Figure 3.



Absolute COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated hospitalization among adults without immunocompromising conditions in the United States during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023 by predominant circulating SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineage, including effectiveness of original monovalent vaccines only, bivalent mRNA vaccines received 7–89 days prior to illness onset, and bivalent mRNA vaccines received 90–179 days prior to illness onset compared to unvaccinated patients. IQR = interquartile range; CI = confidence interval

<sup>a</sup> Some estimates are imprecise, which might be due to a relatively small number of persons in each level of vaccination or case status. This imprecision indicates that the actual VE could be substantially different from the point estimate shown, and estimates should therefore be interpreted with caution.

**Table 2** Severe in-hospital outcomes among adults without immunocompromising conditions admitted to hospital with COVID-19 during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023, by vaccination status. Values are numbers (percentages) of total.

Clinical outcome	Total	Unvaccinated	Original monovalent only	Bivalent 7–89 days earlier	Bivalent 90–179 days earlier
Supplemental oxygen therapy <sup>a</sup>	1775/2918 (60.8)	406/658 (61.7)	1086/1807 (60.1)	120/184 (65.2)	163/269 (60.6)
Advanced respiratory support <sup>b</sup>	568/2918 (19.5)	159/658 (24.2)	323/1807 (17.9)	34/184 (18.5)	52/269 (19.3)
Acute organ failure <sup>c</sup>	632/2924 (21.6)	168/660 (25.5)	371/1811 (20.8)	39/184 (21.2)	54/269 (20.1)
ICU admission	514/2924 (17.8)	153/660 (23.2)	281/1811 (15.5)	38/184 (20.7)	42/269 (15.6)
IMV or death	281/2924 (9.6)	92/660 (13.9)	141/1811 (7.8)	25/184 (13.4)	23/269 (8.6)


Abbreviations: ICU = intensive care unit; IMV = invasive mechanical ventilation

<sup>a</sup> Supplemental oxygen therapy was defined as any receipt of supplemental oxygen for patients with no chronic oxygen needs or escalation of respiratory support for patients on chronic oxygen at baseline. Patients on home IMV were not eligible for this outcome.

<sup>b</sup> Advanced respiratory support was defined as new receipt of high-flow nasal cannula, non-invasive ventilation, or IMV. Patients on home IMV were not eligible for this outcome.

<sup>c</sup> Acute organ failure was defined as respiratory failure (new receipt of high-flow nasal cannula, non-invasive ventilation, or IMV), cardiovascular failure (receipt of vasopressors), or renal failure (new receipt of renal replacement therapy).

Figure 4.



Absolute COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against COVID-19-associated severe in-hospital outcomes among adults without immunocompromising conditions in the United States during 8 September 2022–31 August 2023, including effectiveness of original monovalent vaccines only, mRNA bivalent vaccines received 7–89 days before illness onset, and mRNA bivalent vaccines received 90–179 days before illness onset compared to unvaccinated patients. IQR = interquartile range; CI = confidence interval; ICU = intensive care unit; IMV = invasive mechanical ventilation

<sup>a</sup> Some estimates are imprecise, which might be due to a relatively small number of persons in each level of vaccination or case status. This imprecision indicates that the actual VE could be substantially different from the point estimate shown, and estimates should therefore be interpreted with caution.