- 1 **Comparative Effectiveness of the mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccines**
- 2 **Among Adults With Underlying Medical Conditions: A Systematic Literature Review**

# 3 **and Pairwise Meta-Analysis Using GRADE**

- Xuan Wang,<sup>1</sup> Ankit Pahwa,<sup>2</sup> Mary T. Bausch-Jurken,<sup>3</sup> Anushri Chitkara,<sup>2</sup> Pawana Sharma,<sup>4</sup> 4
- 5 Mia Malmenäs,<sup>1</sup> Sonam Vats,<sup>2</sup> Michael Gordon Whitfield,<sup>4</sup> Kira Zhi Hua Lai,<sup>5</sup> Priyadarsini
- 6 Dasari,<sup>6</sup> Ritu Gupta,<sup>2</sup> Maria Nassim,<sup>7</sup> Nicolas Van de Velde,<sup>3</sup> Nathan Green,<sup>8</sup> Ekkehard

Beck<sup>3</sup> 7

- <sup>1</sup>ICON plc, Stockholm, Sweden; <sup>2</sup>ICON plc, Bengaluru, India; <sup>3</sup>Moderna, Inc., Cambridge,
- 9 MA, USA; <sup>4</sup>ICON plc, London, United Kingdom; <sup>5</sup>ICON plc, Toronto, ON, Canada; <sup>6</sup>ICON
- 10 plc, Blue Bell, PA, USA; <sup>7</sup>ICON plc, Langen, Germany; <sup>8</sup>University College London,

11 London, United Kingdom



# 19 **ABSTRACT**

- 20 **Introduction:** This systematic literature review and pairwise meta-analysis evaluated the
- 21 comparative effectiveness of mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b in patients with at least one
- 22 underlying medical condition at high risk for severe COVID-19.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

 **Methods:** MEDLINE, Embase, and Cochrane databases were searched for relevant articles from January 1, 2019 to February 9, 2024. Studies reporting effectiveness data from at least two doses of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 vaccination in adults with medical conditions at high risk of developing severe COVID-19 according to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention were included. Outcomes of interest were SARS-CoV-2 infection (overall, symptomatic, and severe), hospitalization due to COVID-19, and death due to COVID-19. Risk ratios (RRs) were calculated with random effects models. Subgroup analyses by specific medical conditions, number of vaccinations, age, and SARS-CoV-2 variant were conducted. Heterogeneity between studies was estimated with chi-square testing. The certainty of evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations, Assessments, Development, and Evaluations framework. **Results:** Sixty-five observational studies capturing the original/ancestral-containing primary series to Omicron-containing bivalent original-BA4-5 vaccinations were included in the meta-analysis. mRNA-1273 was associated with significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 37 infection (RR, 0.85 [95% CI, 0.79–0.92];  $I^2 = 92.5\%$ ), symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection 38 (RR, 0.75 [95% CI, 0.65–0.86];  $l^2$ =62.3%), severe SARS-CoV-2 infection (RR, 0.83 [95%) 39 CI, 0.78–0.89];  $I^2$ =38.0%), hospitalization due to COVID-19 (RR, 0.88 [95% CI, 0.82–0.94];  $I^2$ =38.7%), and death due to COVID-19 (RR, 0.84 [95% CI, 0.76–0.93];  $I^2$ =1.3%) than

 BNT162b2. Findings were generally consistent across subgroups. Evidence certainty was low or very low because sufficiently powered randomized controlled trials are impractical in this heterogeneous population.

 **Conclusion:** Meta-analysis of 65 observational studies showed that vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-

- 46 19-related hospitalization and death than BNT162b2 in patients with medical conditions at
- 47 high risk of severe COVID-19.
- 48 **Keywords:** BNT162b2; comorbidity; COVID-19; effectiveness; mRNA vaccine; mRNA-
- 49 1273; SARS-CoV-2; severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2

50

## **Key Summary Points**

- *Why carry out this study?*
- More than 20% of the global population has a medical condition that increases their risk of
- developing severe COVID-19.
- Global and national health authorities recommend COVID-19 vaccination in populations with
- underlying medical conditions to mitigate the risk of severe illness; however, limited data are
- available to inform population-level policy and individual vaccination decisions.
- *What was learned from the study?*
- To support clinical decision-making regarding COVID-19 vaccination, this systematic
- literature review and meta-analysis synthesized real-world effectiveness data to evaluate the
- comparative effectiveness of mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 in adults with at least one
- medical condition that increases the risk of developing severe COVID-19.
- Vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-
- 2 infections and COVID-19–associated hospitalization and death in patients at risk of
- developing severe COVID-19 based on underlying medical conditions.

# **INTRODUCTION**



world effectiveness data are crucial to help inform vaccine selection and procurement

 decisions for COVID-19 national immunization programs because comparative high quality RCT evidence is lacking in the populations at greatest risk of severe COVID-19 disease. Similar to seasonal influenza vaccination [15], COVID-19 vaccines are now updated periodically [16]; regulators and policy makers no longer require RCT evidence for approval of updated COVID-19 vaccines [17,18], and data from observational studies are increasingly used to support policy [19]. Given differences across vaccine formulations, the prohibitive number of people needed to enroll in potential RCTs designed for each high-risk group, and the variability in SARS-CoV-2 variants that emerge and their impact on the burden of disease, synthesis of effectiveness data using robust meta-analyses on the comparative performance of the two major COVID-19 vaccines provides a means to inform the choice of vaccine for future mRNA COVID-19 vaccination, particularly among vulnerable patient populations. We therefore conducted a systematic literature review (SLR) and pairwise meta-analysis to

 compare the clinical effectiveness of mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 in adults with at least one underlying medical condition predisposing them to developing severe COVID-19. Our specific research question was "Following primary series vaccination and additional vaccine doses, is mRNA-1273 more effective than BNT162b2 at preventing SARS-CoV-2 infections and COVID-19–related hospitalizations and deaths in people with underlying medical conditions?" To evaluate the certainty of evidence generated from our meta-analysis, we employed the Grading of Recommendations, Assessments, Development, and Evaluations (GRADE) framework [20] used by national immunization technical advisory groups (NITAGs) to develop vaccine recommendations [21].

### **METHODS**

### **Search strategy and study selection**

- This SLR and meta-analysis is registered in INPLASY (INPLASY202460065) and was
- conducted according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-
- Analyses 2020 framework [22]. Data are from previously conducted studies; no new studies
- with human participants or animals were performed.
- Embase, MEDLINE, MEDLINE In-Process, e-pubs ahead of print, and Cochrane databases,
- including Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials and Cochrane Database of
- Systematic Reviews, were searched via the Ovid platform to retrieve studies published from
- January 1, 2019 to February 9, 2024. Search queries are provided in **Table S1**. To
- 121 complement the main search, previous SLRs completed by our research group [12,13] as well
- as recently published SLRs were cross-checked for additional references [12,13,23-38].
- The population, intervention, comparison, and outcomes used in the SLR are summarized in
- **Table S2.** We focused this SLR on adults with medical conditions known to increase the risk
- of developing severe COVID-19, a population considered to be a high priority group for
- COVID-19 vaccination by WHO and national public health institutes such as the US Centers
- for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the European Centre for Disease Prevention
- and Control [3,5,39]. We defined the target population by selecting comorbidities from the
- list of medical conditions published by the CDC as those conferring elevated risk for
- developing severe COVID-19 [3]: adults with autoimmune disease, solid tumors, solid organ
- transplant, hematologic malignancies, chronic kidney disease with or without hemodialysis,
- type 1 or 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular disease, chronic liver disease,
- neurologic disease, chronic respiratory disease, obesity, primary immunodeficiency
- syndrome or described as immunocompromised. Published clinical trials and observational

135	studies reporting clinical effectiveness outcomes in adults $\geq$ 18 years of age with the
136	previously specified underlying medical conditions were eligible for inclusion in the SLR.
137	Only studies reporting data from participants who received mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2,
138	including variant-updated versions, were included. Homologous primary series with or
139	without homologous or heterologous additional doses where the last dose was mRNA-1273
140	or BNT162b2 were allowed (Table S2). Studies reporting data from heterologous 2-dose
141	vaccine regimens, comparing only mRNA-1273 or only BNT162b2 as the last dose of the
142	series versus another COVID-19 vaccine as the last dose, or comparing mRNA-1273 or
143	BNT162b2 primary series versus other COVID-19 vaccine primary series were excluded.
144	Clinical effectiveness outcomes of interest were those relevant to vaccine effectiveness (VE)
145	against COVID-19 as follows: SARS-CoV-2 infection, symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection,
146	severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalization due to COVID-19, and death due to COVID-
147	19. SARS-CoV-2 infections were symptomatic or asymptomatic and confirmed by a positive
148	laboratory test. Symptomatic infections were further defined as a positive test accompanied
149	by COVID-19 symptoms, including but not limited to fever, cough, shortness of breath,
150	sudden onset of anosmia or ageusia, and in some countries, runny nose. Severe SARS-CoV-2
151	infections were defined by individual studies; infections that resulted in hospitalization or
152	death were also considered to be severe infections for this analysis. Hospitalization due to
153	COVID-19 was defined as hospitalization associated with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test. Death
154	due to COVID-19 was defined as death associated with a positive SARS-CoV-2 test and no
155	other reported cause of death.

 Additional rules used to determine study and data inclusion in the meta-analysis are provided in the **Appendix – Supplementary Methods**.

Two independent reviewers screened all identified articles using a 2-level approach.

Discrepancies were resolved by consensus or a third reviewer. In level 1, titles and abstracts

were screened against the inclusion criteria. In level 2, the full texts of articles that passed

- level 1 screening were retrieved and evaluated against selection criteria to determine final
- eligibility.

#### **Data extraction and quality assessment**

Study design details, baseline patient and disease characteristics, vaccine intervention details,

and effectiveness endpoints were extracted. Data were extracted for single, specific medical

conditions if available; however, patients may have had other underlying comorbidities.

- Original study authors were contacted during data abstraction to provide clarity or additional data if needed.
- Risk of bias was assessed in accordance with Cochrane review guidelines [40] using the

Newcastle-Ottawa Scale [41] for observational studies. The certainty of evidence for meta-

analysis results was evaluated based on GRADE [21].

## **Statistical analysis**

 Consistent with previous comparative effectiveness meta-analyses in immunocompromised populations and older adults [12-14], we conducted a pairwise meta-analysis to compare vaccination with mRNA-1273 to vaccination with BNT162b2 in patients with underlying medical conditions. Only studies that reported the number of events and sample size, VE, or other effect measures per arm and subgroup were included in the meta-analysis. Risk ratios (RRs) were pooled across studies using random effects meta-analysis models*.* Individual studies were weighted using the inverse variance method [42]. A continuity correction of 0.5 was added to the number of events and sample size in both arms in studies where no events were observed in one or both arms [43]. A standard pairwise meta-analysis with RRs as the

 input comparing mRNA-1273 to BNT162b2 was conducted [42,44,45]. Where available, RRs were calculated from the number of events and sample size per arm, consistent with the methodology of other recently conducted meta-analyses for COVID-19 vaccines [28,34]. For studies that only reported VE, RR was estimated as 1−(VE/100) based on the reported definition of VE. Based on the assumption that all COVID-19 outcomes were rare [46,47], odds ratio (OR), hazard ratio (HR), and incidence rate ratio (IRR) were considered to be approximately equal to RR. The same approach was therefore taken for studies reporting OR, 189 HR, or IRR; RR was estimated as  $(1-\text{OR}) \times 100$ ,  $(1-\text{HR}) \times 100$ , and  $(1-\text{IRR}) \times 100$ . If a study reported VE, OR, HR, or IRR both adjusted for covariates and unadjusted, adjusted data were preferentially used in the meta-analysis. Because the target population consists of patients who may have multiple comorbidities and immunocompromising conditions, we primarily considered two populations: the broad at-risk population of adults with at least one medical condition as previously specified and the very high risk population of immunocompromised adults with medical conditions defined as clinically extremely vulnerable (CEV) groups 1 or 2 [48]. Although limited by feasibility, for comprehensiveness, we also conducted additional meta-analyses for specific groups and medical conditions (cancer, cardiovascular-metabolic-renal disease, treatment with immunosuppressive therapy) and individual comorbidities (autoimmune disease, cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic respiratory disease, diabetes, hematologic malignancy, solid organ transplant), which are presented in the **Appendix – Supplemental Methods** with the definitions of the medical conditions. Similar to seasonal influenza vaccination, multiple mRNA COVID-19 vaccine formulations have been administered across pandemic and non-pandemic settings and COVID-19 vaccines

are also expected to be periodically updated to match circulating variants [49]. In order to



the meta-analysis because of insufficient data [58], mixed series VE [59], and unclear vaccine

- series with no clarification provided by authors [60], leaving 65 studies (all non-RCTs)
- included in the meta-analysis of adults with at least one underlying medical condition. Forty-

 five studies (all non-RCTs) of adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions were included in the meta-analysis.



- 58 remaining evaluable studies, 33 (57%) had no serious risk of bias and 24 (41%) had
- serious and 1 (2%) had very serious risk of bias (**Table S3**).
- Meta-analysis results of the comparative effectiveness of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 in the
- base-case are shown in **Figures 2–5** and in the subgroups of groups of medical conditions
- and individual comorbidities in **Figures S1–S10**.
- There was no suspected publication bias for any outcomes in the base-case populations,
- except for possible publication bias for symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in adults with
- 261 CEV 1 or 2 conditions (Egger's regression test,  $P < 0.05$ ).

# **SARS-CoV-2 infection**

- Meta-analysis of 52 studies reporting the SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome found that
- vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of SARS-CoV-2
- infection compared with vaccination with BNT162b2 in adults with at least one underlying
- medical condition (RR, 0.85 [95% CI, 0.79–0.92]; **Figure 2** and **Figure 3a**). There was
- 267 considerable heterogeneity between the studies  $(I^2=92.5\%)$ .
- In 38 studies reporting the SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome in adults with CEV 1 or 2
- conditions, vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of
- SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with BNT162b2 (RR, 0.90 [95% CI, 0.84–0.97]; **Figure**
- **4**). Between-study heterogeneity was estimated to be considerable  $(I^2=80.2\%)$ .
- The certainty of evidence in both primary meta-analyses was very low because of
- inconsistency and indirectness arising from heterogeneous outcome definitions and the
- composition of the populations analyzed; risk of bias also contributed to very low evidence
- certainty in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).



# **Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection**

A total of 11 studies reporting symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection were included in the

meta-analysis of adults with at least one underlying medical condition. In this population,

vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of infection

compared with BNT162b2 (RR, 0.75 [95% CI, 0.65–0.86]; **Figure 2; Figure 3b**).

Heterogeneity between studies was estimated to be substantial  $(I^2=62.3\%)$ .

Meta-analysis of 6 studies reporting data for adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions found that

vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a trend towards lower risk of symptomatic

infection compared with vaccination with BNT162b2 (RR, 0.83 [95% CI, 0.68–1.01]; **Figure** 

**4**); however, this result was not statistically significant. There was substantial heterogeneity

294 between studies  $(I^2=62.2\%)$ .

The certainty of evidence in both primary meta-analyses was low because only

nonrandomized studies were included, and because of indirectness resulting from

heterogeneity in the composition of the population of adults with at least one underlying

medical condition (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).



## **Severe SARS-CoV-2 infection**

- Meta-analysis of 42 studies reporting the severe SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome found that
- vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of severe SARS-
- CoV-2 infection compared with BNT162b2 in adults with at least one underlying medical
- condition (RR, 0.83 [95% CI, 0.78–0.89]; **Figure 2** and **Figure 3c**). Heterogeneity was
- 310 estimated to likely be not important between studies  $(I^2=38.0\%)$ .
- Meta-analysis of 28 studies reporting the severe SARS-CoV-2 infection outcome in adults
- with CEV 1 or 2 conditions found that vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a
- significantly lower risk of severe SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with vaccination with
- BNT162b2 (RR, 0.81 [95% CI, 0.77–0.86]; **Figure 4**). No heterogeneity between the studies 315 was observed  $(I^2=0\%)$ .
- The certainty of evidence in both primary meta-analyses was very low because of risk of bias and indirectness resulting primarily from heterogeneity in the composition of the populations analyzed (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).
- Subgroup meta-analyses of studies reporting severe SARS-CoV-2 infection by vaccine
- regimen, age group, and SARS-CoV-2 variant were generally similar to the primary results in
- adults with at least one underlying medical condition (**Figure 5a**) and in patients with CEV 1
- or 2 conditions (**Figure 5b**). Trends towards reduced risk of severe SARS-CoV-2 infection

- among patients who received mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 were observed in all of the
- subgroups analyzed, including the Delta and Omicron variant subgroups.

#### **Hospitalization due to COVID-19**

- Meta-analysis of 27 studies reporting hospitalization due to COVID-19 found that
- vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of
- hospitalization compared with BNT162b2 in adults with at least one underlying medical
- condition (RR, 0.88 [95% CI, 0.82–0.94]; **Figure 2** and **Figure 3d**). Heterogeneity between
- studies was estimated to likely be not important  $(I^2=38.7\%)$ .
- In 22 studies reporting hospitalization due to COVID-19 in adults with CEV 1 or 2
- conditions, vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of
- hospitalization compared with BNT162b2 (RR, 0.84 [95% CI, 0.79–0.89]; **Figure 4**). No
- 334 heterogeneity between studies was observed  $(I^2=0\%)$ .

 The certainty of evidence in both primary meta-analyses was very low because of risk of bias and indirectness resulting primarily from heterogeneity in the composition of the population analyzed (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).

- Results from subgroup meta-analyses of studies reporting hospitalization due to COVID-19
- by vaccine regimen, age group, and SARS-CoV-2 variant were generally similar to the
- primary results in adults with at least one underlying medical condition (**Figure 5a**) and in
- adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions (**Figure 5b**). Trends towards reduced risk of
- hospitalization among patients who received mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 were observed
- across all of the subgroups analyzed, including the Delta and Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant
- subgroups.

### **Death due to COVID-19**

- Meta-analysis of 21 studies reporting the death due to COVID-19 outcome found that
- vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of death due to
- COVID-19 compared with vaccination with BNT162b2 in adults with at least one underlying
- medical condition (RR, 0.84 [95% CI, 0.76–0.93]; **Figure 2** and **Figure 3e**). Heterogeneity
- 350 between studies was estimated to likely be not important  $(I^2=1.3\%)$ .
- In 13 studies reporting death due to COVID-19 in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions,
- vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with a significantly lower risk of death due to
- COVID-19 compared with BNT162b2 (RR, 0.68 [95% CI, 0.50–0.91]; **Figure 4**). No
- 354 heterogeneity between studies was observed  $(I^2=0\%)$ .
- The certainty of evidence in both primary meta-analyses was very low because of risk of bias,
- imprecision, and indirectness resulting primarily from the heterogeneity in the composition of
- the populations analyzed (**Table 2** and **Table 3**).
- When analyzed by vaccine regimen, age group, and SARS-CoV-2 variant subgroups, trends
- toward reduced risk of death due to COVID-19 with mRNA-1273 vaccination versus
- BNT162b vaccination were observed in adults with at least one underlying medical condition
- (**Figure 5a**) and in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions (**Figure 5b**). All subgroups analyzed,
- including the Delta and Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant subgroups were consistent with the
- primary analyses, except in adults with at least one underlying medical condition who
- 364 received ≥3 heterologous vaccine doses (RR, 1.05 [95% CI, 0.35–3.18];  $I^2$ =23.8%).

#### **DISCUSSION**

In this meta-analysis of 65 studies comprising more than 9 million vaccinated adults with at

least one underlying medical condition putting them at risk for developing severe COVID-19,



may have more than one underlying medical condition influencing risk, as has been

recognized in previous estimates of the global at-risk population [4]. Because no assumptions

 were made about a single primary medical condition in the populations of our primary analyses, our finding that vaccination with mRNA-1273 was associated with reduced risk of severe COVID-19 in adults with at least one underlying medical condition and patients who are immunocompromised is relevant also to patients who may have multiple and varied comorbidities. Interpreting results for patient subgroups defined by groups of medical conditions and individual diseases is challenging because smaller sample sizes and disease- specific factors (eg, use of immunosuppressive medications in some patients with autoimmune disease) may mask differences in VE between COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. We observed a considerable amount of heterogeneity between studies for the SARS-CoV-2 infection and symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection outcomes but not important or no heterogeneity for the severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, hospitalization due to COVID-19, and death due to COVID-19 outcomes. The observed heterogeneity in this meta-analysis also occurred to a lesser extent than in the previous meta-analyses of Kavikondala, et al [13] and Wang, et al [12]. Among the factors that may be driving the observed heterogeneity between studies are differences in study populations, statistical approaches employed, outcome definitions (eg, for severe COVID-19), the post-vaccination timepoints analyzed, and vaccination schedules. Subgroup analyses to account for differences in age, dosing regimens, and SARS-CoV-2 variants did not reduce the observed heterogeneity. However, the extensive subgroup analyses conducted were consistent with the primary results and thus confirm the robustness of our main findings.

 At the current stage of the COVID-19 pandemic, in which there are high levels of immunity in the general population and with Omicron being the predominant circulating SARS-CoV-2 variant [1,2], the public health focus has shifted to preventing severe COVID-19 in vulnerable populations through vaccination [5]. In our Omicron subgroup analysis, there was

 a statistically significant reduction in risk favoring mRNA-1273 for overall, symptomatic, and severe SARS-CoV-2 infection outcomes in adults with at least one underlying medical condition and overall SARS-CoV-2 infection and hospitalization due to COVID-19 in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions. All remaining outcomes, except for symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions, for which no studies were reported, numerically favored mRNA-1273 over BNT162b2 for the Omicron subgroup. The latter findings could be attributed to relatively small numbers of studies included in the meta- analysis of the Omicron subgroup, especially for severe events, and the heterogeneity of the target population. As data are still accumulating in the Omicron setting, statistically significant differences in VE may become apparent. However, the Omicron subgroup analysis confirms the overall findings of the main analysis, and thus suggests applicability of the findings of this meta-analysis for current and future vaccine decision-making. A key limitation of our study is that no RCTs or head-to-head trials were identified for inclusion in our evidence synthesis. Our meta-analysis was based on observational studies, which are considered in the hierarchy of evidence to be of lower quality, resulting in a low level of certainty per GRADE. While all of the included studies were observational and considered to have some risk of bias, approximately half of the studies were considered to have a serious risk of bias or reported insufficient information to evaluate risk of bias, limiting the feasibility of sensitivity analyses. However, we conducted several subgroup analyses and found that estimates of VE were consistent with the primary analyses across all COVID-19 outcomes studied. Availability of higher quality observational studies would further add to the evidence on comparative COVID-19 VE. Many of the studies identified for

this meta-analysis did not specify the SARS-CoV-2 variant reported, or authors defined

variants differently. For example, Hernandez et al, reported data for Alpha, Delta, and

Omicron SARS-CoV-2 infections [61] and Pinana et al, reported data for Delta SARS-CoV-2

 infections only [107], despite the studies having been conducted in the same countries and during similar time periods. Most studies reported data from all vaccinated patients; however, some studies considered all infected and vaccinated patients, further contributing to the heterogeneity of the meta-analysis population. Finally, patients may have had multiple medical conditions, which makes interpreting the results presented in the **Supplementary Material** in patients grouped by medical conditions challenging.

 The primary strength of our evidence synthesis is that it is, to our knowledge, the first meta- analysis to provide comparative effectiveness results for the two available COVID-19 mRNA vaccines in adults with underlying medical conditions at high risk for developing severe COVID-19 disease across original/ancestral-containing primary series and booster vaccination up until and including Omicron-containing bivalent original/B4-5 mRNA vaccines. We used broad search terms and robust SLR methodology. By searching the MEDLINE, Embase and Cochrane databases and crosschecking results with other previously published SLRs and meta-analyses, we developed a global analysis population of patients from different stages of the pandemic with multiple high-risk medical conditions represented. Original study authors were contacted to provide clarification on published data where necessary, enhancing the quality of data included in our analysis. Of all the base-case meta- analyses tested, publication bias was only suspected in adults with CEV 1 and 2 conditions 461 for the symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 outcome, further increasing the strength of our study. In addition, using advanced meta-analysis methodology applied in other meta-analyses of COVID-19 vaccination [28,34] allowed inclusion of both studies reporting event and participant numbers by vaccine arm as well as studies reporting only VE. Notably, due to the lack of head-to-head data, our use of observational studies reporting VE data for each vaccine to compare VE between the two COVID-19 mRNA vaccines is supported by a similar analysis by the CDC Influenza Division [127].



#### **Author Contributions**

- XW, AP, MTB-J, MM, and EB designed and performed the systematic literature review and
- meta-analysis and critically evaluated the manuscript. PS, SV, RG, and MN performed the
- systematic literature review and critically evaluated the manuscript. AG, MGW, KZHL, PD,
- and NG conducted the analysis and critically evaluated the manuscript. MTB-J, NVdV, and
- EB conceptualized the article and provided oversight and critical evaluation of the
- manuscript. All authors contributed to the article and approved the submitted version.

## **Acknowledgments**

- Writing assistance was provided by Erin McClure, PhD, and Sheri Arndt, PharmD, of ICON
- (Blue Bell, PA, USA) in accordance with Good Publication Practice (GPP 2022) guidelines,
- funded by Moderna, Inc., and under the direction of the authors.

#### **Data Sharing Statement**

- All original data generated or analyzed in this study are included in this article/as
- Supplementary Material. Further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

### **Conflicts of Interest**

- XW, AP, AC, PS, MM, SV, MGW, KZHL, PD, RG, and MN are employees of ICON plc, a
- clinical research organization paid by Moderna, Inc., to conduct the study. NG is an
- independent consultant employed at University College of London, and was paid by
- Moderna, Inc. to conduct aspects of the study. MTB-J, NVdV, and EB are employees of
- Moderna, Inc., and hold stock/stock options in the company. Authors employed by Moderna,
- Inc. were involved in the study design, analysis and interpretation of data, the writing of the
- manuscript, and the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

### **REFERENCES**

- 1. Arora RK, Joseph A, Van Wyk J, et al. SeroTracker: a global SARS-CoV-2
- seroprevalence dashboard. Lancet Infect Dis*.* 2021;21:e75-e6.
- 2. World Health Organization (WHO). Statement on the fifteenth meeting of the IHR
- (2005) Emergency Committee on the COVID-19 pandemic. Available at:
- [https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe_gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E)
- [the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe_gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E)
- [coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe_gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E)
- [pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe_gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E)
- 510 gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD\_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p
- [-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E.](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic?adgroupsurvey=%7Badgroupsurvey%7D&gclid=EAIaIQobChMI4Ojtsdbe_gIVjQRyCh07igt4EAAYASACEgJ9pfD_BwE&fbclid=IwAR2M8EAyiSrAodhK9p-X582nHkP2AigpSX8pYIsLsPwqYh4SG26RGokGe7E) Accessed July 5, 2024.
- 3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Underlying conditions and the higher risk
- for severe COVID-19. Available at: [https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-](https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-care/underlying-conditions.html?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html)
- [care/underlying-](https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-care/underlying-conditions.html?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html)
- [conditions.html?CDC\\_AAref\\_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-](https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-care/underlying-conditions.html?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html)
- [ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/covid/hcp/clinical-care/underlying-conditions.html?CDC_AAref_Val=https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/clinical-care/underlyingconditions.html) Accessed July 30, 2024.
- 4. Clark A, Jit M, Warren-Gash C, et al. Global, regional, and national estimates of the
- population at increased risk of severe COVID-19 due to underlying health conditions
- in 2020: a modelling study. Lancet Glob Health*.* 2020;8:e1003-e17.
- 5. World Health Organization (WHO). WHO roadmap on uses of COVID-19 vaccines
- in the context of Omicron and high population immunity. Available at:
- [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373987/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccines-](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373987/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccines-SAGE-Prioritization-2023.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1)
- [SAGE-Prioritization-2023.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1.](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/373987/WHO-2019-nCoV-Vaccines-SAGE-Prioritization-2023.2-eng.pdf?sequence=1) Accessed June 18, 2024.
- 6. Spikevax (mRNA-1273). Full Prescribing Information, Moderna, Inc., Cambridge,
- MA, 2022.

7. Comirnaty (BNT162b2). Full Prescribing Information, Pfizer/BioNTech, New York,

NY, 2022.

8. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273

SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. N Engl J Med*.* 2021;384:403-16.

- 9. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. N Engl J Med*.* 2020;383:2603-15.
- 
- 10. Cari L, Naghavi Alhosseini M, Mencacci A, Migliorati G, Nocentini G. Differences
- in the expression levels of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in cells treated with mRNA-
- based COVID-19 vaccines: a study on vaccines from the real world. Vaccines (Basel)*.*  2023;11:879.
- 11. Zhang L, More KR, Ojha A, et al. Effect of mRNA-LNP components of two globally-
- marketed COVID-19 vaccines on efficacy and stability. NPJ Vaccines*.* 2023;8:156.
- 12. Wang X, Haeussler K, Spellman A, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mRNA-1273

and BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines in immunocompromised individuals: a

- systematic review and meta-analysis using the GRADE framework. Front Immunol*.*
- 2023;14:1204831.
- 13. Kavikondala S, Haeussler K, Wang X, et al. Comparative effectiveness of mRNA-

1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines among older adults: systematic literature

review and meta-analysis using the GRADE framework. Infect Dis Ther*.* 

- 2024;13:779-811.
- 14. Kavikondala S, Haeussler K, Wang X, et al. Immunogenicity of mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 in immunocompromised patients: systematic review and meta-analysis using GRADE. Infect Dis Ther*.* 2024;13:1419-38.
- 15. Nafziger AN, Pratt DS. Seasonal influenza vaccination and technologies. J Clin Pharmacol*.* 2014;54:719-31.

- 16. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. CDC recommends updated 2024-2025
- COVID-19 and flu vaccines for fall/winter virus season. Available at:
- [https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/s-t0627-vaccine-recommendations.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2024/s-t0627-vaccine-recommendations.html)
- Accessed July 7, 2024.
- 17. US Food & Drug Administration. FDA takes action on updated mRNA COVID-19
- vaccines to better protect against currently circulating variants. US Food & Drug
- Administration. Available at: [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-takes-action-updated-mrna-covid-19-vaccines-better-protect-against-currently-circulating)
- [announcements/fda-takes-action-updated-mrna-covid-19-vaccines-better-protect-](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-takes-action-updated-mrna-covid-19-vaccines-better-protect-against-currently-circulating)
- [against-currently-circulating.](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/fda-takes-action-updated-mrna-covid-19-vaccines-better-protect-against-currently-circulating) Accessed August 28, 2024.
- 18. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. ECDC-EMA statement on
- updating COVID-19 vaccines composition for new SARS-CoV-2 virus variants.
- European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Available at:
- [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-vaccines-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-vaccines-composition-variants-statement-ECDC-EMA_0.pdf)
- [composition-variants-statement-ECDC-EMA\\_0.pdf.](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/covid-19-vaccines-composition-variants-statement-ECDC-EMA_0.pdf) Accessed August 28, 2024.
- 19. Bollaerts K, Wyndham-Thomas C, Miller E, et al. The role of real-world evidence for
- regulatory and public health decision-making for Accelerated Vaccine Deployment- a
- meeting report. Biologicals*.* 2024;85:101750.
- 20. Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, Oxman A, eds. Handbook for Grading the
- Quality of Evidence and the Strength of Recommendations Using the GRADE
- Approach: The GRADE Working Group; 2013.
- 21. U.S. Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) Handbook for
- Developting Evidence-Based Reommendations: Formulating questions, conducting
- the systematic review, and assessing the certainty of evidence using GRADE. Centers
- for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at:

- [https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/recs/grade/downloads/ACIP-GRADE-](https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/recs/grade/downloads/ACIP-GRADE-Handbook_4-22-24.pdf)
- [Handbook\\_4-22-24.pdf.](https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/recs/grade/downloads/ACIP-GRADE-Handbook_4-22-24.pdf) Accessed July 31, 2024.
- 22. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ*.* 2021;372:n71.
- 23. Cai C, Peng Y, Shen E, et al. A comprehensive analysis of the efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccines. Mol Ther*.* 2021;29:2794-805.
- 24. Grana C, Ghosn L, Evrenoglou T, et al. Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccines.
- Cochrane Database Syst Rev*.* 2022;12:CD015477.
- 25. Kow CS, Hasan SS. Real-world effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine: a meta-
- analysis of large observational studies. Inflammopharmacology*.* 2021;29:1075-90.
- 26. Lee A, Wong SY, Chai LYA, et al. Efficacy of covid-19 vaccines in
- immunocompromised patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. BMJ*.*
- 2022;376:e068632.
- 27. Sadeghi S, Kalantari Y, Shokri S, et al. Immunologic response, efficacy, and safety of vaccines against COVID-19 infection in healthy and immunosuppressed children and adolescents aged 2 - 21 years old: a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Virol*.*
- 2022;153:105196.
- 28. Xu J, Lan X, Zhang L, et al. The effectiveness of the first dose COVID-19 booster vs.
- full vaccination to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection and severe COVID-19 clinical
- event: a meta-analysis and systematic review of longitudinal studies. Front Public
- Health*.* 2023;11:1165611.
- 29. Elzouki AY, Elshafei MN, Aziz A, et al. Seroconversion and safety of Covid-19 vaccines in pa-tients with chronic liver disease and liver transplant: A systematic review. Qatar Med J*.* 2023;2023:21.



- 38. Lee A, Wong SY, Tay SH. Booster COVID-19 Vaccines for Immune-Mediated
- Inflammatory Disease Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Efficacy
- and Safety. Vaccines (Basel)*.* 2022;10.
- 39. European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control. Interim public health
- considerations for COVID-19 vaccination roll-out during 2023*.* Stockholm, Sweden:
- April 5, 2023, 2023.
- 40. Higgins JPT SJ, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in
- a randomized trial. In: Higgins JPT TJ, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ,
- Welch VA, ed. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version
- 6.3 (updated February 2022): Cochrane; 2022.
- 41. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for
- Assessing the Quality of Nonrandomised Studies in Meta-Analyses. Available at:
- [https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical\\_epidemiology/oxford.asp.](https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp) Accessed February
- 16, 2023.
- 42. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. Control Clin Trials*.*  1986;7:177-88.
- 43. Deeks JJ, Higgins JPT, Altman DG. Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking
- meta-analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al, eds. Cochrane Handbook
- for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. version 6.4 ed: Cochrane; 2023.
- 44. Daly C, Anwer S, Welton NJ, Dias S, Ades A. Meta-Analysis of Event Outcomes:
- Guideline Methodology Document 3. NICE Guidelines Technical Support Unit.
- Available at: [https://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-](https://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-sciences/centres/cresyda/mpes/nice/guideline-methodology-documents-gmds/)
- [sciences/centres/cresyda/mpes/nice/guideline-methodology-documents-gmds/.](https://www.bristol.ac.uk/population-health-sciences/centres/cresyda/mpes/nice/guideline-methodology-documents-gmds/)
- Accessed October 11, 2023.

- 45. Bucher HC, Guyatt GH, Griffith LE, Walter SD. The results of direct and indirect
- treatment comparisons in meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Clin

Epidemiol*.* 1997;50:683-91.

- 46. Greenland S, Thomas DC. On the need for the rare disease assumption in case-control studies. Am J Epidemiol*.* 1982;116:547-53.
- 47. Wu N, Joyal-Desmarais K, Ribeiro PAB, et al. Long-term effectiveness of COVID-19
- vaccines against infections, hospitalisations, and mortality in adults: findings from a
- rapid living systematic evidence synthesis and meta-analysis up to December, 2022.
- Lancet Respir Med*.* 2023;11:439-52.
- 48. BC COVID Therapeutics Committee. Practice Tool #2 Definitions of
- CEV/Immunosuppressed. BC Centre for Disease Control. Available at:
- [https://medicalstaff.islandhealth.ca/sites/default/files/covid-19/latest-](https://medicalstaff.islandhealth.ca/sites/default/files/covid-19/latest-communications/Island%20Health/bcctc-practice-tool-2-definitions-cev-immunosuppressed.pdf)
- [communications/Island%20Health/bcctc-practice-tool-2-definitions-cev-](https://medicalstaff.islandhealth.ca/sites/default/files/covid-19/latest-communications/Island%20Health/bcctc-practice-tool-2-definitions-cev-immunosuppressed.pdf)
- [immunosuppressed.pdf.](https://medicalstaff.islandhealth.ca/sites/default/files/covid-19/latest-communications/Island%20Health/bcctc-practice-tool-2-definitions-cev-immunosuppressed.pdf) Accessed February 16, 2023.
- 49. Chi WY, Li YD, Huang HC, et al. COVID-19 vaccine update: vaccine effectiveness,
- SARS-CoV-2 variants, boosters, adverse effects, and immune correlates of protection.
- J Biomed Sci*.* 2022;29:82.
- 50. Lambrou AS, Shirk P, Steele MK, et al. Genomic Surveillance for SARS-CoV-2
- Variants: Predominance of the Delta (B.1.617.2) and Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variants -
- United States, June 2021-January 2022. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.*
- 2022;71:206-11.
- 51. Implications for the EU/EEA on the Spread of the SARS-CoV-2 Delta (B.1.617.2)
- Variant of Concern. European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. Available
- at: [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Implications-for-the-EU-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Implications-for-the-EU-EEA-on-the-spread-of-SARS-CoV-2-Delta-VOC-23-June-2021.pdf)

- [EEA-on-the-spread-of-SARS-CoV-2-Delta-VOC-23-June-2021.pdf.](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/Implications-for-the-EU-EEA-on-the-spread-of-SARS-CoV-2-Delta-VOC-23-June-2021.pdf) Accessed August
- 3, 2024, 2024.
- 52. 06/15/2021: Lab Advisory: CDC Classifies SARS-CoV-2 Variant B.1.617.2 (Delta) a
- Variant of Concern. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Available at:
- [https://www.cdc.gov/locs/2021/06-15-2021-lab-advisory-CDC\\_SARS-CoV-](https://www.cdc.gov/locs/2021/06-15-2021-lab-advisory-CDC_SARS-CoV-2_Variant_B_1_617_2_Delta.html)
- [2\\_Variant\\_B\\_1\\_617\\_2\\_Delta.html.](https://www.cdc.gov/locs/2021/06-15-2021-lab-advisory-CDC_SARS-CoV-2_Variant_B_1_617_2_Delta.html) Accessed August 3, 2024, 2024.
- 53. Sterne JA, Egger M. Funnel plots for detecting bias in meta-analysis: guidelines on choice of axis. J Clin Epidemiol*.* 2001;54:1046-55.
- 54. Sterne JAC, Egger M. Regression methods to detect publication and other bias in
- meta-analysis. In: Rothstein HR, Sutton AJ, Borenstein M, eds. Publication Bias in
- Meta-Analysis: Prevention, Assessment and Adjustments: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2005:99-110.
- 55. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
- Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Available at:
- [https://training.cochrane.org/handbook.](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook) Accessed July 30, 2024.
- 56. Schwarzer G. meta: an R package for meta-analysis. R News*.* 2007;7:40-5.
- 57. Viechtbauer W. Conducting meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. J Stat Softw*.* 2010;36:1-48.
- 58. Leuva H, Zhou M, Brau N, et al. Influence of cancer on COVID-19 incidence,
- outcomes, and vaccine effectiveness: a prospective cohort study of U.S. veterans.
- Semin Oncol*.* 2022;49:363-70.
- 59. Oliver MJ, Thomas D, Balamchi S, et al. Vaccine effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2
- infection and severe outcomes in the maintenance dialysis population in Ontario,
- Canada. J Am Soc Nephrol*.* 2022;33:839-49.



- 67. Kopel H, Nguyen VH, Bogdanov A, et al. Comparative Effectiveness of the Bivalent
- (Original/Omicron BA.4/BA.5) mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines mRNA-1273.222 and
- BNT162b2 Bivalent in Adults With Underlying Medical Conditions in the United
- States. *medRxiv*. Preprint posted online
- 68. Quiroga B, Soler MJ, Ortiz A, 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;15:1856-64.

- 69. Alkadi MM, Hamad A, Ghazouani H, et al. Effectiveness of messenger RNA vaccines
- against SARS-CoV-2 infection in hemodialysis patients: a case-control study.
- Vaccines (Basel)*.* 2022;11:49.
- 70. Song Q, Bates B, Shao YR, et al. Risk and outcome of breakthrough COVID-19
- infections in vaccinated patients with cancer: real-world evidence from the National
- COVID Cohort Collaborative. J Clin Oncol*.* 2022;40:1414-27.
- 71. Nguyen VH, Boileau C, Bogdanov A, et al. 2359. Relative effectiveness of mRNA-
- 1273, BNT162b2, and Ad26.COV2.S vaccines in adults at higher risk for severe
- COVID-19 outcomes. Open Forum Infectious Diseases*.* 2023;10:ofad500.1980.
- 72. 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.
- 73. Butt AA, Talisa VB, Yan P, et al. 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. Clin Infect Dis*.*
- 2022;75:e617-e22.
- 74. Cook CE, Patel NJ, Fu X, et al. Comparative effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-
- 1273 vaccines against COVID-19 infection among patients with systemic

 autoimmune rheumatic diseases on immunomodulatory medications. J Rheumatol*.*  2023;50:697-703. 75. Drawz PE, DeSilva M, Bodurtha P, et al. Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA- 1273 second doses and boosters for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection and SARS-CoV-2-related hospitalizations: a statewide report from the Minnesota Electronic Health Record Consortium. Clin Infect Dis*.*  2022;75:890-2. 76. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Naleway AL, 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. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*.* 2021;70:1553. 77. Embi PJ, Levy ME, Patel P, et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines at preventing emergency department or urgent care encounters and hospitalizations among immunocompromised adults: an observational study of real-world data across 10 US states from August-December 2021. Vaccine*.* 2023;41:5424-34. 78. Figueiredo JC, Merin NM, Hamid O, et al. Longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine-induced humoral immune responses in patients with cancer. Cancer Res*.*  2021;81:6273-80. 79. Fu Y, Wu K, Wang Z, et al. Effectiveness of various COVID-19 vaccine regimens among 10.4 million patients from the National COVID Cohort Collaborative during pre-Delta to Omicron periods - United States, 11 December 2020 to 30 June 2022. Vaccine*.* 2023;41:6339-49. 80. Holroyd KB, Healy BC, Conway S, et al. Humoral response to COVID-19 vaccination in MS patients on disease modifying therapy: immune profiles and clinical outcomes. Mult Scler Relat Disord*.* 2022;67:104079.

- 81. Joerns J, Bollineni S, Mahan LD, et al. High-dose mycophenolate use at vaccination
- is independently associated with breakthrough COVID-19 among lung transplant
- patients. Transplantation*.* 2022;106:e271-e4.
- 82. John BV, Ferreira RD, Doshi A, et al. Third dose of COVID-19 mRNA vaccine
- appears to overcome vaccine hyporesponsiveness in patients with cirrhosis. J Hepatol*.*
- 2022;77:1349-58.
- 83. Kelly JD, Leonard S, Boscardin WJ, et al. Comparative mRNA booster effectiveness
- against death or hospitalization with COVID-19 pneumonia across at-risk US veteran
- populations. Nat Commun*.* 2023;14:2976.
- 84. Kelly JD, Leonard S, Hoggatt KJ, et al. Incidence of severe COVID-19 illness
- following vaccination and booster with BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, and Ad26.COV2.S vaccines. JAMA*.* 2022;328:1427-37.
- 85. 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;161:827-36.
- 86. Kshirsagar M, Nasir M, Mukherjee S, et al. The risk of hospitalization and mortality
- after breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection by vaccine type: observational study of
- medical claims data. JMIR Public Health Surveill*.* 2022;8:e38898.
- 87. Liew J, Gianfrancesco M, Harrison C, 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.
- 88. Malinis M, Cohen E, Azar MM. Effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in fully
- vaccinated solid organ transplant recipients. Am J Transplant*.* 2021;21:2916-8.




- 19, hospitalizations, and death: a retrospective analysis of national surveillance data.
- Int J Infect Dis*.* 2023;129:188-96.
- 104. Egri N, Calderon H, Martinez R, et al. Cellular and humoral responses after second
- and third SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations in patients with autoimmune diseases treated
- with rituximab: specific T cell immunity remains longer and plays a protective role
- against SARS-CoV-2 reinfections. Front Immunol*.* 2023;14:1146841.
- 105. Mazuecos A, Villanego F, Zarraga S, et al. Breakthrough infections following mRNA
- SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in kidney transplant recipients. Transplantation*.*
- 2022;106:1430-9.
- 106. Odriozola A, San Segundo D, Cuadrado A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 and liver transplant:
- how has it behaved in this sixth wave? Transplantation*.* 2022;106:1445-9.
- 107. Pinana JL, Lopez-Corral L, Martino R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine response and rate of breakthrough infection in patients with hematological disorders. J Hematol Oncol*.*  2022;15:54.
- 108. Pinana JL, Martino R, Vazquez L, et al. SARS-CoV-2-reactive antibody waning,
- booster effect and breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection in hematopoietic stem cell
- transplant and cell therapy recipients at one year after vaccination. Bone Marrow Transplant*.* 2023;58:567-80.
- 109. Pinana JL, Vazquez L, Calabuig M, et al. One-year breakthrough SARS-CoV-2
- infection and correlates of protection in fully vaccinated hematological patients.
- Blood Cancer J*.* 2023;13:8.
- 110. Rodriguez-Mora S, Corona M, Solera Sainero M, et al. Regular humoral and cellular immune responses in individuals with chronic myeloid leukemia who received a full vaccination schedule against COVID-19. Cancers (Basel)*.* 2023;15:5066.



119. Marinaki S, Xagas E, Tsoutsoura P, et al. Occurrence of severe SARS-CoV-2

- infection in fully vaccinated solid organ transplant recipients. Transplant Proc*.*  2022;54:1405-8.
- 120. Boekel L, Stalman EW, Wieske L, et al. Breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infections with
- the delta (B.1.617.2) variant in vaccinated patients with immune-mediated
- inflammatory diseases using immunosuppressants: a substudy of two prospective

cohort studies. Lancet Rheumatol*.* 2022;4:e417-e29.

- 121. Magnusson JM, Larsson H, Alsaleh A, et al. COVID-19 in lung transplant recipients:
- an overview of the Swedish national experience. Transpl Int*.* 2021;34:2597-608.
- 122. Kissling E, Hooiveld M, Martinez-Baz I, et al. Effectiveness of complete primary

vaccination against COVID-19 at primary care and community level during

predominant Delta circulation in Europe: multicentre analysis, I-MOVE-COVID-19

and ECDC networks, July to August 2021. Euro Surveill*.* 2022;27:2101104.

- 123. Yeo T, Quek AML, Yong KP, et al. COVID-19 infection after two doses of SARS-
- CoV-2 mRNA vaccine in multiple sclerosis, AQP4-antibody NMOSD and MOGAD.
- Mult Scler Relat Disord*.* 2022;65:104003.
- 124. Chen CC, Hsu MK, Huang YJ, et al. Protective effect of vaccine doses and antibody
- titers against SARS-CoV-2 infection in kidney transplant recipients. Transpl Int*.*

2023;36:11196.

- 125. Haarhaus M, Woitas RP, Veiga PM, et al. Multinational comparative efficacy of 6
- different COVID-19 vaccines for the prevention of breakthrough infection and
- mortality in HD patients [abstr 4363]. Nephrology Dialysis Transplantation*.*
- 911 2023;38: gfad063c 4363.

- 912 126. Glover J, Izzo D, Odato K, Wang L. EBM page generator. Trustees of Dartmouth
- 913 College and Yale University. Available at: [https://www.ebmpyramid.org/index.php.](https://www.ebmpyramid.org/index.php)

914 Accessed August 28, 2024.

- 915 127. Lewis NM, Chung JR, Uyeki TM, et al. Interpretation of relative efficacy and
- 916 effectiveness for influenza vaccines. Clin Infect Dis*.* 2022;75:170-5.

## 918 **TABLES**

## 919 **Table 1** Characteristics of included studies



































- 920 <sup>a</sup> Assumed based on study period.
- <sup>b</sup> Number of vaccinated participants included in the infection analysis. For the symptomatic infection analysis, n=1,831 (mRNA-1273) and
- 922  $n=2,139$  (BNT162b2; for the severe infection analysis,  $n=1,518$  (mRNA-1273) and  $n=1,638$  (BNT162b2).
- 923 CIndefined number of doses of any vaccine prior to the Omicron-containing bivalent original-BA4-5 booster dose.
- <sup>d</sup> Overall number of vaccinated participants. No separate numbers per vaccine arm were provided.
- 925 A, dose of AstraZeneca ChAdOx1 COVID-19 vaccine; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CML, chronic myeloid leukemia; IgG, immunoglobulin
- 926 G; J, dose of Johnson & Johnson Ad26.COV2.S COVID-19 vaccine; EHR, electronic health record; M, dose of Moderna mRNA-1273 COVID-
- 927 19 vaccine; MS, multiple sclerosis; NR, not reported; NS, not specified; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; P, dose of Pfizer/BioNTech
- 928 BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine; R, dose of any mRNA COVID-19 vaccine; RAT, rapid antigen test; RT-PCR, reverse transcription polymerase
- 929 chain reaction; X, dose of unknown COVID-19 vaccine.
- 930

# 931 **Table 2** Summary of overall GRADE findings in adults with at least one underlying medical condition





932

933 GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessments, Development, and Evaluations; HR, hazard ratio; IRR, incidence rate ratio; OR, odds

934 ratio; RoB, risk of bias; RR, relative risk; VE, vaccine effectiveness.

935 a Total number of patients across studies that reported the number of events and sample size for a particular outcome. Studies that reported only

- 936 VE, RR, OR, HR, or IRR were not counted
- 937 b Rating downgraded due to considerable heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =92.5%)
- 938 <sup>c</sup> Major concern for population heterogeneity: Patients with mixed conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were
- 939 considered in 15.4% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with
- differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern for intervention heterogeneity, outcome heterogeneity and indirect
- comparison: Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 3.8% of studies; indirect comparison was performed in 5.8% of studies;
- outcome definitions were rather heterogeneous (test positive and/or symptomatic, any severity)
- 943 d Lower grading (type 4) due to very serious concern for inconsistency and indirectness
- 944  $e^{\text{e}}$  Major concern for population heterogeneity: Patients with mixed conditions were considered in 18.2% of studies. Additionally, the studies may
- have included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern
- for indirect comparison: Indirect comparison was performed in 9.1% of studies
- 947 <sup>f</sup> Lower grading (type 3) due to serious concern for indirectness and nonrandomized studies
- <sup>g</sup> Serious or very serious RoB in 19 of 42 studies (45.3%): Boekel 2022 [120], Capuano 2023 [112], Dimitrov 2023 [116], Embi 2021 [76],
- Figueiredo 2021 [78], Hernandez 2022 [61], Kshirsagar 2022 [86], Liew 2022 [87], Magnusson 2021 [121], Malinis 2021 [88], Manley 2023
- [62], Marinaki 2022 [119], Miao 2023 [89], Motwani 2023 [63], Odriozola 2022 [106], Song 2022 [70], Valkov 2023 [117], Wang 2022 [98],
- and Yetmar 2022 [99]
- <sup>h</sup> Major concern for population heterogeneity: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was studied or patients with mixed
- conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 30.9% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have
- included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern for
- intervention heterogeneity, outcome heterogeneity and indirect comparison: Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 7.1% of
- studies; indirect comparison was performed in 9.5% of studies; outcome definitions were rather heterogeneous (defined severe infection and
- derived from hospitalization and/or death)
- 958 <sup>i</sup> Lower grading (type 4) due to serious concern for RoB and indirectness
- <sup>j</sup> Serious or very serious RoB in 12 of 27 studies (44.4%): Boekel 2022 [120], Embi 2021 [76], Figueiredo 2021 [78], Kshirsagar 2022 [86],
- Liew 2022 [87], Magnusson 2021 [121], Manley 2023 [62], Marinaki 2022 [119], Miao 2023 [89], Motwani 2023 [63], Odriozola 2022 [106],
- and Wang 2022 [98]

<sup>962</sup> k Major concern for population heterogeneity: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was studied or patients with mixed

conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 44.4% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have

included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern for

intervention heterogeneity and indirect comparison: Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 3.7% of studies; indirect comparison

was performed in 14.8% of studies

967 <sup>1</sup> Serious or very serious RoB in 12 of 21 studies (57.1%): Boekel 2022 [120], Capuano 2023 [112], Dimitrov 2023 [116], Hernandez 2022 [61],

Kshirsagar 2022 [86], Liew 2022 [87], Malinis 2021 [88], Manley 2023 [62], Miao 2023 [89], Odriozola 2022 [106], Valkov 2023 [117], and

Yetmar 2022 [99]

970 m Major concern for population heterogeneity and intervention heterogeneity: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was

studied or patients with mixed conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 52.4% of studies.

Additionally, the studies may have included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of

immunosuppressive therapies. Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 19.0% studies. Some concern for indirect comparison:

Indirect comparison was performed in 4.8% of studies

975 Rating downgraded due to 17 out of 21 studies (81.0%) with 95% CIs crossing thresholds of harm as well as benefit

976 <sup>o</sup> Lower grading (type 4) due to serious concern for RoB and imprecision and very serious concern for indirectness

## 977 **Table 3** Summary of overall GRADE findings in adults with CEV 1 or 2 conditions





978 CEV, clinically extremely vulnerable; GRADE, Grading of Recommendations, Assessments, Development, and Evaluations; HR, hazard ratio;

979 IRR, incidence rate ratio; OR, odds ratio; RoB, risk of bias; RR, relative risk; VE, vaccine effectiveness.

- 980 <sup>a</sup> Total number of patients across studies that reported the number of events and sample size for a particular outcome. Studies that reported only 981 VE, RR, OR, HR, or IRR were not counted
- 982 b Serious or very serious RoB in 12 out of 38 studies (31.6%): Alkadi 2022 [69], Boekel 2022 [120], Chen 2023 [124], Embi 2021 [76],
- 983 Magnusson 2021 [121], Malinis 2021 [88], Manley 2023 [62], Marinaki 2022 [119], Motwani 2023 [63], Radcliffe 2022 [100], Rooney 2022
- 984 [94], and Wang 2022 [98]
- 985  $\degree$  Rating downgraded due to considerable heterogeneity ( $I^2$ =80.2%)
- 986 <sup>d</sup> Some concern for population, intervention, outcome heterogeneity and indirect comparison: Patients with mixed conditions were considered in
- 987 13.2% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use
- 988 of immunosuppressive therapies. Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 2.6% studies. Indirect comparison was performed in 5.3%
- 989 studies. Outcome definitions rather heterogeneous (test positive and/or symptomatic, any severity)
- 990 <sup>e</sup> Lower grading (type 4) due to serious concern for RoB and inconsistency and very serious concern for indirectness
- 991 <sup>f</sup> Low grading (type 3) due to possible publication bias and inclusion of only nonrandomized studies
- 992 <sup>8</sup> Serious or very serious RoB in 15 out of 28 studies (53.6%): Boekel 2022 [120], Capuano 2023 [112], Embi 2021 [76], Hernandez 2022 [61],
- 993 Liew 2022 [87], Magnusson 2021 [121], Malinis 2021 [88], Manley 2023 [62], Marinaki 2022 [119], Miao 2023 [89], Motwani 2023 [63],
- 994 Odriozola 2022 [106], Song 2022 [70], Wang 2022 [98], and Yetmar 2022 [99]
- 995 h Major concern for population heterogeneity: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was studied or patients with mixed
- 996 conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 28.6% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have
- 997 included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern for
- 998 intervention heterogeneity, outcome heterogeneity and indirect comparison: Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 3.6% of
- 999 studies; indirect comparison was performed in 10.7% of studies; outcome definitions were rather heterogeneous (defined severe infection and
- 1000 derived from hospitalization and/or death)
- 1001 <sup>i</sup> Lower grading (type 4) due to serious concern for RoB and very serious concern for indirectness

*i* Serious or very serious RoB in 11 out of 22 studies (50.0%): Boekel 2022 [120], Embi 2021 [76], Holroyd 2022 [80], Liew 2022 [87],

- Magnusson 2021 [121], Manley 2023 [62], Marinaki 2022 [119], Miao 2023 [89], Motwani 2023 [63], Odriozola 2022 [106], and Wang 2022 [98]
- 1005 k Major concern for population heterogeneity and indirect comparison: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was studied or
- patients with mixed conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 40.9% of studies. Additionally,
- the studies may have included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive
- therapies. Indirect comparison was performed in 18.2% of studies. Some concern for intervention heterogeneity: Intervention comparison pairs
- were heterogeneous in 4.5% of studies
- 1010 <sup>1</sup> Rating downgraded due to 14 out of 22 studies (63.6%) with 95% CIs crossing thresholds of harm as well as benefit
- 1011  $\mu$  Lower grading (Type 4) due to serious concern for risk of bias, indirectness and imprecision
- 1012 <sup>n</sup> Serious or very serious RoB in 9 out of 13 studies (69.2%): Boekel 2022 [120], Capuano 2023 [112], Hernandez 2022 [61], Liew 2022 [87],
- Malinis 2021 [88], Manley 2023 [62], Miao 2023 [89], Odriozola 2022 [106], and Yetmar 2022 [99]
- <sup>o</sup> Major concern for population heterogeneity: SARS-CoV-2-infected subset of the vaccinated population was studied or patients with mixed
- conditions or "immunocompromised" patients (as defined in the article) were considered in 46.2% of studies. Additionally, the studies may have
- included patients with comorbidities not of interest and patients with differences in the use of immunosuppressive therapies. Some concern for
- intervention heterogeneity: Intervention comparison pairs were heterogeneous in 7.7% of studies
- 1018 P Rating downgraded due to 11 out of 13 studies (84.6%) with 95% CIs crossing thresholds of harm as well as benefit

#### 1019 **FIGURES**

- 1020 Fig. 1 PRISMA flow diagram. <sup>a</sup> Includes 2 preprints and 1 poster. CCRT, Cochrane Central
- 1021 Register of Controlled Trials; CDSR, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews; PRISMA,
- 1022 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses; SLR, systematic

1023 literature review.



 **Fig. 2** Summary of meta-analysis results on clinical effectiveness outcomes of the mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines in the overall population of adults with at least one of the following underlying medical conditions: autoimmune disease, solid tumor, solid organ transplant, hematologic malignancy, chronic kidney disease with and without hemodialysis, type 1 and 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular disease, chronic liver condition, neurologic condition, chronic respiratory condition, obesity.



- 1031 **Fig. 3** Meta-analysis results comparing the mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines in the overall population of adults with at least
- 1032 one medical condition<sup>a</sup> by study for (a) SARS-CoV-2 infection, (b) symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, (c) severe SARS-CoV-2 infection, (d)
- 1033 hospitalization due to COVID-19, and (e) death due to COVID-19. <sup>a</sup>Autoimmune disease, solid tumor, solid organ transplant, hematologic
- 1034 malignancy, chronic kidney disease with and without hemodialysis, type 1 and 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease, cerebrovascular disease,
- 1035 chronic liver condition, neurologic condition, chronic respiratory condition, obesity.

## **(a) SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=52)**



#### **(b) Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=11)**



### 1040 **(c) Severe SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=42)**



**Risk Ratio (log scale)** 

Favors mRNA-1273 **Favors BNT162b2**
## **(d) Hospitalization due to COVID-19 (n=27)**



## **(e) Death due to COVID-19 (n=21)**



**Fig. 4** Summary of meta-analysis results on clinical effectiveness outcomes of the mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines in adults





1050 **Fig. 5** Summary of subgroup meta-analysis results on clinical effectiveness outcomes of the mRNA-1273 versus BNT162b2 COVID-19

1051 vaccines in adults with (a) at least one underlying medical condition<sup>a</sup> and (b) CEV 1 and 2 conditions. <sup>a</sup>Autoimmune disease, solid tumor, solid

- 1052 organ transplant, hematologic malignancy, chronic kidney disease with and without hemodialysis, type 1 and 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease,
- 1053 cerebrovascular disease, chronic liver condition, neurologic condition, chronic respiratory condition, obesity. Blue shading represents
- 1054 statistically significant RR in favor of mRNA-1273 over BNT162b2, purple shading represents statistically nonsignificant RR, and pink shading
- 1055 represents statistically nonsignificant RR in favor of BNT162b2 over mRNA-1273. CEV, clinically extremely vulnerable; RR, risk ratio.

## 1056 **(a) Adults with at least one underlying medical condition**



## 1058 **(b) Adults with CEV 1 and 2 conditions**

