#### **Supplementary Materials:**

#### **Cost-effectiveness of the second COVID-19 booster vaccination in the United States**

This supplementary document describes in detail the model construction and estimation of parameters presented in the main text.

### **1.1 Health states and the force of infections**

We developed a decision-analytic SEIR-Markov model by five age groups (0-4yrs with 18,827,338) individuals, 5-11yrs with 28,584,443 individuals, 12-17yrs with 26,154,652 individuals, 18-49yrs with 138,769,369 individuals, and 50+yrs with 119,557,943 individuals) to simulate the disease transmission and progression of the Omicron variant over a period of 180 days in the United States (US). Our model, in each age group, consisted of 13 health states including 6 uninfected states depicting varied vaccination status and 7 infected states depicting varied disease progression of COVID-19 **(Figure 1).**

We defined the 13 health states as follows.

- Susceptible: individuals who have not been vaccinated.
- One dose vaccinated: individuals who have revived one dose vaccination.
- Fully vaccinated: individuals who have completed series vaccinations.
- Short-term booster VE: the vaccine efficacy from 2 weeks to 4 months after a booster dose.
- Long-term booster VE: the vaccine efficacy 4 months beyond a booster dose.
- Second booster VE: the vaccine efficacy after a second booster shot.
- Incubation (E): cases prior to symptom onset.
- Asymptomatic (A): cases who never developed symptoms ever throughout the course of their disease.
- Mild/moderate (I): cases without pneumonia and cases with mild pneumonia.
- Severe: cases who developed dyspnoea and/or hypoxemia and managed in a hospital but not requiring intensive care unit.
- Critical: cases who developed respiratory failure, and/or septic shock, and/or multiple organ dysfunction/failure and managed in an intensive care unit; some of them who recuperated from critical disease need to go through the recuperation stage-remaining in the hospital or other health care facility
- Recovered: cases who recovered from infection stages.
- Death: COVID-19 related death

People with various vaccination status by age group have different risk of being infected and different disease progression to different clinical outcomes. For the susceptible individuals, the infection risk is measured by the parameter of force of infection  $(\lambda_{i,t})$ , i, j denotes five age groups (0-4yrs, 5-11yrs, 12-17yrs, 18-49yrs, and 50+yrs). The  $\lambda_{i,t}$  is given by

$$
\lambda_{i,t} = \beta_{i,t} \sum_{j=1}^{5} k_{i,j} \frac{(\omega E_{j,t} + \omega A_{j,t} + I_{j,t})}{N_{i,j}}
$$

Where the transmission coefficient  $(\beta_{i,t})$  denotes the probability that a susceptible individual has been infected by contacting other infectious cases by age group once. The  $\lambda_{i,t}$  is determined by the contact metric between age groups  $(k_{i,j})$  and number of infectious patients (E, A, I). Previous studies had reported a 75% lower infectiveness (1- $\omega$ ) of latent, asymptomatic individuals (E, A) compared with symptomatic individuals  $(I)^1$ . The contact metric in the US is obtained from the polished literature as follows.<sup>2</sup>



Infections

### **1.2 Real-world vaccine efficacy against Omicron infection and severe progression**

To identify real-world vaccine efficacy ( VE) against Omicron infection and severe progression, we collected multiple scientific literature including real population incidence among varied vaccination status groups from an ongoing systematic review conducted by The International Vaccine Access Center<sup>3</sup>. We searched the published report version  $(10<sup>th</sup> Nov 2022)$  and found 99 relevant papers regarding the mRNA-based booster vaccine effectiveness against Omicron (80 booster VE papers and 26 second booster VE papers, of which 7 repeated). We scrutinized the full texts of all papers for eligibility, of which 81 were excluded (27 studies included no original cases number; 22 studies adopt vaccinated individuals as reference; 10 studies were focused on special population such as pregnancies, previous infection and patients receiving haemodialysis; 19 studies included sample during BA. 1 Omicron dominant period; 3 studies were designed by cohort research and not enough to produce meta-analysis). After elimination of ineligible literature, we finally included 18 studies from an ongoing systematic review (17 booster VE papers and 5 second booster VE papers, of which 4 repeated).



Existing evidence indicated that the booster VE would gradually wane with time and the Centre of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended second booster for those aged ≥50 years 4 months after their prior dose to increase their protection further<sup>4-7</sup>. Thus, we defined the VE from 2 weeks to 4 months after a booster dose as a 'short-term booster VE', whereas the VE beyond 4 months as a 'long-term booster VE'. Combined with the VE classification of preventing Omicron infection and severe progression, we extracted original cases data using standard tables designed by case-control studies (details were shown in Additional file.xlsx). Then, we used random-effects meta-analysis to generate overall odds ratio (OR) estimates. Finally, we calculated the VE using the formula of (1–OR) multiplied by 100%.<sup>5</sup>





**Figure S1**. Forest plot for the pooled odds ratio for Omicron variant.

### **1.3 Model calibration**

We refined the model inputs of transmission coefficient and vaccination rates by age groups automatically with TreeAge Pro's calibration tool to adjust inputs until the model results match observed COVID-19 related mortality and vaccination data in the US. The model calibration results are shown as follow.



**Figure S2.** Model calibration for COVID-19 related deaths by age groups in the US.



**Figure S3.** Model calibration for vaccination status of uninfected individuals by age groups in the US.



The calibrated parameters are shown as follows:

### **1.4 Distribution of clinical disease stages of various vaccination status**





Based on the short-term booster VE (Group B), long-term booster VE (Group C) and 2<sup>nd</sup> booster VE (**Group D**), we developed a mathematical model to estimate the similar distributions in varied vaccination group (**Figure S4**). In the model, we calculated the numerator and denominator of the proportion of severe infections in vaccinated patients  $(P_{\nu s})$  by three factors, which are the proportion of severe infections in unvaccinated infections  $(P_s)$ , the VE for preventing Omicron infection  $(V_i)$  and severe progression  $(V_s)$ . Then, we could calculate the respective proportion of clinical outcomes by vaccination status.



 $V_i$ : Vaccine efficacy for preventing a SARS-CoV-2 infection

 $V_s$ : Vaccine efficacy for preventing a severe COVID-19 case

 $P_s$ : Proportion of severe cases in all unvaccinated COVID-19 infections

 $P_{\text{vs}}$ : Proportion of severe cases in all vaccinated COVID-19 infections

$$
\longrightarrow P_{vs} = \frac{n \times P_s \times (1 - V_s)}{n \times (1 - V_i)}
$$

**Figure S3**. The model flowchart to estimate the proportion of severe cases in the COVID-19 infections.

<b>Clinical outcomes</b>	Group $A$ 50+y rs	Group <b>B</b> 50+ $v$ rs	Group $C$ 50+y rs	Group $D \, 50+$ yrs	Group A 18- 49yrs	Group <b>B</b> 18- 49yrs	Group C <sub>18</sub> 49yrs	Group D 18- 49yrs
Asymptomatic infection	31.00%	32.85%	31.67%	32.05%	31.00%	33.50%	33.41%	33.44%
Mild/Moderate illness	60.82%	64.46%	62.15%	62.89%	68.36%	66.29%	66.11%	66.17%
Severe illness	6.760%	2.224%	5.110%	4.177%	0.511%	0.168%	0.386%	0.316%
Critical (recover) illness	0.348%	0.115%	0.263%	0.215%	0.095%	0.031%	0.072%	0.058%
Critical (die) illness	1.067%	0.351%	0.807%	0.659%	0.033%	0.011%	0.025%	0.020%
<b>Clinical outcomes</b>	Group A 12- 17yrs	Group <b>B</b> 12- 17yrs	Group $C_12$ 17yrs	Group $D_12$ 17yrs	Group A 5- 11yrs	Group B 5- 11yrs	Group C <sub>5</sub> 11yrs	Group D 5- 11yrs
Asymptomatic infection	33.00%	33.17%	33.06%	33.10%	33.00%	33.17%	33.06%	33.10%
Mild/Moderate illness	66.23%	66.58%	66.36%	66.43%	66.23%	66.58%	66.36%	66.43%
Severe illness	0.623%	0.205%	0.471\%	0.385%	0.684%	0.225%	0.517%	0.423%
Critical (recover) illness	0.138%	0.045%	0.104%	0.085%	0.081%	0.027%	0.061\%	0.050%

The details of the distribution are list as follow.

# **1.5 Direct medical cost**

We collected the direct medical costs of COVID-19 disease in the US from published literature and Medicare Administrative Contractor report<sup>15-17</sup>. The cost of PCR tests and rapid antigen self-test for COVID-19 infection was estimated to be \$51 and \$11 per person, respectively. In addition, we collected cost per outpatient visit, general hospitalisation and ICU admission and the duration of each disease stage<sup>18</sup>. The cost of medical services varied across clinical disease stages, and we calculated the total direct medical cost of COVID-19 cases with varied severity by multiplying the unit cost of the medical services by the duration of each disease stage.



# **1.6 Health state utilities**

We collected utility scores for COVID-19 patients from the disutility weights of severe lower respiratory tract infection<sup>19,20</sup> and the estimates of pricing models for COVID-19 treatments published by the Institute for Clinical and Economic Review<sup>21</sup>. We calculated the average utility from two sources and adopted their lowest and highest bounds<sup>22</sup>.



# **1.7 Sensitivity analyses**

We extensively explored the impact of model parameters on the baseline results with univariate and probabilistic sensitivity analyses (PSA). Univariate sensitivity analysis is for each of 17 parameters and varying one parameter at one time in their range. PSA allows variation of all 17 parameters together at one time in their distribution with random sampling.



### **1.8 The impact of contact matrix on the results**

To examine the impact of contact matrix on the findings, we assumed all age groups interact only within their peers. We re-calibrate the model to the number of death cases and obtain the following contact matrix.



**Figure S4.** Model re-calibration for COVID-19 related deaths by age groups in the US.

		<i><u>INTECLIONS</u></i>								
		$0 - 4$	$5-11$	$12 - 17$	18-49	$\geq 50$				
Susceptible	$0 - 4$	18.48	0		0	0				
	$5 - 11$	0	24.69	0	0					
	$12 - 17$	$\theta$	0	29.46	0					
	18-49	0	0	0	12.73					
	$\geq 50$	$\theta$	0	0	0	10.61				

The new contact metric in the US is obtained from the polished literature as follow.  $\mathbf{I} \cup \mathbf{C}$ 





### **Supplement Reference**

1. Prem K, Liu Y, Russell TW, et al. The effect of control strategies to reduce social mixing on outcomes of the COVID-19 epidemic in Wuhan, China: a modelling study. *Lancet Public Health* 2020; **5**(5): e261-e70.

2. Prem K, Zandvoort KV, Klepac P, et al. Projecting contact matrices in 177 geographical regions: An update and comparison with empirical data for the COVID-19 era. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2021; **17**(7): e1009098.

3. IVAC. Results of COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness Studies: An Ongoing Systematic Review. 2021. [https://view](https://view-hub.org/resources)[hub.org/resources](https://view-hub.org/resources) (accessed Oct 21 2021).

4. Goldberg Y, Mandel M, Bar-On YM, et al. Waning Immunity after the BNT162b2 Vaccine in Israel. *N Engl J Med* 2021.

5. Chemaitelly H, Tang P, Hasan MR, et al. Waning of BNT162b2 Vaccine Protection against SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Qatar. *N Engl J Med* 2021.

6. Thomas SJ, Moreira ED, Jr., Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine through 6 Months. *N Engl J Med* 2021.

7. CDC. CDC Recommends Additional Boosters for Certain Individuals. 2022. <https://www.cdc.gov/media/releases/2022/s0328-covid-19-boosters.html> (accessed August 12, 2022).

8. CDC. COVID-19 Case Surveillance Public Use Data. 2022. [https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data/vbim-akqf) [Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data/vbim-akqf](https://data.cdc.gov/Case-Surveillance/COVID-19-Case-Surveillance-Public-Use-Data/vbim-akqf) (accessed November 15, 2022).

9. CDC. Provisional COVID-19 Deaths by Sex and Age. 2022. [https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Provisional-COVID-19-](https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Provisional-COVID-19-Deaths-by-Sex-and-Age/9bhg-hcku) [Deaths-by-Sex-and-Age/9bhg-hcku](https://data.cdc.gov/NCHS/Provisional-COVID-19-Deaths-by-Sex-and-Age/9bhg-hcku) (accessed November 15, 2022).

10. Wang L, Berger NA, Kaelber DC, Davis PB, Volkow ND, Xu R. COVID infection rates, clinical outcomes, and racial/ethnic and gender disparities before and after Omicron emerged in the US. *medRxiv* 2022.

11. Marks KJ, Whitaker M, Agathis NT, et al. Hospitalization of Infants and Children Aged 0-4 Years with Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 2020-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(11): 429-36.

12. Shi DS, Whitaker M, Marks KJ, et al. Hospitalizations of Children Aged 5-11 Years with Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 - COVID-NET, 14 States, March 2020-February 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(16): 574-81.

13. Marks KJ, Whitaker M, Anglin O, et al. Hospitalizations of Children and Adolescents with Laboratory-Confirmed COVID-19 - COVID-NET, 14 States, July 2021-January 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(7): 271-8.

14. Adjei S, Hong K, Molinari NM, et al. Mortality Risk Among Patients Hospitalized Primarily for COVID-19 During the Omicron and Delta Variant Pandemic Periods - United States, April 2020-June 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 2022; **71**(37): 1182-9.

15. Tsai Y, Vogt TM, Zhou F. Patient Characteristics and Costs Associated With COVID-19-Related Medical Care Among Medicare Fee-for-Service Beneficiaries. *Ann Intern Med* 2021; **174**(8): 1101-9.

16. CDC. Medicare Administrative Contractor (MAC) COVID-19 Test Pricing. 2021. <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/mac-covid-19-test-pricing.pdf> (accessed July 30, 2022).

17. NOR. Why rapid COVID tests are in short supply in the U.S. 2021. [https://www.npr.org/sections/health](https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2021/12/10/1062700278/how-the-u-s-got-on-the-slow-track-with-at-home-covid-tests)[shots/2021/12/10/1062700278/how-the-u-s-got-on-the-slow-track-with-at-home-covid-tests](https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2021/12/10/1062700278/how-the-u-s-got-on-the-slow-track-with-at-home-covid-tests) (accessed July 30, 2022).<br>18. Reddy KP, Shebl FM, Foote JHA, et al. Cost-effectiveness of public health strategies for COVID-19 epidemi

Reddy KP, Shebl FM, Foote JHA, et al. Cost-effectiveness of public health strategies for COVID-19 epidemic control in South Africa: a microsimulation modelling study. *Lancet Glob Health* 2021; **9**(2): e120-e9.

19. Global, regional, and national incidence, prevalence, and years lived with disability for 354 diseases and injuries for 195 countries and territories, 1990-2017: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2017. *Lancet* 2018; **392**(10159): 1789-858.

20. Cleary SM, Wilkinson T, Tamandjou Tchuem CR, Docrat S, Solanki GC. Cost-effectiveness of intensive care for hospitalized COVID-19 patients: experience from South Africa. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021; **21**(1): 82.

21. Kohli M, Maschio M, Becker D, Weinstein MC. The potential public health and economic value of a hypothetical COVID-19 vaccine in the United States: Use of cost-effectiveness modeling to inform vaccination prioritization. *Vaccine* 2021; **39**(7): 1157-64.<br>22. **Sassi** 

22. Sassi F. Calculating QALYs, comparing QALY and DALY calculations. *Health Policy Plan* 2006; **21**(5): 402-8.

23. Sanders GD, Neumann PJ, Basu A, et al. Recommendations for Conduct, Methodological Practices, and Reporting of Cost-effectiveness Analyses: Second Panel on Cost-Effectiveness in Health and Medicine. *Jama* 2016; **316**(10): 1093-103.