



#### Unidad de Evidencia y Deliberación para la toma de decisiones UNED



# COVID-19 Living Evidence Synthesis # 8

(Version 8.7: 14 March 2022)

### **Question**

What is the effectiveness of available COVID-19 vaccines for children and adolescents, including variants of concern?

### **Findings**

For vaccine effectiveness in variants of concern (VOC), we present a <u>visual</u> <u>summary of evidence in Table 1</u> and <u>Table 2</u>.

Methods are presented in Box 1 and in the following appendices:

- 1) reference list
- 2) glossary
- 3) data-extraction template
- 4) process for assigning variant of concern to studies
- 5) research question and critical appraisal process
- 6) <u>detailed description of the narrative</u> <u>summary statement</u>.

Overall, 33 studies were appraised and 8 used to complete this summary. The reasons for excluding the remaining 25 studies are reported in the second section of Appendix 2.

One new study has been added since the previous edition of this living evidence synthesis, which is signaled by a last updated date of 14 March 2022 (highlighted in yellow). The new study included results for VOC Omicron and VOC Delta.

### Box 1: Our approach

We retrieved candidate studies and updates to living evidence syntheses on vaccine effectiveness using the following mechanisms:

1) PubMed via COVID-19+ Evidence Alerts; 2) systematic scanning of pre-print servers; 3) updates to the COVID-END inventory of best evidence syntheses; and 4) cross-check with updates from the VESPa team. We included studies and updates to living evidence syntheses identified up to two days before the version release date. We did not include press releases unless a preprint was available. A full list of included and excluded studies is provided in **Appendix 1**. A glossary is provided in **Appendix 2**.

**Prioritized outcome measures:** Infection, severe disease (as defined by the study investigators), death, and transmission.

**Data extraction:** We prioritized variant-confirmed and vaccine-specific data over total study population data (variant assumed and/or vaccine unspecified). We extracted data from each study in duplicate using the template provided in **Appendix 3**. Relevance to VOC is determined directly, when reported by study authors, or indirectly where reasonable assumptions can be made about the variant prevalent in the jurisdiction at the time of the study as described in **Appendix 4**.

Critical appraisal: We assessed risk of bias, direction of effect, and certainty of evidence. Risk of bias: assessed in duplicate for individual studies using an adapted version of ROBINS-I. Direction of vaccine effect: "prevented" or "protects" was applied to mean estimates or range of mean estimates of effect that are greater than or equal to 50% (the lowest acceptable limit for vaccine effectiveness as determined by WHO). Certainty of evidence: assessed for the collection of studies for each vaccine according to variant of concern using a modified version of GRADE. Details of the research question for this synopsis and the critical appraisal process are provided in Appendix 5.

**Summaries:** We summarized the evidence by presenting narrative evidence profiles across studies, with or without pooling, as appropriate. A template for the summary statements used on page 1 under "Findings" and in Table 1 under each VOC is provided in **Appendix 6**.

We update this document every Wednesday and post it on the COVID-END website.

### Highlights of changes this report

• New data on Pfizer [BNT162b2] against VOC Omicron and VOC Delta has been added to Table 1 and Table 2 of one serious risk of bias study (ref 8)

### Pfizer/Comirnaty [BNT162b2]

### • VOC Delta

- We have low certainty evidence that <u>1 dose</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented infection from VOC **Delta** (59% [95% CI, 52 to 65] 1 Obs [2]) in adolescents age 12 to 18 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>1 dose</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Delta** (range of mean estimates: 70 to 76% 1 Obs [5]) in adolescents age 12 to 17 years
- We have moderate certainty evidence that <u>2 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented infection from VOC **Delta** (range of mean estimates: 90 to 92% 3 Obs [1][2][6]) in adolescents age 12 to 18 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>2 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Delta** (range of mean estimates: 87 to 96% 1 Obs [5]) in adolescents age 12 to 17 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>2 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented ICU admission from VOC **Delta** (98% [95% CI, 93 to 99] 1 Obs [4]), in adolescents age 12 to 18 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>2 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented MIS-C from VOC **Delta** (91% [95% CI, 78 to 97] 1 Obs [7]), in adolescents age 12 to 18 years

### • VOC Omicron

- We have low certainty evidence that <u>1 dose</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Omicron** (range of mean estimates: 44 to 53% 1 Obs [5]) in adolescents age 12 to 17 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>2 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Omicron** (range of mean estimates: 71 to 83% 1 Obs [<u>5</u>]) in adolescents age 12 to 17 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>3 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Omicron** (81% [95% CI, 59 to 91] 1 Obs [8]) in adolescents age 16 to 17 years

#### Overall

- We have low certainty evidence that <u>1 dose</u> BNT162b2 (Pfizer) prevented infection from SARS-CoV-2 (non dominant variant) (67% [95% CI, 50 to 78] 1 Obs [3]) in adolescents age 12 to 15 years
- We have low certainty evidence that <u>2 doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer)</u> prevented infection from SARS-CoV-2 (non dominant variant) (91% [95% CI, 88 to 93] 1 Obs [3]) in adolescents age 12 to 15 years

### • VOC Delta to Omicron

• We have low certainty evidence that <u>3 doses</u> of **BNT162b2 (Pfizer)** prevented symptomatic infection from VOC **Delta to Omicron** (86% [95% CI, 73 to 93] - 1 Obs [8]) in adolescents age 16 to 17 years

# Table 1: Visual summary of evidence for COVID-19 vaccines for variants of concern (up to 28 days after 2 doses)

**Percentages** indicate <u>level of effectiveness</u> from 0% (no effect) to 100% (full protection): ranges of estimated means are provided when  $\geq 1$  study is available; estimated mean value is provided for single studies

Colour indicates level of certainty based on the evidence

High certainty evidence	Moderate certainty evidence	Low certainty evidence
pooling of low to moderate	single RCT with low to moderate	single RCT or observational
risk of bias RCTs or pooling	risk of bias or >one observational	study with serious risk of bias
of observational studies with	study with low to moderate risk of	or multiple low to serious risk
low risk of bias and	bias and at least partially	of bias observational studies
consistent findings	consistent findings	with inconsistent findings

Outcome	Vaccine Effectiveness (2 doses unless otherwise stated)					
(and vaccine)	up to 28 days after last dose each combination of vaccine, variant, and					
	Overall	Alpha	Beta	Gamma	Delta	Omicron
Any Infection	Overan	Aipiia	Deta	Gaiiiiia	Dena	Officion
•	040/			I	00 020/	
Pfizer	91%				90 - 92%	
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
Symptomatic I	nfection					
Pfizer					87 - 96%	71 - 83%
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
Transmission						
Pfizer						
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
ICU Admission	n					
Pfizer					98%	
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
Severe Disease	(may includ	le death for s	ome studies)			
Pfizer			Í			
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
Death			•			
Pfizer						
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
			1	1	1	L

<sup>\*</sup>Single dose

<sup>\*\*</sup>mean estimate of effect less than the lowest acceptable limit for vaccine effectiveness as determined by WHO

# Table 2: Visual summary of evidence for COVID-19 vaccines for variant of concern – Delta [2 doses>28 days since last dose]

**Percentages** indicate <u>level of effectiveness</u> from 0% (no effect) to 100% (full protection): ranges of estimated means are provided when  $\geq 1$  study is available; estimated mean value is provided for single studies

Colour indicates level of certainty based on the evidence

High certainty evidence	Moderate certainty evidence	Low certainty evidence
pooling of low to moderate	single RCT with low to moderate	single RCT or observational
risk of bias RCTs or pooling	risk of bias or >one observational	study with serious risk of bias
of observational studies with	study with low to moderate risk of	or multiple low to serious risk
low risk of bias and	bias and at least partially	of bias observational studies
consistent findings	consistent findings	with inconsistent findings

Outcome (and vaccine)	Variant	Number of doses	Time since Last Dose (days)	Vaccine Effectiveness		
Any Infection	ny Infection					
Pfizer						
Moderna						
CoronaVac						
Symptomatic In	nfection					
Pfizer	Delta	1	28 to 34	61 to 63%		
			35 to 41	56 to 58%		
			42 to 55	44 to 54%		
			56 to 69	36 to 48%		
			70 to 83	35 to 46%		
			84 to 104	29 to 53%		
			105	30.9% (95% CI, 25.4 to 36.0)		
		2	35 to 69	91.5% (95% CI, 89.9 to 93.0)		
			70	83.7% (95% CI, 72.0 to 90.5)		
			14 to 149	85 to 92%		
	Omicron	1	28 to 34	33 to 42%		
			35 to 41	36 to 49%		
			42 to 55	29 to 40%		
			56 to 69	23 to 27%		
			70 to 83	16 to 27%		
			84	17 to 26%		
			105	12.5% (95% CI, 96.9 to 17.8)		
		2	35 to 69	49.5% (95% CI, 45.7 to 53.0)		

			70	22.6% (95% CI, 14.5 to 29.9)
			14 to 149	34 to 45%
Moderna				
CoronaVac				
Transmission				
Pfizer				
Moderna				
CoronaVac				
ICU Admission	ì			
Pfizer				
Moderna				
CoronaVac				
MIS-C				
Pfizer	Delta	2	28	91% (78 to 97)
Moderna				
CoronaVac				
Severe Disease	(may include	e death for so	ome studies)	
Pfizer				
Moderna				
CoronaVac				
Death	•		•	
Pfizer				
Moderna				
CoronaVac				

Table 3: Key findings about vaccine effectiveness

Vaccine	Effectiveness	Findings
Pfizer/	Delta	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
BioNTech		outcomes at least 14 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 18:
	At least 14 days	• 59% (95% CI, 52 to 65) from infection (1 Obs - [2])
Comirnaty	after 1st dose	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
FD3 7/1/4 < 01 01	&	outcomes at least 14 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 17:
[BNT162b2]	At least 7 days	• 70 to 76% (RME) from infection (1 Obs - [5])
	after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
		outcomes at 0 to 27 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 15:
		• 14.2% (95% CI, - 25.6 to 41.4) against hospitalization (1 Obs - [5])
		BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
		outcomes at 0 to 27 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 16 to 17:
		• 64.6% (95% CI, 40.7 to 78.9) against hospitalization (1 Obs - [5])
		BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
		outcomes at least 7 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 18:
		• 90 to 92% against infection (RME) (3 Obs -[1][2][6])

	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
	outcomes at least 7 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 17:
	• 87 to 96% against symptomatic infection (RME) (1 Obs -[5])
	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
	outcomes at least 14 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 18:
	• 94% (95% CI, 90 to 96) against hospitalization (1 Obs - [4])
	• 98% (95% CI, 93 to 99) from ICU admission (1 Obs - [4])
	(5 Obs) [1][2][4][5][6]; last update 2022-02-28
Delta	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta for the following
	outcomes at least 28 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 17:
>30 days after 1 <sup>st</sup>	• 76 to 83% (RME) against hospitalization (1 Obs - [5])
dose	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by
	VOC Delta the following number of days after 1st dose in
	adolescents age 12 to 17:
	• 61 to 63% (RME) – at 28 to 34 days (1 Obs - [5])
	• 56 to 58% (RME) — at 35 to 41 days (1 Obs - [5])
	• 44 to 54% (RME) – at 42 to 55 days (1 Obs - [5])
	• 36 to 48% (RME) – at 56 to 69 days (1 Obs - [5])
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	• 35 to 46% (RME) – at 70 to 83 days (1 Obs - [5])
	• 29 to 53% (RME) – at 84 to 104 days (1 Obs - [5])
	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by
	VOC Delta the following number of days after 1st dose in
	adolescents age 16 to 17:
	• 30.9% (95% CI, 25.4 to 36.0) – at least 105 days (1 Obs - [5])
	(1 Obs) [5]; last update 2022-02-28
Delta	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by
	VOC Delta for the following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in
>30 days after	adolescents age 16 to 17:
2 <sup>nd</sup> dose	• 91.5% (95% CI, 89.9 to 93.0) - at 35 to 69 days (1 Obs - [5])
	• 83.7% (95% CI, 72.0 to 90.5) - at least 70 days (1 Obs - [5])
	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by
	VOC Delta for the following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in
	adolescents age 12 to 17:
	• 85 to 92% (RME) - at 14 to 149 days (1 Obs - [8])
	BNT162b2 provided protection against MIS-C by VOC Delta the
	following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 18:
	• 91% (95% CI, 78 to 97) - at least 28 days, Median 84 days (IQR
	51–122) (1 Obs - [Z])
	(3 Obs) [5][7][8]; last update 2022-03-14
Omicron	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Omicron for the
	following outcomes at least 14 days after 1st dose in adolescents age
At least 14 days	12 to 17:
after 1 <sup>st</sup> dose	• 44 to 53% (RME) from symptomatic infection (1 Obs - [5])
&	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Omicron for the
At least 7 days	following outcomes at least 7 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age
after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose	12 to 17:
	• 71 to 83% from symptomatic infection (RME) (1 Obs -[5])
	(1 Obs) [5]; last update 2022-02-28
	(1 Obs) [2], iust apaute 2022-02-20

	Omicron Any time frame	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Omicron for the following outcomes at least 7 days after 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose in adolescents age 16 to 17:
	after 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose	• 81% (95% CI, 59 to 91) from symptomatic infection (1 Obs - [8]) (1 Obs) [8]; <i>last update</i> 2022-03-14
	Omicron	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by VOC Omicron the following number of days after 1st dose in
	>30 days after 1 <sup>st</sup> dose	adolescents age 12 to 17:
	dose	<ul> <li>33 to 42% (RME) – at 28 to 34 days (1 Obs - [5])</li> <li>36 to 49% (RME) – at 35 to 41 days (1 Obs - [5])</li> </ul>
		• 29 to 40% (RME) – at 42 to 55 days (1 Obs - [5])
		• 23 to 27% (RME) — at 56 to 69 days (1 Obs - [5])
		• 16 to 27% (RME) — at 70 to 83 days (1 Obs - [5])
		• 17 to 26% (RME) – at least 84 days (1 Obs - [5])
		BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by VOC Omicron the following number of days after 1st dose in
		adolescents age 16 to 17:  • 12.5% (95% CI, 6.9 to 17.8) – at least 105 days (1 Obs - [5])
		(1 Obs) [5]; last update 2022-02-28
	Omicron	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection from
	20.1	VOC Omicron for the following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in
	>30 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose	adolescents age 16 to 17:
Z dose		• 49.5% (95% CI, 45.7 to 53) - at 35 - 69 days (1 Obs - [5])
		<ul> <li>22.6% (95% CI, 14.5 to 29.9) - at least 70 days (1 Obs - [5])</li> <li>BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by VOC Omicron for the following number of days after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose in children age 5 to 11:</li> <li>51% (95% CI, 30 to 65) - at 14 to 67 days (1 Obs - [5])</li> <li>BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by VOC Omicron for the following number of days after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 17:</li> </ul>
		• 34 to 45% (RME) - at 14 to 149 days (1 Obs - [8])
		(2 Obs) [5][8]; last update 2022-03-14
Moderna	VOC	No data
Spikevax		
[mRNA-1723]		
AstraZeneca [ChAd0x1]	VOC	No data
Vaxzevria		
Serum Institute of India [Covishield]*		
Johnson & Johnson	VOC	No data

[AD26.COV2.S]*		
Sinovac	VOC	No data
	VOC	INO uata
[CoronaVac]		
Sinopharm	VOC	No data
(Wuhan)		
[WIV04]*		
Sinopharm		
(Beijing)		
[HBO2]		
[BBIBP-CorV]*		
Novavax	VOC	No data
NVX-	VOC	1NO data
CoV2373]*	NOC	NT 1
FBRI	VOC	No data
[EpiVacCorona]		
*		
Bharat Biotech	VOC	No data
[Covaxin]		
[BBV152]*		
Gamaleya	VOC	No data
[Sputnik V]		
[Gam-COVID-		
Vac]*		
, acj		

	Studies Covering Time Frame for More than One VOC			
Vaccine	Effectiveness	Findings		
Pfizer/	Overall	BNT162b2 provided protection for the following outcomes at least		
BioNTech		14 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 15:		
		• 67% (95% CI, 50 to 78) from infection (1 Obs - [3])		
Comirnaty		• 100% (95% CI, 100 to 100) from hospitalization (1 Obs - [3])		
FD3 71714 (64 63		BNT162b2 provided protection for the following outcomes at least		
[BNT162b2]		7 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 15:		
		• 91% (95% CI, 88 to 93) from infection (1 Obs - [3])		
		• 81% (95% CI, -55 to 98) from hospitalization (1 Obs - [3])		
		(1 Obs) [3]; last update 2021-12-13		
	Delta to	BNT162b2 provided protection against hospitalization by VOC		
	Omicron	Delta to Omicron for the following number of days after $2^{nd}$ dose		
		in children age 5 to 11:		
	>30 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup>	• 74% (95% CI, -35 to 95) - at 14 to 67 days (1 Obs - [8])		
	dose	BNT162b2 provided protection against hospitalization by VOC		
		Delta to Omicron for the following number of days after <u>2<sup>nd</sup> dose</u>		
		in adolescents age 12 to 17:		
		• 92 to 94% (RME) - at 14 to 149 days (1 Obs - [8])		
		BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by		
		VOC Delta to Omicron for the following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup>		
		dose in children age 5 to 11:		
		• 46% (95% CI, 24 to 61) - at 14 to 67 days (1 Obs - [8])		

	BNT162b2 provided protection against symptomatic infection by VOC Delta to Omicron for the following number of days after 2 <sup>nd</sup>		
	dose in adolescents age 12 to 17:		
	• 76 to 83% (RME) - at 14 to 149 days (1 Obs - [8])		
	(1 Obs) [8]; last update 2022-03-14		
Delta to	BNT162b2 provided protection against VOC Delta to Omicron for		
Omicron	the following outcomes at least 7 days after 3rd dose in adolescents		
	age 16 to 17:		
Any time frame	• 86% (95% CI, 73 to 93) from symptomatic infection (1 Obs - [8])		
after 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose	(1 Obs) [8]; last update 2022-03-14		

Links to references are provided in Appendix 1

Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization. Pharmacovigilance for COVID-19 Vaccines. <a href="https://covid-19pharmacovigilance.paho.org">https://covid-19pharmacovigilance.paho.org</a>

\*As of the date of publication, these vaccines have not been approved for the population of children and adolescents.

Flórez ID<sup>1,2</sup>, Velásquez-Salazar P¹, Martínez JC¹, Linkins L³, Abdelkader W³, Iorio A³, Lavis J³, Patiño-Lugo DF¹. COVID-19 living evidence synthesis #8 (version 7): What is the effectiveness of available COVID-19 vaccines in children and adolescents in general and specifically for variants of concern? Evidence and Deliberation Unit for Decision Making (UNED), University of Antioquia & Health Information Research Unit (HIRU), McMaster University, 14 March 2022.

To help Canadian decision-makers as they respond to unprecedented challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic, COVID-END in Canada is preparing rapid evidence responses like this one. The development and continued updating of this living evidence synthesis has been funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) and the Public Health Agency of Canada. The opinions, results, and conclusions are those of the team that prepared the living evidence synthesis, and independent of the Government of Canada, CIHR and the Public Health Agency of Canada. No endorsement by the Government of Canada, CIHR or Public Health Agency of Canada is intended or should be inferred.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Faculty of Medicine, University of Antioquia, Colombia

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> School of Rehabilitation Science, McMaster University, Canada

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University, Canada

Appendix 1: Summary of Study Findings and Appraisals

	Section 1: included studies								
Ref	Author	Bottom line	ROBINS- I*	Design, Notes					
	*Note: ROBINS-I score risk of bias: Low risk of bias indicates high quality								
1	Glatman- Freedman	BNT162b2 showed VE 91.5% (95% CI, 88.2 to 93.9) against infection at least 8 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 15 years. There were no deaths in either group.	Serious	Population cohort in Israel of adolescents age 12 to 15 years; 2,034,591 vaccinated persondays and 13,623,714 unvaccinated person-days; time and setting for VOC Delta <i>Included in LES 8.1</i>					
2	Reis	BNT162b2 showed VE 59% (95% CI, 52 to 65) against infection 14 to 20 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 18.  BNT162b2 showed VE 90% (95% CI, 88 to 92) against infection 7 to 21 days after 2nd dose in adolescents age 12 to 18.	Moderate	Case-control study in Israel; 94,354 vaccinated matched to 94,354 unvaccinated adolescents age 12 to 18; time and setting for VOC Delta Included in LES 8.1					
3	Tartof	BNT162b2 showed VE 67% (95% CI, 50 to 78) against infection and VE 100% (95% CI, 100 to 100) against hospitalization at least +14 days after 1st dose in adolescents age 12 to 15 years.  BNT162b2 showed VE 91% (95% CI, 88 to 93) against infection and VE 81% (95% CI, -55 to 98) against hospitalization at least +7 days after 2nd dose in adolescents age 12 to 15 years.	Moderate	Retrospective Cohort in USA of 3,436,957 Kaiser Permanente Southern California (KPSC) healthcare system members ≥12 years of age between Dec 14, 2020 – Aug 8, 2021. The cohort included 122,779 adolescents age 12 to 15 years.  The primary exposure was being fully vaccinated, defined as receiving 2 doses of BNT162b2 with ≥ 7 days after the second dose.  Over the study period, 28.4% of 9,147 specimens sent for whole genome sequencing (WGS) and viral lineage designation were Delta. <i>Included in LES 8.1 last update 2022-01-04</i>					
4	Olson	BNT162b2 showed VE 94% (95% CI, 90 to 96) against hospitalization at least +14 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 18 years.  BNT162b2 showed VE 95% (95% CI, 88 to 97) in adolescents age 12 to 15 years and VE 94% (95% CI, 88 to 97) in	Moderate	Test-negative study in U.S of adolescents age 12 to 18 years between Jun 1–Oct 25, 2021; 299 fully vaccinated (receipt of 2 doses of BNT162b2 vaccine, with the second dose administered ≥14 days before illness onset), 55 partially					

		adolescents age 16 to 18 years against		vaccinated (had received only one dose of vaccine or who had
		hospitalization at least +14 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup>		received a second dose less than
		dose.		
		RNT162b2 showed VE 080/ (050/ CL 02		14 days before illness onset) and
		BNT162b2 showed VE 98% (95% CI, 93		868 unvaccinated (no receipt of
		to 99) against ICU admission at least +14 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12		any COVID-19 vaccine before illness onset), time and setting
		to 18 years.		for VOC Delta.
		to 10 years.		Included in LES 8.2
				last update in LES 8.3
5	Powell	BNT162b2 showed after 1st dose VE	Moderate	Test-negative case-control
	1 OWCH	74.5% (95% CI, 73.2 to 75.6) at 14-20	Moderate	design in England of
		days, VE 63.4% (95% CI, 61.7 to 65.1) at		adolescents age 12-17 years
		28-34 days, VE 47.5% (95% CI, 44.9 to		from week 37, 2021 onwards;
		49.9) at 56-69 days, and VE 53.1% (95%		there were 617,259 eligible tests
		CI, 41.6 to 62.4) at least 84 days, in		for 12-15-year-olds and 225,670
		adolescents age 12 to 15 years against		for 16-17-year-olds.
		infection. (VOC Delta)		Symptomatic 12-15-year-olds
		integration († 6 6 2 cm)		and 16-17-year-olds with PCR-
		BNT162b2 showed after 1st dose VE		confirmed SARS-COV-2
		49.6% (95% CI, 43.9 to 54.8) at 14-20		infection was compared with
		days, VE 42.1% (95% CI, 36.7 to 46.9) at		vaccination status in
		28-34 days, VE 22.5% (95% CI, 19.1 to		symptomatic adolescents in the
		25.8) at 56-69 days, and VE 17.2% (95%		same age-groups who had a
		CI, 12.0 to 22.1) at least 84 days, in		negative SARS-COV-2 PCR
		adolescents age 12 to 15 years against		test, time and setting for VOC
		infection. (VOC Omicron)		Delta.
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		All cases prior to week 48 were
		BNT162b2 showed after <u>1<sup>st</sup> dose</u> VE		defined as Delta, unless S gene
		75.9% (95% CI, 74.3 to 77.3) at 14-20		target failure (SGTF),
		days, VE 60.6% (95% CI, 58.1 to 62.9) at		genotyping or sequencing
		28-34 days, VE 36.3% (95% CI, 33.1 to		information confirmed
		39.3) at 56-69 days, VE 29.3% (95% CI,		otherwise. Tests were defined as
		25.9 to 32.6) at 84-104 days, and VE		Omicron from week 48
		30.9% (95% CI, 25.4 to 36.0) at least 105		onwards using SGTF,
		days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years		genotyping or sequencing
		against infection. (VOC Delta)		information.  Included in LES 8.2
		BNT162b2 showed after 1st dose VE		Updated in LES 8.6
		51.4% (95% CI, 42.7 to 58.8) at 14-20		
		days, VE 33% (95% CI, 18.6 to 44.9) at		
		28-34 days, VE 26.6% (95% CI, 17.4 to		
		34.8) at 56-69 days, VE 20.5% (95% CI,		
		13.0 to 27.3) at 84-104 days, and VE		
		12.5% (95% CI, 6.9 to 17.8) at least 105		
		days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years		
		against infection. (VOC Omicron)		
		BNT162b2 showed after <u>2<sup>nd</sup> dose</u> VE		
		93.2% (95% CI, 81.5 to 97.5) at 7-13 days		

		and VE 87.2% (95% CI, 73.7 to 93.8) at least 14 days in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against infection. (VOC Delta)		
		BNT162b2 showed after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose VE 83.1% (95% CI, 78.2 to 86.9) at 7-13 days and VE 73% (95% CI, 66.4 to 78.3) at least 14 days in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against infection. (VOC Omicron)		
		BNT162b2 showed after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose VE 93.1% (95% CI, 91.6 to 94.4) at 7-13 days, VE 96.1% (95% CI, 95.2 to 96.8) at 14-34 days, VE 91.5% (95% CI, 89.9 to 93.0) at 35-69 days, and VE 83.7% (95% CI, 72.0 to 90.5) at least 70 days in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against infection. (VOC Delta)		
		BNT162b2 showed after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose VE 76.1% (95% CI, 73.4 to 78.6) at 7-13 days, VE 71.3% (95% CI, 69.3 to 73.1) at 14-34 days, VE 49.5% (95% CI, 45.7 to 53.0) at 35-69 days, and VE 22.6% (95% CI, 14.5 to 29.9) at least 70 days in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against infection. (VOC Omicron)		
		BNT162b2 showed after 1st dose VE 14.2% (95% CI, -25.6 to 41.4) at 0-27 days, and VE 83.4% (95% CI, 54.0 to 94.0) at least 28 days in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against hospitalization. (VOC Delta)		
		BNT162b2 showed after 1st dose VE 64.6% (95% CI, 40.7 to 78.9) at 0-27 days, and VE 76.3% (95% CI, 61.1 to 85.6) at least 28 days in adolescents age 16 to 18 years against hospitalization. (VOC Delta)		
6	Lutrick	BNT162b2 showed VE 92% (95% CI, 79 to 97) against infection at least +14 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 17 years.	Moderate	Prospective cohort in Arizona, of 243 adolescents aged 12–17 years between Jul 25 - Dec 4, 2021; 21,693 vaccinated persondays and 4,288 unvaccinated person-days; time and setting for VOC Delta.  Included in LES 8.3

7	Zambrano	BNT162b2 showed VE 91% (95% CI, 78 to 97) against MIS-C at least +28 days after 2 <sup>nd</sup> dose in adolescents age 12 to 18 years.	Moderate	Test-negative case-control design in 24 pediatric hospitals in 20 states of U.S among hospitalized patients aged 12–18 years between Jul 1–Dec 9, 2021; 283 participants; VE was assessed by comparing the odds of antecedent vaccination in 102 patients with MIS-C (case patients) and 181 patients in two groups of hospitalized controls (test-negative and syndromenegative) matched to casepatients; time and setting for VOC Delta. <i>Included in LES 8.3</i>
8	Klein	BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 74% (95% CI, -35 to 95) at 14-67 days, in children age 5 to 11 years against hospitalization. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 92% (95% CI, 79 to 97) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against hospitalization. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 94% (95% CI, 87 to 97) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against hospitalization. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 46% (95% CI, 24 to 61) at 14-67 days, in children age 5 to 11 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 83% (95% CI, 80 to 85) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 83% (95% CI, 80 to 85) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta to Omicron)  BNT162b2 showed after 2nd dose VE 76% (95% CI, 71 to 80) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta to Omicron)	Serious	Test-negative case-control design in 10 states of the U.S among 39,217 emergency department (ED) and urgent care (UC) encounters and 1,699 hospitalizations among persons aged 5–17 years with COVID-19–like illness during April 9, 2021– January 29, 2022. VE was estimated comparing the odds of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result between vaccinated (received at least 2 doses ≥14 days earlier or 3 doses ≥7 days earlier) and unvaccinated (received no doses) patients; time and setting for VOC Delta and VOC Omicron.  Included in LES 8.7

BNT162b2 showed after 3<sup>rd</sup> dose VE 86% (95% CI, 73 to 93) at least 7 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta to Omicron)

BNT162b2 showed after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose VE 92% (95% CI, 89 to 94) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta)

BNT162b2 showed after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose VE 85% (95% CI, 81 to 89) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Delta)

BNT162b2 showed after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose VE 51% (95% CI, 30 to 65) at 14-67 days, in children age 5 to 11 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Omicron)

BNT162b2 showed after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose VE 45% (95% CI, 30 to 57) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 12 to 15 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Omicron)

BNT162b2 showed after 2<sup>nd</sup> dose VE 34% (95% CI, 8 to 53) at 14-149 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Omicron)

BNT162b2 showed after 3<sup>rd</sup> dose VE 81% (95% CI, 59 to 91) at least 7 days, in adolescents age 16 to 17 years against symptomatic infection. (VOC Omicron)

Section 2: excluded studies					
Author	Reason for exclusion	Version of exclusion			
Tang	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years	Excluded in LES 8.1			
<u>Naleway</u>	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.1			
Chadeau-Hyam round 14	Vaccine effectiveness not reported	Excluded in LES 8.1			
de Gier	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.2			
Delahoy	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.2			
<u>Lin</u>	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years	Excluded in LES 8.2*			
McLean	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years	Excluded in LES 8.2			
Chadeau-Hyam round 15 final report	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.2			
Chung	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years, Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.3*			
<u>Fisman</u>	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years	Excluded in LES 8.3			
Lyngse	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.3			
<u>Prunas</u>	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.3			
Chiew	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.3			
Elliot	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.4			
New York State Department of Health	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.4			
Andeweg	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.5			
<u>Jalali</u>	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.5*			
Choe	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.6			
<u>Britton</u>	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.6			
<u>Madhi</u>	Did not report the vaccine effectiveness in <18 years	Excluded in LES 8.6			
<u>Dorabawila</u>	Critical risk of bias	Excluded in LES 8.6			
<u>De Serres</u>	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.7			
Nyberg	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.7			
<u>Hoeg</u>	Clinical outcomes of interest for this LES not reported	Excluded in LES 8.7			
Levi	Did not report results according to vaccine type	Excluded in LES 8.7			

<sup>\*</sup> For this studies links have been updated after their exclusion

## Appendix 2: Glossary (revised 13 Jan 2022)

AZ: AstraZeneca

**Alpha**: variant of concern B.1.1.7

Beta: variant of concern B.1.351

Delta: variant of concern B.1.617.2

Gamma: variant of concern P.1

**Epsilon:** variant of concern B.1.427/B.1.429

MIS-C: Multisystem inflammatory syndrome in children

MOD: Moderna

**Obs:** observational study

OR: odds ratio

**PF**: Pfizer

RME: range of mean estimates across 2 or more studies

**VE (Vaccine effectiveness):** measure of how well a vaccine protects people from getting the outcome of interest in real-world practice (For example: VE of 92% against infection means that 92% of people will be protected from becoming infected with COVID and 8% of people will still be at risk of becoming infected with COVID)

VET: vaccine effectiveness against transmission

**VOC:** variant of concern

**VOI:** variant of interest

# Appendix 3: Data-extraction template (revised 13 Jan 2022)

Vaccine product	
Source	First author of study
Link	DOI or PubMed ID
Date published	in format YYYY/MM/DD or preprint
Country	
Funding	public or industry
Study details	
Study type	RCT/cohort/data-linkage/test-negative/case-control/other
Surveillance	routine screening Y or N
Intervention	Pfizer/Comirnaty [BNT162b2]/Moderna/Spikevax [mRNA-1273]/AstraZeneca/Vaxzevria [ChAdOx1]/Johnson & Johnson [AD26.COV2.S]/Sinovac [CoronaVac]/Sinopharm (Wuhan) [WIV04]/Novavax [NVX-CoV2373]/FBRI [EpiVacCorona]/Bharat Biotech [Covaxin] [BBV152]/Gamaleya [Sputnik V] [Gam-COVID-Vac]
Dose and timing	
Control group	not vaccinated, <7day vaccinated internal control, none, other
Total (N)	number of all study participants
Female	number or %
< 12 years	number or %
≥ 12 years	number or %
Outcomes	outcomes separated by VOC type
Outcomes	confirmed infection/asymptomatic/mild symptomatic/severe symptoms/hospitalized/ICU/death/MIS-C
1st Dose VE	VE with 95% CI
Days post 1st dose	days post 1st dose when VE provided
2nd Dose VE	VE with 95% CI
Days post 2nd dose	days post 2nd dose when VE provided
Rates per X person- days/years	vaccinated vs control
HR	vaccinated vs control
RR	vaccinated vs control
Adjusted	Regression, stratification, matching and associated variables
Transmission	infection rates in unvaccinated contacts of vaccinated individuals
Critical appraisal	See Appendix 5

### Appendix 4: Process for assigning Variant of Concern to studies

A Variant of Concern is considered to be the dominant (≥50%) strain in a study if any of the following conditions apply:

- i) the authors make a statement about prevalence of VOC during the study time frame
- ii) time and setting of the study is consistent with a VOC being dominant according to the following open tracking sources:

Nextstrain. Real-time tracking of pathogen evolution. <a href="https://nextstrain.org/">https://nextstrain.org/</a> Outbreak Info. <a href="https://outbreak.info/location-reports">https://outbreak.info/location-reports</a>

### Appendix 5: Research question and critical appraisal process (revised 13 Jan 2022)

Review question:

Participants	People aged under 18 years at risk of COVID-19 (usually without but sometimes with previous COVID-19 infection)			
Intervention	COVID-19 Vaccine			
Comparator	Unvaccinated children and adolescents (*)			
Outcomes	PCR-diagnosis of COVID-19 infection; symptomatic disease; hospital/ICU			
admission; death; transmission; MIS-C				

<sup>(\*)</sup> Eligible studies must have a comparison group (unvaccinated; non-immune period; time since vaccination; 2 doses vs 3 doses); before-after studies, where the infection rate in the first 2 weeks after the vaccination are used as control are commonly performed and may be appraised

### Key exclusion criteria

Studies that address the question of interest but from which the information of children cannot be separated from that of adults.

Comparison of one vaccine vs another (e.g., relative effectiveness) is not eligible. Studies reporting only antibody responses are excluded.

### **Critical Appraisal Process**

We appraise the quality of the individual studies using an adapted version of ROBINS-I. This tool classifies the Risk of Bias of a study as **Low, Moderate, Serious, Critical, or No Information**. <u>Low Risk of Bias indicates High Quality, and Critical Risk of Bias indicates Very Low (insufficient) Quality.</u> ROBINS-I appraises 7 bias domains and judges each study against an ideal reference randomized controlled trial. To improve the utility of ROBINS-I for assessing studies reporting vaccine effectiveness, we have focused on study characteristics that introduce bias as reported in the vaccine literature. (WHO. Evaluation of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness. Interim Guidance. 17 March 2021). Studies rated as "critical" risk of bias will not be included in the Summary statements on Page 1-2 (exception: if limited data available for an outcome for a VOC). An overall judgement of "serious" or "critical" is given when the study is judged to be at serious or critical risk of bias in at least one domain or "serious" in 3 separate ROBINS-I domains.

VE Study	Description
Characteristics that	
may introduce bias	
Study design	In cohort studies, people who get vaccinated may differ in health-
	seeking behaviour from people who do not get vaccinated; using a
ROBINS-I: Bias in	test-negative study design minimizes this type of bias
selection of participants	
into study	Examples and typical judgement:
·	• test-negative design with a clearly defined symptomatic study population (low)
	• test-negative design (mixed or unclear study population) or case- control or cohort design or data-linkage with no concerns (moderate)
	• cross-sectional design or case-control (concerns about whether controls had same access to vaccines/risk of exposure to COVID or unclear) or cohort design (concerns that exposed and

Serious		non-exposed were not drawn from the same population)		
Questionnaires are prone to recollection bias; Population databases developed for purpose of tracking COVID vaccines minimize this type of bias in classification of interventions				
developed for purpose of tracking COVID vaccines minimize this type of bias    ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions	Method for confirming	Questionnaires are prone to recollection bias; Population databases		
type of bias  type of bias or study type obtain thout confirmation by an additional method (e.g., without patient whout individual level data of one of understey on on-COVID propose by thout individual level data (scious)  on or unclear description of database type (critical)  Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period	vaccination			
Examples and typical judgement:   database linkage study (low)   Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (e.g., registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)   Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (serious)   Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)   Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes   ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions				
<ul> <li>database linkage study (low)</li> <li>Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (e.g., registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)</li> <li>Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (serious)</li> <li>Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)</li> <li>Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Assignment of infection start date</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>To or unclear description of database type (critical)</li> <li>Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms</li> </ul> </li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>**ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>**ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>**ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>**GOBINS-I: Bias in classification of int</li></ul>	ROBINS-I: Bias in	71		
<ul> <li>database linkage study (low)</li> <li>Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (e.g., registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)</li> <li>Questionnaire without confirmation by an additional method (serious)</li> <li>Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)</li> <li>Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Assignment of infection start date</li> <li>database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (scrious)</li> <li>no or unclear description of database type (critical)</li> <li>Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time</li> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>R</li></ul>	classification of	Examples and typical judgement:		
<ul> <li>Questionnaire with confirmation by an additional method (e.g., registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)</li> <li>Questionnaire without confirmation by an additional method (scrious)</li> <li>Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)</li> <li>Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Assignment of infection start date</li> <li>Classification of interventions</li> <li>To or unclear description of database type (critical)</li> <li>Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms</li> </ul> </li> <li>Verification of symptoms</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom set reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom set reduces risk of patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no informa</li></ul></li></ul>	interventions			
registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)  • Questionnaire without confirmation by an additional method (serious)  • Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)  Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date reduces risk of misclassification of infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period, of symptoms  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of interventions  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine				
Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)   Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes   ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions   • database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (moderate)   • database for non-COVID purpose without individual level data (serious)		registry) of at least a subset of study population (moderate)		
<ul> <li>Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone (critical)</li> <li>Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes</li> <li>Catabase for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (moderate)</li> <li>database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (serious) interventions</li> <li>Assignment of infection start date</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test</li> </ul> </li> <li>Verification of interventions</li> <li>Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> <li>reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		Questionnaire without confirmation by an additional method		
Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date (serious)  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date (serious)  Examples and typical judgement:  • database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (serious)  • no or unclear description of database type (critical)  Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Fospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias		(serious)		
Databases used for retrieval of COVID test results, participant prognostic factors, and clinical outcomes  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (c.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom onset reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Framples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)		Estimating vaccination status based on surveillance data alone		
to bias due to missing information and misclassification  Examples and typical judgement:  outcomes  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms  Verification of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom onset reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Fixamples and typical judgement:  using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias		(critical)		
Examples and typical judgement:   Catabase for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (moderate)	Databases used for			
Examples and typical judgement:   • database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (moderate)   • database for non-COVID purpose without individual level data (moderate)   • database for non-COVID purpose without individual level data (serious)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • no or unclear description of database type (critical)   • using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of missassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time   Examples and typical judgement:   using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)   using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test	retrieval of COVID test	to bias due to missing information and misclassification		
<ul> <li>database for non-COVID purpose but with individual level data (moderate)</li> <li>database for non-COVID purpose without individual level data (moderate)</li> <li>database for non-COVID purpose without individual level data (serious)</li> <li>no or unclear description of database type (critical)</li> <li>Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:</li> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:</li> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> <li>Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias</li> </ul>	results, participant			
(moderate)	prognostic factors, and			
<ul> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Assignment of infection start date infection start date</li> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Verification of symptoms         <ul> <li>ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:</li> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine</li> </ul>	clinical outcomes			
classification of interventions  Assignment of infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
Assignment of infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  • no or unclear description of database type (critical)  Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date reduces risk of misclassification bias (e.g., vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias		± ±		
Using date of symptom onset (if within 10 days of testing) as infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms  Verification of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
infection start date  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms  Verification of symptoms  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
vaccinated participant who is reported as COVID+ may have been infected prior to receiving the vaccine or during non-immune period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time    Examples and typical judgement:     using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)     using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test     Examples and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Examples and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Females and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Females and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Females and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Females and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)     Females and typical judgement:     Using a more date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptoms or reduces risk of false-negative COVID is not an outcome (no information)	C			
ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias	infection start date			
classification of interventions    Examples and typical judgement:   • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)   • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)    Verification of symptoms   Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test    Examples and typical judgement:   • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)   • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)     Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine   Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias   Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period   Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune   Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune   Reported absence of vaccine   Reported absence of vaccine   Reported absence   Re				
Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Accounting for nonimmune period (first 14 days after first vaccine				
Examples and typical judgement:  • using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias		period) and sensitivity of assays decreases over time		
<ul> <li>using a PCR positive test that was part of an ongoing standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)</li> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>Verification of symptoms</li> <li>Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine</li> </ul>	interventions			
standardized monitoring system (e.g., within a health network) (low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
(low)  • using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Verification of symptoms  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test  ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
<ul> <li>using sample date without interview or documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>Verification of symptoms</li> <li>Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test</li> <li>Examples and typical judgement:         <ul> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> </ul> </li> <li>Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine</li> </ul>				
confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test    Examples and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)   if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)    Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
disease only) (serious)  Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test    Examples and typical judgement:     using sample date without patient report / documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)   if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)    Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
Verification of symptoms       Prospective, standardized collection of symptoms from patients reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test         ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions       Examples and typical judgement: <ul> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> </ul> Accounting for non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
reduces risk of missing information bias; testing within 10 days after symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test    Examples and typical judgement:	Verification of			
symptom onset reduces risk of false-negative COVID test    Covid test				
ROBINS-I: Bias in classification of interventions  Examples and typical judgement:  • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine	oymptoms			
Examples and typical judgement:   • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)   • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)    Accounting for non-immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine   days and typical judgement:   • using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)   • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)   Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias	ROBINS-I: Bias in	of the first reduced flow of false negative 60 vito test		
<ul> <li>using sample date without patient report/ documented confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)</li> <li>if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)</li> <li>Accounting for nonimmune period (first 14 days after first vaccine</li> </ul>		Examples and typical judgement:		
confirmation of symptoms ≤ 10 days (relevant for symptomatic disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Accounting for non- immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine				
disease only) (serious)  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Accounting for non- immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine				
• if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Accounting for non- immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine  • if symptomatic COVID is not an outcome (no information)  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
Accounting for non- immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine  Reported absence of vaccine effect during non-immune period reduces risk of residual confounding bias				
immune period (first 14 days after first vaccine reduces risk of residual confounding bias	Accounting for non-			
days after first vaccine	immune period (first 14			
· ·	days after first vaccine			
	dose)	Example/common case:		
	<u> </u>			

ROBINS-I: Bias due to	presence of an effect during non-immune period or result not		
confounding	reported (moderate)		
	<ul> <li>unclear that non-immune period was considered (serious)</li> </ul>		
Inclusion of	Exclusion (or separate analysis) of participants with prior COVID		
participants with prior	infection reduces concern about differences in infectivity as well as		
COVID infection	risk-taking and health-seeking behaviour		
	non taking and nearth seeking seekivoor		
ROBINS-I: Bias due to	Examples and typical judgement:		
confounding	• inclusion of prior infection status as a covariate in the models		
	(moderate)		
	previously infected not excluded or analyzed separately (serious)		
Accounting for	Accounting for calendar time reduces bias due to differences in		
calendar time	vaccine accessibility and risk of exposure over time		
	The state of the s		
ROBINS-I: Bias due to	Examples and typical judgement:		
confounding (time-	• use of time-varying statistics without explicit mention of		
varying confounding)	adjustment for calendar time (moderate)		
, ,	• not taken into account but short-time frame (e.g., ≤2 months)		
	(serious)		
	• not taken into account and time frame >2 months (critical)		
Adjustment for	Adjustment for prognostic factors for COVID infection, severity of		
prognostic factors	disease, and vaccination, such as age, gender, race, ethnicity,		
	socioeconomic factors, occupation (HCW, LTC), and chronic		
ROBINS-I: Bias due to	medical conditions		
confounding			
	Examples and typical judgement:		
	• no or insufficient adjustment for occupation (or number of tests		
	as a surrogate for exposure risk) -exception age>65 or LTCF		
	resident (moderate)		
	• no or insufficient adjustment for socioeconomic factors (or		
	neighborhood or income as a surrogate), race, ethnicity (serious)		
	• no or insufficient adjustment for age (any study population) or		
Tastina fue a succession	chronic medical conditions (LTC)(critical)		
Testing frequency	Similar frequency of testing between groups reduces risk of bias		
ROBINS-I: Bias in	introduced by detecting asymptomatic infection in one group but		
measurement of	not in another (e.g., when only one group undergoes surveillance		
	screening)		
outcomes	Examples and typical judgement:		
	<ul> <li>no systematic screening but consistent methods for detection in</li> </ul>		
	one group vs. the other, e.g., within health networks (moderate)		
	<ul> <li>screening performed for a subset of both study groups (serious)</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>screening performed routinely in one study group but not in the</li> </ul>		
	other (critical)		
	outer (efficial)		

### Appendix 6: Detailed description of the narrative summary statement (revised 13 Jan 2022)

We include studies with the following clinical outcomes: prevention of infection, MIS-C, severe disease (as defined by the study investigators), hospitalization, death, and prevention of transmission. These outcomes were selected because they are less susceptible to bias, or they are important for parents and patients. If data are not available for these specific outcomes, but are available for symptomatic infection, data for these additional outcomes are provided temporarily.

We aim at providing a lay language, standardized summary statement for each combination of vaccine and VOC for which we found evidence.

Where <u>more than one study</u> was found, we will provide a summary statement with a <u>range of the</u> estimates across the studies.

Where a <u>single study</u> provided data, we will provide the <u>estimate plus 95% confidence interval</u> for that study. As additional studies are added, the estimate plus confidence interval will be replaced by a range as described above.

In the summaries, "prevented" or "protects" will be applied to mean estimates or range of mean estimates that are greater than or equal to 50%.

# Appendix 7: Table 1b. Visual summary of evidence for COVID-19 vaccines overall and for variants of concern (Moderate to Low Risk of Bias Studies compared to All studies)

Top orange row = moderate or low ROB studies only

Bottom yellow row = serious ROB studies only

Outcome	Va	Vaccine Effectiveness (2 doses unless otherwise stated) for						
(and		each combination of vaccine, variant, and outcome						
vaccine)	_							
	Overall	Alpha	Beta	Gamma	Delta	Omicron		
Any Infection	1							
Pfizer	91%				90 to 92%			
	(1 Obs – ref 3)				(2 Obs – ref 2,6)			
	Same single				91.5%			
	study				(1 Obs - ref 1)			
Moderna								
CoronaVac								
Symptomatic	Infection				<u> </u>			
Pfizer					Same single	Same single		
					study	study		
					87 to 96%	71 to 83%		
					(1 Obs - ref 5)	(1 Obs - ref 5)		
Moderna								
CoronaVac								
Transmission	1					T		
Pfizer								
Moderna								
CoronaVac								
ICU Admissi	on			1				
Pfizer					98%			
					(1 Obs - ref 4) Same single			
Moderna					study			
CoronaVac								
	no (may in also de	dooth for or	no otudica)					
	se (may include	ueam for son	ne studies)	T	T			
Pfizer								
Moderna CoronaVac	+							
						<u> </u>		
Death	1	T						
Pfizer								
Moderna								
CoronaVac	o of offert less the		agantabla lim	1	effortive manage	<u> </u>		

<sup>\*\*</sup>mean estimate of effect less than the lowest acceptable limit for vaccine effectiveness as determined by WHO

### Notes:

Comparing Table 1 with Table 1b allows you to see whether it is an RCT or multiple Obs studies that determined the "moderate certainty of evidence" rating on Table 1