

## BRIEF REPORT

# Effectiveness of BA.1- and BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent COVID-19 mRNA vaccines against symptomatic SARS-cov-2 infection during the BA.5-dominant period in Japan

Takeshi Arashiro,<sup>1-4\*</sup> Yuzo Arima,<sup>1</sup> Jin Kuramochi,<sup>5,6</sup> Hirokazu Muraoka,<sup>7</sup> Akihiro Sato,<sup>8</sup> Kumi Chubachi,<sup>9</sup> Atsushi Yanai,<sup>10</sup> Hiroko Arioka,<sup>10</sup> Yuki Uehara,<sup>11,12</sup> Genei Ihara,<sup>13</sup> Yasuyuki Kato,<sup>14</sup> Naoki Yanagisawa,<sup>15</sup> Akihiro Ueda,<sup>16</sup> Hideaki Kato,<sup>17</sup> Hideaki Oka,<sup>18</sup> Yusuke Nishida,<sup>18</sup> Yuki Nidaira,<sup>5</sup> Takahiro Asami,<sup>19</sup> Torahiko Jinta,<sup>20</sup> Akira Nakamura,<sup>21</sup> Kunihiro Oba,<sup>22</sup> Daisuke Taniyama,<sup>23</sup> Kei Yamamoto,<sup>18</sup> Katsushi Tanaka,<sup>17</sup> Kankuro Ueshima,<sup>24</sup> Tetsuji Fuwa,<sup>24</sup> Ashley Stucky,<sup>1</sup> Tadaki Suzuki,<sup>2</sup> Chris Smith,<sup>3,4</sup> Martin Hibberd,<sup>3</sup> Koya Ariyoshi,<sup>4</sup> Motoi Suzuki<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Center for Surveillance, Immunization, and Epidemiologic Research, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>2</sup>Department of Pathology, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>3</sup>Faculty of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, United Kingdom; <sup>4</sup>School of Tropical Medicine and Global Health, Nagasaki University, Nagasaki, Japan; <sup>5</sup>Kuramochi Clinic Interpark, Tochigi, Japan; <sup>6</sup>Department of Global Health Promotion, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>7</sup>CLINIC FOR Tamachi, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>8</sup>KARADA Internal Medicine Clinic, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>9</sup>Chubachi Internal Respiratory Medicine Clinic, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>10</sup>Department of General Internal Medicine, St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>11</sup>Department of Clinical Laboratory, St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>12</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Fujita Health University School of Medicine, Aichi, Japan; <sup>13</sup>Machida Ekimae Naika Clinic, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>14</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, International University of Health

\*Corresponding author: Takeshi Arashiro, Center for Surveillance, Immunization, and Epidemiologic Research, National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Toyama 1-23-1, Shinjuku, Tokyo 162-8640, Japan, Tel: +81-3-5285-1111; Fax: +81-3-5285-1189, E-mail: [arashirot@niid.go.jp](mailto:arashirot@niid.go.jp)

© The Author(s) 2023. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Infectious Diseases Society of America. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial reproduction and distribution of the work, in any medium, provided the original work is not altered or transformed in any way, and that the work is properly cited. For commercial re-use, please contact [journals.permissions@oup.com](mailto:journals.permissions@oup.com)

and Welfare Narita Hospital, Chiba, Japan; <sup>15</sup>Yanagisawa Clinic, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>16</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Japanese Red Cross Medical Center, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>17</sup>Infection Prevention and Control Department, Yokohama City University Hospital, Yokohama, Japan; <sup>18</sup>Department of General Internal Medicine and Infectious Diseases, Saitama Medical Center, Saitama, Japan; <sup>19</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Sano Kosei General Hospital, Tochigi, Japan; <sup>20</sup>Department of Pulmonary Medicine, St. Luke's International Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>21</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Asahi General Hospital, Chiba, Japan; <sup>22</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Showa General Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>23</sup>Department of Infectious Diseases, Showa General Hospital, Tokyo, Japan; <sup>24</sup>NATURALI Co., Ltd, Tokyo, Japan

In this multi-center prospective test-negative case-control study in Japan, the effectiveness of both BA.1-containing and BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent COVID-19 mRNA vaccines against symptomatic infection during the BA.5-dominant period was high compared to no vaccination (65% and 76%) and moderate compared to monovalent vaccines administered over half a year before (46% combined).

**Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; test-negative design; vaccine effectiveness; SARS-CoV-2 variants

## INTRODUCTION

Although mRNA vaccines against COVID-19 initially showed high efficacy and effectiveness, waning immunity and the repeated emergence of variants with immune escape capacity caused concern [1]. To combat this, bivalent vaccines containing mRNA coding for the ancestral strain and either Omicron subvariant BA.1 or BA.4/BA.5 were developed by both Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna. In Japan, both BA.1-containing and BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccines were approved for use on September 20 and October 13, 2022, respectively. Since these bivalent vaccines were approved based on *in vitro* and animal model data, quality real-world epidemiological data are urgently needed to assess their real-world vaccine effectiveness (VE). Japan provides a uniquely suited population to estimate VE, as over two-thirds of the population are considered infection-naïve based on a nationwide seroprevalence study among blood donors with infection-induced seroprevalence of 26.5% in mid-November 2022 and with a relatively stable testing strategy [2,3]. Here we report the results of a multi-center prospective test-negative design case-control study conducted in Japan to evaluate the effectiveness of bivalent vaccines against symptomatic severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection during the BA.5-dominant period.

## METHODS

### Study design and setting

The COVID-19 vaccination rollout in Japan is detailed in the **Supplementary Methods**. Our study, Factors Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection And The Effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines (FASCINATE study), is a multi-center prospective case-control study in healthcare facilities in Japan [4]. This report includes individuals who visited one of 10 healthcare facilities in an outpatient setting due to COVID-19-like symptom(s) in the Kanto region (Tokyo and 3 surrounding metropolitan prefectures) between September 20 and December 31, 2022. During this period, BA.5 was estimated to be responsible for 75%–100% of SARS-CoV-2 infections in the Kanto region [5].

### Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criterion was all individuals aged  $\geq 16$  years. Individuals who did not or could not consent to participate in the study, required immediate lifesaving treatment, or had previously participated in this study were excluded. In the analysis, we also excluded individuals who had unknown symptom onset time, were tested  $\geq 15$  days after symptom onset, received vaccine types other than mRNA vaccines, or received unknown vaccine types.

### Classification of exposures and outcome

A questionnaire was administered before the test results were available to minimize social desirability bias. Vaccination status was recorded based on the questionnaire via a copy of the vaccine record/certificate and checked for plausibility. Vaccination status was classified into 17 categories: (1) not vaccinated, (2) dose 1 or  $\leq 13$  days after dose 2, (3) 14 days–3 months (14–90 days) after dose 2, (4) 3–6 months (91–180 days) after dose 2, (5)  $>6$  months (181 days) after dose 2, (6)  $\leq 13$  days after dose 3 (first booster dose), (7) 14 days–3 months (14–90 days) after dose 3, (8) 3–6 months (91–180 days) after dose 3, (9)  $>6$  months (181 days) after dose 3, (10)  $\leq 13$  days after dose 4 (second booster dose), (11) 14 days–3 months (14–90 days) after dose 4, (12) 3–6 months (91–180 days) after dose 4, (13)  $>6$  months (181 days) after dose 4, (14)  $\leq 13$  days after BA.1-containing bivalent vaccine, (15)  $\geq 14$  days after BA.1-containing bivalent vaccine, (16)  $\leq 13$  days after BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccine, and (17)  $\geq 14$  days after BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccine (categories 1–13 include monovalent recipients only). SARS-CoV-2 polymerase chain reaction (PCR) was done at each medical facility or commercial company for diagnostic purposes; PCR-positive individuals were considered cases and PCR-negative individuals were controls.

### Data analysis

Logistic regression was used to estimate the odds of being vaccinated among cases relative to controls. The model was adjusted for the following *a priori* determined covariates: age group,

sex, presence of any comorbidity, occupation (healthcare/long-term care worker or not), SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test in the past month, self-reported past SARS-CoV-2 infection (categorized by the period of infection), history of close contact, healthcare facility that the participant visited, calendar week, mask wearing, high-risk behavior (dining at a restaurant/bar at night with alcohol consumption in a group as a proxy [6,7]), and influenza vaccination status for the 2022–2023 season. VE against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection was estimated using the following equation:  $VE = (1 - \text{adjusted odds ratio [aOR]}) \times 100\%$ . In addition to absolute VE (aVE; VE comparing the vaccinated and unvaccinated), we calculated relative VE (rVE; VE comparing individuals who received the bivalent vaccine vs. individuals who only received monovalent doses 3–6 months earlier/6+ months earlier) to evaluate the added effect of the bivalent vaccine. Based on *a priori* knowledge that time since vaccination contributes more to VE compared to doses received [8] and due to sample size restrictions, we did not categorize by the number of monovalent vaccines received. Finally, we calculated the aOR of SARS-CoV-2 infection comparing  $\geq 14$  days after the bivalent vaccine against 14 days–3 months after the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> dose of monovalent vaccines for a head-to-head comparison of monovalent vs bivalent vaccines. We also calculated the aOR of SARS-CoV-2 infection by influenza vaccination status to assess the risk of bias. During the study period, influenza activity was extremely low in Japan [9]. Data analyses were performed using STATA version 17.0.

## RESULTS

A total of 6955 individuals were enrolled from 10 medical facilities; 170 were excluded for unknown symptom onset date, 33 for being tested  $\geq 15$  days after symptom onset, and 561 for receiving vaccine types other than monovalent mRNA vaccines or receiving an unknown vaccine type. The final analysis included 6191 individuals with 3498 (56.5%) positive cases. The median age (interquartile range) was 36 (27–48) years (other demographic and clinical characteristics in **Table 1** and the **Supplementary Table**). The aVE of bivalent vaccine (regardless of subvariant coded) was 72% (95% confidence interval [CI], 61–80). When stratified by subvariant coded in the bivalent vaccine, the aVE of BA.1-containing bivalent vaccine was 65% (95% CI, 47–77) and the aVE of BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccine was 76% (95% CI, 65–83) (**Table 2**). The rVE comparing bivalent vaccine (regardless of subvariant coded) versus monovalent vaccines post-3–6 months was 35% (95% CI, 15–51), while rVE comparing bivalent vaccine versus monovalent vaccines post-6 months was 46% (95% CI, 30–58). The aOR of SARS-CoV-2 infection comparing bivalent vaccine  $\geq 14$  days vs. 14 days–3 months after 3 or 4 doses of monovalent vaccine was 0.99 (95% CI, 0.72–1.36) (median interval between the bivalent vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 testing: 34 days [interquartile range {IQR} 24–49]; median interval between the monovalent vaccine and testing: 66 days [IQR 49–80]). The aOR of SARS-CoV-2 infection by influenza vaccination status was 0.95 (95% CI, 0.79–1.13).

## DISCUSSION

In this multi-center test-negative study in Japan, we found that aVE of BA.1-containing bivalent COVID-19 vaccines was 65% and that of BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccines was 76% during the BA.5-dominant period, both against symptomatic infection. Only a few published studies have assessed the effectiveness of BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent VE, mostly against severe COVID-19 [10–12]. Our estimate of aVE against symptomatic infection was higher than that observed in a US study on BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccines [10]. This may be due to substantial differences in the proportion of previously infected individuals as well as public health and social measures (e.g., high frequency of mask wearing in Japan regardless of vaccination status). We also included a number of factors to adjust for potential differences between vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. Similar to the US study, rVE was moderate (46%) with more added benefit with a longer period since the last monovalent vaccine. The head-to-head comparison soon after monovalent and bivalent vaccines did not result in the superiority of the bivalent vaccine during the BA.5-dominant period (aOR, 0.99). However, there are some important limitations in this comparison as monovalent booster vaccines became unavailable after introduction of the bivalent vaccine. Overall, although aVE was high in our study, the bivalent vaccine was not superior to the monovalent vaccine and aVE was lower than that observed for the monovalent primary series against the ancestral strain, Alpha, and Delta variants (85%–95%) [4,13]. This is in line with immune imprinting against the ancestral strain as suggested in other studies [14,15].

This study has several limitations. First, biases and confounding inherent in observational studies are possible. We attempted to minimize these by adjusting for various factors, and there was no association between influenza vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 testing. Second, as we did not have a system to link test results with vaccination history, we asked participants to refer to their vaccine records/certificates and (if not in possession) diary/calendar for accuracy. Third, wide CIs for some estimates warrant careful interpretation of point estimates. Fourth, our analysis was a complete case analysis. Finally, our VE estimates were short-term and require continued assessment to monitor mid- to long-term effectiveness.

In conclusion, we found that bivalent COVID-19 VE was high compared to no vaccination and moderate compared to monovalent vaccines administered over half a year before. Although there was evidence suggestive of immune imprinting, our results support the continued rollout of bivalent vaccines.

## NOTES

**Funding.** This work was supported in part by grants from the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (grant number JPMH21HA2008), the Japan Agency for Medical Research and

Development (AMED) (grant numbers JP21fk0108612, JP22fk0108637), and the Nagasaki University WISE Programme.

**Acknowledgments.** We thank Saki Takeda and Maki Tsukahara for administrative and technical assistance. We thank all staff members at the study sites for their administrative assistance.

**Author contributions.** T. A., Y. A., and M. S. conceived of and designed the study. All authors contributed to the acquisition, analysis, and/or interpretation of the data. T. A. wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors provided critical input to the manuscript for important intellectual content.

**Patient Consent Statement.** The ethics committee of the National Institute of Infectious Diseases approved our study (approval numbers 1332 and 1392). The study is conducted with a waiver of informed consent granted by the ethics committee.

**Potential conflicts of interest.** Takeshi Arashiro is an unpaid consultant for the World Health Organization. The other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

**Data availability.** Individual-level data of patients included in this manuscript after de-identification are considered sensitive and will not be shared. The study methods and statistical analyses are all described in detail in the Methods and throughout the manuscript.

## References

1. International Vaccine Access Center (IVAC), Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. VIEW-hub: COVID-19 data, vaccine effectiveness studies. Available at: <https://view-hub.org/covid-19/effectiveness-studies>. Accessed April 14, 2023.
2. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare/National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan. Seroprevalence among blood donors, November 2022 [in Japanese]. Available at: <https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/ja/2019-ncov/2484-idsc/11729-covid19-82.html>. Accessed April 14, 2023.
3. Arashiro T, Arai S, Kinoshita R, et al. National seroepidemiological study of COVID-19 after the initial rollout of vaccines: Before and at the peak of the Omicron-dominant period in Japan. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* **2023**; irv.13094.
4. Arashiro T, Arima Y, Muraoka H, et al. COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection during Delta-dominant and Omicron-dominant periods in Japan: a multi-center prospective case-control study (FASCINATE study). *Clin Infect Dis* **2022**; ciac635.
5. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Japan. Estimated subvariant prevalence via SARS-CoV-2 genomic surveillance using specimen from commercial company [in Japanese]. Available at: <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10900000/001039363.pdf>. Accessed April 14, 2023.
6. Arashiro T, Arima Y, Muraoka H, et al. Behavioral factors associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection in Japan. *Influenza Other Respir Viruses* **2022**; 16(5):952–61.
7. Arashiro T, Arima Y, Kuramochi J, et al. Letter to the editor: Importance of considering high-risk behaviours in COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness estimates with observational studies. *Euro Surveill.* **2023**; 28(4):2300034.

8. National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Japan. Influenza activity compared to past 10 years [in Japanese]. Available at: <https://www.niid.go.jp/niid/ja/flu-m/813-idsc/map/130-flu-10year.html>. Accessed April 14, 2023.
9. International Vaccine Access Center (IVAC), Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health. Results of COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness Studies: An Ongoing Systematic Review (Page 16). Available at: [https://view-hub.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/COVID19%20VE%20Studies\\_Forest%20Plots\\_Omicron\\_0.pdf](https://view-hub.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/COVID19%20VE%20Studies_Forest%20Plots_Omicron_0.pdf). Accessed April 14, 2023.
10. Link-Gelles R, Ciesla AA, Fleming-Dutra KE, et al. Effectiveness of bivalent mRNA vaccines in preventing symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection – increasing community access to testing program, United States, September–November 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2022**; 71(48):1526–30.
11. Tenforde MW, Weber ZA, Natarajan K, et al. Early estimates of bivalent mRNA vaccine effectiveness in preventing COVID-19-associated emergency department or urgent care encounters and hospitalizations among immunocompetent adults - VISION Network, nine states, September–November 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2022**; 71(5152):1616–24.
12. Surie D, DeCuir J, Zhu Y, et al. Early estimates of bivalent mRNA vaccine effectiveness in preventing COVID-19-associated hospitalization among immunocompetent adults aged  $\geq 65$  years - IVY Network, 18 states, September 8–November 30, 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* **2022**; 71(5152):1625–30.
13. Abu-Raddad LJ, Chemaitelly H, Butt AA; National Study Group for COVID-19 Vaccination. Effectiveness of the BNT162b2 Covid-19 vaccine against the B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants. *N Engl J Med* **2021**; 385(2):187–9.
14. Collier AY, Miller J, Hachmann NP, et al. Immunogenicity of BA.5 bivalent mRNA vaccine boosters. *N Engl J Med* **2023**; NEJMc2213948.
15. Chemaitelly H, Ayoub HH, Tang P, et al. Immune imprinting and protection against repeat reinfection with SARS-CoV-2. *N Engl J Med* **2022**; 387(18):1716–8.

**Table 1.** Demographic and Clinical Characteristics of the Study Participants

	All (n = 6191)	Test Positive (n = 3498)	Test Negative (n = 2693)
Age in years, n (%)			
16–19	300 (4.9)	181 (5.2)	119 (4.4)
20–29	1719 (27.8)	900 (25.7)	819 (30.4)
30–39	1505 (24.3)	793 (22.7)	712 (26.4)
40–49	1243 (20.1)	743 (21.2)	500 (18.6)
50–59	897 (14.5)	591 (16.9)	306 (11.4)
60–69	347 (5.6)	200 (5.7)	147 (5.5)
70+	180 (2.9)	90 (2.6)	90 (3.3)
Sex, n (%); missing = 18 (0.3%)			
Male	3404 (55.1)	1976 (56.7)	1428 (53.2)
Female	2769 (44.9)	1512 (43.4)	1257 (46.8)

Comorbidity, <sup>a</sup> n (%)			
Yes	1525 (24.6)	824 (23.6)	701 (26.0)
No	4666 (75.4)	2674 (76.4)	1992 (74.0)
Occupation, n (%)			
Healthcare/long-term care worker	427 (6.9)	203 (5.8)	224 (8.3)
Other	5764 (93.1)	3295 (94.2)	2469 (91.7)
Days from onset to SARS-CoV-2 test; exact onset date missing = 7 (0.1%) <sup>b</sup>			
	1 (1–2)	1 (1–2)	1 (1–2)
History of close contact, n (%)			
Yes	658 (10.6)	425 (12.2)	233 (8.7)
No/unknown	5533 (89.4)	3073 (87.9)	2460 (91.4)
SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test in the past month, n (%); missing = 200 (3.2%)			
Yes	898 (15.0)	446 (13.2)	452 (17.4)
No	5093 (85.0)	2945 (86.9)	2148 (82.6)
Past SARS-CoV-2 infection, n (%); missing = 74 (1.2%)			
Yes	647 (10.6)	94 (2.7)	553 (20.8)
Ancestral strain-dominant period (2020–February 2021)	37 (0.6)	14 (0.4)	23 (0.9)
Ancestral-to-Alpha replacement period (March– May 2021)	12 (0.2)	6 (0.2)	6 (0.2)
Alpha-to-Delta replacement period (June–July 2021)	24 (0.4)	9 (0.3)	15 (0.6)
Delta-dominant period (August–December 2021)	42 (0.7)	16 (0.5)	26 (1.0)
BA.1/BA.2-dominant period (January–June 2022)	294 (4.8)	35 (1.0)	259 (9.7)
BA.5-dominant period (July 2022)	202 (3.3)	8 (0.2)	194 (7.3)
Multiple infections	6 (0.1)	1 (0.0)	5 (0.2)
Period of infection missing	30 (0.5)	5 (0.1)	25 (0.9)
No	5471 (89.4)	3364 (97.3)	2107 (79.2)
Number of vaccinations received, n (%); missing = 66 (1.1%)			
0	668 (10.9)	442 (12.8)	226 (8.5)
1	63 (1.0)	33 (1.0)	30 (1.1)
2	1380 (22.5)	811 (23.5)	569 (21.3)
3	2945 (48.1)	1617 (46.8)	1328 (49.8)
4	947 (15.5)	492 (14.2)	455 (17.1)



5	122 (2.0)	62 (1.8)	60 (2.3)
Vaccine type for all doses received, n (%)			
BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech)	2349 (43.1)	1325 (44.0)	1024 (41.9)
mRNA-1273 (Moderna)	1127 (20.7)	633 (21.0)	494 (20.2)
Heterologous mRNA	1410 (25.8)	761 (25.2)	649 (26.6)
BA.1-containing bivalent	227 (4.2)	121 (4.0)	106 (4.3)
BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent	344 (6.3)	175 (5.8)	169 (6.9)
Interval between BA.1-containing bivalent vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 testing, <sup>b</sup> days			
Interval between BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 testing, <sup>b</sup> days	21 (9–33)	22 (8–33)	21 (11–33)
Interval between BA.1-containing bivalent vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 testing among individuals who received the bivalent vaccine $\geq 14$ d before, <sup>b</sup> days			
Interval between BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent vaccine and SARS-CoV-2 testing among individuals who received the bivalent vaccine $\geq 14$ d before, <sup>b</sup> days	30 (23–44)	30 (24–45)	29 (22–44)
Doses of monovalent vaccines received before bivalent vaccine (among individuals who received bivalent vaccine)			
2	51 (8.9)	22 (7.4)	29 (10.6)
3	399 (69.9)	213 (72.0)	186 (67.6)
4	121 (21.2)	61 (20.6)	60 (21.8)
Mask-wearing in the past 2 weeks; missing = 132 (2.1%)			
Wore at home and outside	414 (6.8)	235 (6.9)	179 (6.8)
Wore outside at all times	5263 (86.9)	2987 (87.2)	2276 (86.5)
Wore only when having conversation	349 (5.8)	189 (5.5)	160 (6.1)
Almost never wore masks	33 (0.5)	16 (0.5)	17 (0.7)
High-risk behaviors in the past 2 weeks (went to restaurant/bar at night with alcohol present), n (%); missing = 195 (3.1%)			
Yes	2081 (34.7)	1183 (34.8)	898 (34.6)
No	3915 (65.3)	2216 (65.2)	1699 (65.4)

Abbreviations: SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

<sup>a</sup> Comorbidities include hypertension, heart disease, diabetes mellitus, obesity, kidney disease, asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cancer, immunodeficiency, and immunosuppressant use.

<sup>b</sup> Median (interquartile range).

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT

**Table 2.** Absolute and Relative Effectiveness of BA.1- or BA.4/BA.5-containing Bivalent Vaccine Against Symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 by Dose Number and Time Since Vaccination during the BA.5-dominant Period

Vaccination Status	Test Positive, n	Test Negative, n	Adjusted Odds Ratios (95% CI) <sup>a</sup>	Vaccine Effectiveness, % (95% CI)
<b>Comparison between vaccinated vs unvaccinated</b>				
Unvaccinated	442	226	1	NA
Dose 1 or ≤13 d after dose 2	36	31	0.54 (0.29–1.00)	46 (0–71)
14 d–3 mo after dose 2	52	38	0.68 (0.40–1.16)	32 (-16–60)
3–6 mo after dose 2	34	24	0.58 (0.31–1.07)	42 (-7–69)
>6 mo after dose 2	571	436	0.58 (0.46–0.74)	42 (26–54)
≤13 d after dose 3	0	1	NA	NA
14 d–3 mo after dose 3	70	115	0.24 (0.16–0.35)	76 (65–84)
3–6 mo after dose 3	364	373	0.45 (0.35–0.58)	55 (42–65)
>6 mo after dose 3	987	664	0.50 (0.40–0.63)	50 (37–60)
≤13 d after dose 4	9	3	1.27 (0.25–6.45)	NA
14 d–3 mo after dose 4	119	150	0.33 (0.23–0.47)	67 (53–77)
3–6 mo after dose 4	120	99	0.39 (0.26–0.59)	61 (41–74)
>6 mo after dose 4	6	1	1.78 (0.21–15.30)	NA
≤13 d after BA.1-containing bivalent	21	24	0.29 (0.14–0.51)	71 (49–86)
≤13 d after BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent	65	57	0.32 (0.20–0.51)	68 (49–80)
≥14 d after BA.1-containing bivalent	95	76	0.35 (0.23–0.53)	65 (47–77)
≥14 d after BA.4/BA.5-containing bivalent	112	116	0.24 (0.17–0.35)	76 (65–83)
<b>Comparison between bivalent vaccine vs 3–6 mo after monovalent dose<sup>b</sup></b>				
Unvaccinated	442	226	NA	NA
Dose 1 or ≤13 d after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	45	35	NA	NA
14 d–3 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	241	303	NA	NA

3–6 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	518	496	1	NA
>6 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	1564	1101	NA	NA
≤13 d after bivalent dose	86	81	0.72 (0.49–1.04)	28 (-4–51)
≥14 d after bivalent dose	207	192	0.65 (0.49–0.85)	35 (15–51)
Comparison between bivalent vaccine vs >6 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>				
Unvaccinated	442	226	NA	NA
Dose 1 or ≤13 d after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	45	35	NA	NA
14 d–3 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	241	303	NA	NA
3–6 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	518	496	NA	NA
>6 mo after monovalent dose <sup>b</sup>	1564	1101	1	NA
≤13 d after bivalent dose	86	81	0.60 (0.42–0.86)	40 (14–58)
≥14 d after bivalent dose	207	192	0.54 (0.42–0.70)	46 (30–58)
Comparison between bivalent vaccine vs 14 d–3 mo after 3 or 4 doses of monovalent vaccines				
Unvaccinated	442	226	NA	NA
Dose 1 or dose 2	703	533	NA	NA
14 d–3 mo after 3 <sup>rd</sup> or 4 <sup>th</sup> monovalent dose	189	265	1	NA
3–6 mo after 3 <sup>rd</sup> or 4 <sup>th</sup> monovalent dose	484	472	1.52 (1.18–1.96)	NA
>6 mo after 3 <sup>rd</sup> or 4 <sup>th</sup> monovalent dose	993	665	1.77 (1.38–2.28)	NA
≤13 d after bivalent dose	86	81	1.09 (0.73–1.63)	-9 (-63–27)
≥14 d after bivalent dose	207	192	0.99 (0.72–1.36)	1 (-36–28)

Abbreviations: CI, confidence interval; NA, not available (includes categories with small sample size or irrelevant comparisons); SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

<sup>a</sup> Adjusted for age group, sex, presence of comorbidities, occupation (healthcare worker or not), SARS-CoV-2 diagnostic test in the past month, past SARS-CoV-2 infection, history of close contact, healthcare facility, calendar week, mask wearing, high-risk behavior, and influenza vaccination status for the 2022–2023 season.

<sup>b</sup> Regardless of doses received.