### RESEARCH ARTICLE

**a** OPEN ACCESS **D** Check for updates

# **Vaccine effectiveness of recombinant and standard dose influenza vaccines against outpatient illness during 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 calculated using a retrospective test-negative design**

Rich[a](#page-0-0)rd K. Zimmerman<sup>a</sup>, Klancie Dauer<sup>b</sup>, Lloyd Clarke<sup>c</sup>, Mary Patricia Nowalk D<sup>a</sup>, Jonathan M. Raviotta<sup>a</sup>, and G. K. Balasubramani<sup>b</sup>

<span id="page-0-1"></span><span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>a</sup>Department of Family Medicine, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; <sup>b</sup>Department of Epidemiology, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; c Department of Pharmacy, Division of Infectious Diseases/Pharmacy Department – AMP, UPMC Health System, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

#### **ABSTRACT**

Newer influenza vaccine formulations have entered the market, but real-world effectiveness studies are not widely conducted until there is sufficient uptake. We conducted a retrospective test-negative casecontrol study to determine relative vaccine effectiveness (rVE) of recombinant influenza vaccine or RIV4, compared with standard dose vaccines (SD) in a health system with significant RIV4 uptake. Using the electronic medical record (EMR) and the Pennsylvania state immunization registry to confirm influenza vaccination, VE against outpatient medically attended visits was calculated. Immunocompetent outpatients ages 18–64 years seen in hospital-based clinics or emergency departments who were tested for influenza using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays during the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 influenza seasons were included. Propensity scores with inverse probability weighting were used to adjust for potential confounders and determine rVE. Among this mostly white and female cohort of 5,515 individuals, 510 were vaccinated with RIV4 and 557 were vaccinated with SD, with the balance of 4,448 (81%) being unvaccinated. Adjusted influenza VE estimates were 37% overall (95% CI = 27, 46), 40% (95% CI = 25, 51) for RIV4 and 35% (95% CI = 20, 47) for standard dose vaccines. Overall, rVE of RIV4 compared to SD was not significantly higher (11%; 95% CI = -20, 33). Influenza vaccines were moderately protective against medically attended outpatient influenza during the 2018–2019 and 2019– 2020 seasons. Although the point estimates are higher for RIV4, the large confidence intervals around VE estimates suggest this study was underpowered to detect significant rVE of individual vaccine formulations.

## **Introduction**

<span id="page-0-2"></span>In recent influenza seasons, influenza vaccine effectiveness (VE) has been moderate at best ranging from 19% to 52% from 2009–2010 to 2019–2020 (pre-COVID-19 pandemic) in the  $US<sub>1</sub><sup>1</sup>$  $US<sub>1</sub><sup>1</sup>$  $US<sub>1</sub><sup>1</sup>$  and vaccination is often ineffective against the A (H3N2) strain. The A(H3N2) strain is more likely to mutate, thus evading vaccine-induced immunity and resulting in lower VE. In addition, A(H3N2) is more sensitive to genetic substitutions that occur during the production of egg-based influenza vaccines. Thus, new influenza vaccines are being developed and manufactured to avoid these mutations, in an effort to improve influenza VE. One newer vaccine formulation, recombinant influenza vaccine (RIV4), is not produced in egg culture, thereby lowering the possibility for mutations; it contains three times the amount of antigen as standard dose (SD) vaccines and has been shown to be effective against influenza in a RCT in healthy adults, $<sup>2</sup>$  $<sup>2</sup>$  $<sup>2</sup>$  and to be more effective</sup> than SD to prevent influenza cases in a RCT in adults aged 50 years and over.<sup>[3](#page-4-2)</sup> Therefore, RIV4 may be more effective for those with reduced immune function such as the elderly, and people with high-risk conditions, than other vaccine formulations[.3](#page-4-2) VE studies of specific vaccine types and relative <span id="page-0-6"></span><span id="page-0-5"></span>VE studies among various vaccine types are generally limited until uptake of specific vaccines reaches sufficient numbers for comparative analyses. This constraint has been especially evident among younger adults whose overall influenza vaccine uptake is generally lower than that of older populations.<sup>4</sup> While there are numerous studies of the rVE of cell-cultured influenza vaccine, $5-7$  $5-7$  there are relatively few involving RIV4 VE against outpatient influenza illness, and that include nonelderly adults. We conducted a retrospective test-negative case-control study of influenza VE against medically attended outpatient illness using data from electronic medical records (EMR) of a large health system to determine the VE of influenza vaccines and relative VE (rVE) of RIV4 among persons 18–64 years of age in the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 seasons.

## **Patients and methods**

The University of Pittsburgh Institutional Review Board approved this retrospective study using EMR databases. A testnegative case-control study estimates VE by comparing the odds of vaccination among confirmed influenza cases to the odds of vaccination among controls.

<span id="page-0-4"></span><span id="page-0-3"></span>CONTACT Mary Patricia Nowalk and thowalk@pitt.edu **Department of Family Medicine**, University of Pittsburgh, Suite 520 Schenley Place, 4420 Bayard Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published with license by Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

#### **ARTICLE HISTORY**

Received 8 December 2022 Revised 16 January 2023 Accepted 3 February 2023

#### **KEYWORDS**

Influenza; vaccine effectiveness; recombinant influenza vaccine; relative vaccine effectiveness



#### *Patients*

Participants were outpatients 18 through 64 years of age as of August 1 each season who had a test for influenza at a UPMC hospital-based clinic or Emergency Department at any time between 11/01/2018 and 04/30/2020. UPMC Health System has a 44–45% market share in the state, and the local county. The Theradoc® infection control database was used to identify those tested for influenza using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays. Influenza cases were those who tested positive for influenza and controls were those who tested negative for influenza, regardless of any other identified viral infection. Both the EMR and Pennsylvania Statewide Immunization Information System (PA-SIIS) were queried for influenza vaccines given between August 1 and the date of illness/PCR testing. Incomplete vaccination information was considered to be missing and these patients were not included in analyses. Patients with no influenza vaccine record in PA-SIIS or the EMR were assumed to be unvaccinated. Exclusion criteria were testing within 2 weeks of vaccination, having two different types of influenza vaccine in a season, receiving a high dose or adjuvanted influenza vaccine, missing vaccination data, and having an immunocompromising condition. High-risk conditions were based on the list found in [Appendix 1](#page-6-0) and included chronic cardiovascular and respiratory diseases.

### *Statistical methods*

For analysis, patients were grouped into recombinant vs. other standard dose vaccine recipients. Descriptions of variables for each group were summarized as frequencies and percentages for categorical data. Baseline characteristics between the vaccination groups were compared using chi-square or the Fisher's exact tests for categorical variables. Using adjusted odds ratios (aOR) obtained from multivariable logistic regression models, VE estimates were calculated as  $(1-aOR) \times 100$ . The dependent variable of interest was influenza status. The primary exposure of interest was vaccine type (recombinant vs. standard dose vaccines). Vaccinated individuals with no information about type of vaccine received were not included in the rVE analyses. The independent variables were age, influenza season (2018–2019 and 2019–2020), sex, race and presence of one or more high-risk conditions. Relative VE (rVE) was calculated as 1 minus the ratio of adjusted VE for recombinant and standard dose vaccine times 100%.

We conducted propensity adjustment analyses to reduce the potential impact of selection effects (i.e., confounding) on baseline characteristics – age (18–64 years, continuous), race (white, nonwhite), sex (male, female), presence of ≥1 high-risk condition (yes, no), season (2018–2019, 2019–2020). Number of high-risk conditions was not equally distributed among vaccine recipient groups (see [Appendix 2](#page-9-0)).

We estimated the propensity scores using the Generalized Boosted Regression Models (GBM) approach, which is a nonparametric model that allows for nonlinear relationships with a maximum number of iterations set to the default (i. e.,10,000) that minimized the balance statistics of interest. We used the balance statistic based on absolute standardized bias

(also referred as the effect size or absolute standardized mean difference) and summarized across variables. We allowed a maximum of three splits for each tree in the model, allowing for three-way interactions among all covariates to be considered. The shrinkage parameter was set to 0.0005 to ensure a smooth fit.

We also checked the balance of all the variables included in the model to assess the quality of the propensity score and overlap in the range of propensity scores across treatment and comparison groups using a value under 0.25 as indicative of good balance. We also used the balance plots to compare the propensity score distributions and to evaluate the common support. We used five plot methods to determine the balance of each covariate used in the propensity score model: 1) optimization using the estimated mean average treatment effect; 2) box plot of the propensity of the vaccine; 3) the standardized effect size of the unweighted and weighted values; 4) t-test p-values of the group mean of the covariate; and 5) K-S p-values of the covariates. We also checked that there were no extreme values in the estimated weights using the GBM method. In all, the weights were stable and balanced. See an example in [Appendix 3](#page-10-0).

Using the propensity score, we calculated the inverse probability of receiving standard dose vaccine weighting. In this approach, for an individual receiving standard dose vaccine *t*, the weight equals  $1/p_t(x)$ , where  $p_t(x)$  is the propensity score (probability that an individual with characteristic *x* receives standard dose vaccine *t*). A propensity score weighted logistic regression with influenza status as the dependent variable was fitted to estimate the effect of vaccine (standard dose vs. recombinant vaccine) on outcome and also used inverse probability weighting to estimate VE and its 95% confidence intervals. Because all the covariates are balanced using the weighted method, we fit the model with propensity weights and the inverse probability weight to estimate the rVE.

We performed two sensitivity analyses using 1) for all adults ≥18 years including the immunocompromised, excluding recipients of other advanced vaccines (Flucelvax, HD Fluzone, and Fluad) in the analytic dataset; and 2) nonimmunocompromised adults 18–64 years, excluding age ≥65 years, and recipients of other advanced vaccine (Flucelvax). The final dataset included non-immunocompromised adults 18–64 years, including recipients of other (non-RIV4) advanced vaccines (Flucelvax) in the standard dose group.

All analyses were two-sided and the alpha level was set to 0.05. All analyses were conducted using SAS, version 9.4 statistical software (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). We used the Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups (TWANG) software package and the SAS Macros (available at <http://www.rand.org/statistics/twang/downloads.html>) to calculate the propensity scores.

#### **Results**

The total number of influenza test results among outpatients was 6,274, of which 112 were excluded because of missing vaccination information (see [Appendixes 4](#page-12-0) and [5](#page-12-1)) or vaccination <14 days before illness, and 641 were excluded because patients were immunocompromised, leaving 5,515 for analysis

<span id="page-2-0"></span>

\*Standard dose: Afluria (n=49), Fluarix (n=91), FluLaval (n=81), SD Fluzone (n=114), FlucelVax (n=222) \*\*185 subjects were vaccinated after they became ill and were classified as unvaccinated

**Figure 1.** Flow chart.

[\(Figure 1](#page-2-0)). Of these, 510 were vaccinated with recombinant and 557 were vaccinated with standard dose vaccines, with the balance of 4,448 being unvaccinated.

Demographic characteristics of the population are shown in [Table 1](#page-2-1); most participants were white (73.3%) and female (62.9%) and less than half (40.7%) had a high-risk condition. Patients who received RIV4 were significantly less often white  $(p < .001)$ , but did not otherwise differ from those who received SD. There were significant demographic and health differences (*p* < .001) between vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals with whites, females, older and healthier individuals more often vaccinated against influenza.

Overall, influenza vaccines (including SD) were moderately effective against outpatient illness (37%; 95% CI = 27, 46) during 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 seasons. Influenza vaccines were effective against both influenza A and B, but VE was higher for influenza B (52%;  $95\%CI = 36, 64$ ) than for influenza A  $(31\%; 95\%CI = 17, 42)$ . With the exception of patients 50–64 years of age, adjusted VEs were significant, ranging from 33% to 46% across age, sex, and risk groups ([Table 2\)](#page-3-0).

When estimating VE overall and for each age and risk group adjusting for the other variables and stratifying by vaccine type, both recombinant and standard dose vaccines were significantly effective compared with no vaccination,

<span id="page-2-1"></span>



\*Vaccinated=Flublok and standard dose vaccines (Afluria, Fluarix, FluLaval, SD Fluzone and FlucelVax). †

<sup>+</sup>High-risk conditions include chronic cardiovascular, respiratory disease, among others. See [Appendix 1.](#page-6-0)

with few exceptions ([Table 3,](#page-3-1) columns a and b). Significant adjusted VE estimates ranged from 29% to 47%. Standard dose vaccines were not significantly effective for those with one or more high-risk conditions (VE =  $20\%$ ; 95%CI =  $-8$ , 40); whereas, recombinant vaccine was significantly effective for those with high-risk conditions  $(45\%; 95\%CI = 25, 56)$ .

Relative VE of recombinant compared with standard dose vaccines overall was insignificant even when adjusted for propensity scores with inverse probability weights ( $rVE = 11$ ; 95%  $CI = -20, 33$ ) [\(Table 3,](#page-3-1) columns d-f). Subgroup analyses by age and risk group identified no significant rVE for recombinant influenza vaccine. Although the point estimate for rVE for those with a high-risk condition was 26%, the 95%CI was −8 to 50.

Sensitivity analyses were conducted using different patient groups including a cohort for all adults ≥18 years including the immunocompromised and excluding recipients of other advanced and high-dose vaccines [\(Appendix 6\)](#page-13-0) and adults 18–64 years, excluding the immunocompromised and those who received other advanced (non-RIV4) vaccines [\(Appendix 7](#page-14-0)). Results were similar to the primary analyses in

that recombinant and standard dose vaccines were generally effective, except standard dose vaccine among older age and high risk/immunocompromised groups. Relative VE of recombinant vaccine was not significant for any subgroup after adjustments using inverse probability weights.

## **Discussion**

<span id="page-3-2"></span>The Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices and U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have completed literature reviews, GRADE analyses and Evidence-to-Recommendations processes on influenza vaccines in seniors and voted that seniors should receive high-dose, adjuvanted or recombinant influenza vaccine.<sup>[8](#page-4-6)</sup> An outstanding question involves VE in those younger than 65 years, which was addressed in this analysis by testing rVE of RIV4 (high dose and adjuvanted vaccines are not licensed for use in persons <65 years of age).

<span id="page-3-3"></span>Previous research, including retrospective test-negative case-control study during  $2019-2020^9$  and a RCT during 2014–2015, $3$  has demonstrated significant rVEs for RIV4

<span id="page-3-0"></span>**Table 2.** Overall influenza vaccine effectiveness (all vaccines combined\*) during the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 influenza seasons.

			<b>Vaccine Effectiveness</b>	
Group	Influenza Positive %	Influenza Negative %	Unadjusted % (95% CI)	Adjusted** % (95% CI)
Overall	14	22	40 (30, 49)	37 (27, 46)
Influenza A	17	22	26 (13, 38)	31 (17, 42)
Influenza B	9	22	63 (51, 72)	52 (36, 64)
Age 18-49 years	12	20	48 (37, 57)	46 (35, 56)
Age 50-64 years	24	26	$13(-13, 34)$	$13 (-14, 34)$
Female sex	17	24	37 (24, 47)	33 (19, 44)
Male sex	11	18	46 (29, 59)	46 (28, 59)
High-risk condition <sup><math>†</math></sup>	22	30	34 (19, 47)	33 (18, 46)
No high-risk condition	10	16	44 (29, 55)	42 (26, 54)
2018-2019 season	19	29	40 (20, 55)	41 (21, 56)
2019-2020 season	13	20	41 (30, 51)	36 (23, 47)

Bold indicates non-overlapping intervals. \*Vaccinated: Recombinant and Standard dose egg-based vaccines (Afluria, Fluarix, FluLaval, SD Fluzone, and FlucelVax).

\*\*Multivariable logistic regression model adjusted for age, race, sex, season, and high-risk conditions, except that the stratified variable is not included as an adjustment in its own analysis. †

<sup>+</sup>High-risk conditions include chronic cardiovascular, respiratory disease, among others. See [Appendix 1.](#page-6-0)

	<b>Adjusted Vaccine</b> Effectiveness,* % (95% CI)		Relative Vaccine Effectiveness of Recombinant vs. Standard Dose Influenza Vaccine, % (95% CI)			
Group	Recombinant (a)	Standard dose (b)	Unadjusted (C)	Adjusted using a priori variables** (d)	Adjusted using propensity score (e)	Adjusted using inverse probability weights (t)
Overall	40 (25, 51)	35 (20, 47)	$6(-24, 29)$	$11 (-19, 34)$	$13 (-19, 37)$	$11 (-20.33)$
Age 18-49 years	50 (33, 61)	44 (28, 56)	$8(-30, 35)$	$15 (-24, 40)$	$11 (-29, 38)$	$9(-31, 36)$
Age 50-64 years	$14 (-25, 40)$	$13 (-23, 39)$	$3(-54, 39)$	$6(-52, 42)$	$4(-56, 41)$	$-2$ ( $-66, 36$ )
Female sex	37 (18, 51)	29 (10, 45)	$6(-31, 32)$	$11 (-25, 37)$	$10 (-28, 37)$	$8(-31, 35)$
Male sex	48 (20, 65)	44 (20, 61)	$9(-54, 46)$	$9(-62, 49)$	$3(-76, 47)$	$6(-64, 46)$
High-risk condition	43 (25, 56)	$20 (-8, 40)$	$27(-6, 49)$	$30 (-1, 52)$	$32(-1, 54)$	$26 (-8, 50)$
No high-risk condition	31 (1, 52)	47 (30, 60)	$-34 (-109, 14)$	$-35(-115, 15)$	$-22 (-95, 24)$	$-25(-98, 20)$
2018-2019 season	43 (15, 62)	40 (13, 59)	$5(-59, 43)$	$8(-57, 46)$	$9(-58, 48)$	$7(-60, 46)$
2019-2020 season	38 (20, 52)	33 (15, 48)	$7(-30, 33)$	$9(-30, 36)$	$11 (-28, 38)$	$9(-30, 35)$

<span id="page-3-1"></span>**Table 3.** Effectiveness and relative effectiveness of recombinant and standard dose influenza vaccines against RT-PCR-confirmed influenza during the 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 influenza seasons.

Bold indicates non-overlapping confidence intervals.

\*Adjusted vaccine effectiveness for recombinant and standard dose vaccines vs. no vaccination.

\*\*Multivariable logistic regression model adjusted for age, race, sex, season, and high-risk conditions, except that the stratified variable is not included as an adjustment in its own analysis.

Propensity score: Generalized Boosted Regression Method was used to calculate the propensity score using TWANG (Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups).

vs. standard dose vaccines of 13% among adults ≥65 years of age against hospital encounters and 30% among adults ≥50 years of age against PCR-confirmed influenza-like illness, respectively. Using a health system's EMR database, we found that the use of influenza vaccine was moderately effective against outpatient visits to the Emergency Department and hospital-based outpatient clinics with higher point estimates for effectiveness against influenza B (52%) than influenza A (31%) over the 2018–2019 through 2019–2020 seasons. These VE estimates are comparable to VE reported in the US Flu VE Network ranging from 34% to 45% for influenza B compared to 26–43% for influenza A among  $18-64$ -year-olds in these seasons.<sup>1</sup> Our relative VE estimates for RIV4 vs. SD favored RIV4 by 11% but were not significant, with wide confidence intervals.

We speculate that the study was underpowered because less than 20% of the analyzable cohort had documented influenza vaccination, despite our inquiry of both the medical record and the state immunization information system. Influenza vaccine uptake estimates for Pennsylvania adults 18–49 years old range from 39% to 43% and for adults 50– 64 years range from 59% to  $68\%$ .<sup>10</sup> We suspected that some community pharmacies and employer vaccination sites did not report to the state system during this time period. Thus, these findings should be interpreted with caution.

<span id="page-4-7"></span>In recent years, typical influenza seasons have been exemplified by an influenza A wave that is primarily A(H1N1) or A (H3N2) with a smaller influenza B wave starting later in the season. The 2018–2019 and 2019–2020 influenza seasons were atypical in that 2018–2019 influenza A(H1N1) and A(H3N2) co-circulated and in 2019–2020 influenza A(H1N1) and influenza B co-circulated. Thus, without a predominant strain causing a significant majority of influenza cases, rVE estimates necessarily included protection against all vaccine strains combined and rVE of different vaccine formulations against specific strains was not conducted.

#### *Strengths and limitations*

The vaccination rate of the final analytic cohort of working age adults was only 19%. Failure to capture vaccination status biased VE toward the null. Despite the initial large size of this database, it was underpowered because of the limited number of recorded recombinant and standard dose vaccinees. Our assumptions for sample size calculations were based on the entire population of adults. This analysis was restricted to 18–64-year-olds who have lower vaccine uptake.

<span id="page-4-8"></span>While there are other ways to estimate  $rVE<sub>1</sub><sup>11</sup>$  we compared RIV4 and SD using propensity and inverse probability weighting methods. Both methods produce similar results.

A strength of the study is confirmation of influenza by RT-PCR testing; case definition, high-risk conditions and vaccination status were based on EMR-documented data, while symptoms and demographics were self-reported. A further strength is the large number of tests performed. Moreover, this study uses the best observational design, i.e., the test-negative design,

<span id="page-4-9"></span>but all observational studies are subject to biases of undetected confounders.<sup>[12](#page-5-3)[,13](#page-5-4)</sup>

### **Conclusions**

Influenza vaccines were moderately protective. Although the point estimates are higher for RIV4, the large, overlapping confidence intervals around VE estimates suggest this study was underpowered to detect significant rVE of individual vaccine formulations. Larger, better powered studies are warranted to achieve more precise estimates for individual influenza strains, population subgroups, and virus subtypes.

#### **Disclosure statement**

Drs. Zimmerman, Raviotta, Nowalk, and Balasubramani received investigator-initiated grant funding from Sanofi for this project. Drs. Nowalk and Balasubramani, have grant funding from Merck & Co., Inc. for an unrelated project. Ms. Dauer and Mr. Clarke have no conflicts to report.

#### **Funding**

This work was supported by Sanofi through an investigator-initiated grant (SP-2021-13463). This work represents the views of the authors and not Sanofi.

### **ORCID**

Mary Patricia Nowalk D http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1702-2690

#### **References**

- <span id="page-4-0"></span>1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Past seasons' vaccine effectiveness estimates. [2022](#page-0-2) Oct 6 [accessed 2022 Oct 26]. [https://](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/past-seasons-estimates.html) [www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/past-seasons-estimates.html](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/vaccines-work/past-seasons-estimates.html) .
- <span id="page-4-1"></span>2. Treanor JJ, El Sahly H, King J, Graham I, Izikson R, Kohberger R, Patriarca P, Cox M. Protective efficacy of a trivalent recombinant hemagglutinin protein vaccine (FluBlok®) against influenza in healthy adults: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Vaccine. [2011](#page-0-3);29(44):7733–39. doi:[10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.07.128](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.07.128).
- <span id="page-4-2"></span>3. Dunkle LM, Izikson R, Patriarca P, Goldenthal KL, Muse D, Callahan J, Cox MMJ. Efficacy of recombinant influenza vaccine in adults 50 years of age or older. N Engl J Med. [2017;](#page-0-4)376 (25):2427–36. doi:[10.1056/NEJMoa1608862.](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1608862)
- <span id="page-4-3"></span>4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Flu vaccination coverage, United States, 2021–22 influenza season. [2022](#page-0-5) Oct 18 [accessed 2022 Nov 30]. [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/cover](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/coverage-2022estimates.htm) [age-2022estimates.htm](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/coverage-2022estimates.htm) .
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>5. Izurieta HS, Chillarige Y, Kelman J, Wei Y, Lu Y, Xu W, Lu M, Pratt D, Chu S, Wernecke M, et al. Relative effectiveness of cellcultured and egg-based influenza vaccines among elderly persons in the United States, 2017–2018. J Infect Dis. [2018](#page-0-6) Dec 18;220 (8):1255–64. doi:[10.1093/infdis/jiy716](https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiy716).
- 6. Bruxvoort KJ, Luo Y, Ackerson B, Tanenbaum HC, Sy LS, Gandhi A, Tseng HF. Comparison of vaccine effectiveness against influenza hospitalization of cell-based and egg-based influenza vaccines, 2017–2018. Vaccine. 2019;37(39):5807–11. doi:[10.1016/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.08.024) [j.vaccine.2019.08.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.08.024).
- <span id="page-4-5"></span>7. Puig-Barberà J, Tamames-Gómez S, Plans-Rubio P, Eiros-Bouza JM. Relative effectiveness of cell-cultured versus egg-based seasonal influenza vaccines in preventing influenza-related outcomes in subjects 18 years old or older: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2022;19(2):818. doi:[10.3390/ijerph19020818](https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19020818).
- <span id="page-4-6"></span>8. Grohskopf LA, Blanton LH, Ferdinands JM, Chung JR, Broder KR, Talbot HK, Morgan RL, Fry AM. Prevention and control of

seasonal influenza with vaccines: recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices—United States, 2022–23 influenza season. MMWR Recomm Rep. [2022](#page-3-2);71 (1):1–28. doi:[10.15585/mmwr.rr7101a1.](https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.rr7101a1)

- <span id="page-5-0"></span>9. Izurieta HS, Lu M, Kelman J, Lu Y, Lindaas A, Loc J, Pratt D, Wei Y, Chillarige Y, Wernecke M, et al. Comparative effectiveness of influenza vaccines among US medicare beneficiaries ages 65 years and older during the 2019–2020 season. Clin Infect Dis. [2021;](#page-3-3)73(11):e4251–59. doi:[10.1093/cid/ciaa1727.](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa1727)
- <span id="page-5-1"></span>10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Flu vaccination coverage by jurisdiction: data collection period: 05/01/2022-05/28/ 2022 Pennsylvania. [2022](#page-4-7) Sep 29. [https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvax](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/dashboard/vaccination-adult-coverage.html)  [view/dashboard/vaccination-adult-coverage.html .](https://www.cdc.gov/flu/fluvaxview/dashboard/vaccination-adult-coverage.html)
- <span id="page-5-2"></span>11. Lewis NM, Chung JR, Uyeki TM, Grohskopf L, Ferdinands JM, Patel MM. Interpretation of relative efficacy and effectiveness for influenza vaccines. Clin Infect Dis. [2022;](#page-4-8)75(1):170–75. doi:[10.](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab1016)  [1093/cid/ciab1016.](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab1016)
- <span id="page-5-3"></span>12. Sullivan SG, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Cowling BJ. Theoretical basis of the test-negative study design for assessment of influenza vaccine effectiveness. Am J Epidemiol. [2016;](#page-4-9)184(5):345–53. doi:[10.](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kww064) [1093/aje/kww064.](https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kww064)
- <span id="page-5-4"></span>13. De Serres G, Skowronski D, Wu X, Ambrose C. The test-negative design: validity, accuracy and precision of vaccine efficacy estimates compared to the gold standard of randomised placebo-controlled clinical trials. Eurosurveillance. [2013](#page-4-9);18 (37):20585. doi:[10.2807/1560-7917.ES2013.18.37.20585](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES2013.18.37.20585).

# <span id="page-6-0"></span>**Appendix 1. ICD10 codes for high risk**





(*Continued*)

E11\* Type 2 diabetes mellitus E13\* Other specified diabetes mellitus

O24\* Diabetes mellitus in pregnancy, childbirth, and the puerperium

#### R. K. ZIMMERMAN ET AL.

#### (Continued).



#### ICD10 Description M07\* Enteropathic arthropathies<br>M08\* Juvenile arthritis M08\* Juvenile arthritis<br>M30\* Polvarteritis node M30\* Polyarteritis nodosa and related conditions<br>M31\* Other necrotizing vasculopathies M31\* Other necrotizing vasculopathies<br>M32\* Systemic lupus erythematosus (SI M32\* Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE)<br>M33\* Dermatopolymyositis M33\* Dermatopolymyositis<br>M34\* Systemic sclerosis [scl M34\* Systemic sclerosis [scleroderma]<br>M35.0\* Sicca syndrome [Siögren] M35.0\* Sicca syndrome [Sjögren]<br>M35.9\* Systemic involvement of o  $M35.9*$  Systemic involvement of connective tissue, unspecified<br> $O89.0*$  Congenital absence and malformations of spleen Q89.0\* Congenital absence and malformations of spleen<br>T45.1×1 Poisoning by antineoplastic and immunosuppress Poisoning by antineoplastic and immunosuppressive drugs, accidental(unintentional) Z21\* Asymptomatic human immunodeficiency virus [HIV] infection status Z48.2\* Encounter for aftercare following organ transplant<br>Z51.0\* Encounter for antineoplastic radiation therapy Z51.0\* Encounter for antineoplastic radiation therapy<br>Z51.1\* Encounter for antineoplastic chemotherapy an  $Z51.1*$  Encounter for antineoplastic chemotherapy and immunotherapy<br> $Z94*$  Transplanted organ and tissue status  $Z94*$  Transplanted organ and tissue status<br> $B18*$  Chronic viral hepatitis B18\* Chronic viral hepatitis<br>K70\* Alcoholic liver disease K70\* Alcoholic liver disease<br>K71\* Toxic liver disease K71\* Toxic liver disease<br>K72\* Hepatic failure, no K72\* Hepatic failure, not elsewhere classified<br>K73\* Chronic hepatitis not elsewhere classified K73\* Chronic hepatitis, not elsewhere classified<br>K74\* Fibrosis and cirrhosis of liver  $K74*$  Fibrosis and cirrhosis of liver<br> $K75*$  Other inflammatory liver dise  $K75*$  Other inflammatory liver diseases<br> $K76*$  Other diseases of liver K76\* Other diseases of liver<br>K77\* Liver disorders in disea  $K77*$  Liver disorders in diseases classified elsewhere<br>181\* Portal vein thrombosis I81\* Portal vein thrombosis<br>I85\* Esophageal varices 185\* Esophageal varices<br>Z79.5\* Long term (current Z79.5\* Long term (current) use of steroids<br>Z79.82\* Long term (current) use of aspirin ( Long term (current) use of aspirin (\*will only be used for those<19 years of age) C00\* Malignant neoplasm of lip<br>C01\* Malignant neoplasm of base C01\* Malignant neoplasm of base of tongue<br>C02\* Malignant neoplasm of other and unsp  $CO2*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of tongue  $CO3*$  Malignant neoplasm of gum C03\* Malignant neoplasm of gum<br>C04\* Malignant neoplasm of floor C04\* Malignant neoplasm of floor of mouth<br>C05\* Malignant neoplasm of palate C05\* Malignant neoplasm of palate<br>C06\* Malignant neoplasm of other a  $C06*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of mouth  $C07*$  Malignant neoplasm of parotid gland  $C07*$  Malignant neoplasm of parotid gland<br> $C08*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and uns C08\* Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified major salivary glands<br>C09\* Malignant neoplasm of tonsil C09\* Malignant neoplasm of tonsil<br>C10\* Malignant neoplasm of oroph C10\* Malignant neoplasm of oropharynx<br>C11\* Malignant neoplasm of nasopharyn C11\* Malignant neoplasm of nasopharynx<br>C12\* Malignant neoplasm of pyriform sinu C12\* Malignant neoplasm of pyriform sinus<br>C13\* Malignant neoplasm of hypopharynx C13\* Malignant neoplasm of hypopharynx Malignant neoplasm of other and ill-defined sites in the lip, oral cavity and pharynx C15<sup>\*</sup> Malignant neoplasm of esophagus<br>C16<sup>\*</sup> Malignant neoplasm of stomach C16\* Malignant neoplasm of stomach<br>C17\* Malignant neoplasm of small inter-C17\* Malignant neoplasm of small intestine<br>C18\* Malignant neoplasm of colon C18\* Malignant neoplasm of colon<br>C19\* Malignant neoplasm of rectos C19\* Malignant neoplasm of rectosigmoid junction<br>C20\* Malignant neoplasm of rectum C20<sup>\*</sup> Malignant neoplasm of rectum<br>C21<sup>\*</sup> Malignant neoplasm of anus an C21\* Malignant neoplasm of anus and anal canal  $C22*$  Malignant neoplasm of liver and intrahepatic bile ducts  $C23*$  Malignant neoplasm of gallbladder C23\* Malignant neoplasm of gallbladder<br>C24\* Malignant neoplasm of other and u C24\* Malignant neoplasm of other and unspecified parts of biliary tract C25\* Malignant neoplasm of pancreas  $C25*$  Malignant neoplasm of pancreas<br> $C26*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and  $C26*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and ill-defined digestive organs  $C30*$  Malignant neoplasm of nasal cavity and middle ear Malignant neoplasm of nasal cavity and middle ear C31\* Malignant neoplasm of accessory sinuses<br>C32\* Malignant neoplasm of larvnx C32\* Malignant neoplasm of larynx<br>C33\* Malignant neoplasm of trache Malignant neoplasm of trachea C34\* Malignant neoplasm of bronchus and lung<br>C37\* Malignant neoplasm of thymus C37\* Malignant neoplasm of thymus<br>C38\* Malignant neoplasm of heart, m  $C38*$  Malignant neoplasm of heart, mediastinum and pleura<br> $C39*$  Malignant neoplasm of other and ill-defined sites in the Malignant neoplasm of other and ill-defined sites in the respiratory system and intrathoracic organs  $C40*$  Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage of limbs  $C41*$  Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage of other Malignant neoplasm of bone and articular cartilage of other and unspecified sites

- 
- C43\* Malignant melanoma of skin<br>C44\* Other and unspecified malign Other and unspecified malignant neoplasm of skin





Other congenital malformations of nervous system

(*Continued*)

#### (Continued).



# <span id="page-9-0"></span>**Appendix 2. Distribution of high-risk conditions between the two cohorts**



# <span id="page-10-0"></span>**Appendix 3. Sample plots for Standardized Mean Difference (SMD) and balance plots between the two cohorts before and after weighting**



Plot 1 (optimize): GBM Optimization

Plot 1 GBM Optimization\_3.







Plot 3 (es): Standardized Effect Sizes Pre/Post Weighting

Plot 3 Standardized Effect\_5.



Plot 4 (t): T-test P-values of Group Means of Covariates

Plot 4 T test *p* values o\_6.



## Plot 5 (ks): K-S P-values of Group Distns of Covariates

Plot 5 Kolmogrov Simrnov\_7.

## <span id="page-12-0"></span>**Appendix 4. Patient characteristics by vaccination status (missing, recombinant, standard dose)**

<span id="page-12-1"></span>

# **Appendix 5. Effectiveness and relative effectiveness of recombinant and standard dose influenza vaccines including missing vaccination data**



<sup>1</sup>Missing (unknown) vaccination subjects are included in the recombinant group.<br><sup>2</sup>Missing (unknown) vaccination subjects are included in the standard dose group

2Missing (unknown) vaccination subjects are included in the standard dose group.

Missing (unknown) vaccination subjects are included in the unvaccinated group.

# <span id="page-13-0"></span>**Appendix 6. Sensitivity Analysis 1: Demographics and VE estimates**

Baseline demographics all adults≥18 years old including immunocompromised, excluding recipients of other advanced (Flucelvax, FluAd) and high dose (High dose Fluzone) vaccines



Effectiveness and relative effectiveness of recombinant and standard dose influenza vaccines against RT-PCR confirmed influenza for all adults≥18 years old including immunocompromised, excluding recipients of other advanced (Flucelvax, FluAd) and high dose (High dose Fluzone) vaccines



Bold indicates non-overlapping confidence intervals. \*Standard dose = Afluria, Fluarix, Flulaval and SD Fluzone.

\*Adjusted vaccine effectiveness for recombinant and standard dose vaccines (Afluria, Fluarix, Flulaval and SD Fluzone) vs. no vaccination.

\*\*Multivariable logistic regression model adjusted for age, race, sex, season, and high-risk conditions, except that the stratified variable is not included as an adjustment in its own analysis.

Propensity score: Generalized Boosted Regression Method was used to calculate the propensity score using TWANG (Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups). †

High-risk not included.

## <span id="page-14-0"></span>**Appendix 7. Sensitivity Analysis 2: Demographics and VE estimates**

Baseline demographics for non-immunocompromised adults 18–64 years old, excluding recipients of other advanced (non-RIV4) vaccines



Effectiveness and relative effectiveness of recombinant and standard dose influenza vaccines against RT-PCR confirmed influenza for non-immunocompromised adults 18–64 years old, excluding recipients of other advanced (non-RIV4) vaccines



Bold indicates non-overlapping confidence intervals. \*Adjusted vaccine effectiveness for recombinant and standard dose vaccines vs. no vaccination.

\*\*Multivariable logistic regression model adjusted for age, race, sex, season, and high-risk conditions, except that the stratified variable is not included as an adjustment in its own analysis.

Standard dose = All standard dose egg-based; excludes other advanced (non-RIV4) vaccines Propensity score: Generalized Boosted Regression Method was used to calculate the propensity score using TWANG (Toolkit for Weighting and Analysis of Nonequivalent Groups).