Rapid review on the effects of vaccination in the immunocompromised and those on dialysis Paul Moayyedi, Cathy Yuan

Population

- Immunocompromised
 - HIV infection
 - Primary immune or complement deficiency
 - On immunosuppressive therapy
 - Malignancy
 - Transplant
- Dialysis
 - Hemodialysis
 - Peritoneal dialysis

Intervention

- COVID-19 vaccine approved in Canada
 - BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech)
 - mRNA-1273 (Moderna)
 - AZD1222 (ChAdOx1) (AstraZeneca-Oxford)
 - Ad26.COV2.S (Johnson & Johnson)

Comparator

- Healthy control
- Disease control (for immunosuppression e.g. inflammatory bowel disease – outcome of vaccines in those with and without immunosuppressive therapy)

Outcome

- Protection against developing symptomatic COVID-19
- Immunogenicity in disease subgroups
- Harms of COVID vaccines in immunocompromised or dialysis patients

Overview

216 titles screened

96 excluded

-35 too small

-29 duplicate

-17 wrong population

- 15 other reason

120 eligible

Efficacy in preventing COVID-19 infections

Author	Country	Overall population	Immunocompr omised	Infections over follow up	Vaccine effectiveness well popn (95% CI)	Vaccine effectiveness immunocomp (95% CI)
Dagan 2021	Israel	3,159,136	32,003	10,561	91% (83-96%)	90% (49-100%)
Young-Xu 2021	US (VA system)	6,710,750	99,107	15,404	94% (92-95%)	88% (82-92%)

Both studies compared vaccinated with unvaccinated and defined protection period as ≥ 7 days after 2nd vaccine Pooled population vaccine effectiveness = 94% (95% CI = 92-95%) Pooled immunocompromised vaccine effectiveness = 88% (95% CI = 83-93%)

Dagan N et al. NEJM 2021; 384:1412-23 and Young-Xu Y et al. doi2021.06.14.21258906 (not peer reviewed)

Efficacy in preventing COVID-19 infections: IBD

- Another study provided contributing evidence but could not be pooled with the previous two studies.
- Evaluated 5,562 inflammatory bowel disease (53% on biologics) versus 864,575 controls after vaccination (both first and second).
- During follow up 19 (0.36%) IBD patients were diagnosed with COVID-19 compared with 2227 (0.28%) controls (RR = 1.3; 95% CI = 0.83-2.05)
- After adjustment RR = 0.95; 95% CI = 0.51- 1.78)
- Did not give data for biologic therapies separately but noted that there was less than 50% of the COVID-19 IBD infections in this group.

Efficacy summary

- Only a modest reduction in vaccine efficacy for COVID-19 vaccination in the immunocompromised in population studies
- These studies have only a small number of certain groups such as primary immune deficiencies and transplant patients
- These data are largely reassuring but need more granular immunogenicity data for immunocompromised subgroups

Immunogenicity of vaccines in HIV Evaluation of seroconversion after 2nd vaccine

- 5 studies
- 258 HIV 97% converted (titres similar to controls)
- 948 controls 99% converted
- RR = 1.00 (95% CI = 0.98-1.01)
- $|^2 = 0\%$

	HIV +	ve	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk	Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Rand	om, 95% Cl	
Frater 2021	51	51	49	49	24.7%	1.00 [0.96, 1.04]			
Levy 2021	139	141	269	272	67.1%	1.00 [0.97, 1.02]			
Madhi 2021	30	32	22	23	2.4%	0.98 [0.87, 1.11]	-	ł	
Haidar 2021	35	37	105	107	5.6%	0.96 [0.89, 1.05]	•	-	
Shrotri 2021	3	3	494	497	0.3%	0.88 [0.61, 1.28]	-	-	
Total (95% CI)		264		948	100.0%	1.00 [0.98, 1.01]			
Total events	258		939						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	= 0.00; Ch	i ^z = 1.73	2, df = 4 (P = 0.7	9); I ^z = 0%	6		10	100
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.51	(P = 0.6	i1)				Favours control	Favours HIV	100

Seroconversion in malignancy

- 30 studies
- 17 cohort studies and 13 case series
- 3459 cancer patients
- 1969 healthy controls
- All studies that reported stated IgG titres lower in malignancy cases than controls

Overall seroconversion in patients with malignancy

Group	Number of studies	Number of patients	Proportion converted (95% CI)
Solid malignancy 1 st vaccine	8	635	54% (38-69%)
Solid malignancy 2 nd vaccine	9	850	91% (86-95%)
Hematological 1 st vaccine	8	606	48% (32-63%)
Hematological 2 nd vaccine	14	2197	64% (56-73%)

Comparison of malignancy with healthy controls after second vaccine

Malignancy	No. studies	Total participants	RR seroconversion (95% Cl)
Solid	6	792	0.91 (0.86 to 0.97)
Hematological	9	2600	0.65 (0.55 to 0.77)

Solid malignancy slightly worse seroconversion than healthy controls

Risk factors for poor outcome are age and having active treatment at time of vaccine

Hematological malignancy significantly worse than healthy controls and worse than solid malignancy (p=0.00001)

Immunogenicity after 2nd vaccine in immunosuppressive therapy patients

- 16 studies
- 1320 patients
- 1250 healthy or disease (not in immunosuppressive therapy) controls
- No difference between control groups so these controls combined

Immunogenicity after 2nd vaccine in immunosuppressive therapy patients

Group	Number of studies	Number of patients	Proportion converted (95% CI)
Inflammatory Bowel Diseases	3	59	95% (82-100%)
Rheumatological diseases	3	538	88% (79-95%)
Multiple Sclerosis	3	145	42% (33-52%)
Various autoimmune disease	7	578	64% (56-73%)

Comparison of response to 2nd vaccine in those on immunosuppressive therapy compared to controls

Group	No. studies	Total participants	RR seroconversion (95% CI)
Inflammatory bowel disease	3	110	1.00 (0.89 to 1.12)
Various autoimmune diseases	8	1571	0.92 (0.87 to 0.97)
Unclear indication	1	175	0.34 (0.11 to 1.06)
Multiple Sclerosis	2	202	0.42 (0.30 to 0.59)

Modest impact of immunosuppressive therapy on seroconversion rates although titres lower than healthy controls No impact for biologics used in IBD although number studies are small. We have more data after the first vaccine and one study (1) suggested a slightly lower seroconversion rate for anti-TNF in 1293 participants (RR = 0.88; 95% 0.80 to 0.97) Immunosuppressive drugs used in MS seem to have a greater impact on seroconversion rates – particularly for Fingolimod and Ocerlizumab (Cladribine seems to have little impact on seroconversion). Seroconversion in transplant patients after their second vaccine

- 22 studies
 - 14 cohort studies
 - 8 case series
- 2729 participants
 - 2038 transplant patients
 - 691 healthy controls
- Various solid organ transplants predominantly kidney, liver, heart, lung
- Overall seroconversion rate = 27% (95%CI = 22 to 33%)

Comparison of seroconversion in transplant patients compared to healthy controls after second vaccine

	Transp	lant	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Bertrand 2021	8	45	8	9	6.2%	0.20 [0.10, 0.39]	
Firket 2021	3	10	10	10	4.8%	0.33 [0.14, 0.80]	
Grupper 2021	51	136	25	25	10.2%	0.38 [0.31, 0.48]	-
Haidar 2021	68	183	105	107	10.4%	0.38 [0.31, 0.46]	+
Havlin 2021	0	46	10	10	0.8%	0.01 [0.00, 0.18]	←─────
Korth 2021	5	23	23	23	5.7%	0.23 [0.11, 0.49]	_
Marinaki 2021	20	34	116	116	9.8%	0.59 [0.45, 0.78]	
Mazzola 2021	38	133	25	25	9.8%	0.29 [0.22, 0.38]	
Miele 2021	6	16	23	23	6.8%	0.39 [0.21, 0.72]	_
Narasimhan 2021	18	73	49	49	8.7%	0.25 [0.17, 0.38]	
Peled 2021	14	77	134	136	8.0%	0.18 [0.11, 0.30]	_ -
Rabinowich 2021	38	80	25	25	10.1%	0.48 [0.38, 0.61]	-
Rincon-Arevalo 2021	4	40	55	69	4.4%	0.13 [0.05, 0.32]	
Sattler 2021	4	39	60	64	4.4%	0.11 [0.04, 0.28]	
Total (95% CI)		935		691	100.0%	0.29 [0.23, 0.38]	◆
Total events	277		668				
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0).15; Chi ² ∶	= 68.74	, df = 13	(P ≤ 0.0	00001); I ^z	= 81%	
Test for overall effect: Z	:= 9.48 (P	< 0.00	001)				Favours control Favours transplant

Seroconversion after 2nd vaccination in patients with primary immune deficiencies

- These are all rare disorders
- Three studies
 - Two cohort studies, one case series
- 277 participants
 - 153 cases
 - 124 healthy controls
- 31% (95% CI 4 to 70%) converted
- RR = 0.23 (95% CI 0.09 to 0.55) compared to healthy

	Primary immune def	iciency	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Nadesalingam 2021	4	80	35	96	38.2%	0.14 [0.05, 0.37]		_	
Salinas 2021	14	47	28	28	61.8%	0.31 [0.20, 0.47]			
Total (95% CI)		127		124	100.0%	0.23 [0.09, 0.55]			
Total events	18		63						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 2	0.29; Chi² = 2.88, df = 1 Z = 3.27 (P = 0.001)	(P = 0.09)); I² = 65%	ò			0.01	0.1 1 10 10 Favours control Favours immunodeficienc)0 V

Primary immunodeficiencies

- A number of different disorders with varying ability to mount a response to vaccination
- For example, none of the 10 X-linked Aglobulinemia (XLA) seroconverted. This is entirely expected as these individuals cannot produce immunoglobulin (which is what is measured when evaluating response to vaccines).
- However, XLA had a more pronounced T-cell response to vaccination than other immunodeficiencies or healthy controls. This suggest the immune system of XLA is trying to compensate to provide some protection against COVID-19.

Seroconversion from 2nd vaccination in dialysis patients

- Twenty one studies
 - 6 cohort
 - 15 case series
- 2588 participants
 - 2186 cases
 - 402 controls



- 89% (95% CI = 85 to 93%) converted
- RR = 0.87 (95%Cl = 0.79 to 0.96)

Summary

Impact on seroconversion	Diseases
None	HIV infection
Minor	Most immunosuppressive medication Solid malignancy patients Dialysis patients
Moderate	Hematologic malignancy
Severe	MS patients on Fingolimod or Ocerlizumab Some patients with primary immunodeficiencies Transplant patients

Additional data

- Three studies have reported on response to a third vaccination in high risk groups. All report an increase in seroconversion and also a rise in antibody titres towards that seen in healthy controls.
- For example Ducloux reported and increase in seroconversion from 40/45 to 42/45 with titres rising from a median of 672 to 6435 with the third vaccination.



Figure 3 | Individual variations in antibody titers (severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 [SARS-Cov-2] immunoassay, which Abbott designed to detect IgG antibodies to the receptor-binding domain of the S1 subunit of the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2) during the vaccine scheme. UA, xxx.

Ducloux D et al. Kidney International 2021 in press

Safety of vaccination in the immunocompromised

- Less data
- Combined all diseases
- Evaluated overall adverse events
- 9 studies, 1023 participants
- Less adverse events in immunocompromised
- No reports of worsening disease after immunization
- No serious adverse event signal

Appendix figures

Solid malignancy: proportion seroconverting after 1st vaccine



Proportion meta-analysis plot [random effects]

Solid malignancy: proportion seroconverting after 2nd vaccine



Proportion meta-analysis plot [random effects]

Hematological malignancy: proportion seroconverting after 1st vaccine



Proportion meta-analysis plot [random effects]

Hematological malignancy: proportion seroconverting after 2nd vaccine



Proportion meta-analysis plot [random effects]

Comparison of malignancy with healthy controls after second vaccine

	Maligna	ancy	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
1.1.1 Solid maligna	ncy								
Barriere 2021	40	42	24	24	7.4%	0.96 [0.88, 1.05]		+	
Haidar 2021	28	34	105	107	6.8%	0.84 [0.72, 0.98]		-	
Massarweh 2021	92	102	78	78	7.6%	0.90 [0.84, 0.97]		-	
Monin 2021	18	19	12	12	6.7%	0.96 [0.82, 1.14]		+	
Palich 2021	210	223	49	49	7.7%	0.95 [0.91, 0.99]		1	
Shroff 2021	42	52	50	50	7.0%	0.81 [0.71, 0.93]		-	
Subtotal (95% CI)		472		320	43.0%	0.91 [0.86, 0.97]		•	
Total events	430		318						
Heterogeneity: Tau	²= 0.00; Chi	≈ = 11.8	89, df = 5	(P = 0.0)	04); I ^z = 58	3%			
Test for overall effe	ct: Z = 3.02 ((P = 0.0)	03)						
1.1.2 Hernatologica	n malignan	cy							
Ghione 2021	36	86	197	201	5.6%	0.43 [0.33, 0.55]		-	
Haidar 2021 (hem)	41	75	105	107	6.2%	0.56 [0.45, 0.69]			
Herishanu 2021	66	167	52	52	6.4%	0.40 [0.33, 0.48]		+	
Maneikis 2021	643	857	68	68	7.7%	0.76 [0.72, 0.79]		•	
Monin 2021	3	5	12	12	2.0%	0.61 [0.31, 1.20]			
Parry 2021	39	55	36	37	6.5%	0.73 [0.61, 0.87]			
Pimpinelli 2021	77	92	36	36	7.3%	0.84 [0.77, 0.93]		-	
Tzarfati 2021	235	315	107	108	7.6%	0.75 [0.70, 0.81]		•	
van Oekelen 2021	219	260	67	67	7.6%	0.85 [0.80, 0.90]		.*	
Subtotal (95% CI)		1912		688	57.0%	0.65 [0.55, 0.77]		•	
Total events	1359		680						
Heterogeneity: Tau	²= 0.05; Chi	² = 188.	.17, df = 8	8 (P < 0	.00001);1	l²= 96%			
Test for overall effe	ct: Z = 5.18 ((P < 0.0)	0001)						
Total (95% CI)		2384		1008	100.0%	0.75 [0.67, 0.84]		•	
Total events	1789		998						
Heterogeneity: Tau [:]	²= 0.04; Chi	z = 328.	.89, df = 1	4 (P <	0.00001)	; I² = 96%			100
Test for overall effe	ot: Z = 4.94 ((P < 0.0	0001)				0.01	Eavours control Eavours malignand	00
Test for subaroup a	lifferences:	Chi ^z = 1	4.67.df=	= 1 (P =	0.0001).	I ² = 93.2%		ravours control i avours manghand	/

Immunogenicity after 2nd vaccine in those on immunosuppressive therapy compared to controls

	Immunosuppressive ti	nerapy	Conti	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.6.1 IBD							
Ben-Dov 2021	29	29	4	4	5.7%	1.00 [0.74, 1.34]	_ _
Kennedy 2021	17	20	6	7	4.9%	0.99 [0.70, 1.41]	
Wong 2021	10	10	40	40	8.3%	1.00 [0.88, 1.14]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)		59		51	19.0 %	1.00 [0.89, 1.12]	◆
Total events	56		50				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ² = 0.00, df = 2 (P :	= 1.00); l ^a	= 0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 0.02 (P = 0.99)						
1.6.2 MS							
Achiron 2021	34	93	78	79	6.2%	0.37 [0.28, 0.48]	_
Apostolidis 2021	10	20	10	10	3.8%	0.52 [0.34, 0.82]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		113		89	10.0%	0.42 [0.30, 0.59]	◆
Total events	44		88				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.03; Chi ² = 1.79, df = 1 (P :	= 0.18); l ²	= 44%				
Test for overall effect: Z	= 5.03 (P < 0.00001)						
1.6.3 autoimmune dise	ases						
Boekel 2021	58	62	52	55	8.9%	0.99 [0.90, 1.08]	+
Braun-Moscovici 2021	205	242	22	22	9.0%	0.86 [0.80, 0.94]	-
Deepak 2021	85	100	85	86	9.0%	0.86 [0.79, 0.94]	+
Giesen 2021	26	26	42	42	9.2%	1.00 [0.94, 1.06]	+
Haberman 2021	42	51	25	26	8.1%	0.86 [0.74, 0.99]	
Haidar 2021	58	72	181	195	8.5%	0.87 [0.77, 0.98]	-
Rubbert-Roth 2021	45	51	20	20	8.5%	0.90 [0.79, 1.01]	-
Shrotri 2021	23	24	494	497	9.0%	0.96 [0.89, 1.05]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		628		943	70.1%	0.92 [0.87, 0.97]	•
Total events	542		921				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi² = 20.18, df = 7 (F	? = 0.005)	; I² = 65%)			
Test for overall effect: Z	= 3.03 (P = 0.002)						
1.6.4 indicaton unclear							
Broseta 2021	2	6	165	169	0.9%	0.34 [0.11, 1.06]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		6		169	0.9%	0.34 [0.11, 1.06]	
Total events	2		165				
Heterogeneity: Not appl	licable						
Test for overall effect: Z	= 1.86 (P = 0.06)						
Total (95% CI)		806		1252	100.0%	0.85 [0.76, 0.95]	•
Total events	644		1224				
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.04; Chi ² = 141.68, df = 13	(P < 0.00	0001); I r =	91%		-	
Test for overall effect: Z	= 2.78 (P = 0.005)						Eavours control Eavours immunosuppressive
Test for subgroup differ	rences: Chi² = 25.58, df = 3	3 (P < 0.0	001), I ^z =	88.3%			avous contor i avous minutosuppressive
Test for subaroup differ	rences: Chi ² = 25.58, df = 3	3 (P < 0.0	001), I² =	88.3%			Favours control Favours immunosuppressive

Adverse events in immunocompromised compared to healthy controls

Immunocompro	nised	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio		
Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		
100	186	41	50	13.9%	0.66 [0.54, 0.79]	-		
45	94	16	24	12.1%	0.72 [0.50, 1.02]			
22	51	32	49	11.8%	0.66 [0.45, 0.96]			
11	26	12	38	8.5%	1.34 [0.70, 2.56]			
63	80	16	17	14.1%	0.84 [0.71, 0.99]	+		
9	31	11	16	8.6%	0.42 [0.22, 0.80]			
18	71	18	21	11.1%	0.30 [0.19, 0.46]	_ - _		
11	38	34	70	9.6%	0.60 [0.34, 1.04]			
14	81	53	80	10.2%	0.26 [0.16, 0.43]	_		
	658		365	100.0%	0.58 [0.43, 0.77]	•		
293		233						
= 0.15; Chi ² = 50.00	, df = 8 (l	P < 0.000	01); l² :	= 84%				
Z = 3.69 (P = 0.000	02)					Eavours immunocompromised Eavours control		
-	Immunocomproi Events 100 45 22 11 63 9 18 11 14 293 = 0.15; Chi² = 50.00 : Z = 3.69 (P = 0.00)	Immunocompromised Events Total 100 186 45 94 22 51 11 26 63 80 9 31 18 71 11 38 14 81 658 293 = 0.15; Chi ² = 50.00, df = 8 (: Z = 3.69 (P = 0.0002)	ImmunocompromisedContrEventsTotalEvents1001864145941622513211261263801693111187118113834148153E58293233= 0.15; Chi² = 50.00, df = 8 (P < 0.000); Z = 3.69 (P = 0.0002)	ImmunocompromisedControlEventsTotalEventsTotal1001864150459416242251324911261238638016179311116187118211138347014815380658365293233= 0.15; Chi ² = 50.00, df = 8 (P < 0.00001); I ² = 3.69 (P = 0.0002)	ImmunocompromisedControlEventsTotalEventsTotalWeight100186415013.9%4594162412.1%2251324911.8%112612388.5%6380161714.1%93111168.6%1871182111.1%113834709.6%1481538010.2%Cost293233= 0.15; Chi² = 50.00, df = 8 (P < 0.000 U1); I² = 84%	Immunocompromised EventsControlFotalWeightRisk Ratio100186415013.9%0.66 [0.54, 0.79]4594162412.1%0.72 [0.50, 1.02]2251324911.8%0.66 [0.45, 0.96]112612388.5%1.34 [0.70, 2.56]6380161714.1%0.84 [0.71, 0.99]93111168.6%0.42 [0.22, 0.80]1871182111.1%0.30 [0.19, 0.46]113834709.6%0.60 [0.34, 1.04]1481538010.2%0.26 [0.16, 0.43]293233233233233= 0.15; Chi ² = 50.00, df = 8 (P < 0.000 UT); I ² = 84%34%		