

Risk of Relapse After COVID-19 Vaccination Among Patients With Multiple Sclerosis in France

Xavier Moisset, Emmanuelle Leray, Chouki Chenaf, Frederic Taithe, Sandra

Vukusic, Aurélien Mulliez, Pierre Clavelou

▶ To cite this version:

Xavier Moisset, Emmanuelle Leray, Chouki Chenaf, Frederic Taithe, Sandra Vukusic, et al.. Risk of Relapse After COVID-19 Vaccination Among Patients With Multiple Sclerosis in France. Neurology, 2024, 103 (5), pp.e209662. 10.1212/wnl.00000000209662 . hal-04698925

HAL Id: hal-04698925 https://hal.science/hal-04698925v1

Submitted on 22 Oct 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Risk of relapse after COVID-19 vaccination among patients with multiple sclerosis in France: a self-controlled case series.

3

8 9

Xavier Moisset, MD¹*, Emmanuelle Leray, PhD²*, Chouki Chenaf, MD¹, Frédéric Taithe,
MD³, Sandra Vukusic, MD^{4,5,6}, Aurélien Mulliez, MSc⁷, and Pierre Clavelou, MD¹.

6 * These authors contributed equally to this work.7

- 1- Université Clermont Auvergne, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, Inserm, Neuro-Dol, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France
- 2- Univ Rennes, EHESP, CNRS, Inserm, ARENES UMR 6051, RSMS U 1309, F-35000
 Rennes
- 12 3- Service de Neurologie, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, F-63000, Clermont-Ferrand, France
- 4- Service de neurologie, sclérose en plaques, pathologies de la myéline et neuroinflammation, Centre de Ressources, Recherche et Compétence sur la Sclérose en Plaques et Fondation Eugène Devic EDMUS pour la Sclérose en Plaques, Hôpital Neurologique Pierre Wertheimer, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon-Bron, F-69677, France
- 5- Centre des Neurosciences de Lyon, INSERM 1028 et CNRS UMR5292, Observatoire
 Français de la Sclérose en Plaques, Lyon, F-69003, France
 - 6- Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, Villeurbanne, F-69100, France
 - 7- Biostatistics Unit, DRCI, CHU Clermont-Ferrand, F-63000, Clermont-Ferrand, France
- 21 22 23

20

24 Corresponding author:

- 25 Xavier MOISSET
- 26 CHU Gabriel Montpied
- 27 Service de Neurologie
- 28 58 rue Montalembert
- 29 63000 Clermont-Ferrand
- 30 Tel: +33 6 79 53 01 31
- 31 E-mail: <u>xmoisset@chu-clermontferrand.fr</u> / xavier.moisset@gmail.com
- 32

34 Abstract

35 Background and objectives

People with multiple sclerosis (MS) have an increased risk of severe coronavirus infection 36 due to their level of motor disability or exposure to certain immunosuppressive treatments. 37 Thus, MS patients have had priority access to COVID-19 vaccination. However, relapses 38 following vaccination have been reported, leading some patients to not seek the recommended 39 booster doses. The main objective was to estimate the risk of severe relapse after one, two, 40 and three (booster) doses of COVID-19 vaccination in patients with MS. The secondary 41 objectives were to assess the risk of relapse in clinically meaningful subgroups according to 42 the type of vaccine, the characteristics of the patients, and the use of disease modifying 43 treatments (DMTs). 44

45 Methods

We conducted a nationwide study using data from the French national health data system. MS patients were identified according to ICD codes, specific treatments, and reimbursement data up to March 31, 2022. Relapses requiring treatment with high-dose corticosteroids were identified. A self-controlled case series method was used to evaluate the risk of relapse associated with COVID-19 vaccines in the 45 days after vaccination. The associated risk was evaluated after one, two, or three (booster) doses and is expressed as overall incidence rate ratios (IRRs) and in subgroups of interest.

53 **Results**

Overall, 124,545 patients with MS were identified on January 1, 2021, and 82% received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine (n=102,524) until December 31, 2021, for a total of 259,880 doses. The combined IRR for MS relapse was 0.97 [0.91–1.03], p=0.30. The same absence of risk was confirmed in various subgroups (age <50 years, duration of MS <10 years, use of DMT). A small increase in the relapse risk cannot be excluded after a booster dose (IRR =1.39 [1.08–1.80]) for patients with high MS activity, especially when not treated.

60 **Discussion**

There is no increased risk of relapse requiring corticosteroid therapy after COVID-19
vaccination for almost all patients. We cannot exclude an increased risk following the booster
dose for patients who have had at least two relapses in the previous two years.

64 Classification of Evidence

- 65 This study provides Class III evidence that COVID-19 vaccination does not increase the risk
- 66 of severe relapse in patients with multiple sclerosis.

68 Introduction

During the COVID-19 pandemic, it was shown that patients with multiple sclerosis (MS) had a risk of severe infection due to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) that was more than twice that of the general population¹. Such excess risk is mainly explained by the level of disability and comorbidities (hypertension, diabetes, cancer, obesity). A residual increase in such risk can be attributed to immunosuppressants, especially anti-CD20 therapies. Because of the higher risk of severe infection, patients with MS were given priority for vaccination in France.

However, case series of relapses following COVID-19 vaccination have been reported^{2,3} and 76 the analysis of a cohort of 1661 patients with MS recently concluded that there was a small 77 increase in the incidence of relapse after COVID-19 vaccination⁴. First episodes of acute 78 inflammatory central nervous system diseases (neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder and 79 myelin oligodendrocyte glycoprotein antibody-associated disease) have also been reported⁵. A 80 systematic review and meta-analysis of 19 observational studies involving nearly 15,000 81 patients with MS concluded that there was no excess risk⁶. However, certain elements could 82 not be properly considered. Each series had potential selection biases and lacked an 83 appropriate control group or control period. In addition, potential risk factors for relapse 84 85 merited assessment, in particular the patients' age and disease duration, as younger patients with shorter disease duration are at a higher risk of relapse. Disease modifying treatments 86 (DMTs) also needed to be considered. Finally, the type of vaccine used and the number of 87 doses received could also influence the risk of relapse. Such risk factors have never been 88 assessed in sufficiently large samples of patients with MS. 89

90 If there is an increase in the risk of relapse, such information would be of major importance91 for both clinicians and patients with MS, as some patients are already reluctant to be

vaccinated^{7,8}, despite clear guidelines⁹. The absence of such a risk would be reassuring for
patients, especially if booster shots are to be repeated in the future.

The main objective of the present study was to estimate the risk of severe relapse after one, two, and three (booster) doses of COVID-19 vaccination for patients with MS in a comprehensive nationwide cohort sufficiently large to explore a small increase in the risk of relapse. The secondary objectives were to assess the risk of relapse in clinically meaningful subgroups according to the type of vaccine, the characteristics of the patients (age, disease duration, previous relapses), and the use of DMTs.

101 Methods

102 *Data source*

The study was carried out using the French National Health Data System (SNDS)^{10,11}, which 103 104 covers approximately 99% of the French population, i.e. 66 million inhabitants. It contains exhaustive anonymous individual data concerning reimbursed outpatient health expenditures 105 (SNIIRAM), such as consultations, drugs dispensed by pharmacies, laboratory tests, etc. 106 Information about long-term diseases (LTDs) with 100% coverage is recorded using the 107 International Classification Diseases 10th Revision (ICD-10), with reference to the date of 108 onset of the disease. Sociodemographic data are available, such as the sex, age, and postal 109 110 code of residence. This information is linkable to the national hospital database (PMSI), which contains inpatient data with dates of admission and discharge, diagnoses (coded using 111 ICD-10), procedures, and expensive drugs or medical devices. This database is also linked to 112 the National COVID-19 Vaccination Database (VAC-SI), which includes the brand name of 113 the vaccine, the date of injection, and the dose number. 114

115 The SNDS database covering from January 1, 2009, to March 31, 2022 was explored.

116 Standard protocol approvals

The Clermont-Ferrand University Hospital has had permanent access to the SNDS since the
governmental decision published on June 29, 2021 (decree number 2021-848 and French data
protection authority decision CNIL-2016-316). The study was approved by local Ethics
Committee (IRB00013412, "CHU de Clermont Ferrand IRB #1", IRB number 2023-CF115)
with compliance to the French policy of individual data protection.

122 Study population

Patients with MS were identified in the database as having a LTD for MS (ICD-10 code G35),
having been hospitalised for MS, or receiving a DMT specific for MS (at least one

reimbursement for beta-interferons, glatiramer acetate, oral teriflunomide, dimethyl fumarate, 125 fingolimod, oral cladribine, natalizumab, or ocrelizumab) over the study period^{12,13}. Patients 126 that were identified by only one hospitalisation (without specific treatment or LTD for MS) 127 were excluded. Patients identified with neuromyelitis optica (ICD-10 G360 or eculizumab or 128 tocilizumab administration in the absence of rheumatoid arthritis) were also excluded from 129 the selection. The remaining patients were assigned a MS identification date according to the 130 earliest date for which there was information indicating MS among the LTDs, hospitalisation, 131 and treatment data. For the main analysis, patients with an onset of MS after December 31, 132 2019, were excluded. Patients who died before January 1, 2021, were also excluded. For the 133 complementary analysis of new MS cases identified in 2021, the same identification 134 algorithm has been applied, focusing solely on the year 2021. 135

136 *Outcomes*

The primary outcome was treated MS relapse. Because relapse as a clinical event was not directly available in the database, we used a specific recently published algorithm based on hospital admissions and the use of high-dose corticosteroids (either oral or intravenous)¹²⁻¹⁴. This highly efficient algorithm was shown to have a positive predictive value of 95% and a negative predictive value of 96%. Relapses were retrieved from January 1, 2019, to March 31, 2022.

143 *Exposure*

For each patient, only the first three vaccine injections were considered, whereas the French
recommendations were to give four doses of vaccine to people at high risk of severe infection,
including patients on immunosuppressive therapy for MS.

147 A 45-day time frame was chosen to define the risk period, as potential vaccine-induced 148 relapses are believed to generally occur within the first 28 days after vaccination⁶ and as treatment was used as a proxy and could have been slightly delayed after clinical onset of therelapse.

151 *Other data*

152 Patient comorbidities (cardio or neurovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, respiratory disease, cancer) were determined using LTD, hospitalization, and treatment data. The patient status 153 concerning DMT (specific to MS and used for patient identification or not) was considered as 154 155 follows: for intravenous anti-CD20 treatment (ocrelizumab and rituximab), patients were considered to have been treated for nine months following the last dispensation. For other 156 treatment (mycophenolate mofetil, azathioprine, methotrexate, cyclophosphamide, glatiramer 157 158 acetate, dimethylfumarate, interferon beta, cladribine, teriflunomide, anti-S1P, ofatumumab, and natalizumab), patients were considered to have been treated for 42 days after the last 159 dispensation. 160

161 Overall study design

162 Based on the main objective, we focused on self-controlled study designs, which are well 163 suited for vaccine safety evaluation. Three self-controlled designs are used to control unmeasured confounding factors: case-crossover (CCO), case-time control (CTC) and self-164 controlled case series (SCCS). We decided to use the two most appropriate methods in our 165 166 context (SCCS and CTC) to evaluate the potential risk of relapse associated with COVID-19 vaccination¹⁵ and to check their concordance. CCO was avoided because of potential temporal 167 bias: vaccination was not uniform during 2021 (Figure S1) and relapses could be linked to a 168 certain level of seasonal variation¹⁶. In such situation, CTC is recommended over the CCO. 169

Major validity assumptions for using such methods were satisfied in the present study: vaccination is an intermittent/transient type of exposure and MS relapse is an abrupt, possibly recurrent, and rare event. Minor validity assumptions were not all met, but the study design was adapted to account for this, as explained below. 174 SCCS study

The SCCS method allows investigation of the association between transient exposure and an 175 adverse event and is especially suited to study adverse reactions to vaccines¹⁷. The method 176 uses only subjects that are exposed to the COVID-19 vaccine. No separate controls (subjects 177 unexposed to the COVID-19 vaccine) are required, as the cases act as their own controls. For 178 each patient, time was divided into control and risk periods (Figure 1). As recommended, 179 neurologists generally avoid proposing vaccination to MS patients in the month following a 180 relapse. Thus, a 30-day pre-vaccination period with a lower probability of relapse was 181 expected, which violated the minor event-independent exposure assumption. We therefore 182 decided to consider a 30-day "pre-exposure" period that was discarded from the control 183 period. As the vaccination scheme involved a potential overlap between exposure and pre-184 exposure periods (particularly for the 1st and 2nd dose of vaccine) and because the pre-185 186 exposure period was expected to contain fewer relapses due to the practice of neurologists, we decided to consider the overlap and to divide the periods to make them suitable for combined 187 period evaluation. Due to the potential modifying effect of DMTs on relapse risk and the 188 possible alternation between treatment and nontreatment periods, we considered treatment as 189 a time varying covariate. Because of the non-uniformity of the temporal distribution of 190 191 vaccination during 2021 (violating the time-trend minor validation assumption), we created a seasonal time varying covariate by dividing the time periods according to the month of the 192 year (Figure S1). Other minor assumptions can be considered to have been satisfied: MS 193 relapse can be considered to be independent when recurrent and MS relapse is not responsible 194 for censoring (death). However, the data was censored at the date of death (when applicable), 195 at the date of the 4th vaccine injection (minus 30 days to properly exclude the 4th dose pre-196 exposition period), or otherwise on March 31, 2022. The starting date was the date of the 1st 197

vaccination injection for the 1st patient, minus 30 days (for pre-exposition purpose), that is
November 30, 2020.

200 *CTC study*

201 The first step of the CTC study was a CCO, in which cases were patients with a MS relapse. The date of the relapse defined the end of the risk period, for which the beginning was set to 202 203 45 days before. Control periods were considered immediately (with no overlap) prior to the 204 risk period, for the same duration. The timeframe considered to identify cases spanned from April 1, 2021 (so that the earliest beginning of a control period was still after the date of the 205 1st patient vaccination, considering 45 days of exposure) until March 31, 2022. The second 206 207 step of the CTC study was to select the control subjects, i.e., patients without a MS relapse. The purpose of this group was to correct for the time trend bias in the CCO analysis of the 208 cases. The control group was selected using propensity score matching. After matching, an 209 index date was attributed to each control, corresponding to the relapse date of his/her matched 210 case, thus making it possible to compute the risk and control periods for the control subjects 211 212 in the same way as for the cases.

213 Statistical analysis

The data for the study population is described using means ± standard deviations (SDs) and medians and interquartile ranges for continuous variables and crude numbers and proportions for categorical variables. Patients who received a COVID-19 vaccine before December 31, 2021, were compared to unvaccinated patients for the same date using appropriate statistical tests. The distribution of vaccinations and of relapses over the study period are shown using a histogram to evaluate the time trend of vaccination and seasonality of MS relapses.

220 The time between a relapse and vaccination was plotted to assess the event-independent221 exposure assumption.

For the SCCS study, the incidence rate ratio (IRR) of MS relapse was computed using a conditional Poisson regression model. Exposition and pre-exposition periods for each dose of vaccine (1^{st} to 3^{rd}) were considered to estimate the main effects. The model was adjusted to control for the seasonal effect (month) and the effect of DMT. Results are shown as IRRs and their 95% confidence intervals, but only for periods with a time contribution >0.7% (the time contribution was calculated as the sum of the time periods of interest divided by the total time of each period).

For the CTC study, the propensity score was computed by logistic regression, with group 229 (case / control) as the dependant variable and sex, age, MS duration, cardio neurovascular 230 231 disease, diabetes mellitus, respiratory disease, cancer, and MS treatments as covariates. The four nearest control neighbours were paired to each case using the difference in the logit of 232 the propensity score with a calliper constraint set <0.1. After matching, a conditional logistic 233 regression was used considering the interaction term between vaccine exposure and the 234 subject's group (case or control). The CTC OR corresponds to the ratio between the OR of 235 236 CCO analysis of cases and the that of CCO analysis of controls. The CTC OR is shown with its 95% confidence interval. 237

238 Subgroup and sensitivity analyses

Sensitivity analyses were systematically performed with a 90-day risk period for the SCCS study to consider potential delays in the initiation of corticosteroids after symptoms onset. As there is a risk of pseudo-outbreaks following vaccination, we proposed a sensitivity analysis, dividing the 45-day period analysed into two parts: D1 to D4, then D5 to D45. Indeed, according to the available data, this risk almost exclusively concerns the first four days following vaccination¹⁸.

The main analyses were repeated in subgroups of patients with a higher risk of relapse:
patients <50 years of age and those with a duration of MS <10 years. Interactions between the

vaccine exposure period and the treatment status (No DMT / moderate-efficacy DMT / highefficacy DMT) was tested for patients with high inflammatory activity (≥ 2 relapses) in the previous two years.

Analyses were also performed separately for each type of vaccine manufacturer. For this analysis, only patients who received the same type of vaccine for each dose were considered.

An additional specific analysis was carried out for patients whose MS was identified in 2021. For these incident cases during the year in question, the date of identification of MS was analysed on the basis of the rate of vaccination carried out in the general population (non-MS) and on the basis of the date of vaccination in these people newly identified with MS.

Finally, at least partial data on the results of tests for Covid-19 infection have been available since the beginning of 2024, covering the whole of 2021. An analysis aimed at identifying the link between Covid-19 infection proven by a positive test and the risk of a relapse has also been carried out.

260

261 Data availability

The authors are unable to share the data with individuals outside their team. Data from the French administrative healthcare databases (SNDS) were on the SNDS portal. However, legitimate entities, whether they belong to the public or private sector, have the opportunity to request access to the data directly, provided that their research objectives align with the broader interests of public health. Requests to access these datasets should be directed to https://www.health-data-hub.fr/.

268 **Results**

Overall, 124,545 patients with MS were identified on January 1, 2021. Patients who received at least one dose of a COVID-19 vaccine before the end of 2021 (n=102,524, 82.3%) are presented in **Table 1** and compared to those who did not.

272 Risk of relapse after a first, second, and booster dose of vaccine in the overall population

Overall, 102,524 patients with MS received at least one dose of vaccine, for a total of 259,880 273 doses. The second dose was received by 96,990 (94.6%) of those who received a first dose 274 and 60,366 (58.9%) received a booster dose during the year 2021. The time between 275 vaccination and relapse are shown in weeks from the time of vaccination (Figure 2A), 276 negative values corresponding to relapses that occurred before vaccination. There was a lower 277 number of relapses during the four weeks before vaccination. We observed a similar effect 278 just before the 2nd and booster doses (Figure 2B, 2C). The exposure period included the 45 279 days after vaccination. For the messenger RNA vaccines, the first two doses were most often 280 given three to four weeks apart. Thus, it is possible that a period that counted as exposure to 281 the first dose counted as pre-exposure to the second. The days considered for the analysis are 282 presented in Table S1. 283

There was no increase in relapse risk following the first vaccine dose (IRR=1.01 [0.88 - 1.15], p=0.93) (**Figure 3**). Similarly, there was no increased risk of relapse following the second (IRR=1.02 [0.94 - 1.12], p=0.61) or booster doses (IRR=1.00 [0.90 - 1.11], p=0.79). The combined IRR for all three doses was 0.97 [0.91 - 1.03], p=0.30, excluding the pre-exposure periods. Taking DMT into account, a slight excess risk of relapse was observed following the booster dose in patients not receiving any DMT (**Table S2**).

290 *Risk of relapse in specific sub-groups*

We analysed subgroups of MS patients with a higher risk of inflammation (**Figure 4**), consisting of those under 50 years of age, those with MS diagnosed <10 years before, and those with at least two relapses in the two years before vaccination. There was an increase in the risk of relapse following the booster dose for patients who had had two or more relapses in the previous two years (IRR=1.28 [1.07 - 1.53], p=0.006). Among these patients with high levels of inflammation, the increased relapse risk was mainly observed for those who were untreated (**Figure S2**). No other subgroup showed an increased risk of relapse.

Similarly, we performed an analysis according to the type of vaccine used (Table S3, Figure

S3). Both types of mRNA vaccine (BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273) were analysed (**Table S4**).

300 The two viral vector vaccines (ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 and Ad26.COV2) were also analysed

301 (Table S5). There was no excess risk of relapse for any type of vaccine.

302 Verification and confirmation with the CTC design

The CTC study confirmed the results of the SCCS study, showing no increase in the risk of relapse after any of the three vaccine doses. Overall, there was even a small decrease in the risk of relapse, with an OR of 0.90 [95% CI 0.83 - 0.98], p=0.01.

306 Sensitivity analysis

The results were similar for the SCCS design using a 90-day risk period as those using a 45-307 day risk period (Figure S4). By splitting the 45-day period following vaccination in two, 308 309 there was a reduced risk of relapse treated in the four days following vaccination (**Table S6**, Figure S5). This result does not support the inclusion of a significant number of pseudo-310 relapses. There has been no increase in the number of incident cases of MS identified during 311 312 2021 in connection with the implementation of the Covid-19 vaccination in the general population (Figure S6). Moreover, the identification of MS in these newly diagnosed patients 313 314 most often preceded vaccination (Figure S7). In fact, the fact of being diagnosed gave priority access to vaccination in France and could encourage vaccination in the following 315 weeks. The delay between the identification of a Covid-19 infection (positive test) and the 316 identification of a relapse was studied (Figure S8). A significant peak was seen at D0 and D1, 317

- 318 corresponding to the simultaneous identification of a Covid-19 infection and the initiation of
- 319 treatment for a relapse.

320 Classification of evidence

- 321 This study provides Class III evidence that COVID-19 vaccination does not increase the risk
- 322 of severe relapse in patients with multiple sclerosis.

324 **Discussion**

In this nationwide study, we did not find any significant increase in the risk of treated relapse 325 requiring the use of corticosteroid therapy after Sars-Cov2 vaccination for >100,000 patients 326 with MS in France by the end of March 2022. This result was confirmed for clinically 327 meaningful subgroups at a higher risk of relapse due to younger age or shorter disease 328 329 duration. However, we did observe an increase in relapse risk after the booster dose for patients with high inflammatory activity in the previous two years, especially those who went 330 untreated. The type of vaccine was not associated with relapse risk. These findings are 331 reassuring and have direct implications for the management of patients with MS in the context 332 333 of pandemics.

334

Many case reports and case series have been published suggesting a possible risk of relapse 335 336 just after COVID-19 vaccination, the largest study indicating a small increase in relapse risk⁴. Other cases of post-vaccination inflammatory outbreaks have also been reported^{19,20}. 337 However, no population-based study has been conducted to date to assess such risk while 338 limiting the risk of selection bias and including the entire population at a national level. In 339 addition, the studies conducted to date have not addressed the specific risk of the initial 340 341 vaccination and the booster dose. In the current study, the sufficient size of the population allowed for an independent analysis of each dose, leading to the conclusion that there is no 342 343 excess risk for either of the two doses of the initial vaccination or the booster dose, except in 344 the small sub-group of patients with very high inflammatory activity, especially those who went untreated. 345

The sample size also allowed analysis for each type of vaccine. The data presented are highly reliable for the vaccines BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273, which have been administered to thousands of patients. In contrast, the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 and Ad26.COV2 vaccines have been less widely used for patients with MS in France and the confidence intervals are wider. It

is more difficult to draw conclusions on vaccine combinations, as some patients did not always receive the same brand of vaccine and some combinations were used by very few patients. However, there are no indications of an excess risk, regardless of the vaccine or combination of vaccines.

Several studies have shown that the risk of relapse can be increased by infections. For 354 example, patients with MS experienced significantly increased relapse rates and enhanced 355 356 lesion activity shortly after a bacterial urinary tract infection, a viral respiratory infection, or gastroenteritis, as measured by MRI²¹. Another study found that infection increased the risk of 357 relapse approximately twofold²². Of note, the annualised relapse rate (ARR) outside the risk 358 359 periods was approximately one in these two studies, indicating that the patients had high inflammatory activity and were not receiving highly active DMT. In the present study, the 360 ARR was approximately 0.1 and there was no increase following COVID-19 vaccination, 361 except after the booster dose for patients with high inflammatory activity, especially those 362 who went untreated. It has long been known that previous inflammatory activity is one of the 363 main predictors of the risk of a new relapse²³. Thus, patients who had experienced two or 364 more relapses in the previous two years were naturally most at risk of relapse, in particular if 365 no DMT had been initiated in the interim. It is likely that the induced immune response (either 366 367 after natural infection or vaccination) can be a trigger of a relapse for these patients with highly active inflammation. However, this does not mean that a highly effective DMT should 368 always be applied before the necessary vaccines are administered. In fact, several treatments, 369 370 notably anti-CD20s, are known to limit or even prevent the vaccine reaction. This parameter must be taken into account when initiating DMT. Some clinicians suggest using natalizumab 371 372 for a few months, to allow time for the necessary vaccinations, before initiating anti-CD20 therapy in a highly active patient. 373

These results are consistent with those of previous studies concerning vaccination²⁴, although 374 controversies have existed for years, notably for the yellow fever^{9,25,26} and rabies²⁷ vaccines. 375 French guidelines and those of the American Academy of Neurology for immunization are 376 reassuring for many vaccines^{9,28}. However, they were both published in 2019 and obviously 377 could not have had any data regarding COVID-19 vaccination. The results of this study show 378 that it is possible to vaccinate the vast majority of the MS patient population without a 379 subsequent increased risk of relapse. Thus, the recommended booster doses should be 380 administered without any ulterior motive. For patients with high inflammatory activity, it is 381 justified to have highly effective DMT before performing the booster doses, while 382 emphasizing that the humoral response is very limited following certain treatments, notably 383 anti-CD20. 384

385 Limitations

The main limitation of this study was the type of data used. The data available corresponded 386 to the total care provided in the hospital or the drugs reimbursed. Certain long-term 387 conditions, such as MS, are easily identifiable. However, very little clinical data are available. 388 To identify MS relapses, we relied on a recent algorithm based on five criteria that allowed 389 the identification of relapses requiring hospital admission or corticosteroid therapy. This 390 signifies that benign relapses (i.e., not seen by neurologists or not needing the use of 391 corticosteroid therapy) were not considered in the outcomes, which would imply that the ARR 392 may have been underestimated, whereas the impact on the IRR would be low. A limitation of 393 identifying hospitalisations is that it is not possible to know with certainty the cause of the 394 hospitalisation and whether it is actually related to a relapse, although the positive predictive 395 value of the algorithm is around 95%. In fact, a hospitalisation for another reason (e.g. 396 pyelonephritis) may be incorrectly counted as a hospitalisation for a relapse, although Z512 397 398 code (part of the algorithm for relapse identification) is normally not used in such situation.

However, the impact on the IRR is a priori very small, as this type of hospitalisation can occurin both the post-vaccination and control periods.

Another point is that pseudo-relapses may have been treated and thus identified as relapses. 401 Pseudo-relapses are common in the post-vaccination phase¹⁸, affecting around 3% of patients. 402 However, all symptoms generally resolve within 4 days. As the sensitivity analysis did not 403 404 reveal any increase in the number of relapses treated in the first few days following 405 vaccination, this phenomenon is probably marginal and does not seem to affect the overall interpretation of the results. Data on the results of Covid-19 screening tests have recently been 406 407 added to the database. An analysis of these data shows no link between the occurrence of a 408 Covid-19 infection and the risk of subsequent relapses. However, these data suggest that pseudo-relapses induced by Covid-19 infections may have been treated as relapses. 409

In the coming months, all data for the year 2022 will be available for analysis. Thus, it will be possible to assess whether the excess risk is confirmed for the patients with the most active inflammation based on a larger number of patients who received the first booster dose. It will also be possible to determine whether the second booster dose amplifies such risk.

414

In conclusion, there is no increased risk of relapse requiring corticosteroid treatment following coronavirus vaccination for the vast majority of patients with MS. Data for the mRNA vaccines were acquired for very large populations and are robust. These vaccines can be used without any worry about the risk of relapse to provide booster doses to patients for whom they are warranted. However, particular caution is needed for patients with the highest inflammatory activity in the previous two years, who should first receive DMT.

422 **Declaration of interests**

Xavier Moisset has received financial support from Allergan-Abbvie, Aptis Pharma, Biogen,
BMS, Grünenthal, Lilly, Lundbeck, Teva, Merck-Serono, Novartis, Orion, Pfizer, Roche, and
Sanofi-Genzyme and non-financial support from SOS Oxygène not related to the submitted
work.

Emmanuelle Leray reports consulting and lecture fees or travel grants from Biogen,
Genzyme, MedDay Pharmaceuticals, Merck Serono, Novartis, and Roche. Nothing related to
the contents of the present work.

430 Chouki Chenaf has nothing to disclose.

431 Frédéric Taithe has received financial support from Alexion, Biogen, Merck, Novartis,

432 Sanofi, not related to the submitted work.

433 Sandra Vukusic has received financial support from Biogen, BMS-Celgene, Janssen, Merck,

434 Novartis, Roche, Sandoz, Sanofi, not related to the submitted work.

435 Aurélien Mulliez has nothing to disclose.

436 Pierre Clavelou has received financial support from Biogen, Janssen, Merck, Novartis,437 Sanofi-Genzyme, Teva, not related to the submitted work.

439 **References**

- Sormani MP, Schiavetti I, Carmisciano L, et al. COVID-19 Severity in Multiple
 Sclerosis: Putting Data Into Context. Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflammation.
 2022;9:e1105.
- Fragoso YD, Gomes S, Gonçalves MVM, et al. New relapse of multiple sclerosis and
 neuromyelitis optica as a potential adverse event of AstraZeneca AZD1222 vaccination
 for COVID-19. Mult Scler Relat Disord. 2022;57:103321.
- Rinaldi V, Bellucci G, Buscarinu MC, et al. CNS inflammatory demyelinating events
 after COVID-19 vaccines: A case series and systematic review. Front Neurol.
 2022;13:1018785.
- 449 4. Stastna D, Menkyova I, Drahota J, et al. To be or not to be vaccinated: The risk of MS or
 450 NMOSD relapse after COVID-19 vaccination and infection. Mult Scler Relat Disord.
 451 2022;65:104014.
- Francis AG, Elhadd K, Camera V, et al. Acute Inflammatory Diseases of the Central
 Nervous System After SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination. Neurol Neuroimmunol
 Neuroinflammation. 2023;10:e200063.
- 455 6. Stefanou M-I, Palaiodimou L, Theodorou A, et al. Safety of COVID-19 vaccines in 456 multiple sclerosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Mult Scler Houndmills 457 Basingstoke Engl. Epub 2023 Feb 1.:13524585221150881.
- Yap SM, Al Hinai M, Gaughan M, et al. Vaccine hesitancy among people with multiple
 sclerosis. Mult Scler Relat Disord. 2021;56:103236.
- Biem L, Friedli C, Chan A, Salmen A, Hoepner R. Vaccine Hesitancy in Patients With
 Multiple Sclerosis: Preparing for the SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination Challenge. Neurol
 Neuroimmunol Neuroinflammation. 2021;8:e991.
- 463 9. Lebrun C, Vukusic S, French Group for Recommendations in Multiple Sclerosis
 464 France4MS the Société francophone de la sclérose en plaques SFSEP, List of
 465 investigators. Immunization and multiple sclerosis: Recommendations from the French
 466 Multiple Sclerosis Society. Rev Neurol (Paris). 2019;175:341–357.
- Tuppin P, Rudant J, Constantinou P, et al. Value of a national administrative database to guide public decisions: From the système national d'information interrégimes de l'Assurance Maladie (SNIIRAM) to the système national des données de santé (SNDS) in France. Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique. 2017;65 Suppl 4:S149–S167.
- Herrich Bezin J, Duong M, Lassalle R, et al. The national healthcare system claims databases in
 France, SNIIRAM and EGB: Powerful tools for pharmacoepidemiology.
 Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf [online serial]. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf; 2017;26.
 Accessed at: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28544284/. Accessed April 5, 2023.
- 475 12. Mainguy M, Tillaut H, Degremont A, et al. Assessing the Risk of Relapse Requiring
 476 Corticosteroids After In Vitro Fertilization in Women With Multiple Sclerosis.
 477 Neurology. Epub 2022 Aug 11.:10.1212/WNL.00000000201027.

- Foulon S, Maura G, Dalichampt M, et al. Prevalence and mortality of patients with
 multiple sclerosis in France in 2012: a study based on French health insurance data. J
 Neurol. 2017;264:1185–1192.
- 481 14. Bosco-Lévy P, Debouverie M, Brochet B, et al. Comparative effectiveness of dimethyl
 482 fumarate in multiple sclerosis. Br J Clin Pharmacol. 2022;88:1268–1278.
- 483 15. Cadarette SM, Maclure M, Delaney JAC, et al. Control yourself: ISPE-endorsed
 484 guidance in the application of self-controlled study designs in pharmacoepidemiology.
 485 Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2021;30:671–684.
- Harding K, Tilling K, MacIver C, et al. Seasonal variation in multiple sclerosis relapse. J
 Neurol. 2017;264:1059–1067.
- Petersen I, Douglas I, Whitaker H. Self controlled case series methods: an alternative to
 standard epidemiological study designs. BMJ. 2016;354:i4515.
- Labani A, Chou S, Kaviani K, Ropero B, Russman K, Becker D. Incidence of multiple
 sclerosis relapses and pseudo-relapses following COVID-19 vaccination. Mult Scler
 Relat Disord. 2023;77:104865.
- 493 19. Kelly H, Johnson J, Jakubecz C, Serra A, Abboud H. Prevalence of iatrogenic CNS
 494 inflammation at a tertiary neuroimmunology clinic. J Neuroimmunol. 2022;370:577928.
- 495 20. Mealy MA, Cook LJ, Pache F, et al. Vaccines and the association with relapses in patients with neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorder. Mult Scler Relat Disord.
 497 2018;23:78–82.
- 498 21. Correale J, Fiol M, Gilmore W. The risk of relapses in multiple sclerosis during systemic
 499 infections. Neurology. 2006;67:652–659.
- Buljevac D, Flach HZ, Hop WCJ, et al. Prospective study on the relationship between
 infections and multiple sclerosis exacerbations. Brain J Neurol. 2002;125:952–960.
- Sormani MP, Rovaris M, Comi G, Filippi M. A composite score to predict short-term disease activity in patients with relapsing-remitting MS. Neurology. 2007;69:1230–
 1235.
- 505 24. Grimaldi L, Papeix C, Hamon Y, et al. Vaccines and the Risk of Hospitalization for
 506 Multiple Sclerosis Flare-Ups. JAMA Neurol. Epub 2023 Sep 5.:e232968.
- 507 25. Confavreux C, Suissa S, Saddier P, Bourdès V, Vukusic S, Vaccines in Multiple
 508 Sclerosis Study Group. Vaccinations and the risk of relapse in multiple sclerosis.
 509 Vaccines in Multiple Sclerosis Study Group. N Engl J Med. 2001;344:319–326.
- 26. Papeix C, Mazoyer J, Maillart E, et al. Multiple sclerosis: Is there a risk of worsening after yellow fever vaccination? Mult Scler Houndmills Basingstoke Engl.
 2021;27:2280–2283.
- 513 27. Huttner A, Lascano AM, Roth S, et al. Rabies vaccination and multiple sclerosis relapse:
 514 A retrospective cohort study. Mult Scler Relat Disord. 2021;51:102906.

- 515 28. Farez MF, Correale J, Armstrong MJ, et al. Practice guideline update summary:
- 516 Vaccine-preventable infections and immunization in multiple sclerosis: Report of the
- 517 Guideline Development, Dissemination, and Implementation Subcommittee of the
- 518 American Academy of Neurology. Neurology. 2019;93:584–594.

519

	Not vaccinated	Vaccinated
	N = 22 021	N = 102 524
Female sex, n (%)	15 516 (70.5)	73 637 (71.8)
Age (years), mean \pm SD	52.6 ± 16	54.3 ± 14.2
\geq 50 years, n (%)	12 310 (55.9)	64 139 (62.6)
Duration of MS (years), mean \pm SD	13.5 ± 8.9	13.5 ± 8.8
< 10 years, n (%)	9 111 (41.4)	42 054 (41.0)
Number of relapses in the previous 2 years, n (%)		
0	19 046 (88.1)	87 954 (85.8)
1	1 890 (8.6)	10 617 (10.4)
≥ 2	725 (3.3)	3 953 (3.9)
Comorbidities, n (%)		
Cardio-neurovascular	3 348 (15.2)	16 189 (15.8)
Cancer	1 880 (8.5)	9 563 (9.3)
Respiratory	2 704 (12.3)	13 053 (12.7)
Diabetes mellitus	1 262 (5.7)	6 818 (6.7)
Disease modifying treatments (DMT), n (%)		
No DMT	15 409 (70.0)	53 652 (52.3)
Any moderate efficacy DMT	3 871 (17.6)	29 974 (29.2)
Teriflunomide	1038 (4.7)	8 870 (8.7)
Dimethyl fumarate	1 021 (4.6)	7 719 (7.5)
Beta interferon	875 (4.0)	6 425 (6.3)
Glatiramer acetate	579 (2.6)	4 375 (4.3)
Mycophenolic mofetil	140 (0.6)	1 063 (1.0)
Methotrexate	117 (0.5)	966 (0.9)
Azathioprine	99 (0.5)	550 (0.5)
Cyclophosphamide	2 (0.01)	6 (0.01)
Any high efficacy DMT	2 741 (12.4)	18 898 (18.4)
Fingolimod	1 186 (5.4)	8 098 (7.9)
Ocrelizumab	650 (3.0)	4 602 (4.5)
Natalizumab	599 (2.7)	3 883 (3.8)
Rituximab	306 (1.4)	2 315 (2.3)

522 Table 1. Comparison of patients with MS vaccinated at least once against COVID-19, or not, during the

523 year 2021. The values for age, comorbidities, and DMT are as of January 1, 2021. Data are presented as the

524 mean (SD), median (IQR), or n (%).

526	Figure legends		
527			
528	Figure 1. 45-day periods considered, for each vaccine dose, in measuring the risk of a		
529	relapse. The pre-exposure period (30 days) is excluded from the control period.		
530			
531	Figure 2. Number of relapses counted each week relative to the date the first (A), second		
532	(B) or booster (C) dose of vaccine administered.		
533			
534	Figure 3. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) and 95% confidence intervals for each observation		
535	period. The global exposure to each of the three doses is noted on the right of the figure.		
536 537	* Exp. Dose 1 (all) = All Dose 1 expositions in combination with Dose 2 or Booster dose (exposition or pre- exposition)		
538 539	Exp. Dose 2 (all) = All Dose 2 expositions in combination with Dose 1 or Booster dose (exposition or pre- exposition)		
540 541	Exp. Booster dose (all) = All Booster dose expositions in combination with Dose 1 or Dose 2 (exposition or pre- exposition)		
542			
543	Figure 4. Incidence rate ratio (IRR) and 95% confidence intervals for each dose and		
544	subgroup of interest. Only the "pure" exposure period without any pre-exposure to another		

545 dose is presented.