

Department of Public Health
Clinical Pharmacology, Pharmacy
and Environmental Medicine
Winsloewparken 19
DK-5000 Odense C
Denmark
Phone: +45 2927 0172
E-mail: hckildegaard@health.sdu.dk

February 2022

Re: BMJ-2021-068898.R2

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your evaluation of our revised manuscript. We are glad that you find the manuscript improved. Please find below a point-by-point response to the comments made by the statistical editor.

Changes to the manuscript have been marked using the track changes function in Word. We look forward to hearing from you again soon.

Sincerely,

Helene Kildegaard
MD
Clinical Pharmacology, Pharmacy and Environmental Medicine
University of Southern Denmark
JB Winsløvsvej 19, 2
5000 Odense C, Denmark
E-mail: hckildegaard@health.sdu.dk
Phone: 0045 29270172

Reviewer #1

I thank the authors for a very clear response and revision. I think the responses are well-justified, and I am reassured about the aspects that previously caused concern, such as there being no missing covariates and the justification for the choice of the reference group. Furthermore, the work has been updated with longer follow-up and thus more children than before. It also is very well written and I think an excellent research article.

Thank you for your positive comments and review.

Minor comments:

“The BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine was effective in preventing documented SARS-CoV-2 infection three months after ...” – should this be better expressed as “The BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine was effective in substantially reducing the risk of documented SARS-CoV-2 infection three months after ...”? Also, I think it would read better if this sentence came at the start of the abstract conclusion, rather than the very end.

We have structured the abstract with the vaccine effectiveness statement at the end of the conclusion so that the conclusion follows the same chronology as the remaining abstract and the full manuscript. Further, we do not consider the vaccine effectiveness analysis as the main study finding as this was added as an extra analysis during initial submission.

We have rephrased the vaccine effectiveness statement in the abstract and under “What this study adds” according to the suggestion made.

Table 1 and 2: define who the ‘Reference’ group relates to in the footnote

This has been added.

Lastly, still some extra confidence intervals would be welcome. For example, “Of the 74,611 SARS-CoV-2 positive children in Denmark, 391 were hospitalised within the first month of testing (0.5%).” – please add a 95% CI. Also add confidence intervals for key %s elsewhere in the Results section that do not have them

We have now added confidence intervals for the remaining key% in the Results section.