

Durability of humoral and cellular immunity six months after the BNT162b2 bivalent booster

Julien Favresse¹, Constant Gillot¹, Mélanie Closset², Julien Cabo³, Loris Wauthier³, Clara David⁴, Marc Elsen³, Jean-Michel Dogné¹, and Jonathan Douxfils¹

¹Université de Namur

²CHU UCL Namur Département de Médecine

³Clinique Saint-Luc Bouge

⁴Qualiblood sa Research and Development Department

July 20, 2023

Abstract

Introduction Studies about the duration of the humoral and cellular response following the bivalent booster administration are still scarce. We aimed at assessing the humoral and cellular response in a cohort of healthcare workers that received this booster. **Material and methods** Blood samples were collected before the administration of the bivalent booster from Pfizer-BioNTech and after 14, 28, 90, and 180 days. Neutralizing antibodies against either the D614G strain, the delta variant, the BA.5 variant, or the XBB.1.5 subvariant were measured. The cellular response was assessed by measurement of the release of interferon gamma (IFN γ) from T cells in response to an *in vitro* SARS-CoV-2 stimulation. **Results** A substantial waning of neutralizing antibodies was observed after 6 months (23.1-fold decrease), especially considering the XBB.1.5 subvariant. The estimated T_{1/2} of neutralizing antibodies was 16.1 days (95% CI=10.2–38.4 days). Although most participants still present a robust cellular response after 6 months (i.e., 95%), a significant decrease was also observed compared to the peak response (0.41 versus 0.95 UI/L, p=0.0083). **Conclusion** A significant waning of the humoral and cellular response was observed after 6 months. These data can also help national competent authorities in their recommendation regarding the administration of an additional booster.

Durability of humoral and cellular immunity six months after the BNT162b2 bivalent booster

Julien Favresse^{1,2}, Constant Gillot¹, Mélanie Closset³, Julien Cabo², Loris Wauthier², Clara David⁴, Marc Elsen², Jean-Michel Dogné¹, Jonathan Douxfils^{1,4}.

¹Department of Pharmacy, Namur Research Institute for Life Sciences, Namur Thrombosis and Hemostasis Center, University of Namur, Namur, Belgium.

²Department of Laboratory Medicine, Clinique St-Luc Bouge, Namur, Belgium.

³Department of Laboratory Medicine, Université catholique de Louvain, CHU UCL Namur, Namur, Belgium.

⁴Qualiblood s.a., Research and Development Department, Namur, Belgium.

*Correspondence: Julien Favresse

Department of Pharmacy, University of Namur B-5000 Namur, Belgium Phone +32 81 72 43 91 Email: julien.favresse@slbo.be

Running title: Humoral and cellular response 6 months after the bivalent booster.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, bivalent booster, humoral response, cellular response, Omicron, BA.5, XBB.1.5.

Words (manuscript): 1,051.

Number authors: 9.

Number of references (main text): 10.

Number of references (appendix): 6.

Number of tables: 0.

Number of figures: 1.

Supplemental figures: 2.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that there are no competing interests.

Author contribution: Conceptualization: JF and JD; methodology: JF, CG, MC, JC, LW, CD and JD; software: JF, CG and JD; validation: JF and JD; formal analysis: JF, CG and JD; investigation: JF, CG, MC, JC, LW, and JD; resources: ME, JMD, and JD; data curation: JF, CG, MC, JC, LW, and ME; writing—original draft preparation, JF; writing—review and editing, JF, CG, MC, JC, LW, CD, ME, JMD, and JD; supervision: JD; project administration: JF, MC, ME and JD; funding acquisition: JF, MC, ME, JMD and JD. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Abstract

Introduction

Studies about the duration of the humoral and cellular response following the bivalent booster administration are still scarce. We aimed at assessing the humoral and cellular response in a cohort of healthcare workers that received this booster.

Material and methods

Blood samples were collected before the administration of the bivalent booster from Pfizer-BioNTech and after 14, 28, 90, and 180 days. Neutralizing antibodies against either the D614G strain, the delta variant, the BA.5 variant, or the XBB.1.5 subvariant were measured. The cellular response was assessed by measurement of the release of interferon gamma ($\text{IFN}\gamma$) from T cells in response to an *in vitro* SARS-CoV-2 stimulation.

Results

A substantial waning of neutralizing antibodies was observed after 6 months (23.1-fold decrease), especially considering the XBB.1.5 subvariant. The estimated $T_{1/2}$ of neutralizing antibodies was 16.1 days (95% CI=10.2–38.4 days). Although most participants still present a robust cellular response after 6 months (i.e., 95%), a significant decrease was also observed compared to the peak response (0.41 versus 0.95 UI/L, $p=0.0083$).

Conclusion

A significant waning of the humoral and cellular response was observed after 6 months. These data can also help national competent authorities in their recommendation regarding the administration of an additional booster.

Highlights

- Substantial waning of the humoral response was observed 6 months after the bivalent booster administration, especially considering the XBB.1.5 subvariant.
- A significant decay in the cellular response was also observed over time.
- The proportion of samples still able to release $\text{IFN}\gamma$ in response to an *in vitro* SARS-CoV-2 stimulation remained however high.

Introduction

Neutralizing antibodies against omicron variants and subvariants, which represents a strong correlate of protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection, have been showed to significantly increase after bivalent booster administration¹⁻⁴. Accumulating evidence suggests that T cell response, i.e. helper CD4+ and cytotoxic CD8+ T cells, plays a key role in the protection against severe disease⁵. In contrast to neutralizing antibodies, T cells are more resilient against highly mutated emerging variants, with >80% of epitopes conserved among T cells^{5,6}. Currently, the long-term kinetics of the humoral and cellular immunity has been poorly explored.

Material and methods

In this study, we present the 6-month humoral and cellular results from the participants of the multicenter and prospective CRO-VAX HCP study who received the bivalent booster (ethical approval number: 2020-006149-21; **Appendix**). Thirty-six were females (median age = 51.0 years; IQR = 43.0–58.8) and 15 were males (median age = 51.0 years; IQR = 35.0–59.0). Ages were non-significantly different between females and males ($p = 0.88$). The majority of the participants (45/51; 88.2%) had a history of SARS-CoV-2 (**Appendix**).

A pseudovirus-neutralization test was used to assess the neutralization potency of vaccines-elicited antibodies against either the D614G strain, the delta variant, the BA.5 omicron variant, or the XBB.1.5 omicron subvariant. The antibody titer is determined as the dilution of serum at which 50% of the infectivity is inhibited (IC_{50}) as determined by a nonlinear sigmoid regression model. A sample with a titer of less than 1:20 is considered negative (**Appendix**). Neutralizing antibodies against BA.5 were measured at each timepoint but neutralizing antibodies against the D614G strain, the delta variant and the XBB.1.5 omicron subvariant were only measured at 6 months in a subset of 30 participants randomly selected.

Total antibodies against the NCP (Roche Diagnostics) were measured using the Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 assay. Results above 0.165 cut-off index were considered positive (**Appendix**).

The T cell-mediated immune response was assessed using the cobas IGRA SARS-COV-2 Tubes and the Elecsys IGRA SARS-CoV-2 assay (Roche Diagnostics). The test measures the release of interferon gamma ($IFN\gamma$) from T cells in response to an *in vitro* SARS-CoV-2 stimulation in whole blood samples which have been formerly in contact with the SARS-CoV-2 coated antigens. More than 180 different SARS-CoV-2 antigens (structural (spike, membrane and nucleocapsid) and non-structural) are coated on the antigen tube, enabling a substantial coverage of commonly occurring HLA subtypes for stimulation of both CD4+ and CD8+ T cells. The assay is therefore robust to detect different variants. A result above 0.013 IU/mL was considered positive (**Appendix**).

The detailed statistical analysis process is presented in the **Appendix**.

Results

The highest measured neutralizing capacity against the BA.5 variant was reached at day 28 with a GMT of 1,095 (95% CI = 903.4–1,327), representing a significant 7.0-fold increase from baseline (i.e., 157; 95% CI = 112–219, $p < 0.0001$). A substantial decrease was then observed up to 180 days with an observed GMT of 47.4 (95% CI = 36.6–61.6, $p < 0.0001$), which represents a 23.1-fold decrease. The neutralizing capacity at 180 days was significantly lower compared to baseline ($p = 0.0004$). The proportion of detectable neutralizing antibodies (i.e., <1:20) was 93.6%, 100%, 100%, 98.0%, and 85.4% at baseline and 14, 28, 90, and 180 days after the administration of the vaccine (**Figure 1A**). The fold-change in the neutralizing capacity against BA.5 was similar between participants who received the BA.1 or the BA.4/5 booster ($p > 0.05$) (**Appendix**). The estimated $T_{1/2}$ of neutralizing antibodies was 16.1 days (95% CI = 10.2–38.4 days). According to the model, a mean time of 137 days (95% CI = 76–170) would be needed to cross the dilution titer threshold of 1:20 (**Figure 1B**).

At 6 months, neutralizing antibodies against the Delta variant, the BA.5 omicron variant and the XBB.1.5

omicron subvariant were 1.97, 5.20, and 10.81 lower compared to the D614G strain. The proportion of detectable neutralizing antibodies was 100%, 100%, 91.3%, and 66.6%, respectively (**Figure 1C**).

The highest T-cell response was observed after 14 days with a GMT of 0.95 UI/mL (95% CI = 0.72–1.24), representing a significant 1.97-fold increase from baseline (i.e., 0.48; 95% CI = 0.30–0.77, $p = 0.0306$). A significant decrease was then observed up to 180 days with an observed GMT of 0.41 (95% CI = 0.21–0.82, $p = 0.0083$), representing a 2.28-fold reduction compared to day 14 and a 1.17-fold decrease from baseline. The IFN γ responses at 90 and 180 days were not different from baseline ($p = 0.91$ and 0.95). The proportion of detectable levels of IFN γ was 98%, 100%, 100%, 100%, and 95% at baseline, 14, 28, 90, and 180 days (**Figure 1D**). The fold-change in the IFN γ response against BA.5 was similar between participants who received the BA.1 or the BA.4/5 booster (**Appendix**).

Eleven participants (21.6%) developed a breakthrough infection between 90 and 180 days; which is consistent with the drop of neutralizing antibodies. The infection was associated with a significant raise in BA.5 neutralizing antibodies (fold-increase of 2.55, $p = 0.0039$). The impact on the IFN γ release was not significant in these patients ($p = 0.4961$) (**Appendix**).

Discussion and conclusion

The increase of neutralizing antibodies following the administration of the bivalent booster we documented in our study (i.e., 7.0-fold increase) was consistent with the conclusions of other studies^{4,7}. As for the humoral response following the first two doses of BNT162b2 and the homologous booster^{8,9}, a substantial waning of the humoral response was observed 6 months after the administration of the BNT162b2 bivalent booster. This decrease was especially important considering the XBB.1.5 subvariant. Moreover, the drop of neutralizing antibodies over time coincides with the decrease of bivalent booster effectiveness against infection in the recent report of Lin *et al.*¹⁰.

A significant decay in the cellular response was also observed over time. Nevertheless, the proportion of samples still able to generate IFN γ in response to an *in vitro* SARS-CoV-2 stimulation remained high. This observation is consistent with the maintained and superior effectiveness against severe disease in the report of Lin *et al.*¹⁰. The fact that the release of IFN γ could represent a good surrogate of the risk of severe infection still remains to be evaluated. Importantly, these data can also help national competent authorities in their recommendation regarding the administration of an additional booster.

References:

1. Seekircher L, Bánki Z, Kimpel J, et al. Immune response after two doses of the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine and risk of SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infection in Tyrol, Austria: an open-label, observational phase 4 trial. *The Lancet Microbe* 2023.
2. Nilles EJ, Paulino CT, De St Aubin M, et al. Tracking immune correlates of protection for emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2023; **23** (2): 153-4.
3. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med* 2021; **27** (7): 1205-11.
4. Carr EJ, Wu MY, Gahir J, et al. Neutralising immunity to omicron sublineages BQ.1.1, XBB, and XBB.1.5 in healthy adults is boosted by bivalent BA.1-containing mRNA vaccination and previous Omicron infection. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2023.
5. Wherry EJ, Barouch DH. T cell immunity to COVID-19 vaccines. *Science* 2022; **377** (6608): 821-2.
6. Tarke A, Coelho CH, Zhang Z, et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccination induces immunological T cell memory able to cross-recognize variants from Alpha to Omicron. *Cell* 2022; **185** (5): 847-59 e11.
7. Tan NH, Geers D, Sablerolles RSG, et al. Immunogenicity of bivalent omicron (BA.1) booster vaccination after different priming regimens in health-care workers in the Netherlands (SWITCH ON): results from the direct boost group of an open-label, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2023.

8. Bayart JL, Douxfils J, Gillot C, et al. Waning of IgG, Total and Neutralizing Antibodies 6 Months Post-Vaccination with BNT162b2 in Healthcare Workers. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2021; **9** (10).

9. Favresse J, Gillot C, Bayart JL, et al. Vaccine-induced binding and neutralizing antibodies against Omicron 6 months after a homologous BNT162b2 booster. *J Med Virol* 2023; **95** (1): e28164.

10. Lin DY, Xu Y, Gu Y, Zeng D, Sunny SK, Moore Z. Durability of Bivalent Boosters against Omicron Subvariants. *N Engl J Med* 2023;**388** (19): 1818-20.

Figure 1: (A) Evolution of neutralizing antibodies against the BA.5 omicron variant before and after the bivalent booster with a 6-month follow-up in a population of 51 healthy-volunteers. GMT were 157 (95% CI: 112–219), 598 (470–761), 1,095 (903–1,327), 106 (83.4–134), and 47.4 (36.6–61.6) at baseline and after 14, 28, 90, and 180 days. (B) Kinetic models of the neutralizing capacity against the BA.5 omicron variant. (C) Comparison of the neutralizing capacity against the D614G strain, the delta and BA.5 omicron variants, and the XBB.1.5 omicron subvariant in a population of 30 healthy-volunteers 6 months after having received the bivalent booster. GMT were 319 (95% CI: 241–423), 162 (119–220), 61.4 (42.7–88.2), and 29.5 (21.4–40.6) for the D614G strain, the delta variant, the BA.5 omicron variant, and the XBB.1.5 omicron subvariant. The dotted line represents the positivity cut-off for neutralizing antibodies (dilution titer of 1:20). (D) Evolution of the cellular response by means of the measurement of IFN γ . GMT were 0.53 UI/mL (95% CI: 0.37–0.75), 0.95 (0.72–1.24), 0.87 (0.65–1.17), 0.65 (0.48–0.87), and 0.52 (0.34–0.79) at baseline and after 14, 28, 90, and 180 days. The positivity cut-off for IFN γ was 0.013 IU/mL. Geometric means and 95% CIs are represented. Only p values <0.05 were graphically represented.

