

1 **B and T cell immune responses elicited by the BNT162b2 (Pfizer–BioNTech)**
2 **COVID-19 vaccine in nursing home residents**

3 Ignacio Torres¹, Eliseo Albert¹, Estela Giménez¹, María Jesús Alcaraz¹, Pilar Botija²,
4 Paula Amat³, María José Remigia³, María José Beltrán⁴, Celia Rodado⁵, Dixie Huntley¹,
5 Beatriz Olea¹, and David Navarro^{1,6*}

6 ¹*Microbiology Service, Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
7 *Valencia, Spain.*

8 ²*Dirección de Atención Primaria, Departamento de Salud Clínico-Malvarrosa,*
9 *Hospital Clínico Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain.*

10 ³*Hematology Service Clinic University Hospital, INCLIVA Health Research Institute,*
11 *Valencia, Spain.*

12 ⁴*Dirección de Enfermería, Departamento de Salud Clínico-Malvarrosa, Hospital*
13 *Clínico Universitario de Valencia, Valencia, Spain.*

14 ⁵*Comisión Departamental de control de Residencias. Departamento de Salud València*
15 *Clínico Malvarrosa.*

16 ⁶*Department of Microbiology, School of Medicine, University of Valencia, Valencia,*
17 *Spain*

18

19 ***Correspondence:** David Navarro, Microbiology Service, Hospital Clínico
20 Universitario, Instituto de Investigación INCLIVA, Valencia, and Department of
21 Microbiology, University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain. Av. Blasco Ibáñez 17, 46010
22 Valencia, Spain. Phone: 34(96)1973500; Fax: 34(96)3864173; E-mail:
23 david.navarro@uv.es.

24

25

26 **Running title:** Immunogenicity of BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine in nursing home
27 residents.

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 **Objectives:** The immunogenicity of the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine is understudied
30 in elderly people with comorbidities. We assessed SARS-CoV-2-S-targeted antibody
31 and T cell responses following full vaccination in nursing home residents (NHR).

32 **Methods:** We recruited 60 NHR (44 female; median age, 87.5 years), of whom 10 had
33 previously had COVID-19, and 18 healthy controls (15 female; median age, 48.5 years).
34 Pre- and post-vaccination blood specimens were available for quantitation of total
35 antibodies binding RBD and enumeration of SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive IFN- γ CD4⁺ and
36 CD8⁺ T cells by flow cytometry.

37 **Results:** The seroconversion rate in presumably SARS-CoV-2 naïve NHR (95.3%),
38 either with or without comorbidities, was similar to controls (94.4%). A robust booster
39 effect was documented in NHR with prior COVID-19. Plasma antibody levels were
40 higher in convalescent NHR than in individuals across the other two groups. A large
41 percentage of NHR had SARS-CoV-2 S-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ and/or CD4⁺ T cells at
42 baseline, in contrast to healthy controls. Either CD8⁺ and/or CD4⁺ T-cell responses were
43 documented in all control subjects after vaccination. Contrariwise, the percentage of
44 NHR exhibiting detectable SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ or CD4⁺ T-cell responses (or
45 both), irrespective of their baseline SARS-CoV-2 infection status, dropped consistently
46 after vaccination. Overall, SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ and CD4⁺ T-cell responses in
47 NHR decreased in post-vaccination specimens.

48 **Conclusion:** The BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine elicits robust SARS-CoV-2-S
49 antibody responses in NHR. Nevertheless, the frequency and magnitude of detectable

50 SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ T-cell responses after vaccination was lower in NHR compared to
51 controls.

52 **Key words:** SARS-CoV-2, BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine, SARS-CoV-2-S antibodies;
53 SARS-CoV-2-S T cells, Nursing home residents.

54 **INTRODUCTION**

55 The BNT162b2 (Pfizer–BioNTech) COVID-19 vaccine, a nucleoside-modified
56 messenger RNA that encodes the full-length transmembrane S glycoprotein locked in its
57 perfusion conformation, elicits high levels of serum neutralizing antibodies (NtAb),
58 mainly targeting the SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain (RBD), and strong TH₁-
59 skewed functional CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cell responses in experimental models and humans
60 [1-4]. The efficacy of the vaccine has been shown to approach 95% in preventing severe
61 COVID-19 across a wide range of age groups [5]. Nevertheless, there is scarce
62 information as to the immunogenicity and efficacy of this vaccine in elderly people with
63 comorbidities and frailty [6-7], who have been prioritized for vaccination worldwide
64 due to their increased risk of developing severe clinical forms of COVID-19 [8]; indeed,
65 this subset was underrepresented in a phase III clinical trial [5]. In this regard, data from
66 the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine phase I trial suggested reduced lower antibody
67 responses in older people compared to younger participants [2]. To gain further insight
68 into this issue, here we assessed SARS-CoV-2-S targeted antibody and functional T cell
69 responses after vaccination with BNT162b2 in a cohort of nursing home residents
70 (NHR), most displaying one or more comorbidities, either presumably SARS-CoV-2
71 naïve or with documented prior SARS-CoV-2 infection.

72 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

73 **Participants and study design**

74 We enrolled a total of 60 subjects (44 female) onto the study, randomly selected from
75 two NH affiliated to the Clínico-Malvarrosa Health Department, Valencia (Spain),
76 which together provide care for 226 residents. The median age of participants was 87.5
77 years (range, 53-100). As shown in Table 1, 51 subjects (84%) had one or more
78 comorbidities at enrollment (median, 4; range, 1-7). A total of 18 healthy individuals
79 (15 female) aged a median of 48.5 years (range, 27 to 60 years) with no history of
80 SARS-CoV-2 infection at baseline served as controls. Baseline blood specimens were
81 collected within one week before first vaccine dose (from January 2021 to mid February
82 2021) in both NHR and controls. Post-vaccination specimens were drawn at a median of
83 17.5 days (range, 14-35 days) or 15 days (range, 13-35 days) after the second dose in
84 NHR and controls, respectively (from February 2021 to mid March 2021). Blood
85 specimens from participants were collected in sodium heparin tubes (Beckton
86 Dickinson, U.K. Ltd., UK). Plasma specimens were separated following centrifugation
87 and cryopreserved at -20 °C. Informed consent was obtained from participants. The
88 study was approved by the Hospital Clínico Universitario INCLIVA Research Ethics
89 Committee (February, 2021).

90 **Immunogenicity assessment**

91 **Antibody assays**

92 The following immunoassays were used in the current study: (i) Roche Elecsys® Anti-
93 SARS-CoV-2 S (Roche Diagnostics, Pleasanton, CA, USA), an
94 electrochemiluminescence sandwich immunoassay (ECLIA) that quantifies total (IgG
95 and IgM) antibodies directed against RBD. The assay is calibrated with the first WHO
96 International Standard and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody [9]. The
97 limit of detection of the assay is 0.4 U/ml and its quantification range is between 0.8

98 and 250 U/mL; (ii) Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Roche Diagnostics) a qualitative
99 ECLIA detecting IgG and IgM antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein. Both
100 assays were run on cobas® e601 modular analyzer (Roche Diagnostics, Rotkreuz,
101 Switzerland). Plasma specimens were further diluted (1/10) for antibody quantitation
102 when appropriate. (iii) LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS IgG assay (Diasorin S.p.A,
103 Saluggia, Italy), run on a DiaSorin LIAISON platform (DiaSorin, Stillwater, USA),
104 which measures IgG antibodies against a trimeric S-protein antigen. Samples yielding
105 <13 AU/ml were considered negative. Immunoassays were performed and interpreted
106 following the instructions of the respective manufacturers. Cryopreserved plasma
107 specimens were thawed and assayed in singlets within one month after collection.
108 Baseline and follow-up specimens from a given participant were analyzed in the same
109 run.

110 **T cell immunity assay**

111 SARS-CoV-2 reactive IFN γ producing CD8⁺ and CD4⁺ T cells were enumerated
112 by flow cytometry for ICS (BD Fastimmune, BD Beckton Dickinson and
113 Company Biosciences, San Jose, CA), as previously described [10,11]. Briefly,
114 heparinized whole blood (0.5 mL) was simultaneously stimulated for 6 h with two
115 sets of 15-mer overlapping peptides (11-mer overlap) encompassing the
116 SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S) glycoprotein (S1, 158 peptides and S2, 157 peptides) at a
117 concentration of 1 μ g/mL per peptide, in the presence of 1 μ g/ml of costimulatory
118 monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) to CD28 and CD49d. Peptide mixes were obtained from
119 JPT peptide Technologies GmbH (Berlin, Germany). Samples mock-stimulated with
120 phosphate buffered saline (PBS)/dimethyl sulfoxide and costimulatory antibodies were
121 run in parallel. Brefeldin A (10 μ g/mL) was added for the last 4 h of incubation.
122 Blood was then lysed (BD FACS lysing solution) and frozen at -80°C until tested. On

123 the day of testing, stimulated blood was thawed at 37°C, washed, permeabilized (BD
124 permeabilizing solution) and stained with a combination of labeled mAbs
125 (anti-IFN γ -FITC, anti-CD4-PE, anti-CD8-PerCP-Cy5.5, and anti-CD3-APC)
126 for 1 h at room temperature. Appropriate positive (phytohemagglutinin) and isotype
127 controls were used. Cells were then washed, resuspended in 200 μ L of 1%
128 paraformaldehyde in PBS, and analyzed within 2 h on an FACSCanto flow cytometer
129 using DIVA v8 software (BD Biosciences Immunocytometry Systems, San Jose, CA).
130 CD3⁺/CD8⁺ or CD3⁺/CD4⁺ events were gated and then analyzed for IFN γ production.
131 All data were corrected for background IFN- γ production and expressed as a percentage
132 of total CD8⁺ or CD4⁺ T cells. Representative flow cytometry plots are shown in
133 Supplementary Figure 1.

134 **Statistical methods**

135 Frequency comparisons for categorical variables were carried out using the Fisher exact
136 test. Differences between medians were compared using the Mann–Whitney U-test or
137 the Wilcoxon test for unpaired and paired data, when appropriate. Two-sided exact *P*-
138 values were reported. A *P*-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The
139 analyses were performed using SPSS version 20.0 (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA).

140 **RESULTS**

141 **SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies in NHR and controls**

142 No serological evidence of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection was found in 49 (83%) of the
143 59 NHR at baseline. Pre-vaccination plasma was not available from one patient. In
144 addition, these subjects had been tested at least once for presence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA
145 in nasopharyngeal specimens since the beginning of the epidemic, as a part of a local
146 public health policy for nursing homes, systematically returning negative results. Ten

147 (17%) NHR had suffered from COVID-19, as evidenced by presence of SARS-CoV-2 S
148 and N-specific antibodies and a history of compatible clinical picture and one or more
149 RT-PCR positive results in nasopharyngeal specimens (convalescent NHR).

150 Plasma collected after the second vaccine dose was available for 43 of the 49 NHR with
151 no documented prior infection. One of the remaining six patients died before having
152 received the second dose. Forty-one out of the 43 subjects tested positive by Roche
153 SARS-CoV-2-S immunoassay. All but one specimen tested negative by SARS-CoV-2
154 N immunoassay, suggesting that one NHR had presumably contracted SARS-CoV-2
155 infection between the first and the second vaccine dose. Therefore, the overall
156 seroconversion rate in this NHR group was 95.3%. Of interest, plasma specimens from
157 NHR and controls testing negative were run with LIAISON® SARS-CoV-2 TrimericS
158 IgG assay, also returning negative results. All 10 convalescent NHR had detectable
159 SARS-CoV-2 S and N-binding antibodies at baseline; one patient died before receiving
160 the second vaccine dose. A booster effect was observed in all nine individuals following
161 full dose vaccination, with a median 33-fold (range, 10 to 600-fold) increase in antibody
162 levels. Seventeen out of 18 controls had SARS-CoV-2 S-binding antibodies after the
163 second vaccine dose, while none tested positive for N-specific antibodies. Accordingly,
164 the seroconversion rate in this subgroup was 94.4%. As shown in Figure 1, plasma
165 levels of SARS-CoV-2 S antibodies following complete vaccination were higher
166 ($P<0.01$) in convalescent patients (all 2,500 IU/ml) than in presumably SARS-CoV-2
167 naïve NHR (median 1120 IU/ml; range, 1.08-2,500) or controls (median 2,211 IU/ml;
168 range, 18.4-2,500).

169 Among NHR with no documented prior infection, the seroconversion rate was
170 comparable ($P>0.99$) in individuals presenting either with (33/35; 94%) or without
171 comorbidities (9/9; 100%). Moreover, having a comorbidity did not impact significantly

172 ($P=0.14$) on SARS-CoV-2-S antibody levels in this population group (Supplementary
173 Figure 2).

174 **SARS-CoV-2-S-specific T cells in NHR and controls**

175 Analysis of pre-vaccination blood specimens revealed the presence of SARS-CoV-2 S-
176 reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ and CD4⁺ T cells in 18 (36.7%) and 30 (61.2%) of 49 naïve NHR,
177 and in 6 (60%) and 8 (80%) out of 10 infected NHR; these figures were substantially
178 lower in healthy controls (17.6% for CD8⁺ and 29% for CD4⁺ T cells) (Table 2).
179 Following the second vaccine dose, all control subjects had detectable SARS-CoV-2 S-
180 reactive IFN- γ CD4⁺ T cells and 88% had both IFN- γ CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ T cells.
181 Conversely, the percentage of NHR exhibiting detectable SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ or
182 CD4⁺ T cell responses (or both), independently of their baseline SARS-CoV-2 infection
183 status, dropped consistently after vaccination (except for CD8⁺ T cells in NHR without
184 prior infection), as shown in Table 2. Both loss and *de novo* acquisition of detectable
185 SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ CD8⁺ or CD4⁺ T-cell responses were observed in some
186 individuals, particularly in CD8⁺ T cells. Overall, the magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ
187 CD8⁺ or CD4⁺ T cell responses in NHR, irrespective of their SARS-CoV.2 infection
188 status, decreased consistently in post-vaccination specimens, as can be seen in Table 3.
189 The opposite was observed for healthy controls. The same differential kinetics pattern
190 between NHR and controls was noticed when individuals with detectable T cell
191 responses at baseline were analyzed separately (Figure 2).

192 Overall, the rate and magnitude of detectable SARS-CoV-2 S-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ and
193 CD4⁺ T cell responses following vaccination were comparable in NHR with or without
194 comorbidities (Supplementary Table 1).

195 **DISCUSSION**

196 Data on the immunogenicity of the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine in elderly people
197 with comorbidities is relatively limited. The phase I trial [2] included 12 participants
198 aged 55-85 years and assessed only B cell immunity using a SARS-CoV-2 serum
199 neutralization assay and RBD or S1-binding antibody assays. Slightly weaker antibody
200 responses were reported in older people than in younger participants [2]. Brockman et
201 al. [6] found suboptimal antibody responses after the first vaccine dose in long-term
202 care facility residents as compared to controls. Collier et al. [7] evaluated SARS-CoV-
203 2-S-targeted B and T cell responses elicited by multiplex particle-based flow cytometry,
204 and T cell responses as measured by a CD3⁺ IFN- γ Fluorospot, in 50 participants with a
205 median age of 81 years. They found comparable serum antibody neutralization titers
206 and SARS-CoV-2 S-reactive T cell numbers in participants 80 years or above as in
207 those under 80 following the second vaccine dose.

208 Here, we quantified total antibodies binding SARS-CoV-2 RBD by means of an ECLIA
209 normalized to the first WHO international standard [9], which strongly correlate with
210 neutralizing antibody titers [12,13]. In turn, SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive IFN- γ -producing
211 CD8⁺ and CD4⁺ T cell were enumerated using a whole blood flow cytometry assay
212 [10,11] at a median of 2-3 weeks after the second vaccine dose. Most NHR recruited
213 (median age, 87.5 years) had one or more comorbidities (84%), and were either with or
214 without a SARS-CoV-2 diagnosis by serological and molecular assay prior to
215 vaccination. The main findings of the study are summarized as follows.

216 First, overall, the SARS-CoV-2-S seroconversion rate was similar in NHR (95.2%) and
217 controls (94.4%), with no significant differences in median antibody levels across
218 groups. To rule out the presence of antibodies targeting epitopes outside RBD in plasma
219 specimens from NHR and controls testing negative, these were run with a SARS-CoV-2
220 TrimericS IgG assay, which also returned negative results. Second, a dramatic booster

221 effect was documented in all NHR previously infected by SARS-CoV-2; in fact, these
222 subjects reached significantly higher antibody levels than those measured in presumably
223 naïve NHR and controls.

224 Third, while detectable SARS-CoV-2 S-reactive IFN- γ CD8⁺ and/or CD4⁺ T-cell
225 responses were documented in post-vaccination specimens from all control subjects,
226 they were present in 50%-70% of NHR, depending upon the T cell subset considered
227 and whether or not subjects had prior history of SARS-CoV-2 infection. In this context,
228 NHR individuals with no prior documentation of SARS-CoV-2 infection appeared to
229 display poorer post-vaccination T cell responses than convalescent NHR. Moreover, in
230 contrast to controls, a consistent decrease in the number of SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive
231 IFN- γ CD8⁺ and CD4⁺ T cells was noticed in post-vaccination specimens from most
232 NHR, regardless of their SARS-CoV-2 infection status. Interpreting the T cell response
233 data presented herein is shadowed by difficulty in ascertaining the true infection status
234 of NHR and controls, regarding which a differential effect of the second BNT162b2
235 dose on T and B cell immunity was reported in COVID-19-naïve and recovered
236 individuals, with the latter exhibiting poorer responses [14,15]. In effect, functional
237 SARS-CoV-2-S IFN- γ T cells detected in pre-vaccination specimens from NHR and
238 controls with no evidence of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection may well have been seasonal
239 coronavirus cross-reactive T cells, reported to be present in up to 60% (for CD4⁺ T
240 cells) of pre-pandemic blood specimens [see 16 for review]. Circulation of seasonal
241 coronaviruses in NH facilities and repeat exposure of residents is common over the
242 winter season. This may account for the large percentage of NHR with no documented
243 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection displaying T cell responses at baseline (60% for CD4⁺ T
244 cells). Nevertheless, we cannot rule out that some of the current study participants,
245 NHR in particular, could have been asymptotically infected and failed to mount

246 durable antibody responses, despite robustly expanding SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells
247 [17]. This is plausible, as several SARS-CoV-2 outbreaks were declared in both NH
248 during 2020. Likewise, healthy controls in this study were laboratory employees or staff
249 at the Microbiology unit, and could have been exposed and infected. Regardless of the
250 true SARS-CoV-2 infection status of participants, NHR displayed poorer SARS-CoV-2
251 T-cell responses than healthy controls after vaccination. In contrast, Collier et al. [7]
252 found no age-related differences in T-cell response after full vaccination dose, although
253 the authors admitted they were unable to adjust for confounders such as immune
254 suppression and comorbidities and had no information on pre-vaccination SARS-CoV-2
255 infection status of participants. Our findings could be partly explained by the
256 detrimental impact of age-related immunosenescence on immune response to vaccines
257 [18]. Nonetheless, there is biological and clinical use in elucidating whether either
258 cross-reactive or truly specific pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2 may qualitatively
259 or quantitatively modulate vaccine-elicited T cell immune responses, and if so, how this
260 translates into effective protection against the virus. The apparent contraction of SARS-
261 CoV-2-S-reactive IFN- γ T cells in convalescent NHR following the second vaccine
262 dose was also observed by Camara et al. [14], who hypothesized that this second dose
263 may functionally exhaust SARS-CoV-2-S-specific T cells. This may also apply to
264 cross-reactive T cells. In this sense, CD4⁺ T cell responses against common cold
265 coronaviruses (CCC) were decreased in SARS-CoV-2-infected health care workers,
266 suggesting that exposure to SARS-CoV-2 might somehow interfere with CCC
267 responses [19]. Whether this might also be the case following vaccination needs to be
268 defined. Fourth, comorbidities did not appear to have a major impact on either
269 seroconversion rate or magnitude of antibody or T-cell responses following the second
270 vaccine dose in NHR.

271 The current study has several limitations that must be underlined. Firstly, the number of
272 participants was relatively limited; second, the possibility that NHR displayed SARS-
273 CoV-2-S-reactive T cells with functional specificities other than IFN- γ production was
274 not explored. Additionally, a whole-blood flow cytometry assay was used to assess T-
275 cell immunity: it is uncertain whether employing isolated peripheral blood mononuclear
276 cells instead would increase sensitivity. Finally, no attempt was made to differentiate
277 between truly SARS-CoV-2-specific and cross-reactive T cells, which can be
278 accomplished according to recent reports, although this need further validation [20,21].

279 In summary, we were able to document robust SARS-CoV-2-S antibody responses
280 equivalent to those of healthy controls in NHR following complete vaccination,
281 irrespective of SARS-CoV-2 infection status and presence or absence of comorbidities.
282 Nevertheless, our data point to differential vaccine effectivity between NHR and
283 controls in terms of eliciting SARS-CoV-2 IFN- γ T-cell responses. In this context, the
284 potential detrimental effect of pre-existing *bona fide* or cross-reactive SARS-CoV-2
285 immunity seen in NHR merits further investigation.

286 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

287 We are grateful to all personnel who work at NHR affiliated to the Health Department
288 Clínico-Malvarrosa and at Clinic University Hospital, in particular those at
289 Microbiology laboratory, for their commitment in the fight against COVID-19. Eliseo
290 Albert holds a Juan Rodés Contract (JR20/00011) from the Health Institute Carlos III.
291 Ignacio Torres holds a Río Hortega Contract (CM20/00090) the Health Institute Carlos
292 III.

293 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

294 This work received no public or private funds.

295 **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

296 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

297 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

298 EA, EG, MJA, PA, MJR, IT, DH and BO: Methodology and data validation. PB, MJB,
299 CR: in charge of implementing public health policies to combat SARS-CoV-2 epidemic
300 at NHR affiliated to the Health Department Clínico-Malvarrosa. DN: Conceptualization,
301 supervision, writing the original draft. All authors reviewed the original draft.

302 **REFERENCES**

303 1. Sahin U, Muik A, Derhovanessian E, Vogler I, Kranz LM, Vormehr M, et al.
304 COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b1 elicits human antibody and TH1 T cell responses.
305 Nature 2020;586:594-599.

306 2. Walsh EE, Frenck RW Jr, Falsey AR, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, et al. Safety
307 and Immunogenicity of Two RNA-Based Covid-19 Vaccine Candidates. N Engl J Med
308 2020;383:2439-2450.

309 3. Vogel AB, Kanevsky I, Che Y, Swanson KA, Muik A, Vormehr M, et al. BNT162b
310 vaccines protect rhesus macaques from SARS-CoV-2. Nature 2021. doi:
311 10.1038/s41586-021-03275-y.

312 5. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety
313 and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. N Engl J Med
314 2020;383:2603-2615.

315 6. Brockman MA, Mwimanzi F, Sang Y, Ng K, Agafitei O, Ennis S, et al. Weak
316 humoral immune reactivity among residents of long-term care facilities following one

317 dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. medRxiv 2021.03.17.21253773;
318 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.17.21253773>.

319 7. Collier DA, Ferreira I ATM, Datir R, Meng B, Bergamaschi L, Lim E, et al. Age-
320 related heterogeneity in neutralising antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 following
321 BNT162b2 vaccination. medRxiv 2021; doi:
322 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.03.21251054>.

323 8. Soiza RL, Scicluna C, Thomson EC. Efficacy and safety of COVID-19 vaccines in
324 older people. Age Ageing 2021;50:279-283.

325 9. Mattiuzzo G, Bentley EM, Hassall M, Routley S, Richardson S, Bernasconi V, et al.
326 Establishment of the WHO International Standard and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-
327 CoV-2 antibody. WHO/BS/2020.2403, December 10, 2020.

328 10. Giménez E, Albert E, Torres I, Remigia MJ, Alcaraz MJ, Galindo MJ, et al. SARS-
329 CoV-2-reactive interferon-gamma-producing CD8+ T cells in patients hospitalized with
330 coronavirus disease 2019. J Med Virol 2021;93:375-382.

331 11. Fernández-Ruiz M, Olea B, Giménez E, Laguna-Goya R, Trujillo H, Caravaca-
332 Fontán F, et al. SARS-CoV-2-Specific Cell-Mediated Immunity in Kidney Transplant
333 Recipients Recovered from COVID-19. Transplantation 2021; Feb 8. doi:
334 10.1097/TP.0000000000003672.

335 12. Higgins V, Fabros A, Kulasingam V. Quantitative measurement of anti-SARS-CoV-
336 2 antibodies: Analytical and clinical evaluation. J Clin Microbiol 2021; JCM.03149-20.

337 13. Poljak M, Oštrbenk Valenčak A, Štamol T, Seme K. Head-to-head comparison of
338 two rapid high-throughput automated electrochemiluminescence immunoassays

339 targeting total antibodies to the SARS-CoV-2 nucleoprotein and spike protein receptor
340 binding domain. *J Clin Virol* 2021;137:104784.

341 14. Camara C, Lozano-Ojalvo D, Lopez-Granados E, Paz-Artal E, Pion M, Correa-
342 Rocha R, et al. Differential effects of the second SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine dose on
343 T cell immunity in naïve and COVID-19 recovered individuals. *bioRxiv*
344 2021.03.22.436441; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.22.436441>.

345 15. Samanovic MI, Cornelius AR, Wilson JP, Karmacharya T, Gray-Gaillard SL, Allen
346 JR, et al. Poor antigen-specific responses to the second BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine dose
347 in SARS-CoV-2-experienced individuals *medRxiv* 2021.02.07.21251311; doi:
348 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.02.07.21251311>.

349 16. Shrotri M, van Schalkwyk MCI, Post N, Eddy D, Huntley C, Leeman D, et al. T cell
350 response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 2021;
351 16:e0245532.

352 17. Sekine T, Perez-Potti A, Rivera-Ballesteros O, Strålin K, Gorin JB, Olsson A, et al.
353 Robust T Cell Immunity in Convalescent Individuals with Asymptomatic or Mild
354 COVID-19. *Cell* 2020;183:158-168.e14.

355 18. Pereira B, Xu XN, Akbar AN. Targeting Inflammation and Immunosenescence to
356 Improve Vaccine Responses in the Elderly. *Front Immunol* 2020;11:583019.

357 19. da Silva Antunes R, Pallikkuth S, Williams E, Esther DY, Mateus J, Quiambao L, et
358 al. Differential T cell reactivity to endemic coronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2 in
359 community and health care workers. *J Infect Dis* 2021 Apr 2;:jiab176.

360 20. Dykema AG, Zhang B, Woldemeskel BA, Garliss CC, Cheung LS, Choudhury D, et
361 al. Functional characterization of CD4⁺ T-cell receptors cross-reactive for SARS-CoV-
362 2 and endemic coronaviruses. *J Clin Invest* 2021 Apr 8:146922.

363 21. Ogbe A, Kronsteiner B, Skelly DT, Pace M, Brown A, Adland E, et al. T cell assays
364 differentiate clinical and subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections from cross-reactive
365 antiviral responses. *Nat Commun* 2021;12:2055.

366

367

368 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

369 **Figure 1.** SARS-CoV-2-S plasma antibody levels as measured by Roche Elecsys®
370 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay in nursing home residents (NHR) with or without
371 documented prior SARS-CoV-2 infection and healthy controls following complete
372 vaccination. The asterisks indicate a significant difference in antibody levels across
373 groups ($P<0.01$).

374 **Figure 2.** Pre- and post-vaccination SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive IFN- γ -producing CD8⁺ or
375 CD4⁺ T-cell levels in presumably SARS-CoV-2-naïve nursing home residents (NHR)
376 (A), NHR with prior documented SARS-CoV-2 infection (B) and controls (C) with
377 detectable CD8⁺, CD4⁺ T-cell responses or both at baseline.

378 **Supplementary Figure 1.** Flow cytometry plots corresponding to representative
379 examples of individuals either with or without detectable SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive IFN-
380 γ -producing CD8⁺ (upper panels) or CD4⁺ (lower panels) T cells. Heparinized whole
381 blood was simultaneously stimulated with two sets of 15 μ mer overlapping peptides
382 (11 μ mer overlap) encompassing the SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S) glycoprotein (S1, 158

383 peptides and S2, 157 peptides) in the presence of 1 μ g/ml of costimulatory monoclonal
384 antibodies to CD28 and CD49d. Samples mock-stimulated with phosphate-buffered
385 saline (PBS)/dimethyl sulfoxide and costimulatory antibodies served as negative
386 controls. Positive (phytohemagglutinin) and isotype controls were run in parallel. Cells
387 were analyzed on a FACSCanto flow cytometer using DIVA v8 software (BD
388 Biosciences Immunocytometry Systems, San Jose, CA).

389 **Supplementary Figure 2.** SARS-CoV-2-S plasma antibody levels as measured by
390 Roche Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2 S immunoassay in nursing home residents (NHR)
391 with or without comorbidities following full dose vaccination. The *P*-value for
392 comparison is shown.

393

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of nursing home residents included in the study

Characteristic	Nursing home residents no. (%)
Sex	
Male	16 (27)
Female	44 (73)
Comorbidities (≥ 1)	51 (84)
Hypertension	40 (77)
Dyslipidemia	34 (65)
Chronic heart disease	18 (35)
Diabetes mellitus	16 (31)
Vascular disease	14 (27)
Cancer	10 (19)
Chronic renal disease	10 (19)
Chronic respiratory disease	9 (17)
Hyperuricemia	7 (13)
Obesity	2 (4)

Table 2. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive T cells in pre- and post-vaccination blood specimens from nursing home residents and controls			
Study group	SARS-CoV-2-S IFN-γ-producing T cells in pre/post-vaccination peripheral blood specimens		
	No. of subjects with detectable CD8 ⁺ T-cell response (%)	No. of subjects with detectable CD4 ⁺ T-cell response	No. of subjects with detectable CD8 ⁺ and CD4 ⁺ T-cell responses
Nursing home residents with no documented prior SARS-CoV-2 infection	18 (36) / 27 (54)	30 (61) / 23 (46)	17 (34) / 13 (26)
Nursing home residents with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection	6 (60) / 5 (50)	8 (80) / 7 (70)	6 (60) / 4 (40)
Healthy controls	3 (17.6) / 15 (88)	5 (29) / 17 (100)	1 (6) / 15 (88)

Table 3. Enumeration of SARS-CoV-2-S-reactive T cells in pre- and post-vaccination peripheral blood specimens from nursing home residents and healthy controls

Study group	SARS-CoV-2-S IFN- γ -producing T cells in pre/post-vaccination peripheral blood specimens	
	CD8+, median % (range)	CD4+, median % (range)
Nursing home residents with no documented prior SARS-CoV-2 infection	1.02 (0.04-4.25) / 0.36 (0.04-4.95)	1.47 (0.18-5.01) / 0.60 (0.02-4.50)
Nursing home residents with prior SARS-CoV-2 infection	0.69 (0.19-2.25) / 0.27 (0.02-0.76)	2.64 (1.06-4.35) / 0.06 (0.03-0.16)
Healthy controls	0.56 (0.06-1.72) / 1.45 (0.24-7.33)	0.04 (0.02-0.69) / 0.73 (0.03-3.08)

