

1 **Comprehensive mapping of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2**
2 **variants induced by natural infection or vaccination**

3

4 Xinhua Chen, BSc^{1,*}, Zhiyuan Chen, BSc^{1,*}, Andrew S. Azman, PhD^{2,3,4,*}, Ruijia Sun, BSc¹,
5 Wanying Lu, BSc¹, Nan Zheng, BSc¹, Jiabin Zhou MSc¹, Qianhui Wu MSc¹, Xiaowei Deng
6 MSc¹, Zeyao Zhao, BSc¹, Xinghui Chen, BSc¹, Shijia Ge, BSc⁵, Juan Yang, PhD¹, Daniel T.
7 Leung, M.D.^{6,†}, Hongjie Yu, PhD^{1,5,7†}

8

9 *These authors are co-first authors contributed equally to this work.

10 †These authors are joint senior authors contributed equally to this work.

11 Corresponding author: Hongjie Yu, Shanghai Institute of Infectious Disease and

12 Biosecurity, School of Public Health, Fudan University, Shanghai 200032, China; E-mail:

13 yhj@fudan.edu.cn

14

15 **Affiliations:**

16 1. School of Public Health, Fudan University, Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety,

17 Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China

18 2. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,

19 Baltimore, MD, USA

20 3. Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care Medicine, Geneva

21 University Hospitals, Switzerland

22 4. Institute of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Switzerland

23 5. Department of Infectious Diseases, Huashan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai,

24 China

25 6. Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City,

26 UT, USA

27 7. Shanghai Institute of Infectious Disease and Biosecurity, Fudan University, Shanghai,

28 China

29

30 Word count (Abstract): 250

31 Word count (main text): 3,184

32 Running Title: Review of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants

33 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2 variants; neutralizing antibodies; natural infection; vaccination

34

35 **Disclaimer:** The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily

36 represent the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

37 **Research in context**

38 ***Evidence before this study***

39 Several newly emerged SARS-CoV-2 variants have raised significant concerns globally ,
40 and there is concern that SARS-CoV-2 variants can evade immune responses that are
41 based on the prototype strain. It is not known to what extent do emerging SARS-CoV-2
42 variants escape the immune response induced by previous infection or vaccination.
43 However, existing studies of neutralizing potency against SARS-CoV-2 variants are based
44 on limited numbers of samples and lack comparability between different laboratory
45 methods. Furthermore, there are no studies providing whole picture of neutralizing
46 antibodies induced by prior infections or vaccination against emerging variants.
47 Therefore, we systematically reviewed and quantitatively synthesized evidence on the
48 degree to which antibodies from previous SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination
49 effectively neutralize variants.

50

51 ***Added value of this study***

52 In this study, 56 studies, including 2,483 individuals and 8,590 neutralization tests, were
53 identified. Antibodies from natural infection or vaccination are likely to effectively
54 neutralize B.1.1.7, but neutralizing titers against B.1.351 and P1 suffered large
55 reductions. Lineage B.1.351 escaped natural-infection-mediated neutralization the most,
56 with GMT of 79.2 (95% CI: 68.5-91.6), while neutralizing antibody titers against the
57 B.1.1.7 variant were largely preserved (254.6, 95% CI: 214.1-302.8). Compared with

58 lineage B, we estimate a 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.0-2.2) reduction in neutralization against the
59 B.1.1.7, 8.7-fold (95% CI: 6.5-11.7) reduction against B.1.351 and 5.0-fold (95% CI:
60 4.0-6.2) reduction against P.1. The neutralizing antibody response after vaccinating with
61 non-replicating vector vaccines against lineage B.1.351 was worse than responses
62 elicited by vaccines on other platforms, with levels lower than that of individuals who
63 were previously infected. The neutralizing antibodies induced by administration of
64 inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were also remarkably
65 reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.2-1.9).

66

67 ***Implications of all the available evidence***

68 Our findings indicate that antibodies from natural infection of the parent lineage of
69 SARS-CoV-2 or vaccination may be less able to neutralize some emerging variants, and
70 antibody-based therapies may need to be updated. Furthermore, standardized protocols
71 for neutralizing antibody testing against SARS-CoV-2 are needed to reduce lab-to-lab
72 variations, thus facilitating comparability and interpretability across studies.

73 **Abstract**

74 **Background:** Immunity after SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination has been threatened
75 by recently emerged SARS-CoV-2 variants. A systematic summary of the landscape of
76 neutralizing antibodies against emerging variants is needed.

77 **Methods:** We systematically searched PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and 3
78 pre-print servers for studies that evaluated neutralizing antibodies titers induced by
79 previous infection or vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 variants and comprehensively
80 collected individual data. We calculated lineage-specific GMTs across different study
81 participants and types of neutralization assays.

82 **Findings:** We identified 56 studies, including 2,483 individuals and 8,590
83 neutralization tests, meeting the eligibility criteria. Compared with lineage B, we
84 estimate a 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.0-2.2) reduction in neutralization against the B.1.1.7,
85 8.7-fold (95% CI: 6.5-11.7) reduction against B.1.351 and 5.0-fold (95% CI: 4.0-6.2)
86 reduction against P.1. The estimated neutralization reductions for B.1.351 compared to
87 lineage B were 240.2-fold (95% CI: 124.0-465.6) reduction for non-replicating vector
88 platform, 4.6-fold (95% CI: 4.0-5.2) reduction for RNA platform, and 1.6-fold (95% CI:
89 1.2-2.1) reduction for protein subunit platform. The neutralizing antibodies induced by
90 administration of inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were also
91 remarkably reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI:
92 1.2-1.9).

93 **Interpretation:** Our findings indicate that the antibody response established by
94 natural infection or vaccination might be able to effectively neutralize B.1.1.7, but

95 neutralizing titers against B.1.351 and P.1 suffered large reductions. Standardized
96 protocols for neutralization assays, as well as updating immune-based prevention and
97 treatment, are needed.

98 **Funding:** Chinese National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars

99 **Introduction**

100 Since the first sequence of SARS-CoV-2 was published in January of 2020¹, over 1.1
101 million strains have been documented in Global Influenza Surveillance and Response
102 System (GISAID)², with recent reports of several newly emerged lineages, which has
103 raised significant concerns globally. Of particular concern has been the emergence of
104 lineage B.1.1.7 (UK variant, also known as 501Y.V1), lineage B.1.351 (South Africa
105 variants, 501Y.V2), and lineage P.1 (Brazil variant, 501Y.V3), harboring several
106 significant mutations in spike glycoproteins, which are key domains of virus-neutralizing
107 antibodies³. These mutants rapidly became the dominant circulating virus strains in the
108 regions where they were first isolated, and especially for B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, spread
109 globally. Several vital mutations in the receptor-binding domain (RBD), such as N501Y in
110 B.1.1.7 and E484K in B.1.351 and P.1, are associated with increased infectivity and
111 decreased neutralizing potency, with potential to evade humoral immunity from prior
112 infections or vaccinations⁴⁻⁸. Another variant of lineage B.1.427/B.1.429, which first
113 emerged in California, was categorized as a Variant of Concern (VOC) in March 2021
114 according to classification developed by SARS-CoV-2 Interagency Group (SIG) in United
115 States, containing a single L452R mutation in RBD in spike, whose ability of reduced
116 sensitivity to neutralization has yet to be determined⁹.

117

118 There is concern that SARS-CoV-2 variants can evade immune responses elicited by
119 natural infections and vaccines that are based on the prototype strain (Wuhan-Hu-1). It
120 has been shown that neutralization against variants by convalescent plasma is

121 remarkably reduced by several mutations, including E484K shared by lineage B.1.351
122 and P.1¹⁰. Serum collected from recipients of licensed vaccines have a decreased ability
123 to neutralize emerging SARS-CoV-2 mutants to varying degrees, from 1.6-fold reduction
124 for China's protein subunit vaccines to over 6-fold reduction for mRNA vaccines¹¹⁻¹⁵.
125 Additionally, consistent with immunogenicity results, a major loss of efficacy against
126 B.1.351 was seen in NVX-CoV2373 and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccines^{16,17}, though the
127 efficacy was retained against B.1.1.7 for other vaccines¹⁸. However, existing studies of
128 neutralizing potency against SARS-CoV-2 variants are based on limited numbers of
129 samples and lack comparability between different laboratory methods. Furthermore,
130 there are no studies providing whole picture of neutralizing antibodies induced by prior
131 infections or vaccination against emerging variants.

132

133 Here, we systematically summarize the evidence on neutralization ability against
134 various SARS-CoV-2 variants among those previously-infected with strains from the
135 original SARS-CoV-2 lineage and those who have been vaccinated.

136 **Methods**

137 **Study Selection and Data Extraction**

138 We conducted a systematic search from six databases, including three peer-reviewed
139 databases (PubMed, Embase and Web of Science) and three preprint servers (medRxiv,
140 bioRxiv and Europe PMC), for studies published in English between Sep 1, 2020 and Apr
141 18, 2021 with predefined search terms (**Table S1**). We included studies that 1) reported
142 neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants by using serum or plasma collected
143 from individuals with virologically or serologically-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections,
144 and vaccine recipients; and 2) reported or displayed individual antibody titers with
145 summary tables or high-resolution images. Studies that 1) investigated the efficacy of
146 monoclonal and therapeutic antibodies against variants; 2) reported seroprevalence of
147 variants; 3) only detected non-neutralizing antibodies; or 4) reported specific mutation
148 sites from a view of biological mechanism, were excluded. We also excluded abstracts of
149 congress meetings or conference proceedings, study protocols, media news,
150 commentaries, and reviews.

151

152 We screened all eligible studies to extract the study characteristics, study participants,
153 types of variants, laboratory methods and antibody titers (**Table S2**). Data were
154 digitized from the figures in papers by pre-trained investigators with a digital extraction
155 tool if individual titer values were not available in table format¹⁹. We only extracted the
156 titers expressed as reciprocal dilution of serum that neutralizes or inhibits 50% of the
157 virus (e.g., NT50, PRNT50, etc.). When titers were not explicitly stated, but a category

158 defined as less than some value exists, we assumed a titer of half of this value (e.g., titer
159 of 10 is assumed when “<20” was present). For individuals with multiple specimens, we
160 only included one sample that most likely to have neutralization antibodies for each
161 study participant to avoid repeated inclusion. The inclusion and exclusion of studies,
162 screening and scrutinization of included studies, data extraction and verification were
163 performed by two independent researchers, a third researcher was consulted when
164 disagreement arose.

165

166 **Data Synthesis and Analysis**

167 The primary outcome variable was a pooled geometric mean titer (GMT), expressing an
168 average level SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing titers for a group of individual titers. To be
169 specific, we calculated lineage-specific GMT with extracted dataset across different study
170 participants and types of neutralization assays, indicating three stratified factors (i.e.,
171 study participants, types of neutralization assays and lineages).

172

173 Individual-level data were classified into four groups (**Table S3**). Briefly, 1)
174 non-variant-infected individuals, which indicates acutely-infected or convalescent
175 COVID-19 patients infected with parental strains or asymptomatic cases infected with
176 non-variants; 2) variant-infected individuals, which refers to individuals infected with
177 SARS-CoV-2 variants; 3) uninfected vaccine recipients, which refers to healthy vaccines
178 who were not infected with either parental strains or the variants of SARS-CoV-2; 4)
179 previously-infected vaccine recipients, which refers to vaccines who had been infected

180 with parental strains.

181

182 Among different study participants, we further stratified studies by types of
183 neutralization assays. Multiple neutralization assays used in included studies were
184 classified into three categories based on the type of virus (authentic or pseudo) used and
185 the types of vectors [lentivirus or vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV)] used in pseudovirus
186 neutralization assays, namely, live virus neutralization assays, lentivirus-vector
187 pseudovirus neutralization assays, and VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assays.

188

189 Within specific study participants and types of neutralization assays, we calculated
190 lineage-specific GMTs. The categories of SARS-CoV-2-variant lineages among included
191 studies was consistent with taxonomy and classification of Phylogenetic Assignment of
192 Named Global Outbreak Lineage (PANGO lineage)²⁰. Specifically, lineage B.1.1.117,
193 B.1.1.26, B.1.1.50, and B.1.1.29 served as the reference strains when comparing with
194 SARS-CoV-2 variants in some studies^{11,16,21,22}, and they were classified as lineage B.1 due
195 to close phylogenetic distance and shared mutation site of 614G^{22,23}. Emerging and
196 circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants have been divided into three classes by SIG: variant of
197 interest (VOI), variant of concern (VOC), and variant of high consequence (VOHC)²⁴. VOIs
198 include lineage B.1.526, B.1.525 and P.2, with increased transmissibility and disease
199 severity, and VOCs include lineage B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1, B.1.427, and B.1.429, with
200 significant reduction in neutralization and increased hospitalizations or deaths²⁴. At the
201 time of writing, no variants have been classified as VOHC²⁴. The classification of all

202 lineages involved in eligible studies were shown in **Table S4**.

203

204 For non-variant-infected subjects, we further explored potential determinants affecting

205 the GMT, such as the sampling interval post symptom onset, and disease severity.

206 Disease severity was assessed by classifying individuals as either hospitalized or

207 non-hospitalized, based on World Health Organization COVID-19 Clinical management

208 criteria²⁵. We divided the post-symptom-onset sampling interval into three periods (i.e.,

209 0-30 days, 31-90 days, and >90 days) according to the distribution of sampling times in

210 the extracted data (**Figure S9**). We stratified the uninfected vaccine recipients by

211 vaccine platforms (e.g., non-replicating vector, RNA, inactivated, and subunit protein)

212 and the sampling interval post vaccination (i.e., <14 days, 14-90 days, and >90 days)

213 based on a study that evaluated antibody persistence through 6 months after

214 vaccination²⁶. Furthermore, we conducted a matched analysis for samples that had been

215 tested simultaneously against reference strains and variants and calculated the fold

216 changes of GMT.

217

218 **Statistical Analysis**

219 We first performed univariate subgroup analysis, then used multivariate linear

220 regression models to control for potential confounding among non-variant-infected

221 individuals and uninfected vaccinees to quantitatively explore potential factors that may

222 affect GMT. For the multivariate regression model, we included pango lineage, vaccine

223 platform, sampling interval after last dose, and sampling intervals post symptom onset,

224 and disease severity with available data. GMT was calculated as arithmetic mean of
225 log-transformed titer based on natural logarithm form, and t-test 95% CI was estimated.
226 Statistical significance was tested by Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test with Nemenyi's
227 post-hoc test. For paired samples, we used Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test.
228 Only P-value less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$,
229 **, $P \leq 0.001$, ***). All statistical analyses were done using R (version 4.0.1).

230 **Results**

231 **Study selection and data extraction**

232 We identified a total of 5,182 studies after systematically searching multiple data
233 sources with 2,307 coming from peer-reviewed databases, and 2,875 from preprint
234 servers (**Figure 1**). After screening title, abstract, and full-text, 56 studies containing a
235 total of 2,483 individuals and 8,590 neutralization measurements were included in our
236 analysis, with previously uninfected vaccine recipients comprising more than half of
237 studies (44 studies; 4,697/8,590 samples, 54.7%), followed by non-variant-infected
238 individuals (41 studies; 3,440/8,590 samples, 40.0%), variant-infected individuals (8
239 studies; 288/8,590 samples, 3.4%), and previously-infected vaccine recipients (6 studies;
240 165/8,590 samples, 1.9%) (**Figure 1**). Live virus neutralization assays were most
241 common (24 studies, 24/56, 42.9%), followed by lentivirus-vector pseudovirus
242 neutralization assay (22 studies, 22/56, 39.3%) and VSV-vector pseudovirus
243 neutralization assay (13 studies, 13/56, 23.2%) (**Table S7**). The lineage B.1.1.7 and
244 B.1.351 were the two SARS-CoV-2 variants that had been studied the most, comprising
245 more than two third of studies (B.1.1.7: 37 studies, 66.1%; B.1.351: 40 studies, 71.4%)
246 and nearly half of measurements (B.1.1.7: 1,852 measurements, 21.6%; B.1.351: 2,422
247 measurements, 28.2%) (**Table S7**). Other VOCs, such as lineage P.1 and B.1.427/B.1.429
248 were the subject of 20 studies including 863 data points (**Table S7**).

249

250 **Level of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants among**

251 **non-variant-infected individuals**

252 Overall, among studies that evaluated neutralizing antibodies in individuals previously
253 infected with nonvariants, 26.3% (5/19), 95.7% (22/23), and 88.9% (8/9) of the studies
254 found a significant decrease in neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1,
255 respectively. The neutralization levels of 6.2% (47/757), 20.0% (204/1,028), and 6.4%
256 (16/249) samples against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 were reduced to below the limitation
257 of detection.

258

259 In aggregate, neutralizing titers against B.1.351 were significantly reduced, followed by
260 P.1, while titers against B.1.17 were not, when compared to reference lineage titers.

261 With live virus neutralization assays, the pooled GMT was 254.6 (95% CI: 214.1-302.8)
262 for lineage B.1.1.7, 79.2 (95% CI: 68.5-91.6) for B.1.351, 253.1 (95% CI: 194.9-328.8) for
263 P.1, and 275.5 (95% CI: 146.4-518.5) for B.1.427/B.1.429, with an average of 3.4-fold (95%
264 CI: 3.0-4.0) in B.1.351 when comparing to lineage B (**Figure 2A**). The decrease in
265 neutralization for B.1.351 (3.5, 95% CI: 3.0-4.0) is similar when compared to lineage B.1,
266 which has the 614G mutation. In matched analyses, the reduction in the ability of
267 neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 was 1.5 (95% CI: 1.0-2.2), 8.7 (95% CI:
268 6.5-11.7) and 5.0-fold (95% CI: 4.0-6.2) compared with lineage B (**Figure S2**). For
269 lentivirus-vector pseudovirus assays, the average reductions of GMT were 8.1-9.7 fold,
270 4.2-5.1 fold, and 1.4-1.6 fold for lineage B.1.351, P.1, and B.1.1.7 compared to lineage
271 B/B.1/B+D614G (**Figure 2B**). In terms of VSV-vector pseudovirus assays, the average
272 reductions of GMT were 2.0-12.3 fold, 1.2-7.9 fold, and 1.2-7.5 fold for lineage B.1.351,
273 P.1, and B.1.1.7 respectively when compared to reference strains (**Figure 2C**).

274

275 Serum collected from individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 variants show increased
276 neutralizing antibodies level against corresponding mutant strains (**Figure S3**). Notably,
277 B.1.1.7-infected persons also show significant decreased neutralizing antibodies titers
278 against B.1.351 (**Figure S3**). Multivariate analysis also indicated B.1.351 had significantly
279 reduced neutralizing activity for all three neutralization assays after controlling for
280 sampling intervals post symptom onset and/or clinical severity, compared to reference
281 lineages (**Table S8**).

282

283 **Level of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants among vaccine**
284 **recipients**

285 Significant reductions in neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 were found in
286 48.1% (13/27), 100.0% (26/26) and 66.7% (6/9) of the studies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve
287 vaccine recipients, respectively. Partial reductions reached the background levels, with
288 the proportion of 4.0 (41/1,014), 19.1 (237/1,239), and 11.3 (32/281) against B.1.1.7,
289 B.1.351 and P.1, respectively.

290

291 Serum collected from uninfected vaccine recipients had diverse neutralizing antibody
292 levels against SARS-CoV-2 variants across different vaccine platforms. In studies using
293 the live virus neutralization assay, the non-replicating adenoviral vectored vaccine
294 showed generally low GMT against B.1.351 in contrast to other vaccine delivery
295 platforms, with an average of GMTs of 2.1 (95% CI: 1.1-4.1), 70.9 (95% CI: 50.8-98.9),

296 85.9 (95% CI: 75.9-97.2), and 66.6 (95% CI: 51.0-86.9) for platforms of non-replicating
297 vector, inactivated virus, RNA, and protein subunit, respectively (**Figure 3A**). Using
298 lineage B as a reference lineage, we found that the average reduction fold of neutralizing
299 antibodies against B.1.351 was 240.2-fold (95% CI: 124.0-465.6) for non-replicating
300 vector platform, 4.6-fold (95% CI: 4.0-5.2) for RNA platform, and 1.6-fold (95% CI:
301 1.2-2.1) for protein subunit platform (**Figure 3A**). The neutralizing antibodies induced
302 by administration of inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were
303 also remarkably reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI:
304 1.2-1.9) (**Figure 3A**).

305

306 In paired-sample analysis, neutralizing titers induced by mRNA vaccine were reduced
307 3.1-fold (95% CI: 2.4-3.9) against B.1.1.7, 2.7-fold (95% CI: 2.3-3.2) against P.1, and
308 7.4-fold (95% CI: 6.4-8.5) against B.1.351, compared to prototype strain Wuhan-Hu-1
309 that was used for vaccine design (**Figure S4**). In comparison to lineage B+D614G,
310 significant reductions of antibody levels elicited by all included vaccine platforms
311 against lineage B.1.351 were also found in two pseudovirus neutralization assays
312 ($P < 0.05$). Neutralizing antibodies against lentiviral-encapsulated P.1, P.2, and
313 B.1.427/B.1.429 were also significantly reduced when comparing to lineage B+614G
314 ($P < 0.01$) (**Figure 3B**). Additionally, antibodies in serum collected from
315 previously-infected vaccine recipients receiving RNA vaccines or non-replicating-vector
316 vaccines were significantly higher than uninfected vaccine recipients in pseudovirus
317 assays (**Figure S7**). In multivariate regression mode, we found that B.1.351, P.1 and

318 B.1.427/1.429 had significant lower GMT of neutralizing antibodies assessed by live
319 virus neutralization assay, and we found that other vaccine platform shows significant
320 higher antibody level than non-replicating-vector vaccine across all included virus
321 strains (**Table S9**).

322

323 **Comparison between GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by natural infection** 324 **and vaccination**

325 Comparisons of the GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by natural infections
326 (non-variant-infected individuals) and vaccination (uninfected vaccine recipients)
327 showed that individuals infected with parental strains had similar antibodies titers with
328 individuals vaccinated with mRNA vaccines, but significantly higher antibodies titers
329 than individuals administrated with non-replicating vector vaccines against lineage B.1,
330 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, when using live virus neutralization assay to detect neutralizing
331 antibodies (**Figure 4A**). No significant differences between titers were found between
332 non-variant-infected individuals and RNA vaccine-recipients against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and
333 P.1 tested by VSV-based pseudovirus neutralization assays (**Figure 4C**).

334

335 **Discussion**

336 Overall, we comprehensively estimate the antibody levels against preexisting
337 SARS-CoV-2 viruses and recently emerging variants among different study participants
338 using neutralizing antibodies as a protective biomarker. Our analyses found that
339 antibodies in both naturally-infected and vaccine-immune sera/plasma had slightly

340 reduced but largely retained neutralizing activity against B.1.1.7. The neutralizing
341 potency against B.1.351 and P.1 was significantly reduced compared to reference
342 lineages. The antibody response after vaccinating with non-replicating vector vaccines
343 against lineage B.1.351 was worse than responses elicited by vaccines on other
344 platforms, and the level of neutralizing antibodies is lower than that of individuals who
345 were previously infected. This finding suggests that immunity derived from natural
346 infection or vaccination might be less able to neutralize some recently emerging variants,
347 and antibody-based therapies may need to be updated.

348

349 Neutralizing antibodies titers induced from both natural infections and vaccination
350 against B.1.351 and P.1 were significantly lower than that against other variants or
351 reference strains, mainly due to mutations in spike protein that were associated with
352 decreased neutralizing potency to evade humoral immunity (e.g., E484K)²⁷. However,
353 the decrease of neutralizing potency was more obvious in B.1.351 than P.1, although both
354 variants shared the E484K mutation, which could be partly explained by the distinct set
355 of other mutations and/or deletions in the NTD region or enhanced neutralization of P.1
356 by anti-RBD antibodies that bind outside of the RBD²⁸. We found that convalescent and
357 vaccine-induced immune sera had neutralizing potency against B.1.1.7 and B.1.427/
358 B.1.429 that are comparable with reference strains, suggesting that those mutations do
359 not remarkably affect neutralizing activity. While mutations at 501 can increase affinity
360 for angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) and enhance transmissibility of B.1.1.7²⁹⁻³¹,
361 variants of B.1.427/B.1.429 bearing spike mutations L452R, S13I, and W152C were only

362 associated with modest increases in secondary household attack rates, while no
363 evidence of reduced neutralization capacity for these L452R SARS-CoV-2 variants were
364 found³². However, continued vigilance is warranted given the potential for further
365 mutations that might affect the immunogenicity of the vaccines or reduce the
366 cross-reactivity of previously-induced antibodies by natural infections.

367

368 Both previous infection and vaccination have been shown to provide potent protection
369 against similar strains, but it is unclear how neutralizing antibodies against variants
370 induced by natural infection and vaccination might be different. For the other two most
371 prevalent variants, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, natural infection-induced sera/plasma had
372 significantly higher neutralizing levels than that attained by those vaccinated with
373 non-replicating vector vaccine in live virus neutralization assay. Additionally, antibodies
374 induced by RNA-vaccine had similar neutralizing level with antibodies derived from
375 naturally-infected individuals against prevalent variants. This suggests that the
376 neutralizing potency elicited by natural infection of previous prototype strains is
377 relatively robust, whereas the immunity induced by vaccination depends on vaccine
378 platform.

379

380 Although some studies have shown that the neutralization levels from live virus and
381 pseudovirus correlate well,³³⁻³⁵ we stratified the results by each of three neutralization
382 assays to enhance comparability. The results from live virus assays could provide a
383 comprehensive way to assess inherent viral fitness and the potential impact of other

384 mutations outside the spike region^{6,33-35}. However, even within the same live virus
385 neutralization test, different methods were used for experimental endpoints (e.g.,
386 cytopathic effect, fluorescence, etc.), and to report their final individual titers (e.g., NT50,
387 NT80, etc.). In addition, experimental procedures, such as virus titration, serum dilution,
388 virus-serum neutralization, varied greatly across reports from different laboratories.
389 Thus far, there is no integrated or standardized operation procedure for SARS-CoV-2
390 neutralization assay (neither live virus nor pseudovirus), making comparison between
391 studies difficult. International efforts to standardize laboratory methods for SARS-CoV-2
392 neutralization tests are urgently needed. The previous work by WHO in standardizing
393 procedures for avian influenza neutralization assays provides one useful example.^{36,37}

394
395 Our study has several limitations. First, this study synthesized different neutralization
396 assay results to estimate pooled GMTs. While we stratified analyses by neutralization
397 assays according to virus types and vectors to get the most comparable results,
398 significant variation between assays persists. Second, in many studies, individual-level
399 details were not reported, thus limiting our ability to adjust for potential confounding
400 factors in multivariate regression. We tried to contact study authors, but the response
401 rate was generally low. Thirdly, we did not assess the impact of preexisting cellular
402 immunity, which could provide a degree of protection as reported in previous studies³⁸.

403
404 In conclusion, our study provides a comprehensive mapping of the neutralizing potency
405 against SARS-CoV-2 variants induced by natural infection or vaccination. Our findings

406 suggest that immune sera/plasma retained most of its neutralizing potency against
407 B.1.1.7 and B.1.427 / B.1.429 variants, but significantly lost neutralizing potency against
408 B.1.351 and P.1 variants, with B.1.351 having the worst reductions. The evolution of
409 SARS-CoV-2 lineage is still in process, and it's unknown whether long-term
410 accumulation of mutations can erode the neutralizing effectiveness of natural and
411 vaccine elicited immunity, especially in the context of waning immunity. Therefore,
412 longitudinal monitoring of emerging variants and antibody-induced immunity is of high
413 importance, and standardized protocols for neutralizing antibody testing against
414 SARS-CoV-2 are urgently needed.

415 **Contributors**

416 H.Y. designed and supervised the study. X.C. and Z.C. did the literature search, set
417 up the database and did all statistical analyses. X.C., Z.C., A.S.A., and D.T.L.
418 co-drafted the first version of the article. X.C., Z.C., R.S., W.L., N.Z., J.Z., Q.W., X.D.,
419 Z.Z., X.C, S.G., and helped with checking data and did the figures. D.T.L., A.S.A., J.Y,
420 and H.Y. commented on the data and its interpretation, revised the content
421 critically. All authors contributed to review and revision and approved the final
422 manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

423

424 **Declaration of interests**

425 H.Y. has received research funding from Sanofi Pasteur, and Shanghai Roche
426 Pharmaceutical Company; D.T.L. and A.S.A. has received research funding from
427 the US National Institutes of Health. None of those research funding is related to
428 COVID-19. All other authors report no competing interests.

429

430 **Role of the funding source**

431 The funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data
432 interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access
433 to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
434 for publication.

435

436 **Acknowledgments**

437 We thank Junbo Chen, Qianli Wang, and Yuxia Liang from the Fudan University.
438 This study was funded by the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young
439 Scholars (grant no. 81525023), Program of Shanghai Academic/Technology
440 Research Leader (grant no. 18XD1400300), National Science and Technology
441 Major project of China (grant no. 2018ZX10713001-007, 2017ZX10103009-005,
442 2018ZX10201001-010), the US National Institutes of Health (R01 AI135115 to
443 D.T.L. and A.S.A.)
444

445 **References**

- 446 1. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human
447 respiratory disease in China. *Nature* 2020; **579**(7798): 265-9.
- 448 2. Elbe S, Buckland-Merrett G. Data, disease and diplomacy: GISAID's innovative
449 contribution to global health. 2017; **1**(1): 33-46.
- 450 3. Du L, He Y, Zhou Y, Liu S, Zheng BJ, Jiang S. The spike protein of SARS-CoV--a
451 target for vaccine and therapeutic development. *Nature reviews Microbiology*
452 2009; **7**(3): 226-36.
- 453 4. Weisblum Y, Schmidt F, Zhang F, et al. Escape from neutralizing antibodies by
454 SARS-CoV-2 spike protein variants. *eLife* 2020; **9**.
- 455 5. Leung K, Shum MH, Leung GM, Lam TT, Wu JT. Early transmissibility
456 assessment of the N501Y mutant strains of SARS-CoV-2 in the United Kingdom,
457 October to November 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2021; **26**(1).
- 458 6. Planas D, Bruel T, Grzelak L, et al. Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7
459 and B.1.351 variants to neutralizing antibodies. *Nat Med* 2021.
- 460 7. Supasa P, Zhou D, Dejnirattisai W, et al. Reduced neutralization of
461 SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 variant by convalescent and vaccine sera. *Cell* 2021.
- 462 8. Wang P, Nair MS, Liu L, et al. Antibody Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 Variants
463 B.1.351 and B.1.1.7. *Nature* 2021.
- 464 9. Li Q, Wu J, Nie J, et al. The Impact of Mutations in SARS-CoV-2 Spike on Viral
465 Infectivity and Antigenicity. *Cell* 2020; **182**(5): 1284-94.e9.
- 466 10. Greaney AJ, Loes AN, Crawford KHD, et al. Comprehensive mapping of

- 467 mutations to the SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain that affect recognition by
468 polyclonal human serum antibodies. *Cell host & microbe* 2021:
469 2020.12.31.425021.
- 470 11. Huang B, Dai L, Wang H, et al. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 VOC 501Y.V2 by
471 human antisera elicited by both inactivated BBIBP-CorV and recombinant
472 dimeric RBD ZF2001 vaccines. 2021: 2021.02.01.429069.
- 473 12. Liu Y, Liu J, Xia H, et al. Neutralizing Activity of BNT162b2-Elicited Serum —
474 Preliminary Report. *NEJM* 2021.
- 475 13. Wu K, Werner AP, Moliva JI, et al. mRNA-1273 vaccine induces neutralizing
476 antibodies against spike mutants from global SARS-CoV-2 variants. *NEJM* 2021:
477 2021.01.25.427948.
- 478 14. Wu K, Werner AP, Koch M, et al. Serum Neutralizing Activity Elicited by
479 mRNA-1273 Vaccine. 2021.
- 480 15. Wang GL, Wang ZY, Duan LJ, et al. Susceptibility of Circulating SARS-CoV-2
481 Variants to Neutralization. *N Engl J Med* 2021.
- 482 16. Madhi SA, Baillie V, Cutland CL, et al. Efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19
483 Covid-19 Vaccine against the B.1.351 Variant. 2021.
- 484 17. Shinde V, Bhikha S, Hossain Z, et al. Preliminary Efficacy of the NVX-CoV2373
485 Covid-19 Vaccine Against the B.1.351 Variant. *MedRxiv* 2021.
- 486 18. Tarke A, Sidney J, Methot N, et al. Negligible impact of SARS-CoV-2 variants
487 on CD4+ and CD8+ T cell reactivity in COVID-19 exposed donors and vaccinees.
488 bioRxiv; 2021.

- 489 19. Rohatgi A. WebPlotDigitizer. 2020.
- 490 <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/citation.html> (accessed Mar 1 2021).
- 491 20. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, et al. A dynamic nomenclature proposal
492 for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. *Nature microbiology*
493 2020; **5**(11): 1403-7.
- 494 21. Becker M, Dulovic A, Junker D, et al. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2
495 variants of concern in vaccinated individuals. 2021: 2021.03.08.21252958.
- 496 22. Cele S, Gazy I, Jackson L, et al. Escape of SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 from
497 neutralization by convalescent plasma. 2021: 2021.01.26.21250224.
- 498 23. Elbe S, Buckland-Merrett G. Data, disease and diplomacy: GISAID's innovative
499 contribution to global health. *Global challenges (Hoboken, NJ)* 2017; **1**(1): 33-46.
- 500 24. CDC U. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and Definitions. 2021.
- 501 <https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/variant-surveillance/variant-info.html>
502 (accessed Mar 24 2021).
- 503 25. WHO. COVID-19 clinical management. 2021.
- 504 <https://www.who.int/teams/health-care-readiness-clinical-unit/covid-19>
505 (accessed Mar 24 2021).
- 506 26. Doria-Rose N, Suthar MS, Makowski M, et al. Antibody Persistence through 6
507 Months after the Second Dose of mRNA-1273 Vaccine for Covid-19. 2021.
- 508 27. Liu Z, VanBlargan LA, Bloyet L-M, et al. Identification of SARS-CoV-2 spike
509 mutations that attenuate monoclonal and serum antibody neutralization. *Cell*
510 *host & microbe* 2021; **29**(3): 477-88.e4.

- 511 28. Chen RE, Zhang X, Case JB, et al. Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 variants to
512 neutralization by monoclonal and serum-derived polyclonal antibodies. *Nature*
513 *Medicine* 2021.
- 514 29. Starr TN, Greaney AJ, Hilton SK, et al. Deep Mutational Scanning of
515 SARS-CoV-2 Receptor Binding Domain Reveals Constraints on Folding and ACE2
516 Binding. *Cell* 2020; **182**(5): 1295-310.e20.
- 517 30. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact
518 of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* 2021; **372**(6538).
- 519 31. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, et al. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2
520 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature* 2021.
- 521 32. Peng J, Liu J, Mann SA, et al. Estimation of secondary household attack rates
522 for emergent spike L452R SARS-CoV-2 variants detected by genomic surveillance
523 at a community-based testing site in San Francisco. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021.
- 524 33. Rogers TF, Zhao F, Huang D, et al. Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing
525 antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. *Science* 2020;
526 **369**(6506): 956.
- 527 34. Sholukh AM, Fiore-Gartland A, Ford ES, et al. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2
528 neutralization assays for antibody monitoring in natural infection and vaccine
529 trials. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 530 35. Riepler L, Rossler A, Falch A, et al. Comparison of Four SARS-CoV-2
531 Neutralization Assays. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2020; **9**(1).
- 532 36. World Health Organization (WHO). Serological detection of avian influenza

533 A(H7N9) virus infections by modified horse red blood cells
534 haemagglutination-inhibition assay. 2013.
535 [https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf)
536 [_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf) (Accessed 20 December 2019).
537 37. World Health Organization (WHO). Serological detection of avian influenza
538 A(H7N9) infections by microneutralization assay. 2013.
539 [https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis mic](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_microneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf)
540 [roneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_microneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf) (Accessed 20 December 2019).
541 38. Motozono C, Toyoda M, Zahradnik J, et al. An emerging SARS-CoV-2 mutant
542 evading cellular immunity and increasing viral infectivity. 2021:
543 2021.04.02.438288.
544

545 **Figure legends**

546 **Figure 1. Selection flowchart of studies, study participants, and variants**
547 **studied.**

548

549 **Figure 2. Neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants in**

550 **non-variant-infected individuals.** Neutralizing antibodies against reference
551 strains (blue dot) and variants of concern (red dot) were determined in **A)** live
552 virus neutralization assay, **B)** lentivirus-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay,
553 and **C)** VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay. The solid point represents
554 the GMT and the error bar represents the 95% confidence interval. The
555 scattering dot represents individual titers. The numbers in the bottom orange
556 rectangle represent the number of studies and sample sizes (no. of studies/no. of
557 samples). Significant statistical differences are indicated by asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *;
558 $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***).

559


560 **Figure 3. Neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants in uninfected**
561 **vaccine recipients after the administration of different vaccine platforms.**

562 Neutralizing antibodies against reference strains (blue dot), variants of concern
563 (red dot), variants of interest (green dot), and other variants (black dot) were
564 determined in **A)** live virus neutralization assay, **B)** lentivirus-vector pseudovirus
565 neutralization assay, and **C)** VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay. The
566 solid point represents the geometric mean titer (GMT) and the error bar


567 represents the 95% confidence interval. The scattering dot represents individual
568 titers. The numbers in the bottom orange rectangle represent the number of
569 studies and sample sizes (no. of studies/no. of samples). Significant statistical
570 differences are indicated by asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***).

571


572 **Fig 4. Comparison between GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by**
573 **natural infection and vaccination by platforms.** Neutralizing antibodies
574 comparison were determined in **A)** live virus neutralization assay, **B)**
575 lentivirus-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay, and **C)** VSV-vector
576 pseudovirus neutralization assay. Neutralization against same lineage induced by
577 natural infection and different platforms of vaccination was compared. The solid
578 point represents the GMT and the error bar represents the 95% confidence
579 interval. The scattering dot represents individual titers. The numbers in the
580 bottom orange rectangle represent the number of studies and sample sizes (no.
581 of studies/no. of samples). Significant statistical differences are indicated by
582 asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***). N-R vector, non-replicating
583 vector.




A. Live virus neutralization assay



B. Lentivirus-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay




C. VSV-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay




A. Live virus neutralization assay

● Reference lineages Inactivated ● Variants of Concern ● Variants of Interest ● Other variants



B. Lentivirus-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay



C. VSV-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay

