- 1 Analysis of anti-Omicron neutralizing antibody titers in different convalescent plasma sources.
- 2
- 3 Daniele Focosi^{1,#}, Massimo Franchini², Michael J. Joyner³, Arturo Casadevall⁴, David J Sullivan⁴
- 4
- ¹North-Western Tuscany Blood Bank, Pisa University Hospital, 56124 Pisa, Italy.
- 6
- 7 ²Division of Transfusion Medicine, Carlo Poma Hospital, 46100 Mantua, Italy; <u>massimo.franchini@asst-</u>
- 8 <u>mantova.it</u>
- 9 ³Department of Anesthesiology & Perioperative Medicine, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN 55902, USA
- 10 joyner.michael@mayo.edu;
- 11 ⁴Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD
- 12 21218, USA; <u>acasade1@jhu.edu</u>[#]corresponding author: via Paradisa 2, 56124 Pisa, Italy. E-mail:
- 13 <u>daniele.focosi@gmail.com</u>.
- 14 Keywords: COVID19; Omicron; convalescent plasma; vaccine; neutralizing antibodies.
- 15 Word count: abstract 210; body 2979.
- 16 Acknowledgements: none.

Funding Information: The analysis was supported by the U.S. Department of Defense's Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense (JPEO-CBRND), in collaboration with the Defense Health Agency (DHA) (contract number: W911QY2090012) (D.S), with additional support from Bloomberg Philanthropies, State of Maryland, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID) 3R01Al152078-01S1) (A.C).

Author contributions: D.F. and M.J.J. conceived the manuscript; D.F., D.J.S. and M.F. analyzed the literature, curated tables and wrote manuscripts; M.F. provided Figure 1; D.J.S. provided Figures 2 -4.A.C. and M.J.J. revised the manuscript.

- Data availability statement: The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are
 available from the corresponding author on reasonable request
- 27

28 Abstract

29 The latest SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern Omicron, with its immune escape from therapeutic anti-Spike 30 monoclonal antibodies and vaccine-elicited sera, demonstrates the continued relevance of COVID19 31 convalescent plasma (CCP) therapies. Lessons learnt from previous usage of CCP suggests focusing on 32 outpatients and immunocompromised recipients, with high neutralizing antibody (nAb) titer units. In this 33 analysis we systematically reviewed Omicron neutralizing plasma activity data, and found that 34 approximately 50% (426/911) of CCP from unvaccinated donors neutralizes Omicron with a very low 35 geometric mean of geometric mean titers for 50% neutralization (GM(GMT₅₀)) of about 17, representing 36 a more than 24-fold reduction from paired WA-1 neutralization. Two doses of mRNA vaccines in 37 nonconvalescent subjects had a similar 50% percent neutralization with Omicron neutralization GM(GMT(50)) about 24. However, CCP from vaccinees recovered from previous variants of concern or 38 third-dose uninfected vaccinees was nearly 100% neutralizing with Omicron GM(GMT(₅₀)) over 200, a 12-39 40 fold Omicron neutralizing antibody increase compared to unvaccinated convalescents from former VOCs. 41 These findings have implications for both CCP stocks collected in prior pandemic periods and plans to 42 restart CCP collections. Thus, CCP from vaccinated donors provides an effective tool to combat variants 43 that defeat therapeutic monoclonal antibodies.

44 Introduction

The SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant of concern (VOC) (originally named VUI-21NOV-01 by Public Health England and belonging to GISAID clade GRA(B.1.1.529+BA.*) was first reported on November 8, 2021 in South Africa , and shortly thereafter was also detected all around the world. Omicron mutations impact 27% of T cell epitopes ¹ and 31% of B cell epitopes of Spike, while percentages for other VOC were much lower ². The Omicron variant has further evolved to several sublineages which are named by PANGO phylogeny using the BA alias: the BA.1 wave of Winter 2021-2022 has been suddenly replaced by BA.2 and BA.2.12.1 in Spring 2022, and by the BA.4 and BA.5 waves in Summer 2022..

52

The VOC Omicron is reducing the efficacy of all vaccines approved to date (unless 3 doses are delivered) 53 54 and is initiating an unexpected boost in COVID19 convalescent plasma (CCP) usage, with Omicron being 55 treated as a shifted novel virus instead of a SARS-CoV-2 variant drift. Two years into the pandemics, we 56 are back to the starting line for some therapeutic classes. Specifically, Omicron escapes viral 57 neutralization by most monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) authorized to date with the lone exception of bebtelovimab³. Despite the development of promising oral small-chemical antivirals (molnupiravir and 58 59 nirmatrelvir), the logistical and economical hurdles for deploying these drugs worldwide has prevented 60 their immediate and widespread availability, and concerns remain regarding both molnupiravir (both safety⁴ and efficacy⁵) and nirmatrelvir (efficacy), expecially in immunocompromised subjects. COVID19 61 62 convalescent plasma (CCP) was used as a frontline treatment from the very beginning of the pandemic. 63 Efficacy outcomes have been mixed to date, with most failures explained by low dose, late usage, or both, but efficacy of high-titer CCP has been definitively proven in outpatients with mild disease stages ⁶. 64 ⁷. Neutralizing antibody (nAb) efficacy against VOC remains a prerequisite to support CCP usage, which 65 can now be collected from vaccinated convalescents, including donors recovered from breakthrough 66 infections (so-called "hybrid" or "VaxCCP")⁸: pre-Omicron evidence suggest that those nAbs have higher 67 titers and are more effective against VOCs than those from unvaccinated convalescents ^{9, 10}. From a 68 69 regulatory viewpoint, to date, plasma from vaccinees that have never been convalescent does not fall 70 within the FDA emergency use authorization

71 There are tens of different vaccine schedules theoretically possible according to EMA and FDA approvals, 72 including a number of homologous or heterologous boosts, but the most commonly delivered schedules 73 in the western hemisphere have been: 1) BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 for 2 doses eventually followed by a 74 homologous boost; 2) ChAdOx1 for 2 doses eventually followed by a BNT162b2 boost; and 3) Ad26.COV2.S for 1 dose eventually followed by a BNT162b2 boost ¹¹. Many more inactivated vaccines 75 have been in use in low-and-middle income countries (LMIC), which are target regions for CCP therapy: 76 77 this is feasible given the lower number of patients at risk for disease progression there (lower incidences 78 of obesity, diabetes, and hypertension, and lower median age) and the already widespread occurrence of collection and transfusion facilities. Most blood donors there have already received the vaccine schedule 79 before, after or without having been infected, with a nAb titer generally declining over months ¹². Hence 80 81 identifying the settings where the nAb titer is highest will definitively increase the efficacy of CCP collections. Variations in nAb titers against a given SARS-CoV-2 strain are usually reported as fold-changes 82 in geometric mean titer of antibodies neutralizing 50% of cytopathic effect or foci (GMT₅₀) compared to 83 84 wild-type strains: nevertheless, fold-changes for groups that include non-responders can lead to highly 85 artificial results and possibly over-interpretation. Rigorous studies have hence reported the percentage of

responders as primary outcome and provided fold-changes of GMT_{50} where calculation is reasonable (100% responders in both arms)¹³.

To date the most rigorous data repository for SARS-CoV-2 sensitivity to antivirals is the Stanford University Coronavirus Antiviral & Resistance Database, but as of July 24, 2022 the tables there summarizing "Convalescent plasma" and "Vaccinee plasma" (https://covdb.stanford.edu/searchdrdb/?form_only) do not dissect the different heterologous or homologous vaccination schemes, the simultaneous occurrence of vaccination and convalescence, or the time from infection/vaccine to neutralization assay. Consequently, a more in-depth analysis is needed to better stratify CCP types.

94

95 Methods

96 On August 11, 2022, we searched PubMed, medRxiv and bioRxiv for research investigating the efficacy of 97 CCP (either from vaccinated or unvaccinated donors) against SARS-CoV-2 VOC Omicron for article 98 (pre)published after December 1, 2019, using English language as the only restriction. In PubMed we 99 used the search query "("convalescent plasma" or "convalescent serum") AND ("neutralization" or 100 "neutralizing") AND "SARS-CoV-2"", while in bioRxiv and medRxiv we searched for abstract or title 101 containing "convalescent, SARS-CoV-2, neutralization" (match all words). When a preprint was published, 102 the latter was used for analysis. We also screened the reference lists of reviewed articles for additional 103 studies not captured in our initial literature search. Articles underwent evaluation for inclusion by two 104 assessors (D.F. and D.S.) and disagreements were resolved by a third senior assessor (A.C.). We excluded 105 review articles, meta-analyses, studies reporting antibody levels by serological assays other than 106 neutralization, as well as studies exclusively analyzing nAbs in vaccine-elicited plasma/serum from non-107 convalescent subjects. In unvaccinated subjects, convalescence was annotated according to infecting 108 sublineage (pre-VOC Alpha, VOC Alpha, VOC Beta, VOC Delta, or VOC Omicron sublineages). Given the 109 heterologous immunity that develops after vaccination in convalescents, the infecting lineage was not 110 annotated in vaccine recipients. In vaccinees, strata were created for 2 homologous doses, 3 homologous 111 doses, or post-COVID-19 and post-vaccination (Vax-CCP). The mean neutralizing titer for WA-1 (pre-Alpha 112 wild-type), Omicron and number out of total that neutralized Omicron was abstracted from studies.

113 Statistical significance between means was investigated using Tukey's test.

114

115 **Results**

116 Our literature search identified 29 studies dealing with the original Omicron lineage (BA.1), that were 117 then manually mined for relevant details : the PRISMA flowchart for study selection is provided in Figure 118 1. Given the urgency to assess efficacy against the upcoming VOC Omicron, most studies (with a few exceptions^{14, 15, 16, 17}) relied on Omicron pseudovirus neutralization assays, which, as opposed to live 119 120 authentic virus, are scalable, do not require BSL-3 facilities, and provide results in less than 1 week. 121 GMT₅₀ of nAb and fold-reduction (in GMT₅₀ against Omicron compared to wild-type SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., WA-1) were the most common ways of reporting changes, which reduces variability due to difference in 122 123 neutralization assays used.

124 Figure 2 and Table 1 summarize that neutralizing activity to WA-1 from CCP collected from subjects 125 infected with pre-Alpha SARS-CoV-2 (Supplementary Table 1), Alpha VOC (Supplementary Table 2), Beta VOC (Supplementary Table 3), Delta VOC (Supplementary Table 4) or plasma from nonconvalescent 126 127 subjects vaccinated with 2 mRNA vaccine doses (Supplementary Tables 5 and 6)The same plasma types 128 computed a geometric mean of multiple GMT₅₀ from many studies with about a 21-fold reduction against 129 BA.1 geomeans compared to wild-type SARS-CoV-2 geomeans. CCP from uninfected vaccinees receiving a 130 third vaccine dose registered geomean of the GMT(50) of 2,723 (or 10- fold higher nAb geomean of the 131 GMT_{50}) to wild-type viral assays: in this group the nAb geomean of the GMT_{50} fold-reduction against BA.1 132 was 9, but importantly the geomean of the $GMT(_{50})$ was close to 291 again. The approximately 21-fold 133 reduction in nAb geomean of the $GMT(_{50})$ from wild-type to BA.1 was reversed by the 10-15-fold 134 increase in nAb geomean of the GMT(₅₀) from either boosted vaccination or VaxCCP.

135 In addition to the nAb GMT₅₀ levels showing potency, the percentage of individuals within a study cohort 136 positive for any level of BA.1 neutralization shows the likelihood of a possible donation having anti-BA.1 137 activity. All studies but one tested a limited number of 20 to 40 individuals. The pre-Alpha CCP showed 138 that most (18 of 27 studies) had less than 50% of individuals tested within a study with measurable BA.1 139 neutralizing activity: only 2 out of 27 studies indicated 100% of individuals tested showed BA.1 140 neutralization (Figure 3). Likewise, most of the studies investigating Alpha and Beta CCP showed similar 141 percent with nAb. Delta CCP had 6 of 7 studies with more than 50% BA.1 neutralization. The plasma from 142 studies of the 2-dose mRNA vaccines indicated a more uniform distributive increase in percent of 143 individual patients with measurable Omicron nAb's. The stark contrast is Vax-CCP, where 16 of 19 studies 144 had 100% of individuals tested with anti-BA.1 nAb. The 3-dose vaccinee studies similarly had 12 of 17 145 studies with 100% measurable nAb.

There were 5 studies which directly compared anti-WA-1 versus BA.1 nAb titers in nonvaccinated pre-Alpha, Alpha, Beta, and Delta CCP, and vaccinated plasma with the same nAb assay (Figure 4). nAb GMT₅₀ against WA-1 was higher for Alpha and Delta CCP but lower for Beta CCP. nAb geomean of the GMT(₅₀) against BA.1 was actually highest for Beta CCP 13 geomean with geomean levels of 9, 8, 10 for pre-Alpha, Alpha and Delta (Figure 4, panel A). In these 5 studies, nAb geomean of the GMT(₅₀) rose from 2-dose vaccinations to VaxCCP to the 3-dose boosted vaccination. Importantly, for nAb geomean of the GMT(₅₀) against BA.1 were 13 to 103 to 223, respectively representing a 8 to 17-fold rise (Figure 4, panel B).

Another set of 9 matched vaccination studies inclusive of plasma collected after 2- and 3-dose schedules, as well as Vax-CCP depicted a 23-fold rise in geomean of the GMT(₅₀) of anti-BA.1 nAb from the 2-dose vaccine to post COVID-19 vaccinees, and a 21-fold increase after the third vaccine dose. The pattern was similar for nAb geomean of the GMT(₅₀) against WA-1 (Figure 4, panel C).

The AZD1222, 3-dose mRNA-1273 and Ad26.COV2 vaccines were understudied, with 3 or less independent studies at different time points, reported in Table 10. The GMT_{50} nAb to BA.1 after 3mRNA-1273 doses ranged 60 to 2000, with a 5 to 15 fold reduction compared with WA-1. GMT_{50} of anti-BA.1 nAbs after AZD1222 vaccine was modest (~10 to 20), as with Ad26.COV2 vaccine (~20 to 40). Two studies reported on post-COVID-19/post-mRNA-1273 with nAb GMT_{50} against BA.1 of 38 and 272. Studies with 100% of individual patient samples neutralizing BA.1 included 2 3-dose mRNA-1273 studies, one AZD1222 study, and one post-COVID-19/post-mRNA-1273 study.

Few data exist for comparisons among different vaccine boosts. For CoronaVac[®] (SinoVac), three doses led to 5.1 fold reduction in anti-BA.1 nAb GMT_{50} compared to wild-type ¹⁸, while for Sputnik V nAb titer moved from a 12-fold reduction at 6-12 months up to a 7-fold reduction at 2-3 months after a boost with Sputnik Light ^{19, 20}. These *in vitro* findings have been largely confirmed *in vivo*, where prior heterologous SARS-CoV-2 infection, with and without mRNA vaccination, protects against BA.1 re-infection ²¹.

169

Twenty-one studies analyzed the efficacy of CCP and VaxCCP against Omicron sublineages other than 170 BA.1 (summarized in Table 2). Those studies largely confirmed that Omicron CCP per se is poorly effective 171 against the cognate or other Omicron sublineages²² (with the lone exception of cross-reactions among 172 lineages sharing L452 mutations²³ and broad-spectrum nAbs elicited by BA.5²⁴). On the contrary, both 173 homologous and heterologous efficacy of Omicron VaxCCP is again universally preserved ^{15, 25}. Despite 174 evidences that concentrated pooled human IgG from convalescent and vaccinated donors has 5-fold 175 reduced potency against BA.5 compared to wild-type SARS-CoV-2²⁶, such VaxCCP derivative is devoid of 176 177 IgA and IgM nAbs. These findings have important implications if a VaxCCP program is going to be re-178 launched at the time of BA.2 and BA.4/5 waves. In particular, the emerging R346X-harboring BA.4.6, 179 BA.4.7, and BA.5.9 sublineages show 1.5-1.9-fold reduction in GMT₅₀ by BA.1/2 VaxCCP and 2.4-2.6 reduction by BA.5 VaxCCP²⁷. Of interest, VaxCCP after 2 doses remains superior to 4-dose vaccinee 180 plasma, and VaxCCP with 3 vaccine doses is not consistently superior to VaxCCP after 2 vaccines doses²⁸. 181

182

183 Discussion

Since nAbs are by definition antiviral, CCP with a high nAb GMT₅₀ is preferable, , and there is now strong 184 clinical evidence that nAb titers correlate with clinical benefit in randomized clinical trials^{6, 7}. Although 185 nAb titers correlate with vaccine efficacy^{29, 30}, it is important to keep in mind that SARS-CoV-2-binding 186 187 non-neutralizing antibodies can similarly provide protection via Fc-mediated functions ^{31, 32}. However, 188 such functions are harder to measure and no automated assay exist for use in clinical laboratories. Hence, whereas the presence of a high nAb GMT₅₀ in CCP is evidence for antibody effectiveness in vitro, 189 190 the absence of nAb titer does not imply lack of protection in vivo where Fc effects mediate protection by 191 other mechanisms such as antibody-dependent cell-mediated cytotoxicity, complement activation and 192 phagocytosis.

193 The mechanism by which CCP from vaccinated COVID-19 convalescent individuals better neutralizes 194 Omicron lineagesis probably a combination of higher amounts of nAb and broader antibody specificity. Higher amounts of antibody could neutralize antigenically different variants through the law of mass 195 196 action ³³ whereby even lower affinity antibodies elicited to earlier variants would bind to the Omicron 197 variant as mass compensates for reduced binding strength to drive the reaction forward. In addition, 198 vaccinated COVID-19 convalescent individuals would have experienced SARS-CoV-2 protein in two 199 antigenically different forms: as part of intact infective virions generated in vivo during an infectious 200 process and as antigens in vaccine preparations. As the immune system processes the same antigen in 201 different forms, there are numerous opportunities for processing the protein in different manners that 202 can diversity the specificity of the immune response and thus increase the likelihood of eliciting

antibodies that react with variant proteins. Structurally, it has been shown that third dose mRNA vaccination induces mostly class 1/2 antibodies encoded by IGHV1-58;IGHJ3-1 and IGHV1-69;IGHJ4-1 germlines, but not the IGHV2-5;IGHJ3-1 germline, broadly cross-reactive Class 3 antibodies seen after infection ³⁴.

Our analysis provides strong evidence that, unlike what has been observed in Syrian hamster models³⁵,
 CCP from unvaccinated donors is unlikely (less than 50%) to have any measurable Omicron neutralization.
 Although the nAb GMT₅₀ threshold for clinical utility remains poorly defined, it is noticeable that low BA.1
 nAb GMT₅₀ were generally detected in CCP after infection from pre-Omicron VOCs.

211 On the contrary, despite the huge heterogeneity of vaccine schedules, CCP from vaccinated and COVID-212 19 convalescent individuals (Vax-CCP) consistently harbors high nAb titers against BA.1 and novel 213 sublineages if collected up to 6 months since last event (either vaccine dose or infection). These Omicron 214 neutralizing levels are comparable in dilutional titers to that of WA-1 CCP neutralizing WA-1, but their 215 prevalence is much higher at this time, facilitating recruitment of suitable donors. Pre-Omicron CCP 216 boosted with WA-1-type vaccines induces heterologous immunity that effectively neutralizes Omicron in 217 the same assays which rule in or out therapeutic anti-Spike monoclonal antibodies. Consequently, 218 prescreening of Vax-CCP donors for nAb titers is not necessary, and qualification of Vax-CCP units remains 219 advisable only within clinical trials. A more objective way to assess previous infection (convalescence) would be measuring anti-nucleocapsid (N) antibodies, but unfortunately these vanish quickly ^{36, 37}. 220 Previous symptomatic infection and vaccination can be established by collecting past medical history 221 222 (PMH) during the donor selection visit, which is cheaper, faster, and more reliable than measuring rapidly 223 declining anti-N antibodies. Although there is no formal evidence for this, it is likely that asymptomatic 224 infection (leading to lower nAb levels in pre-Omicron studies) also leads to lower nAb levels after 225 vaccination compared to symptomatic infection, given that disease severity correlates with antibody titer ^{38, 39}: hence those asymptomatically infected donors missed by investigating PMH are also less likely to be 226 227 useful.

228 The same reasoning applies to uninfected vaccinees receiving third dose boosts, but several authorities, 229 including the FDA, do not currently allow collection from such donors for CCP therapy on the basis that 230 the convalescent polyclonal and poly-target response is a prerequisite for efficacy and superior to the 231 polyclonal anti-Spike-only response induced by vaccinees. This may be a false premise for recipients of 232 inactivated whole-virus vaccines (e.g., BBIBP-CorV or VLA2001): for BBIBP-CorV, the efficacy against Omicron is largely reduced ^{18, 20, 40}, but the impact of boost doses is still unreported at the time of writing. 233 234 Table 1 and Table 9 clearly show that 3-doses of BNT162b2 are enough to restore nAb levels against 235 Omicron in the absence of SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Another point to consider is that information on nAb levels after the third vaccine dose has been almost exclusively investigated for only 1 month of follow-up, while studies on convalescents extend to more than 6 months: to date it seems hence advisable to start from convalescent vaccinees rather than uninfected 3-dose vaccinees. This is also confirmed by immune escape reported *in vivo* after usage of vaccine (non-convalescent) plasma ⁴¹ despite very high nAb titres, likely due to restricted antigen specificity. Vaccine schedules with a delayed boost seem to elicit higher and broader nAb levels than the approved, short schedules^{42, 43, 44, 45}, but this remain to be confirmed in larger series. The same is true for

breakthrough infections from Alpha or Delta VOC in fully BNT162b2 vaccinated subjects⁴⁶, although
 variation in time from infection due to successive waves is a major confounder.

With the increase of Omicron seroprevalence in time, polyclonal intravenous immunoglobulins collected
from regular donors could become a more standardized alternative to CCP, but their efficacy to date (at
the peak of the vaccinations campaign) is still 16-fold reduced against Omicron compared to wild-type
SARS-CoV-2⁴⁷, and such preparations include only IgG and not IgM and IgA, which have powerful SARSCoV-2 activity ^{48, 49}. Nevertheless, FDA recently reported efficacy of hyperimmune serum against BA.1,
BA.2, BA.3, BA.2.12.1, and BA.4/5 ⁵⁰.

251 CCP collection from vaccinated convalescents (regardless of infecting sublineage, vaccine type and number of doses) is likely to achieve high nAb titer against VOC Omicron, and, on the basis of lessons 252 253 learnt with CCP usage during the first 2 years of the pandemic. Although in ideal situations one would 254 prefer RCT evidence of efficacy against Omicron before deployment, there is concern that variants are 255 generated so rapidly that by the time such trials commenced this variant could be replaced for another. Given the success of CCP in 2 outpatient RCTs reducing hospitalization^{6,7} and the loss of major mAb 256 therapies due to Omicron antigenic changes, the high titers in CCP collected from vaccinated 257 convalescents provides an immediate option for COVID-19, especially in LMIC. Given the reduced 258 hospitalization rate with Omicron compared to Delta ⁵¹, it is even more relevant to identify patient 259 260 subsets at risk of progression in order to minimize the number needed to treat to prevent a single 261 hospitalization: moving from the same criteria used for mAb therapies while using the same (now 262 unused) in-hospital facilities seems a logical approach.

263 We declare we have no conflict of interest related to this manuscript.

264

265 **References**

266	1.	Ahmed SF, Quadeer AA, McKay M. SARS-CoV-2 T cell responses are expected to remain
267		robust against Omicron. <i>Viruses</i> 14 , 79 (2022).
268		
269	2.	Bernasconi A, et al. Report on Omicron Spike mutations on epitopes and
270		immunological/epidemiological/kinetics effects from literature. Accessed at
271		https://virological.org/t/report-on-omicron-spike-mutations-on-epitopes-and-
272		immunological-epidemiological-kinetics-effects-from-literature/770 on July 23, 2022.)
273		(2021).
274		
275	3.	Focosi D, McConnell S, Casadevall A, Cappello E, Valdiserra G, Tuccori M. Monoclonal
276		antibody therapies against SARS-CoV-2. Lancet Infect Dis, (2022).
277		
278	4.	Zhou S, et al. β-d-N4-hydroxycytidine Inhibits SARS-CoV-2 Through Lethal Mutagenesis But Is
279		Also Mutagenic To Mammalian Cells. The Journal of Infectious Diseases 224, 415-419 (2021).
280		

281 282	5.	Jayk Bernal A, <i>et al.</i> Molnupiravir for Oral Treatment of Covid-19 in Nonhospitalized Patients. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 386 , 509-520 (2022).
283 284 285	6.	Libster R <i>, et al.</i> Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 384 , 610-618 (2021).
286 287 288	7.	Sullivan D, et al. Early Outpatient Treatment for Covid-19 with Convalescent Plasma. N Engl J Med, (2021).
289 290 291	8.	Vickers MA, et al. Exponential increase in neutralizing and spike specific antibodies following vaccination of COVID-19 convalescent plasma donors. <i>Transfusion</i> 61 , 2099-2106 (2021).
292 293 294	9.	Schmidt F <i>, et al</i> . High genetic barrier to SARS-CoV-2 polyclonal neutralizing antibody escape. <i>Nature</i> 600 , 512-516 (2021).
295 296 297 298	10.	Di Germanio C <i>, et al.</i> Vaccination of COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Donors Increases Binding and Neutralizing Antibodies Against SARS-CoV-2 Variants. <i>Transfusion</i> 62 , 563-569 (2021).
299 300 301 302 303	11.	Munro APS, <i>et al.</i> Safety and immunogenicity of seven COVID-19 vaccines as a third dose (booster) following two doses of ChAdOx1 nCov-19 or BNT162b2 in the UK (COV-BOOST): a blinded, multicentre, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. <i>The Lancet</i> 398 , 2258-2276 (2021).
304 305 306 307	12.	Franchini M, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels against SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern Delta and Omicron in vaccine breakthrough-infected blood donors. <i>Transfusion</i> 62 , 1171-1176 (2022).
308 309 310	13.	Jacobsen H <i>, et al.</i> Diminished neutralization responses towards SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VoC after mRNA or vector-based COVID-19 vaccinations. 2021.2012.2021.21267898 (2021).
311 312 313	14.	Planas D <i>, et al.</i> Considerable escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron to antibody neutralization. <i>Nature</i> 602 , 671-675 (2022).
314 315 316 317	15.	Bekliz M <i>, et al.</i> Neutralization of ancestral SARS-CoV-2 and variants Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Zeta and Omicron by mRNA vaccination and infection-derived immunity through homologous and heterologous variants. 2021.2012.2028.21268491 (2021).
318 319 320 321	16.	Rossler A, Riepler L, Bante D, von Laer D, Kimpel J. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant Neutralization in Serum from Vaccinated and Convalescent Persons. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 386 , 698- 700 (2022).

322 323 324	17.	Muik A, et al. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron by BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine-elicited human sera. <i>Science (New York, NY)</i> 375 , 678-680 (2022).
325 326 327	18.	Zhao X <i>, et al</i> . Reduced sera neutralization to Omicron SARS-CoV-2 by both inactivated and protein subunit vaccines and the convalescents. 2021.2012.2016.472391 (2021).
328 329 330 331	19.	Dolzhikova IV <i>, et al.</i> Sputnik Light booster after Sputnik V vaccination induces robust neutralizing antibody response to B.1.1.529 (Omicron) SARS-CoV-2 variant. 2021.2012.2017.21267976 (2021).
332 333 334	20.	Bowen JE <i>, et al.</i> Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 neutralizing activity elicited by a comprehensive panel of human vaccines. 2022.2003.2015.484542 (2022).
335 336 337 338	21.	Carazo S, <i>et al.</i> Protection against Omicron re-infection conferred by prior heterologous SARS-CoV-2 infection, with and without mRNA vaccination. 2022.2004.2029.22274455 (2022).
339 340 341	22.	Turelli P <i>, et al</i> . Omicron infection induces low-level, narrow-range SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing activity. 2022.2005.2002.22274436 (2022).
342 343 344	23.	Qu P <i>, et al.</i> Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.4/5 and BA.2.12.1 Subvariants. <i>N</i> Engl J Med 386 , 2526-2528 (2022).
345 346 347	24.	Richardson SI <i>, et al.</i> SARS-CoV-2 BA.4 infection triggers more cross-reactive neutralizing antibodies than BA.1. 2022.2007.2014.500039 (2022).
348 349 350	25.	Zhou R, <i>et al.</i> Vaccine-breakthrough infection by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant elicits broadly cross-reactive immune responses. <i>Clin Transl Med</i> 2 , e720 (2022).
351 352 353 354	26.	Aggarwal A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.5: Evolving tropism and evasion of potent humoral responses and resistance to clinical immunotherapeutics relative to viral variants of concern. 2022.2007.2007.22277128 (2022).
355 356 357	27.	Jian F <i>, et al</i> . Further humoral immunity evasion of emerging SARS-CoV-2 BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants. 2022.2008.2009.503384 (2022).
358 359 360	28.	Xie X, Zou J, Kurhade C, Liu M, Ren P, Shi P-Y. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sublineages by 4 doses of mRNA vaccine. 2022.2007.2029.502055 (2022).
361		

362 363	29.	Khoury DS, <i>et al.</i> Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. <i>Nat Med</i> 27 , 1205-1211 (2021).
364 365 366	30.	Feng S, et al. Correlates of protection against symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Med 27 , 2032-2040 (2021).
367 368 369	31.	Gilbert PB <i>, et al.</i> Immune correlates analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. <i>Science</i> , eab3435 (2021).
370 371 372	32.	Earle KA <i>, et al</i> . Evidence for antibody as a protective correlate for COVID-19 vaccines. <i>Vaccine</i> 39 , 4423-4428 (2021).
373 374 375	33.	Tyrrell DA. Neutralization of viruses by homologous immune serum. II. Theoretical study of the equilibrium state. <i>The Journal of experimental medicine</i> 97 , 863-870 (1953).
376 377 378	34.	Andreano E <i>, et al.</i> COVID-19 mRNA third dose induces a unique hybrid immunity-like antibody response. 2022.2005.2009.491201 (2022).
379 380 381	35.	Ryan KA <i>, et al.</i> Convalescence from prototype SARS-CoV-2 protects Syrian hamsters from disease caused by the Omicron variant. 2021.2012.2024.474081 (2021).
382 383 384 385 386	36.	Krutikov M, et al. Prevalence and duration of detectable SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antibodies in staff and residents of long-term care facilities over the first year of the pandemic (VIVALDI study): prospective cohort study in England. <i>The Lancet Healthy</i> <i>Longevity</i> , (2021).
387 388 389 390	37.	Amjadi MF, <i>et al.</i> Anti-membrane and anti-spike antibodies are long-lasting and together discriminate between past COVID-19 infection and vaccination. 2021.2011.2002.21265750 (2021).
391 392 393 394	38.	Klein S, <i>et al.</i> Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population. <i>The Journal of clinical investigation</i> 130 , 6141-6150 (2020).
395 396 397 398	39.	Focosi D, Franchini M. Clinical predictors of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody titers in COVID-19 convalescents: Implications for convalescent plasma donor recruitment. <i>European journal of haematology</i> 107 , 24-28 (2021).
399 400 401 402	40.	Yu X, <i>et al.</i> Pseudotyped SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant exhibits significant escape from neutralization induced by a third booster dose of vaccination. 2021.2012.2017.21267961 (2021).

403 404 405 406	41.	Gachoud D, <i>et al</i> . Antibody response and intra-host viral evolution after plasma therapy in COVID-19 patients pre-exposed or not to B-cell depleting agents. 2022.2004.2024.22274200 (2022).
407 408 409 410	42.	Chatterjee D, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Spike recognition by plasma from individuals receiving BNT162b2 mRNA vaccination with a 16-week interval between doses. <i>Cell Rep</i> 38 , 110429 (2022).
411 412 413	43.	Grunau B <i>, et al.</i> Immunogenicity of Extended mRNA SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Dosing Intervals. JAMA 327 , 279-281 (2022).
414 415 416 417	44.	Tauzin A, et al. A single BNT162b2 mRNA dose elicits antibodies with Fc-mediated effector functions and boost pre-existing humoral and T cell responses. <i>medRxiv [Preprint]</i> , 2021.2003.2018.435972 (2021).
418 419 420 421 422	45.	Skowronski DM, et al. Two-dose SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness with mixed schedules and extended dosing intervals: test-negative design studies from British Columbia and Quebec, Canada. <i>Clinical infectious diseases : an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America</i> , ciac290 (2022).
423 424 425 426	46.	Miyamoto S, <i>et al.</i> Vaccination-infection interval determines cross-neutralization potency to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron after breakthrough infection by other variants. 2021.2012.2028.21268481 (2022).
427 428 429 430	47.	Focosi D, Franchini M. Passive immunotherapies for COVID-19: The subtle line between standard and hyperimmune immunoglobulins is getting invisible. <i>Rev Med Virol</i> , e2341 (2022).
431 432 433	48.	Klingler J <i>, et al.</i> Role of IgM and IgA Antibodies in the Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2. J Infect Dis 223 , 957-970 (2020).
434 435 436	49.	Wang Z, et al. Enhanced SARS-CoV-2 neutralization by dimeric IgA. Science translational medicine, (2020).
437 438 439 440	50.	Awasthi M, Golding H, Khurana S. SARS-CoV-2 hyperimmune intravenous human immunoglobulins neutralizes Omicron subvariants BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.12.1, BA.3 and BA.4/BA.5 for treatment of COVID-19. <i>Clinical Infectious Diseases</i> , (2022).
441 442 443	51.	Wolter N, et al. Early assessment of the clinical severity of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant in South Africa. Lancet 399 , 437-446 (2022).
444		

445 446	52.	Iketani S, et al. Antibody Evasion Properties of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Sublineages. <i>Nature</i> 604, 553-556 (2022).
447 448 449	53.	Cao YR, <i>et al</i> . BA.2.12.1, BA.4 and BA.5 escape antibodies elicited by Omicron infection. <i>Nature</i> , (2022).
450 451 452	54.	Tuekprakhon A, <i>et al.</i> Antibody escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.4 and BA.5 from vaccine and BA.1 serum. <i>Cell</i> 185 , 2422-2433.e2413 (2022).
453 454 455	55.	Tjan LH <i>, et al.</i> As well as Omicron BA.1, high neutralizing activity against Omicron BA.2 can be induced by COVID-19 mRNA booster vaccination. <i>J Infect Dis,</i> jiac159 (2022).
456 457 458	56.	Khan K <i>, et al.</i> Omicron sub-lineages BA.4/BA.5 escape BA.1 infection elicited neutralizing immunity. 2022.2004.2029.22274477 (2022).
459 460 461	57.	Willett BJ, <i>et al.</i> Distinct antigenic properties of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and BA.5. 2022.2005.2025.493397 (2022).
462 463 464	58.	Muik A, <i>et al.</i> Omicron BA.2 breakthrough infection enhances cross-neutralization of BA.2.12.1 and BA.4/BA.5. 2022.2008.2002.502461 (2022).
465 466 467 468	59.	Graham C, et al. The effect of Omicron breakthrough infection and extended BNT162b2 booster dosing on neutralization breadth against SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. 2022.2008.2004.22278160 (2022).
469 470 471	60.	Yu J <i>, et al.</i> Comparable Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 Variants. 2022.2002.2006.22270533 (2022).
472 473 474 475	61.	Seaman MS, <i>et al</i> . Vaccine Breakthrough Infection with the SARS-CoV-2 Delta or Omicron (BA.1) Variant Leads to Distinct Profiles of Neutralizing Antibody Responses. 2022.2003.2002.22271731 (2022).
476 477 478	62.	Zou J, <i>et al.</i> Cross neutralization of Omicron BA.1 against BA.2 and BA.3 SARS-CoV-2. <i>Nat Commun</i> 13 , 2956 (2022).
479 480 481	63.	Lapointe HR, et al. Serial infection with SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 following three- dose COVID-19 vaccination. 2022.2005.2019.22275026 (2022).
482 483 484	64.	Hachmann NP, et al. Neutralization Escape by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variants BA.2.12.1 and BA.4/BA.5. N Engl J Med 387 , 86-88 (2022).

485 486 487	65.	Wang Q, <i>et al.</i> SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2.12.1, BA.4, and BA.5 subvariants evolved to extend antibody evasion. 2022.2005.2026.493517 (2022).
488 489 490 491	66.	Planas D <i>, et al</i> . Duration of BA.5 neutralization in sera and nasal swabs from SARS-CoV-2 vaccinated individuals, with or without Omicron breakthrough infection. 2022.2007.2022.22277885 (2022).
492 493 494	67.	Wang X <i>, et al.</i> Neutralization of Omicron BA.4/BA.5 and BA.2.75 by Booster Vaccination or BA.2 Breakthrough Infection Sera. 2022.2008.2004.502716 (2022).
495 496	68.	Zeng C, et al. Neutralization and Stability of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant. <i>bioRxiv</i> , (2021).
497 498 499	69.	Liu L <i>, et al.</i> Striking antibody evasion manifested by the Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2. <i>Nature 602,</i> 676-681 (2022).
500 501 502	70.	Schmidt F <i>, et al.</i> Plasma Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 386 , 599-601 (2022).
503 504 505	71.	Arien KK <i>, et al.</i> Three doses of BNT162b2 vaccine confer neutralising antibody capacity against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. <i>NPJ Vaccines</i> 7 , 35 (2022).
506 507 508 509	72.	Lusvarghi S, <i>et al.</i> SARS-CoV-2 BA.1 variant is neutralized by vaccine booster-elicited serum, but evades most convalescent serum and therapeutic antibodies. <i>Sci Transl Med</i> , eabn8543 (2022).
510 511 512 513	73.	Hoffmann M <i>, et al.</i> The Omicron variant is highly resistant against antibody-mediated neutralization: Implications for control of the COVID-19 pandemic. <i>Cell</i> 185 , 447-456 e411 (2022).
514 515 516	74.	Zou J <i>, et al.</i> Neutralization against Omicron SARS-CoV-2 from previous non-Omicron infection. <i>Nat Commun</i> 13 , 852 (2022).
517 518 519	75.	Zhang L <i>, et al.</i> The significant immune escape of pseudotyped SARS-CoV-2 variant Omicron. <i>Emerging microbes & infections</i> 11 , 1-5 (2022).
520 521 522	76.	Gruell H <i>, et al</i> . mRNA booster immunization elicits potent neutralizing serum activity against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. <i>Nat Med</i> 28 , 477-480 (2022).
523 524 525	77.	Dejnirattisai W <i>, et al.</i> SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-B.1.1.529 leads to widespread escape from neutralizing antibody responses. <i>Cell</i> 185 , 467-484 e415 (2022).

526 527 528	78.	Sheward DJ <i>, et al.</i> Variable loss of antibody potency against SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.529 (Omicron). <i>bioRxiv,</i> 2021.2012.2019.473354 (2021).
529 530 531	79.	Tada T, <i>et al.</i> Increased resistance of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant to neutralization by vaccine-elicited and therapeutic antibodies. <i>EBioMedicine</i> 78 , 103944 (2022).
532 533 534 535	80.	Aggarwal A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron: evasion of potent humoral responses and resistance to clinical immunotherapeutics relative to viral variants of concern. <i>medRxiv</i> , 2021.2012.2014.21267772 (2021).
536 537 538	81.	Zhao X, <i>et al.</i> Effects of a Prolonged Booster Interval on Neutralization of Omicron Variant. <i>N Engl J Med</i> 386 , 894-896 (2022).
539 540 541	82.	Bowen JE, et al. Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 neutralizing activity elicited by a comprehensive panel of human vaccines. <i>bioRxiv</i> , (2022).
542 543 544	83.	Carreno JM <i>, et al.</i> Activity of convalescent and vaccine serum against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron. <i>Nature</i> 602 , 682-688 (2022).
545 546 547	84.	Syed AM, et al. Omicron mutations enhance infectivity and reduce antibody neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 virus-like particles. <i>medRxiv</i> , (2022).
548 549 550	85.	Haveri A, <i>et al</i> . Neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant after third mRNA vaccination in health care workers and elderly subjects. <i>Eur J Immunol</i> , (2022).
551 552 553 554	86.	Li M <i>, et al.</i> Convalescent plasma with a high level of virus-specific antibody effectively neutralizes SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. <i>Blood advances</i> , 2022.2003.2001.22271662 (2022).
555 556 557 558	87.	Kurahashi Y, <i>et al.</i> Cross-neutralizing activity against Omicron could be obtained in SARS- CoV-2 convalescent patients who received two doses of mRNA vaccination. <i>medRxiv</i> , 2022.2002.2024.22271262 (2022).
559 560 561 562	88.	Lechmere T, <i>et al.</i> Broad Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Variants, Including Omicron, following Breakthrough Infection with Delta in COVID-19-Vaccinated Individuals. <i>mBio</i> 13 , e0379821 (2022).
563 564 565	89.	Edara VV, et al. mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 mRNA vaccines have reduced neutralizing activity against the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant. <i>Cell Rep Med</i> 3 , 100529 (2022).
566		

567 568	90.	Cele S, <i>et al</i> . Omicron extensively but incompletely escapes Pfizer BNT162b2 neutralization. <i>Nature</i> 602 , 654-656 (2022).
569 570 571	91.	Wilhelm A <i>, et al</i> . Reduced Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant by Vaccine Sera and Monoclonal Antibodies. <i>medRxiv</i> , 2021.2012.2007.21267432 (2021).
572 573 574	92.	Doria-Rose NA, <i>et al.</i> Booster of mRNA-1273 Strengthens SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Neutralization. <i>medRxiv</i> , 2021.2012.2015.21267805 (2021).
575 576 577	93.	Kawaoka Y, et al. Characterization and antiviral susceptibility of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron/BA.2. Res Sq, (2022).
578 579 580	94.	Dejnirattisai W <i>, et al.</i> Reduced neutralisation of SARS-COV-2 Omicron-B.1.1.529 variant by post-immunisation serum. <i>Lancet</i> 399 , 234-236 (2022).
581		
582 583		

584 Figure 1

585 PRISMA flowchart for the current study.



Figure 2

Geometric mean neutralizing titers (GMT₅₀) against WA-1 versus Omicron BA.1 by study for A) unvaccinated convalescent plasma and B) vaccinated plasma with or without COVID-19. Geomeans for entire study groups with neutralization of WA-1 in filled circles with Omicron in empty circles with geomeans and fold reduction (FR) above data and number of studies above x-axis. All geomeans are not statistically significant in difference by multiple comparison in Tukey's test.



599 Figure 3

Percent of individual plasma samples in each study showing any titer of Omicron BA.1 neutralization. The percent of samples within a study condition which neutralized Omicron graphed in increasing percentages with the number of samples tested on the right y axis. A) pre-Alpha CCP neutralization of Omicron; B) Alpha, Beta and Delta CCP neutralization of Omicron C) 2 dose mRNA vaccines neutralization of Omicron D) post-COVID-19/post-vaccine (VaxCCP) and uninfected 3-dose vaccine neutralization of Omicron.

606



- 608 609
- 610
- 611
- 612

613 Figure 4

614 Geometric mean neutralizing titers (GMT₅₀) of anti-WA.1 or anti-Omicron BA.1 neutralizing antibodies in 615 plasma samples from 5 studies investigating diverse SARS-CoV-2 infecting lineage or vaccination status. 5 616 studies characterized A) pre-Alpha, Alpha, Beta and Delta CCP for Omicron nAb compared to WA-1, and 617 also B) 2 or 3 doses BNT162b plasma, as well as post-COVID-19 plus BNT162b vaccine (VaxCCP). C) 9 618 additional studies looked at the same vaccine conditions in the first 5 comparing WA-1 nAb to Omicron 619 nAb.





621

623 Table 1

624 Comparison of WA-1 to Omicron BA.1 nAb and percent with any Omicron BA.1 nAb amongst VOC CCP 625 and vaccination status.

				fold			
				reduction			
				in nAb	total	total	
				GMT₅₀	number	Omicron	Omicron
	number		Omicron	VS.	individuals	BA.1	BA.1
plasma	of	WA-1 nAb	BA1 nAb	Omicron	in all	neutralizing	neutralizing
type	studies	GMT ₅₀	GMT ₅₀	BA.1	studies	number	percent
pre-Alpha	27	326	15	21	679	300	44
Alpha	6	227	5	45	101	38	38
Beta	5	91	8	11	37	19	51
Delta	7	462	42	11	94	69	73
2 dose							
BNT162b2							
plasma	22	639	26	25	434	204	47
2 dose							
mRNA-							
1273							
plasma	9	644	21	31	134	81	60
post-							
COVID-							
19/full							
vacc							
plasma	19	2977	211	14	305	269	88
3 dose							
BNT162b2							
plasma	17	2,723	291	9	307	293	95

627 **Table 2**

628 Efficacy of CCP, vaccinee plasma and VaxCCP expressed as GMT₅₀ against Omicron sublineages. n.d. : no

629 data.

CCP source	target Omicron sublineage						
	BA.1	BA.2	BA.2.12.	BA.2.7	BA.4/5	BA.4.6/BA.4.7/BA	
	1 52	1 52	1	5		.5.9	
wild-type CCP	↓ · ·	\downarrow	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	
(unvaccinated	(including						
)	BA.1.1)	1 52					
uninfected 3-	↓ ³²	$\sqrt{2}$	n.d.	n.d.	stronger	n.d.	
dose mRNA	(including				escape than		
vaccinee	BA.1.1)				BA.2 ^{26, 56, 51}		
plasma		55			24		
any pre-	n.d.	=	n.d.	n.d.		n.d.	
Omicron VOC							
VaxCCP			23		23		
Delta VaxCCP	n.d.	n.d.		n.d.		n.d.	
BA.1 CCP	\downarrow	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	7.5-7.6-fold	n.d.	
					lower than		
					against		
					BA.1 ^{20, 30, 34,}		
				_	50, 57		
BA.1 VaxCCP	1:2929 at	1.3 to 1.8 fold	1.8-fold	3-	2.6-3.2-fold	1.5-1.9 fold lower	
	9-12	lower ^{52, 60, 61}	lower	doses	lower than	than against	
	days ^{10, 20,}	4.2-told	than	better	against	BA.4/5*	
	56, 35, 55	lower ^{ee} than	against	than 2-	BA.1		
		against the	BA.2 ^{26, 55}	doses			
		parental BA.1			4.5-fold		
		sublineage; no	> 5-told		lower than		
		neutralization	lower		against		
		50	compare		BA.Z		
		59	a to wha-		> 5-1010		
			50 type		compared		
					towild		
					tu who ⁵⁸		
					50		
					59		
					3-doses		
					slightly		
					better than		
					2-doses ²⁸		
BA.2 CCP	no data	no data	no data	n.d.	poor ⁵⁷	n.d.	
BA.2 VaxCCP	1.2-fold	1.5-fold lower	2.5-fold	n.d.	66	1.5-1.9 fold lower	
	lower	compared to	lower		2.5-fold	than against	
	compare	wild-type ⁵⁸	compare		lower	BA.4/5 ²⁷	
	d to wild-	59	d to wild-		compared		
	type ⁵⁸	67	type ⁵⁸		to wild-		
	59		67		type ⁵⁸		
	67				59		

					67	
BA.2.12.1 CCP	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
BA.2.12.1	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.	n.d.
VaxCCP						
BA.4/5 CCP	557 (2-	884 (1-FR) ²⁴	n.d.	n.d.	1,047 ²⁴	n.d.
	FR) ²⁴					
BA.4/5	2,785 (2-	4244 (1-FR) ²⁴	n.d.	n.d.	3,779 ²⁴	2.4-2.6 fold lower
VaxCCP	FR) ²⁴					than against
						BA.4/5 ²⁷

630

632 Supplementary table 1

633 634

Synopsis of in vitro studies investigating the efficacy of pre-Alpha CCP against Omicron

		(pre-		(pre-	(pre-		
		Alpha		Alpha	Alpha	(pre-Alpha	(pre-Alpha
	Time	CCP)	(pre-Alpha	CCP)	CCP)	CCP) BA.1	CCP) BA.1
	since	WA-1	CCP) fold	BA.1	number	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	infection	GMT ₅₀	drop vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	in study	number	percent
Zeng ⁶⁸		4980	177	28	18	3	17
Liu ⁶⁹		4344	32	136	10	2	20
Sch midt ⁷⁰	1.2 mo	2616	38	69	20	19	95
Sch midt ⁷⁰	12 mo	2037	15	136	20	17	85
Schmidt ⁷⁰	6 mo	1678	49	34	20	13	65
Arien ⁷¹		1086	22	49	10	1	10
Lusvarghi ⁷²		715	29	25	16	2	13
Hoffman ⁷³		614	80	8	17	8	47
Zou ⁷⁴		601	16	38	64	41	64
Planas ¹⁴	6 mo	569	20	28	16	6	38
Planas ¹⁴	12 mo	580	20	29	23	8	35
Zhang ⁷⁵		556	8	70	28	28	100
Grue ⁷⁶	1.5 mo	494	82	6	30	3	10
Grue ⁷⁶	12 mo	93	12	8	30	9	30
Dejnirattisai ⁷⁷		475	17	28	32	32	100
Sheward ⁷⁸		300	6	50	34	25	74
Tada ⁷⁹		233	26	9	10	4	40
Aggerwal ⁸⁰		210	21	10	20	0	0
Zhao ⁸¹		193	17	11	16	1	6
Bowen ⁸²		162	16	10	28	13	46
Zou ⁷⁴		142	5	28	36	30	83
Carreno ⁸³		100	11	9	15	4	27
Syed ⁸⁴		80	4	20	8	6	75
Bekliz ¹⁵		37	45	1	34	5	15
Haveri ⁸⁵		32	32	1	13	0	0
LI ⁸⁶		28	14	2	71	5	7
Kurahashi ⁸⁷		19	13	2	40	15	38
GM (GMT ₅₀)		326	21	15			44
tota					679	300	

636 Supplementary table 2

637 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of Alpha CCP against Omicron

		(Alpha	(Alpha CCP)			(Alpha CCP)	(Alpha CCP)
	Time	CCP)	fold	(Alpha	(Alpha	BA.1	BA.1
	since	WA-1	reduction	CCP) BA.1	CCP)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	infection	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Lusvarg hi ⁷²		4978	166	30	4	1	25
Dejnirattisai 77		1313	34	39	18	18	100
Rossler ¹⁶		260	64	4	10	0	0
Haveri ⁸⁵		64	32	2	20	0	0
Bekliz ¹⁵		45	56	1	12	2	17
Li ⁸⁶		28	14	2	37	17	46
GM (GMT ₅₀)		525	65	8			38
total					101	38	

638

640 Supplementary table 3

641 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of Beta CCP against Omicron.

		(beta	(beta CCP)			(beta CCP)	(beta CCP)
	Time	CCP)	fold	(beta	(beta	BA.1	BA.1
	since	WA-1	reduction	CCP) BA.1	CCP)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	infection	GMT ₅₀	vs.BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Lusvarg hi ⁷²		439	2	220	2	2	100
Dejnirattisai ⁷⁷							
		327	12	28	14	14	100
Rossler ¹⁶		128	32	4	8	1	13
Bekliz ¹⁵		21	23	1	8	2	25
Haveri ⁸⁵		17	8	2	5	0	0
GM (GMT ₅₀)		140	11	13			51
Tota					37	19	

643 Supplementary table 4

644 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of Delta CCP against Omicron.

		(Delta				(Delta CCP)	(Delta CCP)
	Time	CCP)	(Delta CCP)	(Delta	(Delta	BA.1	BA.1
	since	WA-1	fold drop	CCP) BA.1	CCP)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	infection	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT₅o	number	number	percent
Zeng ⁶⁸		11200	3	3733	19	10	53
Lechmere ⁸⁸		4751	28	170	14	12	86
Lusvarghi ⁷²		1211	66	18	15	12	80
Aggerwal ⁸⁰		770	21	37	10	9	90
Rossler ¹⁶		192	25	8	7	1	14
Bekliz ¹⁵		72	24	3	10	6	60
Dejnirattisai ⁷⁷							
		47	2	27	19	19	100
GM (GMT ₅₀)		167	17	10			73
Total					94	69	

646 Supplementary table 5

647 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of plasma from uninfected recipients of 2 BNT162b2

648 doses against Omicron.

			(2 dose			(2 dose	(2 dose
	Time	(2 dose	BNT162b2	(2 dose		BNT162b2	BNT162b2
	since	BNT162b2	plasma)	BNT162b2	(2 dose	plasma)	plasma)
	second	plasma)	fold	plasma)	BNT162b2	BA.1	BA.1
	BNT162b2	WA-1	reduction	BA.1	plasma)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	dose	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Schmidt ⁷⁰	1 mo	7627	83	92	18	15	83
Liu ⁶⁹		4669	21	222	13	6	46
Zeng ⁶⁸		2769	23	120	48	13	27
Schmidt ⁷⁰	5 mo	2435	19	128	18	15	83
Dejnirattisai ⁷⁷							
		1993	105	19	20	20	100
Chatterjee ⁴²		1544	2	935	25	25	100
Syed ⁸⁴		1280	16	80	21	14	67
Tada ⁷⁹		859	34	25	9	7	78
Bowen ⁸²		764	27	28	10	9	90
Chatterjee ⁴²		641	6	105	19	10	53
Hoffman ⁷³	3 mo	604	60	10	11	1	9
Lusvarghi ⁷²		562	26	22	39	3	8
Grue ⁷⁶	1 mo	546	68	8	30	10	33
Rossler ¹⁶	1 mo	512	32	16	20	9	45
Edara ⁸⁹	1 mo	384	19	20	13	2	15
Muik ¹⁷		368	61	6	25	8	32
Cele ⁹⁰		359	19	19	8	7	88
Bekliz ¹⁵		338	86	4	16	11	69
Planas ¹⁴	5 mo	329	11	30	16	1	6
Carreno ⁸³		300	23	13	10	7	70
Gruel ⁷⁶	5 mo	139	15	9	30	11	37
Wilheim ⁹¹		6	11	1	15	0	0
GM (GMT ₅₀)		639	25	26			47
Total					1319	35	

650 Supplementary table 6

- 651 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of plasma from uninfected recipients of 2 mRNA-
- 652 1273 doses against Omicron.

	time	(2 dose	(2 dose	(2 dose			
	since	mRNA-	mRNA-	mRNA-	(2 dose	(2 dose	(2 dose
	second	1273	1273	1273	mRNA-	mRNA_1273	mRNA_1273
	DNIA		12/J	1275 nlacma)	1072	nlasma) PA 1	
	1070		fold drop	piasina)	1275	plasina) DA.1	plasifia) DA.1
	12/3	VVA-1	Tolu urop	BA.1	plasma)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	dose	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Doria-							
Rose ⁹²		3016	48	63	30	22	73
Syed ⁸⁴		2560	8	320	10	8	80
Doria-							
Rose ⁹²		2269	84	27	30	22	73
Bowen ⁸²		1155	32	36	11	9	82
Tada ⁷⁹		999	26	38	8	5	63
Edara ⁸⁹	1 mo	745	50	15	11	4	36
Carreno ⁸³		400	43	9	10	10	100
Rossler ¹⁶	5 mo	320	40	8	10	1	10
Wilheim ⁹¹		10	20	1	14	0	0
GM							
(GMT ₅₀)		644	31	21			60
Tota					134	81	

654 Supplementary table 7

655 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of plasma from infected and vaccinated (2 BNT162b2

656 doses) subjects (VaxCCP) against Omicron.

		(post-	(post-	(post-			
	month	COVID-	COVID-	COVID-	(post-		
	since last	19/full	19/full	19/full	COVID-	(post-COVID-	(post-COVID-
	event	vacc	vacc	vacc	19/full	19/full vacc	19/full vacc
	(either	plasma)	plasma)	plasma)	vacc	plasma) BA.1	plasma) BA.1
	infection or	WA-1	fold drop	BA.1	plasma)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	vaccination)	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Sch midt ⁷⁰		388872	48	8102	17	17	100
Planas ¹⁴		78162	53	1475	22	22	100
Tada ⁷⁹		14868	16	929	7	7	100
Cele ⁹⁰		13333	25	533	13	13	100
Kawoaka ⁹³		10863	16	665	5	5	100
Kawoaka ⁹³		10002	7	1369	13	13	100
Lechmere ⁸⁸		8843	5	1769	15	15	100
Gruell ⁷⁶		7997	5	1599	30	30	100
Arien ⁷¹		4822	20	241	10	10	100
Carreno ⁸³		3000	14	214	10	10	100
Dejnirattisai ⁷⁷							
		1899	9	215	17	17	100
LI ⁸⁶		1598	20	80	20	20	100
Bekliz ¹⁵		1190	18	66	6	6	100
Haveri ⁸⁵		1024	32	32	33	33	100
Rossler ¹⁶		1000	4	250	5	5	100
Edara ⁸⁹		625	20	31	24	15	63
Kurahashi ⁸⁷	12 mo	369	7	51	19	19	100
Wilheim ⁹¹		200	32	6	20	5	25
Kurahashi ⁸⁷	1 mo	22	14	2	19	7	37
GM (GMT ₅₀)		3124	15	210			88
tota					305	269	

658 Supplementary table 8

659 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of plasma from uninfected subjects vaccinated with

660 3 BNT162b2 doses against Omicron.

	Time					(3 dose	(3 dose
	since	(3 dose	(3 dose	(3 dose		BNT162b2	BNT162b2
	third	BNT162b2	BNT162b2	BNT162b2	(3 dose	plasma)	plasma)
	BNT162b2	plasma)	plasma)	plasma)	BNT162b2	BA.1	BA.1
	vaccine	WA-1	fold drop	BA.1	plasma)	neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	dose	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
Schmidt ⁷⁰	1 mo	65617	17	3860	18	18	100
Planas ¹⁴		12739	18	708	20	20	100
Zeng ⁶⁸		10412	3	3155	23	20	87
Dejnirattisai 77							
		9219	14	649	20	20	100
Grue ⁷⁶	1 mo	6241	5	1248	30	30	100
Lusvarghi ⁷²		5029	7	718	39	39	100
Tada ⁷⁹		4892	14	349	12	12	100
Liu ⁶⁹		4673	7	668	15	15	100
Kawoaka ⁹³		2866	6	485	10	10	100
Arien ⁷¹		2157	13	166	10	10	100
Hoffman ⁷³	1 mo	2006	7	287	10	9	90
Edara ⁸⁹		1247	14	89	35	31	89
Carreno ⁸³		1000	8	125	10	10	100
Syed ⁸⁴		960	4	240	8	8	100
Muik ¹⁷		673	6	112	28	27	96
Haveri ⁸⁵		290	12	24	7	7	100
Wilheim ⁹¹	0.5 mo	150	37	4	12	7	58
GM (GMT ₅₀)		2723	9	291			95
tota					307	293	

661

663 Supplementary table 9

664 Synopsis of *in vitro* studies investigating the efficacy of plasma from uninfected subjects vaccinated with

- 665 3 doses of mRNA-1273, AZD-1222 or Ad26.COV2 against BA.1. Because of diversity of vaccines the
- 666 geomeans and sums were not computed.

667

						BA.1	BA.1
	vaccine	WA-1	fold drop	BA.1		neutralizing	neutralizing
reference	type	GMT ₅₀	vs. BA.1	GMT ₅₀	number	number	percent
	COVID19 +						
	mRNA-						
Careno ⁸³	1273	3000	11	272	10	10	100
	COVID19 +						
	mRNA-						
Edara ⁸⁹	1273 6 mo	931	25	38	13	9	69
	3 dose						
	mRNA-						
Careno ⁸³	1273	1000	17	60	10	10	100
	3 dose						
	mRNA-						
Doria-Rose ⁹²	1273	8457	4	2002	30	30	100
	3 dose						
	mRNA-						
Doria-Rose ⁹²	1273	4216	6	650	30	30	100
	3 dose						
	mRNA-						
Edara ⁸⁹	1273	1395	15	96	17	16	94
Dejnirattisai ⁹⁴	AZD1222	390	19	21	41	41	100
Rossler ¹⁶	AZD1222	250	25	10.0	20	0	0
	AZD1222 5						
Planas ¹⁴	mo	187	18	10	18	2	10
Sved ⁸⁴	Ad26.COV2	28	1	20.0	9	2	22
-	Ad26.COV2						
Schmidt ⁷⁰	1 mo	588	24	25	19	2	11
	Ad26.COV2						
Schmidt ⁷⁰	6 mo	982	23	43	19	11	58