

1 **Does a humoral correlate of protection exist for SARS-CoV-2? A systematic review**

2 Julie Perry<sup>1,2</sup>, Selma Osman<sup>1</sup>, James Wright<sup>1</sup>, Melissa Richard-Greenblatt<sup>1</sup>, Sarah A Buchan<sup>1,3,4</sup>, Manish  
3 Sadarangani<sup>5,6</sup>, Shelly Bolotin<sup>1,3,4,7\*</sup>

4

5 <sup>1</sup> Public Health Ontario, Toronto, ON, Canada

6 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Dentistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

7 <sup>3</sup> Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

8 <sup>4</sup> Centre for Vaccine Preventable Diseases, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

9 <sup>5</sup> Department of Pediatrics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

10 <sup>6</sup> Vaccine Evaluation Center, BC Children's Hospital Research Institute, Vancouver, BC, Canada

11 <sup>7</sup> Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

12

13 Short title: SARS-CoV-2 correlate of protection systematic review

14

15

16 \*Corresponding author

17 E-mail: [shelly.bolotin@oahpp.ca](mailto:shelly.bolotin@oahpp.ca)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background:** A correlate of protection (CoP) is an immunological marker associated with protection  
28 against infection. A CoP can be used to determine whether an individual is protected from infection,  
29 evaluate candidate vaccines, guide vaccination dosing intervals and policy, and understand population-  
30 level immunity against a pathogen. Despite an urgent need, a CoP for SARS-CoV-2 is currently  
31 undefined, leaving an evidence gap for informing public health policy and adapting it appropriately as  
32 new variants of concern emerge. The objective of this study was to systematically review and assess the  
33 evidence for a humoral SARS-CoV-2 CoP.

34 **Methods and Findings:** We searched OVID MEDLINE, EMBASE, Global Health, Biosis Previews and  
35 Scopus from inception to January 4, 2022 and pre-prints (using NIH iSearch COVID-19 portfolio) from  
36 inception to December 31, 2021, for studies describing SARS-CoV-2 re-infection or breakthrough  
37 infection with associated antibody measures. Two reviewers independently extracted study data and  
38 performed quality assessment. Twenty-five studies were included in our systematic review. Several  
39 studies reported re-infection or breakthrough cases that occurred in the presence of robust antibody  
40 levels. Studies that compared aggregate antibody concentrations from individuals who experienced re-  
41 infection or breakthrough compared to those who remained protected did not always find differences  
42 that were statistically significant. However, several studies found an inverse relationship between  
43 antibody levels and infection incidence, risk, or viral load, and a correlation between antibody levels and  
44 vaccine efficacy (VE). Estimates of the contribution of antibody levels to VE varied from 48.5% to 94.2%,  
45 suggesting that both humoral immunity and other immune components contribute to protection. Only  
46 two studies estimated a quantitative CoP. For Ancestral SARS-CoV-2, these included 154 (95%  
47 confidence interval (CI) 42, 559) anti-S binding antibody units/mL (BAU/mL), and 28.6% (95% CI 19.2,  
48 29.2%) of the mean convalescent antibody level following infection. One study reported a CoP for the

49 Alpha (B.1.1.7) variant of concern of 171 (95% CI 57, 519) BAU/mL. As of our search date, no studies  
50 reported an Omicron-specific CoP.

51 **Conclusions:** The reviewed literature was limited by a wide variation in assay methodology and antibody  
52 targets. Few studies reported SARS-CoV-2 lineage. The studies included in our review suggest that if it  
53 exists, a SARS-CoV-2 CoP is likely relative, where higher antibody levels decrease the risk of infection,  
54 but do not eliminate it completely. More work is urgently needed in this area to establish a SARS-CoV-2  
55 CoP and guide policy as the pandemic continues.

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

## 69 **Introduction**

70 As the COVID-19 pandemic progresses, our understanding of immunity against SARS-CoV-2 continues to  
71 evolve. Both previous infection and vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 appear to provide protection against  
72 infection and severe disease (1, 2), but the mechanism and durability of that protection remains unclear  
73 (3, 4). Humoral and cellular immunity likely both contribute to protection (5, 6), but it is uncertain  
74 whether a correlate of protection (CoP) for SARS-CoV-2 exists, and if so, whether it is easily quantifiable  
75 using a diagnostic laboratory test. Without a CoP, serological testing can confirm previous infection or  
76 vaccination, but not immunity, leaving an evidence gap in public health policy particularly as new  
77 variants of concern emerge.

78 A CoP is an immunological marker associated with protection from an infectious agent following  
79 infection or vaccination (7). Some CoPs are mechanistic, indicating that they are directly responsible for  
80 protection. Other CoPs are non-mechanistic or surrogate, and although not directly responsible for  
81 protection, can be used in substitute of the true correlate even if it is unknown (8, 9). A CoP can be  
82 absolute, where protection against disease is certain above a threshold, or relative, where higher levels  
83 of a biomarker correspond to more protection. However, for relative CoPs, even high levels are not  
84 protective in some instances (6). Some correlates vary by endpoint (e.g. symptomatic infection or severe  
85 disease), or are only applicable to a specific endpoint (9). The majority of CoPs described are humoral  
86 and used in a surrogate manner, as these antibodies are easier to detect in clinical laboratory settings  
87 than components of cellular immunity (10).

88 Elucidating a CoP for SARS-CoV-2 is a critical priority for improving our understanding of the extent and  
89 duration of protection against infection for individuals and populations. At the individual level, a CoP  
90 would provide clear immunological vaccine trial endpoints, and therefore may provide a pathway to  
91 licensure for new vaccines (10). If measurable using a diagnostic test, a CoP would enable

92 determination of individual immunity, which is particularly important for immunocompromised  
93 individuals (11, 12) and individuals whose immunity levels have waned (13). At the population level, a  
94 CoP may enhance the utility of serosurveys, by enabling the assessment the level of protection within a  
95 community (10).

96 The search for a SARS-CoV-2 CoP is further complicated by the emergence of variants of concern (VOCs).  
97 Sera from previously infected and/or vaccinated individuals have reduced neutralizing ability against  
98 VOCs including Beta (B.1.351), Delta (B.1.617.2) and Omicron (B.1.1.529) (14-16), with the latter  
99 showing the greatest extent of immune evasion of all VOCs thus far (17). This complicates the search for  
100 a CoP, and raises the possibility that a SARS-CoV-2 CoP may be VOC-specific.

101 With this in mind, and considering that an easily measurable CoP would most likely be humoral and not  
102 cellular, we performed a systematic review to assess the evidence for a humoral CoP for SARS-CoV-2.

103

## 104 **Methods**

### 105 **Data Sources and Searches:**

106 We searched the OVID MEDLINE database for peer-reviewed articles published from database inception  
107 to December 31, 2021, and the EMBASE, Global Health, Biosis Previews and Scopus databases from  
108 inception to January 4, 2022. We used the NIH iSearch COVID-19 Portfolio tool to search for preprint  
109 articles published from database inception to December 31, 2021. In our search strategy, we focused on  
110 studies reporting either re-infection or breakthrough infection following vaccination, since both allow an  
111 evaluation of humoral immune protection. All search terms used are reported in Supplementary Table 1.  
112 We also searched reference lists for suitable articles, and requested article recommendations from  
113 experts in the field.

### 114 **Study Selection**

115 One reviewer screened titles and abstracts using Distiller SR (Ottawa, Ontario, Canada). Studies passed  
116 title and abstract screening if their abstracts discussed re-infection with SARS-CoV-2 or breakthrough  
117 infection following vaccination with COVID-19 vaccine; mentioned antibody measures specific to SARS-  
118 CoV-2; or mentioned a correlate or threshold of protection against SARS-CoV-2. We excluded studies  
119 that focused on immunocompromised populations or animal models.

120 Two reviewers screened full texts of articles that met title/abstract screening criteria using defined re-  
121 infection and breakthrough infection criteria (Table 1). During full-text screening, we included studies  
122 reporting a quantitative CoP against SARS-CoV-2, and studies reporting re-infection or breakthrough  
123 infection according to our definitions along with associated pre-infection measures for any antibody  
124 isotype. If these studies reported aggregate antibody measures (i.e. geometric mean titres (GMT)) we  
125 required them to include summary statistics (i.e. statistical significance testing or 95% confidence  
126 intervals (95% CI)) to permit the determination of statistically significant differences between groups.  
127 We also included studies that correlated antibody levels to vaccine efficacy (VE) or effectiveness, but  
128 only if they provided statistical summary measures (e.g. a correlation co-efficient describing the  
129 relationship between antibody level and VE), or if they correlated an antibody concentration to a VE of  
130 100% (i.e. absolute protection). We only included studies written English or French. We calculated a  
131 Cohen's Kappa to assess inter-rater agreement for full-text screening. Discrepancies were resolved  
132 through discussion or using additional reviewers as needed.

### 133 **Data extraction and Quality Assessment**

134 Two reviewers extracted data in duplicate from articles that met full-text screening criteria. We  
135 extracted data from figures using WebPlotDigitizer (18). We summarized and synthesized the data,  
136 stratifying the included studies by whether they described re-infection or breakthrough infection. We  
137 explored the possibility of meta-analyzing our results.

138 We used the National Institutes of Health National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NIH NHLBI) Study  
139 Quality Assessment tools to assess the quality of each study using the corresponding tools specific for  
140 each study design (19), and adapted it by adding questions to customize the tool for this study. Studies  
141 correlating VE to antibody levels were evaluated using the Cohort and Cross Sectional Tool.

## 142 **Data Synthesis and Analysis**

143 We reported our results using the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses  
144 (PRISMA) 2020 (20). Recognizing that that the immune response following natural infection and  
145 vaccination may differ, we grouped studies involving re-infection separately from studies examining  
146 breakthrough infection for analysis.

147

## 148 **Results**

149 Our literature search identified 11,803 records for screening (Figure 1). After de-duplication, we  
150 screened 4,919 peer-reviewed studies, 783 preprint studies and 16 studies identified through expert  
151 recommendations and scanning of article reference lists. After title/abstract screening and full-text  
152 screening, for which our Kappa was 1.0, we included 30 articles in our review. However, only 25 articles  
153 passed quality assessment. Of these, 14 described SARS-CoV-2 re-infection along with individual or  
154 aggregate humoral measures (2, 21-33), and 11 studies described SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infection  
155 following vaccination or statistical modelling to explore associations between VE and antibody levels  
156 (34-44) (Table 2). Only two studies estimated a SARS-CoV-2 antibody CoP, both using statistical  
157 modelling methods (38, 39).

## 158 **Studies describing SARS-CoV-2 re-infection**

159 Fourteen studies met our SARS-CoV-2 re-infection definition and provided pre-infection antibody values  
160 (Table 3). These included seven cohort studies (2, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 32), and seven case reports (22, 25,

161 28-31, 33). Most study populations were healthcare workers, patients, or long term care home residents  
162 (2, 21-24, 26, 29-33). The remaining studies described individuals from the general population (25, 27,  
163 28). Although not always reported, specimen collection occurred between 14 days and seven months  
164 after initial infection (22, 31) and between 4 days and seven months before re-infection (26, 32).  
165 Antibody test results included various commercial and laboratory developed enzyme-linked  
166 immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) targeting anti-spike (anti-S), anti-receptor binding domain (anti-RBD)  
167 and anti-nucleocapsid (anti-N) antibodies, as well as neutralization assays. No study utilized the World  
168 Health Organization (WHO) International Standard (IS), which was developed to enable the comparison  
169 of serological data from different platforms (45). Only three papers reported on the SARS-CoV-2 lineage  
170 of the re-infection (22, 29, 31). No studies reported serological measures preceding re-infection with  
171 VOCs.

172 Two studies compared antibody levels between individuals who were re-infected and those who were  
173 not. Krutikov et al. did not find a statistically significant difference in anti-N IgG titres (reported as the  
174  $\log_{10}$  IgG (AU/ml)) between those who were re-infected compared to those who were not ( $p=0.544$ ) but  
175 did show that individuals who were antibody-negative at the start of the study were at greater risk of  
176 infection during the study period than those who were antibody-positive (26). Lumley and colleagues  
177 used Poisson regression to compare the incidence rate of infection between seropositive and  
178 seronegative individuals (2), and found that individuals who were anti-S positive were less likely to be  
179 infected compared to those who were anti-S negative (incidence rate ratio (IRR) of 0.11 (95% CI 0.03,  
180 0.44)). Similar findings were observed using anti-N antibody (IRR = 0.11 (95% CI 0.03, 0.45)). Analysis of  
181 the association between continuous antibody concentrations and incidence was also statistically  
182 significant for both antibodies ( $p<0.001$ ) (2).

183



184 **Studies reporting antibody measures related to breakthrough infection or VE**

185 We included 11 studies describing breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection. These included two case reports  
186 (41, 42), one cohort study (40), two case-control studies (34, 43), and two studies that re-analyzed  
187 antibody data from a clinical trial (37, 44). Five in silico studies utilized statistical methods to explore the  
188 association between antibody levels and VE (35-39). The populations studied were either clinical trials or  
189 other vaccine study participants (35-39, 44) or healthcare workers (34, 40-43). Three studies reported  
190 results in WHO IS units (binding antibody units (BAU)/mL) (37, 38, 42), while the rest used units that  
191 were not comparable to each other.

192 Of the 11 studies describing breakthrough infection, six studies provided individual or aggregate  
193 humoral measures (34, 40-44), four studies used statistical modelling to explore associations between  
194 VE and antibody levels (35, 36, 38, 39), and one study included both humoral measures and statistical  
195 modelling (37) (Tables 4 and 5). Five studies (34, 41-44) reported the lineage of the breakthrough  
196 infection, and two modeling studies include VOCs in their analysis (35, 38).

197 *Studies describing breakthrough infections following SARS-CoV-2 vaccination*

198 Seven of the 11 studies provided individual or aggregate antibody levels following one (40) or two doses  
199 of COVID-19 vaccine, including BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) (34, 40-43) mRNA-1273 (Moderna) (37) and  
200 ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AstraZeneca) (44) (Table 4). Depending on the study, specimens were collected  
201 between nine (41) and 109 days (37) after administration of the second vaccine dose. Antibody levels  
202 were assessed using a variety of commercial serology assays and/or neutralization assays. The time  
203 interval between specimen collection for pre-breakthrough antibody levels and breakthrough infection  
204 was not always reported. Five studies reported the viral lineage responsible for breakthrough or re-  
205 infection, including three studies reporting Alpha (B.1.1.7) (34, 42, 44), one reporting B.1.525 (41), and  
206 one reporting Delta (B.1.617.2) (43).

207 Four of the six studies compared aggregate antibody levels between cases and non-cases. Gilbert et al.  
208 calculated geometric mean concentration (GMC) ratios of cases to non-cases, which ranged from 0.57  
209 (95% CI 0.39, 0.84) to 0.71 (95% CI 0.54, 0.94), depending on antibody target and sampling interval (37).  
210 Using Cox regression, the authors found statistically significant associations between increasing antibody  
211 levels and decreasing risk of COVID-19. Bergwerk et al. applied generalizing estimating equations to  
212 predict antibody levels and generate GMT ratios of cases to non-cases. For neutralizing antibodies, these  
213 ranged from a case-to-control ratio of 0.15 (95% CI, 0.04, 0.55) at peak values (within the first month  
214 after the second vaccine dose) to case-to-control ratio of 0.36 (95% CI 0.17, 0.79) by the week before  
215 breakthrough infection (34). Using linear regression, this study demonstrated a statistically significant  
216 correlation between cycle threshold (Ct) value of cases and neutralizing antibody level, suggesting an  
217 inverse relationship between antibody level and viral load. Feng and colleagues did not find a  
218 statistically significant difference between median antibody levels of cases and non-cases, regardless of  
219 the antibody assay used (44). However, using a generalized additive model, infection risk was found to  
220 be inversely correlated to antibody levels. This result was statistically significant for symptomatic but not  
221 asymptomatic COVID-19. Yamamoto et al. found no statistically significant difference in post-vaccination  
222 neutralization levels between healthcare workers who experienced a breakthrough infection and  
223 matched controls during the Delta wave in Japan (43). The authors found that neutralizing titres were  
224 lower against Alpha and Delta variants than the wild-type virus, but were comparable between cases  
225 and controls.

#### 226 *Studies reporting associations between antibody levels and VE*

227 Five of the 10 breakthrough studies described correlations between antibody levels and VE against  
228 BNT162b2 (35, 36, 38, 39), mRNA-1273 (36-39), ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (35, 36, 38, 39), Ad26.COV2.S  
229 (Janssen/ Johnson and Johnson) (35, 36, 38, 39), NVX-CoV2373 (Novavax) (35, 36, 39), CoronaVac  
230 (SinoVac) (36, 39), and rAd26+S+rAd5-S (Gamaleya Research Institute) (36, 39) vaccine. These studies re-

231 analyzed clinical trial and other vaccine studies, and as such the VE outcomes of interest varied across  
232 the severity spectrum, ranging from asymptomatic PCR confirmed infection to severe disease. The  
233 studies generated correlations using either neutralizing antibody levels, derived through plaque  
234 reduction neutralization tests (PRNT) or microneutralization assays, or IgG levels measured through  
235 ELISAs.

236 Three of five studies (35, 36, 39) reported correlation coefficients for the relationship between  
237 neutralizing antibodies and VE ranging from 0.79 to 0.96. Two studies (36, 38) reported correlation  
238 coefficients of 0.82 to 0.94 to describe the relationship between anti-Spike IgG and VE. Since serology  
239 and neutralization assays were not calibrated to a common standard, three studies (35, 36, 39)  
240 normalized antibody concentrations against convalescent sera used in their respective clinical trials, and  
241 reported antibody concentrations as a ratio of the antibody concentration/convalescent serum  
242 concentration. The remaining two studies (37, 38) provided results using the WHO IS.

243 Using different statistical methods, three studies (36-38) attempted to quantitate the contribution of  
244 antibodies to VE measures. Earle et al. incorporated data from seven vaccine clinical trials and reported  
245 that neutralizing antibodies accounted for 77.5% to 84.4% of VE (36). Gilbert et al. focused on mRNA-  
246 1273 clinical trial data and reported that neutralizing antibodies accounted for 48.5% (95% CI 34.5,  
247 62.4%) to 68.5% (95% CI 58.5, 78.4%) of VE (37). This approach was also taken to estimate the effect of  
248 anti-S antibodies, with Earle and colleagues finding that anti-S antibody accounts for 91.3% to 94.2% (no  
249 CIs provided) of variation in efficacy (36). Goldblatt et al., using data from a convenience sample of  
250 individuals vaccinated with BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 or Ad26.COV2.S, reported that  
251 anti-S antibodies account for 68.6% to 97.4% (no CIs provided) of variation in efficacy (38).

252 Two studies estimated a SARS-CoV-2 threshold of protection. Goldblatt et al. calculated protective  
253 thresholds in WHO IS units for ancestral strain SARS-CoV-2 and Alpha (B.1.1.7) of 154 (95% CI 42, 559)

254 and 171 (95% CI 57, 519) anti-S binding antibody units (BAU/mL), respectively. These were generated  
255 using a random effects meta-analytic approach using BNT162b2, mRNA-1273, ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 or  
256 Ad26.COVS clinical trial data. The analyses also included reverse cumulative distribution functions to  
257 estimate vaccine-specific thresholds of protection. Since thresholds calculated from two doses of mRNA  
258 vaccine were extremely high and did not overlap with other calculated thresholds, the authors also  
259 generated an anti-S threshold that excluded them (60 (95% CI 35, 102) BAU/mL). Khoury and colleagues  
260 used a protective neutralization classification model to estimate the antibody concentration resulting in  
261 100% protection, which they estimated to be 28.6% (95% CI 19.2–29.2%) of the mean convalescent  
262 antibody level (39). The authors also applied a logistic model to calculate the 50% protective  
263 neutralization level, which estimates the antibody titre at which 50% of individuals are protected from  
264 infection, and is similar to the protective dose 50% that is sometimes used for influenza virus (46). The  
265 50% protective neutralization level was found to be 20.2% (95% CI 14.4, 28.4) of the mean convalescent  
266 antibody level for symptomatic disease (corresponding to a neutralization titre of between 1:10 to 1:30  
267 in most assays), which the authors estimate corresponds to 54 (95% CI 30–96) international units  
268 (IU)/ml. For severe disease, the 50% threshold was estimated to be only 3% (95% CI 0.71, 13.0%) of the  
269 mean convalescent level.

## 270 **Quality assessment**

271 Studies were assessed for quality after full-text screening (Supplementary Table 2). Quality assessment  
272 was based on NIH NHLBI criteria (19), which centers on adequate description and transparency of  
273 methods, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and definitions. The criteria also includes an assessment of  
274 whether outcome variables were reported equally across all study participants. We excluded studies  
275 that did not adequately measure antibody levels or were missing information as to when antibody levels  
276 were obtained relative to infection, or had missing data or unclear methods related to antibody testing  
277 (47-51). Of the included studies, we noted that only five reported peak antibody levels at 30-60 days

278 post infection or vaccination, the time period which would provide the most insight on peak antibody  
279 levels (31, 40, 42-44). Only seven studies reported antibody levels immediately prior to (within 30 days)  
280 re-infection or breakthrough (2, 26, 27, 31, 33, 40, 42), and only seven studies reporting SARS-CoV-2  
281 lineage (22, 29, 34, 41-44).

282

## 283 **Discussion**

284 The studies included in this review provided mixed evidence regarding a SARS-CoV-2 CoP, with a lack of  
285 standardization between laboratory methodology, assay targets, and sampling time points complicating  
286 comparisons and interpretation. Studies examining the relationship between antibody levels and VE  
287 presented high correlation coefficients, despite utilizing diverse data that included several vaccines and  
288 a variety of assays, VE endpoints and populations (35, 36, 38, 39). The robust correlations despite data  
289 heterogeneity support the concept of an anti-S antibody or neutralizing antibody CoP. Furthermore,  
290 several studies that explored differences in GMTs between cases and non-cases (34, 37) or associations  
291 between antibody levels and viral load with infection incidence or risk (2, 34, 37, 44), found statistically  
292 significant differences and associations. Taken together, these findings further support an antibody  
293 target as a potential correlate. However, while most studies that present aggregate measures support  
294 the existence of a humoral CoP, some individual-level data included in our review provided  
295 contradictory findings. Individuals described in case reports who experienced re-infection or  
296 breakthrough infection had considerable anti-S or neutralizing antibody levels pre-infection, and in some  
297 cases were at the upper limit or exceeded the limit of quantification of commercial assays (40, 41).  
298 Similarly, studies that attempted to estimate the contribution of antibody levels to VE measures (36-38)  
299 found that a substantial proportion of VE was not explained by antibody levels, suggesting that while  
300 important, anti-S or neutralizing antibodies are only one component of protection. These findings

301 support observations from SARS-CoV-2 vaccine trial data, where one-dose vaccinated individuals are  
302 well-protected despite having very low levels of neutralizing antibodies. Consequently, these findings  
303 suggest that cellular immunity or non-neutralizing antibodies may also play a role in protection (36, 52).  
304 From the reviewed literature, our analyses indicate that a humoral SARS-CoV-2 CoP may exist, but may  
305 be relative, such that the risk of infection is greatly reduced but not eliminated (8, 53). One analogous  
306 example of this is the influenza 50% protective dose, defined as the antibody concentration at which the  
307 risk of infection is reduced by half (9, 46). This is in contrast to a CoP that provides complete immunity  
308 (absolute correlate), as has been shown for viruses like rubella (9, 53). Khoury and colleagues provided  
309 evidence for a relative correlate in calculating a “50% protective neutralization level” across vaccine  
310 studies, and finding that lower antibody levels are required to prevent severe disease than to prevent  
311 infection (39). Estimating different thresholds by outcome is concordant with the concept of a relative  
312 threshold (9). Our findings are also in line with real-world observations where SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough  
313 cases are often mild or asymptomatic, suggesting that while there is not adequate immunity to prevent  
314 infection, there is adequate immunity to prevent symptomatic or severe disease (54-57) . Furthermore,  
315 since mRNA vaccines produce high antibody levels while viral vector vaccines result in robust cellular  
316 immunity, it is also possible that the CoP following vaccination may differ by vaccine product (38, 52).  
317 The paucity of estimated quantitative thresholds therefore results in mostly indirect evidence included  
318 in our review.

319 Other data sources that were not eligible for inclusion in our review are supportive of a humoral CoP.  
320 For example, transfer of SARS-CoV-2 convalescent IgG to naïve rhesus macaques was found to be  
321 protective in a dose-dependent manner (5). Convalescent plasma has sometimes been found to be  
322 therapeutically effective in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 (58), and monoclonal antibody therapy  
323 has been approved in the US for both treatment and prophylaxis (59). Although neither animal models  
324 nor manufactured monoclonal antibodies mimic the human immune response precisely, and the

325 effectiveness of convalescent plasma therapy has been mixed (60), these data underscore the  
326 importance of humoral immunity for protection against SARS-CoV-2.

327 There were several limitations to the available literature for this systematic review. Many studies did not  
328 meet our inclusion criteria and pre-set definitions, which were designed to minimize bias. Our review  
329 included many different study types, including several case-reports, which generally provide a lower  
330 level of evidence and are particularly prone to bias (61, 62). There was heterogeneity in the targets that  
331 were measured, including neutralizing antibodies or antibody isotypes directed against spike (whole  
332 Spike, S1, receptor binding domain) or nucleocapsid protein. The included studies used different  
333 laboratory assays, which were generally not comparable. The WHO IS was seldom used, likely because it  
334 was not made available until late 2020. The diversity of laboratory assays and results precluded a meta-  
335 analysis of our data. To overcome the lack of calibration between laboratory assays, some studies  
336 normalized results against convalescent sera. However, since the humoral immune response to natural  
337 infection varies by age and disease severity (63), this method is not ideal for calibrating results. Most  
338 studies did not report which SARS-CoV-2 lineage was associated with the breakthrough or re-infection,  
339 with only a few studies reporting antibody levels preceding infection with a VOC. With the emergence of  
340 Omicron (B.1.1.529), the lack of Omicron-specific serological data prior to re-infection or breakthrough  
341 is unfortunate. Evidence based on *in vitro* neutralization assays suggests that, for immune responses to  
342 Omicron in individuals who have already been exposed to Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 antigens (whether  
343 through infection or vaccination), an Omicron CoP may be higher than for Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 or other  
344 VOCs, due to the reduced effectiveness of Ancestral antibodies for variant spike protein. To that point,  
345 Pfizer-BioNTech has reported a 25-fold reduction in neutralization titres against Omicron compared to  
346 Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 in individuals vaccinated with two doses of BNT162b2 (64). Studies from South  
347 Africa and Germany report a reduction in neutralization up to 41-fold (65, 66), despite two or three  
348 doses of BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 and previous infection. However, neutralization levels cannot be

349 interpreted with regards to immunity in the absence of a CoP. This issue will be further complicated as  
350 the proportion of individuals with an Omicron-specific immune response due to infection, re-infection or  
351 breakthrough increases, especially if the clinical serology tools available for diagnostic purposes  
352 continue to use Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 antigens.

353 Since we restricted our review to evidence on a humoral CoP, we did not examine the role of cellular  
354 immunity. This is a limitation because both animal models and human studies have suggested that  
355 cellular immunity is likely integral to protection (5). Furthermore, the studies included in our review  
356 focused on systemic immunity. Since mucosal antibodies are a known element of SARS-CoV-2 immunity  
357 this was another limitation in our analysis (60). A recent study by Sheikh-Mohamed et al. supports the  
358 role of IgA in protection: breakthrough infection occurred in study participants with low levels of IgA  
359 compared to protected vaccinees, even if their levels of IgG were comparable (67). However, only three  
360 studies included in our review measured IgA levels, albeit in serum and not in mucosae (22, 29, 42).  
361 Since circulating IgA cannot be effectively transported into secretions (68), these studies cannot shed  
362 light on potential mucosal correlates of protection.

363 Our findings emphasize that further research into the role of humoral immunity, including non-  
364 neutralizing antibody, Fc effector functions and cellular and mucosal immunity is a priority, especially in  
365 the context of immune-evading variants like Omicron. The effect of lineage, vaccine product and the  
366 endpoint being measured (i.e. infection, symptomatic disease, severe disease) on the CoP are also  
367 essential questions. However, study designs that are best suited to assess whether a CoP exists are also  
368 quite complex and intensive. For example, human challenge studies are likely the most direct way to  
369 determine a CoP (69), but ethical issues that accompany these types of studies have limited their  
370 application (70). Finally, elucidating a CoP is directly related to raising global vaccine coverage and  
371 ending the COVID-19 pandemic. Currently, 40.5% of the world's population has not been vaccinated  
372 against SARS-CoV-2 (71). The need to approve more vaccines is urgent, but placebo controlled trials



373 have become difficult to perform (38). With this in mind, a temporary CoP, even if imperfect, would  
374 allow us to break through this impasse by performing non-inferiority studies to authorize new vaccine  
375 products.

376 Taken together, our findings suggest that humoral immunity is an integral part of protection against  
377 SARS-CoV-2, and that an antibody target is the most likely immune marker for a SARS-CoV-2 CoP.

378 Although the evidence thus far supports the use of SARS-CoV-2 serology test results to confirm prior  
379 exposure to SARS-CoV-2, we currently do not have the tools to interpret serology with regards to  
380 protection.

381 Some jurisdictions have utilized serology testing in COVID-19 public health policies (72, 73),  
382 underscoring the urgency of elucidating a correlate of protection for SARS-CoV-2 to help guide public  
383 health decision making.

384

### 385 **Contributions**

386 JP and SB conceptualised the study; JP and SO screened articles; JP, SO, JW, SB and MRG extracted data;  
387 SB wrote the original manuscript draft; all authors reviewed and edited the manuscript; more than one  
388 author accessed and verified the underlying data reported in the manuscript.

389

### 390 **Funding**

391 This work was supported by Public Health Ontario and funding from the Public Health Agency of Canada.

392

393

394

395 **Declaration of interests**

396 MS has been an investigator on projects funded by GlaxoSmithKline, Merck, Pfizer, Moderna, Sanofi-  
397 Pasteur, Seqirus, Symvivo and VBI Vaccines. All funds have been paid to his institute, and he has not  
398 received any personal payments. Other authors have no conflicts to declare.

399

400 **Acknowledgements**

401 MS is supported via salary awards from the BC Children’s Hospital Foundation, the Canadian Child Health  
402 Clinician Scientist Program and the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research.

403

404

405

## 406 References

- 407 1. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, Lockhart S, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the  
408 BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;383(27):2603-15.
- 409 2. Lumley SF, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, Matthews PC, Howarth A, Hatch SB, et al. Antibody Status and  
410 Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 Infection in Health Care Workers. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;384(6):533-40.
- 411 3. Chivu-Economescu M BC, Grancea C, Chiriac D, Botezatu A et. al. Kinetics and persistence of cellular  
412 and humoral immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in healthcare workers with or without prior  
413 COVID-19. *J Cell Mol Med.* 2022;Jan. 18 Online ahead of print.
- 414 4. Milne G, Hames T, Scotton C, Gent N, Johnsen A, Anderson RM, et al. Does infection with or  
415 vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 lead to lasting immunity? *Lancet Respir Med.* 2021;9(12):1450-66.
- 416 5. McMahan K, Yu J, Mercado NB, Loos C, Tostanoski LH, Chandrashekar A, et al. Correlates of  
417 protection against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus macaques. *Nature.* 2021;590(7847):630-4.
- 418 6. Thornburg NJ. Adaptive immunity and SARS-CoV-2 2021 [Available from:  
419 [https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/meetings/downloads/slides-2021-09-22/03-COVID-Thornburg-  
420 508.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/acip/meetings/downloads/slides-2021-09-22/03-COVID-Thornburg-508.pdf).
- 421 7. Plotkin SA. Correlates of protection induced by vaccination. *Clinical and vaccine immunology.*  
422 2010;17(7):1055-65.
- 423 8. Plotkin SA. Vaccines: correlates of vaccine-induced immunity. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2008;47(3):401-9.
- 424 9. Plotkin SA, Orenstein W., Offit P. A, Edwards, K.M. . Plotkin's Vaccines, 7th Edition: Elsevier; 2018.
- 425 10. Krammer F. A correlate of protection for SARS-CoV-2 vaccines is urgently needed. *Nat Med.*  
426 2021;27(7):1147-8.
- 427 11. Hall VG, Ferreira VH, Ku T, Ierullo M, Majchrzak-Kita B, Chaparro C, et al. Randomized Trial of a  
428 Third Dose of mRNA-1273 Vaccine in Transplant Recipients. *N Engl J Med.* 2021;385(13):1244-6.
- 429 12. Yau K, Abe KT, Naimark D, Oliver MJ, Perl J, Leis JA, et al. Evaluation of the SARS-CoV-2 Antibody  
430 Response to the BNT162b2 Vaccine in Patients Undergoing Hemodialysis. *JAMA Netw Open.*  
431 2021;4(9):e2123622.
- 432 13. Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Fischer H, Hong V, Ackerson BK, Ranasinghe ON, et al. Effectiveness of mRNA  
433 BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine up to 6 months in a large integrated health system in the USA: a  
434 retrospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2021;398(10309):1407-16.
- 435 14. Sheward D KC, Pankow A, Castro Dopico X, Martin D, Dillner J, Karlsson Hedestam G, Albert J,  
436 Murrell B. Quantification of the neutralization resistance of the Omicron Variant of Concern.  
437 <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CuxmNYj5cpluxWXhijVmuDqntxXwlfXQ/view>; 2021.
- 438 15. Davis C, Logan N, Tyson G, Orton R, Harvey WT, Perkins JS, et al. Reduced neutralisation of the Delta  
439 (B.1.617.2) SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern following vaccination. *PLoS Pathog.*  
440 2021;17(12):e1010022.
- 441 16. Edara VV, Norwood C, Floyd K, Lai L, Davis-Gardner ME, Hudson WH, et al. Infection- and vaccine-  
442 induced antibody binding and neutralization of the B.1.351 SARS-CoV-2 variant. *Cell Host Microbe.*  
443 2021;29(4):516-21 e3.
- 444 17. Hu J, Peng P, Cao X, Wu K, Chen J, Wang K, et al. Increased immune escape of the new SARS-CoV-2  
445 variant of concern Omicron. *Cell Mol Immunol.* 2022.

- 446 18. WebPlotDigitizer [Version 4.5 Released (August 15, 2021)]:[Available from:  
447 <https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/>].
- 448 19. NIH. Study Quality Assessment Tools [Available from: [https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-](https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools)  
449 [topics/study-quality-assessment-tools](https://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health-topics/study-quality-assessment-tools)].
- 450 20. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020  
451 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Int J Surg*. 2021;88:105906.
- 452 21. Ali AM, Ali KM, Fatah MH, Tawfeeq HM, Rostam HM. SARS-CoV-2 reinfection in patients negative  
453 for immunoglobulin G following recovery from COVID-19. *New Microbes New Infect*.  
454 2021;43:100926.
- 455 22. Brehm TT, Pfefferle S, von Possel R, Kobbe R, Norz D, Schmiedel S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Reinfection in a  
456 Healthcare Worker Despite the Presence of Detectable Neutralizing Antibodies. *Viruses*. 2021;13(4).
- 457 23. Dimeglio C, Herin F, Miedouge M, Martin-Blondel G, Soulat JM, Izopet J. Protection of healthcare  
458 workers against SARS-CoV-2 reinfection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;73(7):1323-4.
- 459 24. Gallais F, Gantner, P, Bruel, T, Velay, A, Planas, D, Wendling, M, Bayer, S, Solis, M et al. Anti-SARS-  
460 CoV-2 Antibodies Persist for up to 13 Months and Reduce Risk of Reinfection. *medRxiv*  
461 2021050721256823; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021050721256823>.
- 462 25. Inada M, Ishikane M, Terada M, Matsunaga A, Maeda K, Tsuchiya K, et al. Asymptomatic COVID-19  
463 re-infection in a Japanese male by elevated half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC50) of  
464 neutralizing antibodies. *J Infect Chemother*. 2021;27(7):1063-7.
- 465 26. Krutikov M, Palmer T, Tut G, Fuller C, Shrotri M, Williams H, et al. Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection  
466 according to baseline antibody status in staff and residents of 100 long-term care facilities  
467 (VIVALDI): a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Healthy Longev*. 2021;2(6):e362-e70.
- 468 27. Leidi A, Koegler F, Dumont R, Dubos R, Zaballa ME, Piumatti G, et al. Risk of reinfection after  
469 seroconversion to SARS-CoV-2: A population-based propensity-score matched cohort study. *Clin*  
470 *Infect Dis*. 2021(May 27):ciab495.
- 471 28. Roy S. COVID-19 Reinfection in the Face of a Detectable Antibody Titer. *Cureus*. 2021;13(3):e14033.
- 472 29. Selhorst P, Van Ierssel S, Michiels J, Marien J, Bartholomeeusen K, Dirinck E, et al. Symptomatic  
473 SARS-CoV-2 reinfection of a health care worker in a Belgian nosocomial outbreak despite primary  
474 neutralizing antibody response. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021;73(9):e2985-e91.
- 475 30. Ul-Haq Z, Khan A, Fazid S, Noor F, Yousafzai YM, Sherin A. First documented reinfection of SARS-  
476 COV-2 in second wave from Pakistan. *J Ayub Med Coll Abbottabad*. 2020;32(Suppl 1)(4):S704-S5.
- 477 31. Vetter P, Cordey S, Schibler M, Vieux L, Despres L, Laubscher F, et al. Clinical, virologic and  
478 immunologic features of a mild case of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.  
479 2021;27(5):791.e1-e4.
- 480 32. Wilkins JT, Hirschhorn LR, Gray EL, Wallia A, Carnethon M, Zembower TR, et al. Serologic Status and  
481 SARS-CoV-2 Infection over 6 Months of Follow Up in Healthcare Workers in Chicago: A Cohort  
482 Study. *Infect Control Hosp Epidemiol*. 2021:1-9.
- 483 33. Munivenkatappa A, Sahay RR, Deshpande GR, Patil DY, Shete AM, Sapkal GN, et al. A case with  
484 SARS-CoV-2 reinfection from India. *Indian J Med Microbiol*. 2021.
- 485 34. Bergwerk M, Gonen T, Lustig Y, Amit S, Lipsitch M, Cohen C, et al. Covid-19 Breakthrough Infections  
486 in Vaccinated Health Care Workers. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(16):1474-84.

- 487 35. Cromer D, Juno JA, Khoury D, Reynaldi A, Wheatley AK, Kent SJ, et al. Prospects for durable immune  
488 control of SARS-CoV-2 and prevention of reinfection. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2021;21(6):395-404.
- 489 36. Earle KA, Ambrosino DM, Fiore-Gartland A, Goldblatt D, Gilbert PB, Siber GR, et al. Evidence for  
490 antibody as a protective correlate for COVID-19 vaccines. *Vaccine*. 2021;39(32):4423-8.
- 491 37. Gilbert PB, Montefiori DC, McDermott A, Fong Y, Benkeser DC, Deng W, et al. Immune Correlates  
492 Analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy Trial. medRxiv.  
493 2021;<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.08.09.21261290v4>.
- 494 38. Goldblatt D F-GA, Johnson M et al. . A Population-Based Threshold of Protection for COVID-19  
495 Vaccines. PREPRINT (Version 1) available at Research Square [<https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.09.21261290v4>].  
496 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.08.09.21261290v4>].
- 497 39. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, et al. Neutralizing antibody  
498 levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat*  
499 *Med*. 2021;27(7):1205-11.
- 500 40. Michos A, Tatsi EB, Filippatos F, Dellis C, Koukou D, Efthymiou V, et al. Association of total and  
501 neutralizing SARS-CoV-2 spike -receptor binding domain antibodies with epidemiological and  
502 clinical characteristics after immunization with the 1(st) and 2(nd) doses of the BNT162b2 vaccine.  
503 *Vaccine*. 2021;39(40):5963-7.
- 504 41. Schulte B, Marx B, Korencak M, Emmert D, Aldabbagh S, Eis-Hubinger AM, et al. Case Report:  
505 Infection With SARS-CoV-2 in the Presence of High Levels of Vaccine-Induced Neutralizing Antibody  
506 Responses. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 2021;8:704719.
- 507 42. Strafella C, Caputo V, Guerrera G, Termine A, Fabrizio C, Cascella R, et al. Case Report: Sars-CoV-2  
508 Infection in a Vaccinated Individual: Evaluation of the Immunological Profile and Virus Transmission  
509 Risk. *Front Immunol*. 2021;12:708820.
- 510 43. Yamamoto S, Maeda K, Matsuda K, Tanaka A, Horii K, Okudera K, et al. COVID-19 breakthrough  
511 infection and post-vaccination neutralizing antibody among healthcare workers in a referral  
512 hospital in Tokyo: a case-control matching study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021.
- 513 44. Feng S, Phillips DJ, White T, Sayal H, Aley PK, Bibi S, et al. Correlates of protection against  
514 symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med*. 2021;27(11):2032-40.
- 515 45. World Health Organization. WHO/BS.2020.2403 Establishment of the WHO International Standard  
516 and Reference Panel for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody [Available from:  
517 <https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/WHO-BS-2020.2403>].
- 518 46. Hobson D, Curry RL, Beare AS, Ward-Gardner A. The role of serum haemagglutination-inhibiting  
519 antibody in protection against challenge infection with influenza A2 and B viruses. *J Hyg (Lond)*.  
520 1972;70(4):767-77.
- 521 47. Cohen J SR, Rosenfeld K, Lyons H, White M, Kerr C, Klein DJ, Famulare M. Quantifying the role of  
522 naturally- and vaccine-derived neutralizing antibodies as a correlate of protection against COVID-19  
523 variants. medRxiv 2021053121258018; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021053121258018>. 2021.
- 524 48. Mlcochova P, Kemp SA, Dhar MS, Papa G, Meng B, Ferreira I, et al. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 Delta  
525 variant replication and immune evasion. *Nature*. 2021;599:114-9.
- 526 49. Brunner S ST, Kornek G, Parschalk B, Schnetzinger M, Strassl R, Savic R, Foit A, Resch H,  
527 Thalhammer F. . SARS-CoV-2 Postvaccination Infections Among Staff Members of a Tertiary Care  
528 University Hospital – Vienna, January-July 2021; an Exploratory Study on 8 500 Employees with

- 529 Better Outcome of Vector than m-RNA Vaccine. . Available at SSRN:  
530 <https://ssrncom/abstract=3907198> or <http://dxdoiorg/102139/ssrn3907198>.
- 531 50. Kale P GE, Bihari C, Patel N, Rooge S, Pandey A, Bajpai M, V et al. Clinicogenomic analysis of  
532 breakthrough infections by SARS CoV2 variants after ChAdOx1 nCoV- 19 vaccination in healthcare  
533 workers. medRxiv 2021062821259546; doi: <https://doiorg/101101/2021062821259546>. 2021.
- 534 51. Blain H TE, Pisoni A, Soriteau L, Million E, Léglise M, Bussereau I, Miot S, Rolland Y, Picot M,  
535 Bousquet J. Prior Covid-19 and high RBD-IgG levels correlate with protection against VOC- $\delta$  SARS-  
536 CoV-2 infection in vaccinated nursing home residents medRxiv 2021092121263880; doi:  
537 <https://doiorg/101101/2021092121263880>. 2021.
- 538 52. Liu X, Shaw RH, Stuart ASV, Greenland M, Aley PK, Andrews NJ, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of  
539 heterologous versus homologous prime-boost schedules with an adenoviral vectored and mRNA  
540 COVID-19 vaccine (Com-COV): a single-blind, randomised, non-inferiority trial. Lancet.  
541 2021;398(10303):856-69.
- 542 53. World Health Organization. Correlates of vaccine-induced protection: methods and implications.  
543 World Health Organization. 2013 [Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/84288>.
- 544 54. Mhawish H, Mady A, Alaklobi F, Aletreby W, Asad T, Alodat M, et al. Comparison of severity of  
545 immunized versus non-immunized COVID-19 patients admitted to ICU: A prospective observational  
546 study. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2021;71:102951.
- 547 55. UK Health Security Agency: SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in  
548 England. Technical Briefing: Update on hospitalisation and vaccine effectiveness for Omicron VOC-  
549 21NOV-01 (B.1.1.529).  
550 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/  
551 1045619/Technical-Briefing-31-Dec-2021-Omicron\\_severity\\_updatepdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1045619/Technical-Briefing-31-Dec-2021-Omicron_severity_updatepdf).
- 552 56. Thompson MG, Burgess JL, Naleway AL, Tyner H, Yoon SK, Meece J, et al. Prevention and  
553 Attenuation of Covid-19 with the BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 Vaccines. N Engl J Med.  
554 2021;385(4):320-9.
- 555 57. Public Health Ontario Enhanced Epidemiological Summary: COVID-19 Infection in Children: January  
556 15, 2020 to June 30, 2021.
- 557 58. Katz LM. (A Little) Clarity on Convalescent Plasma for Covid-19. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(7):666-8.
- 558 59. United States Food and Drug Administration. FDA authorizes REGEN-COV monoclonal antibody  
559 therapy for post-exposure prophylaxis (prevention) for COVID-19 2021 [Available from:  
560 [https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-authorizes-regen-cov-monoclonal-  
561 antibody-therapy-post-exposure-prophylaxis-prevention-covid-19](https://www.fda.gov/drugs/drug-safety-and-availability/fda-authorizes-regen-cov-monoclonal-antibody-therapy-post-exposure-prophylaxis-prevention-covid-19).
- 562 60. Rubin EJ, Baden LR, Morrissey S. Audio Interview: Aspects of Covid-19 Immunity. N Engl J Med.  
563 2021;385(8):e31.
- 564 61. Burns PB, Rohrich RJ, Chung KC. The levels of evidence and their role in evidence-based medicine.  
565 Plast Reconstr Surg. 2011;128(1):305-10.
- 566 62. Scaffidi MA, Gimpaya N, Li J, Bansal R, Verma Y, Elsolh K, et al. Completeness of reporting for  
567 COVID-19 case reports, January to April 2020: a meta-epidemiologic study. CMAJ Open.  
568 2021;9(1):E295-E301.

- 569 63. Hansen CB, Jarlhelt I, Perez-Alos L, Hummelshoj Landsy L, Loftager M, Rosbjerg A, et al. SARS-CoV-2  
570 Antibody Responses Are Correlated to Disease Severity in COVID-19 Convalescent Individuals. J  
571 Immunol. 2021;206(1):109-17.
- 572 64. Pfizer. Pfizer and BioNTech Provide Update on Omicron Variant 2021 [updated Wednesday  
573 December 08, 2021. Available from: [https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-  
574 detail/pfizer-and-biontech-provide-update-omicron-variant](https://www.pfizer.com/news/press-release/press-release-detail/pfizer-and-biontech-provide-update-omicron-variant).
- 575 65. Cele S, Jackson L, Khan K, Khoury DS, Moyo-Gwete T, Tegally H, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron has  
576 extensive but incomplete escape of Pfizer BNT162b2 elicited neutralization and requires ACE2 for  
577 infection. medRxiv. 2021.
- 578 66. Wilhelm A WM, Grikscheit K, Toptan T, Schenk B, Pallas C, Metzler M, Kohmer N, Hoehl S, Helfritz  
579 FA, Wolf T, Goetsch U, Ciesek S. Reduced Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant by Vaccine  
580 Sera and Monoclonal Antibodies. medRxiv. 2021.
- 581 67. Sheikh-Mohamed S IB, Chao G, Zuo M, Cohen C et al. mRNA vaccine-induced IgA protect against  
582 SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infection. medRxiv. 2021;December 15,  
583 2021:<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.08.01.21261297v3>.
- 584 68. Russell MW, Moldoveanu Z, Ogra PL, Mestecky J. Mucosal Immunity in COVID-19: A Neglected but  
585 Critical Aspect of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. Front Immunol. 2020;11:611337.
- 586 69. Eyal N. Human challenge trials of covid-19 vaccines still have much to teach us 2021 [Available  
587 from: [https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/01/08/human-challenge-trials-of-covid-19-vaccines-still-  
588 have-much-to-teach-us/](https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2021/01/08/human-challenge-trials-of-covid-19-vaccines-still-have-much-to-teach-us/).
- 589 70. New York Times. "Britain infected volunteers with the coronavirus. Why won't the US?" Oct 14,  
590 2021 [Available from: [https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/14/opinion/covid-human-challenge-  
591 trial.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/14/opinion/covid-human-challenge-trial.html).
- 592 71. Ritchie H ME, Rodés-Guirao L, Appel C, Giattino C, Ortiz-Ospina E, Hasell J, Macdonald B, Beltekian  
593 D and Roser M. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19)". Published online at OurWorldInData.org. 2020  
594 [January 18, 2021]. Available from: '<https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus>'.
- 595 72. Norwegian Institute of Public Health: After you have been vaccinated or have had COVID-19  
596 [Available from: [https://www.fhi.no/en/op/novel-coronavirus-facts-advice/facts-and-general-  
597 advice/after-vaccination-and-recovery-from-covid-19/](https://www.fhi.no/en/op/novel-coronavirus-facts-advice/facts-and-general-advice/after-vaccination-and-recovery-from-covid-19/).
- 598 73. Israeli Ministry of Health: Confirmed Cases and Patients [Available from:  
599 <https://corona.health.gov.il/en/confirmed-cases-and-patients/cases-recovered/>.
- 600 74. Pan American Health Organization. Interim Guidelines for Detecting Cases of Reinfection by SARS-  
601 CoV-2. [https://www.paho.org/en/documents/interim-guidelines-detecting-cases-reinfection-sars-  
602 cov-2](https://www.paho.org/en/documents/interim-guidelines-detecting-cases-reinfection-sars-cov-2) 2020
- 603 75. Dagan N, Barda N, Kepten E, Miron O, Perchik S, Katz MA, et al. BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine  
604 in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination Setting. N Engl J Med. 2021;384(15):1412-23.
- 605
- 606
- 607

Table 1: Definitions applied to determine cases of re-infection and breakthrough in this systematic review.

Term	Definition
SARS-CoV-2 re-infection, suspected case	<p>A symptomatic person with a positive molecular test result for SARS-CoV-2 following a period of <math>\geq 45</math> days from the first infection with SARS-CoV-2, or</p> <p>An asymptomatic person with a positive molecular test result for SARS-CoV-2 following a period <math>\geq 90</math> days from the first infection with SARS-CoV-2, for which SARS-CoV-2 shedding from a previous infection, or an infection of a different etiology have been ruled out (74).</p>
SARS-CoV-2 re-infection, confirmed case	<p>A person who meets the suspected case criteria, but also has a documented time interval for which they were not symptomatic, did not shed SARS-CoV-2 virus or RNA, or had a negative SARS-CoV-2 laboratory test. In addition, the case has had whole genomic sequencing of both the initial and subsequent SARS-CoV-2 virus, with evidence that they belong to different clades or lineages or exhibiting a number of single nucleotide variations that correlate with the probability that each virus is from a different lineage (74).</p>
SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infection with one vaccine dose	<p>A positive molecular test result in an individual who received one dose of a vaccine product that is approved in at least one jurisdiction (i.e. – not an experimental vaccine) at least 14 days previously (75).</p>
SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infection with two vaccine dose	<p>A positive case molecular test result in an individual who received a second dose of a vaccine product that is approved in at least one jurisdiction (i.e. – not an experimental vaccine) at least seven days previously (1)</p>



Table 2: Summary of articles included in this review following re-infection and breakthrough infection definition screening, and types of evidence they describe.

Evidence	Included articles	Number of articles
SARS-CoV-2 re-infection - Describing individual or aggregate humoral measures	Dimeglio et al.(23), Roy et al.(28), Krukitov et al.(26), Leidi et al.(27), Ul-Haq et al.(30), Vetter et al.(31), Ali et al.(21), Gallais et al.(24), Brehm et al.(22), Inada et al.(25), Selhorst et al.(29), Wilkins et al.(32), Lumley et al.(2), Munivenkatappa et al. (33)	14
SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections following vaccination  - Describing individual or aggregate humoral measures  - Describing statistical modelling to explore associations between VE and antibody levels  - Describing both aggregate humoral measures and statistical modelling to explore associations between VE and antibody levels	Strafella et al.(42), Schulte et al.(41), Michos et al.(40), Bergwerk et al.(34), Feng et al.(44), Yamamoto et al. (43)  Khoury et al.(39), Earle et al.(36), Goldblatt et al.(38), Cromer et al.(35)  Gilbert et al.(37)	11
Total		25

Table 3: Articles describing SARS-CoV-2 re-infection along with individual or aggregate humoral measures<sup>#</sup>

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Number of reinfections reported	Lineage of first infection, reinfection	Time from first infection to most recent antibody test before re-infection* (days)	Antibody assay, target isotype (cut-off)	Pre reinfection antibody level*	Time from most recent antibody test* to re-infection (days)	Statistical association
<b>Inada, 2020 (Japan)</b>	Case report, general public	1	Not provided	94	Laboratory developed Anti-S IgG ELISA (cut-off not provided)	15.6 OD ratio	11	None reported
				94	Laboratory developed neutralization assay, IgG specific	50 µg/mL	11	None reported
<b>Roy, 2021 (Not Reported)</b>	Case report, general public	1	Not provided	150 (5 months)	LIASON SARS-CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG test kit (DiaSorin Inc., Saluggia, Italy) (>15.0)	48 AU/ml	47	None reported
<b>Dimeglio, 2021 (France)</b>	Cohort, HCW	5	Not provided	Not provided	Quantitative ELISA (Wantai Biological Pharmacy Enterprise Co, Ltd, China); Total Ab; anti-Spike	Range: 1.5-385.8 S/Co	Not provided (serology performed a median of 167 IQR (156–172) days apart)	None reported
				Not provided	Neutralization test – assay not provided	Range: 0-64 S/CO	Not provided (serology performed a median of 167 days apart)	None reported

<b>Leidi, 2021 (Switzerland)</b>	Cohort, general public	5	Not provided	Not provided	Euroimmun ELISA, (Euroimmun Lubeck, Germany); IgG; anti-S (cut-off: $\geq 0.5$ )	Range: 0.58-2 ratio	Range: 34-185	None reported
<b>Lumley, 2021 (England)</b>	Cohort, HCW	3	Not provided	50-112 days for HCW2; Not provided for HCW1 and HCW3	ELISA (LDT); IgG; Anti-S (cut-off not provided)	Range: 0.34-10.5 million units	Range: 61-179	IRR of 0.11 (95% CI 0.03, 0.44, p = 0.002) in seropositive healthcare workers compared to seronegative healthcare workers
				50-112 days for HCW2; Not provided for HCW1 and HCW3	ELISA (LDT); IgG; Anti-N (cut-off not provided)	Range: 0-7.5 arbitrary units	Range: 10-179	IRR of 0.11 (95% CI 0.03, 0.45, p = 0.002) in seropositive healthcare workers compared to seronegative healthcare workers
<b>Ul-Haq, 2020 (Pakistan)</b>	Case report, HCW	1	Not provided	15	Assay information not provided, cut off of $\geq 1$	1.97	133	None reported
<b>Vetter, 2021 (Switzerland)</b>	Case report, HCW	1	Re-infection lineage different than first infection,	35	Euroimmun Anti-S IgG (Euroimmun, Lubeck, Germany) (cut-off not provided)	2.16 UI/l	169	None reported
				35	Elecsys/Roche (Basel, Switzerland), Total anti-RBD (0.8 U/ml)	21.6 U/ml	169	

			but both clade 20A	35	Elecsys/Roche (Basel, Switzerland), Total anti-N (cut-off not provided)	128 COI	169	
				35	PRNT/neutralization assay 90%	14.1 (1/ (inferred to mean 1/14.1))	169	
<b>Ali, 2020 (Iraq)</b>	Cohort, patients admitted to hospital	17**	Not provided	Not provided	IgG Anti-N (PishTaz Teb Diagnostic, Tehran, Iran) (cut-off=1.1)	5.87 (s/ca)	Not provided	None reported
<b>Gallais, 2021 (France)</b>	Cohort, HCW	1	Not provided	96	Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Quant II assay (Abbott, Sligo, Ireland) (cut-off:50AU/ml)	2.6 log AU/ml	7 months (number of days not reported)	None reported
				96	EDI Novel coronavirus COVID-19 IgG ELISA (San Diego, USA) (no cut-off reported)	1.0 OD S/CO	7 months (number of days not reported)	
<b>Brehm, 2021 (Germany)</b>	Case report, HCW	1	B.3, B.1.177	~6 months	Diasorin IgG Anti-S (Saluggia, Italy) (cut-off: 15 AU/mL)	60 AU/mL	~4 months (number of days not reported)	None reported
				210	Indirect immunofluorescence, IgG, IgM, IgA	IgG 1:320 IgM <1:20 IgA <1:20	73	
				210	Neutralization Assay	Local Hamburg reference isolate (HH-1): 1:80 IC50 B.1.177: 1:160 IC50	73	
<b>Selhorst, 2020 (Belgium)</b>	Case report, HCW	1	V clade, G clade	105	Roche Total anti-N (Basel, Switzerland) (cut-off: ≥1)	102 cut-off/index	80	None reported

				94	PRNT/neutralization assay; 2019-nCoV-Italy-INMI1; NT50	NT <sub>50</sub> 200	91	
<b>Munivenkatappa, 2021 (India)</b>	Case report, HCW	1	Not provided	76 days	ELISA (LDT), IgG, anti-RBD (no cut-off provided)	Ratio of positive to negative: 4.14	31 days	None reported
				76 days	ELISA (LDT), IgG, anti-N (no cut-off provided)	Ratio of positive to negative: 8.57	31 days	None reported
				76 days	PRNT/Neutralization assay, no details provided	Positive (no quantitative result given)	31 days	
<b>Krutikov, 2021 (England)</b>	Cohort, staff and residents in LTC	14	Not provided	Not provided	Mesoscale Diagnostics (MSD) IgG, anti-S (Rockville, USA) (no cut-off provided)	Range: 78-137840 AU/mL	Range: 12-132	Cox regression showed antibody-negative staff and residents at baseline had increased risk of PCR+ infection than those antibody-positive at baseline (aHR range: 0.08 (95% CI 0.03, 0.23) -0.39 (95% CI 0.19, 0.82))
				Not provided	Mesoscale Diagnostics (MSD) IgG, anti-N (Rockville, USA) (no cut-off provided)	Range: 137–222308 AU/ml; Median antibody levels of 101527 (95% CI 18393, 161580) AU/mL	Range: 12-132	No statistically significant difference between antibody levels of individuals re-infected and

						for cases, and 26326 (95% CI 14378, 59633) AU/mL for controls.		those not (p=0.544)
<b>Wilkins, 2021 (USA)</b>	Cohort study, HCW	8	Not provided	Not provided	Abbott ARCHITECT i2000SR Immunoassay system, IgG, anti-N (Sligo, Ireland) (cut- off: $\geq 1.4$ )	Range: 1.92- 6.01 Index Value	Range: 95- 212	None reported

# - Assay results from each study were included for every antibody type (i.e. – anti-S, anti-N, anti-RBD) and isotype (i.e. – IgG, IgM, IgA) measured. In instances where more than one assay target was used to measure the same antibody target in the same study (i.e. – both PRNT and pseudoneutralization results, or anti-S results from two different assays), we included only one of these results. Full data extraction for every study can be accessed in Supplementary File 3.

\*- if more than one test result was provided, the result closest in time to re-infection is presented.

\*\* - In these studies, other reinfections were reported as well, but with no accompanying temporal and laboratory data, or did not meet our reinfection criteria

Definitions: anti-S = anti-spike, anti-N = anti-nucleocapsid, anti-RBD = anti-receptor binding domain, PRNT = plaque reduction neutralization test, LDT= laboratory-developed test, ELISA = enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay, AU = arbitrary units, OD = optical density, IRR = increased relative risk, HCW = health care worker, LTC = long term care

Table 4: Articles describing breakthrough following SARS-CoV-2 infection along with individual or aggregate humoral measures<sup>#</sup>

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
<b>Strafella, 2021 (Italy)</b>	Case report, HCW	Pfizer, 2 doses	1	B.1.1.7	26	Euroimmun Anti-Sars-CoV-2, IgG Anti-S1, IgA Anti-S1, IgM Anti-N (Lubeck, Germany) (cut-off: $\geq 1.1$ )	IgG: 10.47 ratio units IgA: 3.58 ratio units IgM: 0.2 ratio units	26	None reported
					26	Roche Elecsys Anti-Sars-CoV-2 Total anti-RBD (Basel, Switzerland) (cut-off: $>0.8$ BAU/ml)	978.7 U/ml	26	None reported
<b>Schulte, 2021 (Germany)</b>	Case report, HCW	Pfizer, 2 doses	1**	B.1.525	9	Roche, Total Ig, S1 (Basel, Switzerland) (cut-off not provided)	$>250$ U/mL	45	None reported
<b>Gilbert, 2021 (USA)</b>  (Please see Table 5 for	Nested case-cohort within an RCT, vaccine trial participants	Moderna, 2 doses	55 (text) or 46 (Table 1)	Not provided	$\leq 81$	MSD anti-S, IgG (Rockville, USA) (cut-off: $>10.8424$ IU/mL)	GMC of 1890 (95% CI 1449, 2465) IU/mL among cases, 2652 (95% CI 2457, 2863)	Not provided	GMC ratio of cases/non-cases = 0.71 (95% CI 0.54, 0.94)  Cox regression to estimate association between risk

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
additional evidence)							IU/mL among non-cases.		of COVID-19 and anti-S IgG level (per 10-fold increase). HR = 0.66 (95% CI 0.50, 0.88).  34% decrease in risk for every 10-fold increase of Anti-S IgG
					≤81	MSD anti-RBD, IgG (Rockville, USA)(cut-off: >14.0858 IU/mL)	GMC of 2744 (95% CI 2056, 3664) IU/mL among cases, 3937 (95% CI 3668, 4227) IU/mL among non-cases	Not provided	GMC ratio of cases/non-cases 0.70 (95% CI 0.52, 0.94)  Cox regression to estimate association between risk of COVID-19 and anti-RBD IgG level (per 10-fold increase). HR = 0.57 (95% CI 0.40, 0.82).  43% decrease in risk for every 10-fold increase of Anti-RBD IgG
					≤81	Pseudoneutralization assay with ID50 calibrated against WHO IS, neutralizing antibodies (no	GMT of 160 (95% CI 117, 220) ID50 titre among cases, 247 (95% CI 231, 264) ID50 titre among non-cases.	Not provided	GMT ratio of cases/non-cases= 0.65 (95% CI 0.47-0.90)  Cox regression to estimate association between risk of COVID-19 and neutralizing antibody level (per 10-fold increase).



First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
						cut-off reported)			HR = 0.42 (95% CI 0.27, 0.65).  58% decrease in risk for every 10-fold increase of neutralizing antibodies
						Pseudoneutralization assay with ID80 calibrated against WHO IS, neutralizing antibodies (no cut-off reported)	GMT of 332 (95% CI 248, 444) ID80 titre among cases, 478 (95% CI 450, 508) ID80 titre among non-cases.		GMT ratio of cases/non-cases= 0.69 (95% CI 0.52, 0.93)  Cox regression to estimate association between risk of COVID-19 and neutralizing antibody level (per 10-fold increase).  HR = 0.35 (95% CI 0.20, 0.61).  65% decrease in risk for every 10-fold increase of neutralizing antibodies
Feng, 2021 (UK)	Cohort study secondary analysis of clinical trial data	AstraZeneca	171**	Mostly B.1.1.7 and B.1.177	14-42	MSD anti-S, IgG, (Rockville, USA) (no cut-off reported)	Median of 30501 (95% CI 16088, 49529) AU/mL for cases, and 33945 (95% CI 18450,	Not provided	Generalized additive model to estimate risk of symptomatic COVID-19.  Difference between median antibody levels for cases and non-cases: $p > 0.05$

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
							59260) AU/mL for non-cases		Risk was inversely correlated to anti-spike IgG (p=0.003),  There was no association between risk of asymptomatic COVID-19 and anti-spike IgG
					14-42	MSD Anti-RBD, IgG (Rockville, USA) (no cut-off reported)	Median of 40884 (95% CI 20871, 62934) AU/mL for cases, 45693 (95% CI 24009, 82432) AU/mL for non-cases	Not provided	Difference between median antibody levels for cases and non-cases: p>0.05  Risk was inversely correlated to anti-RBD IgG (p=0.018).  There was no association between risk of asymptomatic COVID-19 and anti-RBD IgG
					14-42	Microneutralization assay, neutralizing antibodies (no cut-off reported)	Median titre of 206 (95% CI 124, 331) for cases, 184 (95% CI 101, 344) for non-cases	Not provided. Median follow up period of 53 days (IQR 29,81), starting 7 days after blood draw.	Difference between median antibody levels for cases and non-cases: p>0.05  Risk was inversely correlated to microneutralization titre (p<0.001).

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
									There was no association between risk of asymptomatic COVID-19 and neutralizing antibodies
<b>Bergwerk, 2021 (Israel)</b>	Case-control study, HCW	Pfizer, 2 doses	22**	B.1.1.7 was identified in 85% of breakthrough cases, similar to community prevalence at the time	Median of 36 days (breakthrough infections), median of 35 days (controls)	Beckman Coulter, anti-S1 (Brea, USA)(no cut-off provided)	Case predicted anti-S IgG GMT: 11.2 (95% CI 5.3, 23.9); Control predicted GMT: 21.8 (95% CI 18.6,25.52)	Within a week of breakthrough for cases. Controls were matched to cases by time between second vaccine dose and serology test	Ratio of cases/control GMT: 0.514 (95% CI 0.282, 0.937)  Linear regression to assess correlation between Ct value of cases and neutralizing antibody level during peri-infection period.  Slope= 171.2 (95% CI 62.9, 279.4).
					Median of 36 days (breakthrough infections), median of 35 days (controls)	Pseudoneutralization assay	Case predicted GMT: 192.8 (95% CI 67.6, 549.8); Control predicted GMT: 533.7 (95% CI 408.1, 698.0)	Within a week of breakthrough for cases. Controls were matched to cases by time between second vaccine dose and serology test	Ratio of cases/control GMT: 0.361 (95% CI 0.165, 0.787)

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
<b>Michos, 2021 (Greece)</b>	Cohort study, HCW	Pfizer, 2 doses	2	Not provided	One month	GenScript cPass SARS-CoV-2 Neutralization antibody detection kit (Piscataway, USA)	90 and 95% neutralization	~10 days	None reported
<b>Yamamoto, 2021 (Japan)</b>	Case control study, HCW	Pfizer, 2 doses	17	5 of 17 reported to be Delta	Median of 63 (IQR 43-69) days for cases; 62 (IQR 40-69) days for controls	Abbott Advise Dx SARS-CoV-2 IgG II (Sligo, Ireland), anti-RBD, (no cutoff provided)	Case predicted GMC: 5129 (95% CI 3881, 6779); Control predicted GMC: 6274 (95% CI 5017,7847)	55 (45-64) days	Ratio of cases/control GMC: 0.82 (95% CI 0.65, 1.02), p=0.07
					Median of 63 (43-69) days for cases; Median of 62 (40-69) days for controls	Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 (Basel, Switzerland), Spike total antibody, (no cutoff provided)	Case predicted GMC: 1144 (95% CI 802,1632); Control predicted GMC: 1208 (95% CI 1053-1385)	55 (45-64) days	Ratio of cases/control GMC: 0.95 (95% CI 0.70, 1.27), p=0.72

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
					Median of 63 (43-69) days for cases; Median of 62 (40-69) days for controls	PRNT/neutralization test (SARS-CoV-2 ancestral, Alpha and Delta strains)	Ancestral strain: case predicted GMT: 405 (95% CI 327,501); Control predicted GMT: 408 (320,520)	55 (45-64) days	Ratio of cases/control GMT: 0.99 (95% CI 0.74, 1.34), p= 0.96
						Alpha: Case predicted GMT: 116 (95% CI 80,169) ; Control predicted GMT: 122 (95% CI 96,155)			Ratio of cases/control GMT: 0.95 (95% CI 0.71, 1.28), p = 0.76
						Delta: Case predicted GMT: 123 (95% CI 85, 177); Control predicted GMT: 135 (95% CI 108, 170)			Ratio of cases/control GMT: 0.91 (95% CI 0.61, 1.34), p = 0.63

First author, publication year (study country)	Study design, population	Vaccines included in study and number of doses	Number of cases reported	Lineage of breakthrough infection	Time from last vaccine dose to antibody test* (days)	Antibody assay and target, isotype (cut-off)	Pre-breakthrough antibody level*	Time from antibody test* to breakthrough infection (days)	Statistical association
------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------

# - Assay results from each study were included for every antibody type (i.e. – anti-S, anti-N, anti-RBD) and isotype (i.e. – IgG, IgM, IgA) measured. In instances where more than one assay target was used to measure the same antibody target in the same study (i.e. both PRNT and pseudoneutralization results, or anti-S results from two different assays), we included only one of these results. Full data extraction for every study can be accessed in Supplementary File 3.

\*- If more than one test result was provided, the result closest in time to re-infection is presented.

\*\* - In these studies, other breakthrough infections were reported as well, but with no accompanying temporal and laboratory data

Definitions: anti-S = anti-spike, anti-N = anti-nucleocapsid, anti-RBD = anti-receptor binding domain, PRNT = plaque reduction neutralization test, LDT= laboratory-determined test, ELISA = enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay, AU = arbitrary units, OD = optical density, IRR = increased relative risk, HCW = health care worker, LTC = long term care, GMC = geometric mean concentration, GMT = geometric mean titre, 95% CI = 95% confidence interval, ID50 = infectious dose titer 50, WHO IS = World Health Organization SARS-CoV-2 antibody International Standard, HR = hazard ratio, RCT = randomized controlled trial, MSD = Mesoscale Discovery

Table 5: Articles describing statistical modelling to explore associations between VE and antibody levels<sup>#</sup>

First author and publication year	Vaccine(s) investigated	Antibody assay and target, isotype	Primary outcome	Correlation	Statistical model used	Result and interpretation	Reported correlate of protection
<b>Earle, 2021</b>	Pfizer, Moderna, Sputnik, AstraZeneca, Sinovac, Novavax, and Johnson & Johnson	Neutralization or pseudoneutralization assays, neutralizing antibody	PCR confirmed infection, with or without symptomatic illness, or seroconversion measures (varies by study)	Spearman rank $\rho=0.79$	Locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) regression, with a tricube weight function	Neutralizing antibody accounted for 77.5% of variation in efficacy	Not provided
		Results normalized to HCS	Various ELISAs targeting anti-spike, anti S1 or anti-RBD, IgG	Spearman rank $\rho=0.93$	Locally estimated scatterplot smoothing (LOESS) regression, with a tricube weight function	Anti-spike IgG accounted for 94.2% of variation in efficacy	
<b>Khoury, 2021</b>	Pfizer, Moderna, Sputnik, AstraZeneca, Sinovac, Novavax, and Johnson & Johnson	Various neutralization or microneutralization assays, neutralizing antibody	PCR confirmed infection with no symptoms, symptomatic illness, or moderate to severe/critical illness (varies by study)	Spearman's rank $\rho=0.905$	Logistic model	20.2% (95% CI 14.4, 28.4) of the mean convalescent level estimated to protect 50% of people	Neutralization titre of 1:10 to 1:30, or 54 (95% CI 30, 96) IU/mL
		Results normalized to HCS			Protective neutralization classification model (a distribution-free approach, using individual neutralization levels)	28.6% (95% CI = 19.2, 29.2%) of the mean convalescent level estimated to provide protection in 100% of people	28.6% of mean convalescent level

First author and publication year	Vaccine(s) investigated	Antibody assay and target, isotype	Primary outcome	Correlation	Statistical model used	Result and interpretation	Reported correlate of protection
					Logistic model	3.0% (95% CI 0.71, 13.0) of the mean convalescent level estimated to protect 50% of people against severe disease	
<b>Cromer, 2021</b>	Pfizer, AstraZeneca, Novavax, Johnson & Johnson	Neutralization assay (unspecified, reference not included) using Ancestral, Alpha, Beta and Delta strains	Any infection, symptomatic disease, PCR confirmed infection (varies by study)	Spearman's rank $\rho=0.810$	N/A	N/A	Not provided
<b>Goldblatt, 2021</b>	Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, Johnson & Johnson	Anti-spike	Antibody threshold at which individual is protected	Spearman's rank $\rho=0.940$	Weighted least squares linear regression	Anti-spike antibodies accounted for 97.4% of the variance in efficacy	Not provided
	Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, Johnson & Johnson	Anti-spike	Antibody threshold at which individual is protected against Alpha	Spearman's rank $\rho=0.83$	Weighted least squares linear regression	Anti-Spike antibodies accounted for 68.6% of the variation in efficacy	Not provided
	Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, Johnson & Johnson	Anti-spike	Antibody threshold at which individual is protected		Random effects meta-analysis of each vaccine's reverse cumulative	Individuals with anti-S IgG lab result of at least 154 BAU (95% CI: 42, 559) are	Anti-S IgG: 154 BAU (95% CI: 42, 559)



First author and publication year	Vaccine(s) investigated	Antibody assay and target, isotype	Primary outcome	Correlation	Statistical model used	Result and interpretation	Reported correlate of protection
					distribution function	protected from infection	
	Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca, Johnson & Johnson	Anti-spike	Antibody threshold at which individual is protected against Alpha		Random effects meta-analysis of each vaccine's reverse cumulative distribution function	Individuals with anti-S IgG lab result of at least 171 BAU (95% CI: 57, 519) are protected from infection	Anti-S IgG against Alpha: 171 BAU (95% CI: 57, 519)
<b>Gilbert, 2021</b>  (Please see Table 4 for additional evidence)	Moderna	Lentivirus pseudoneutralization assay, cID50			Causal inference approach using Cox regression	An estimated 68.5% (95% CI 58.5, 78.4%) of VE was mediated by Day 29 cID50 titer	Not provided
		Lentivirus pseudoneutralization assay, cID80			Causal inference approach using Cox regression	An estimated 48.5% (95% CI 34.5, 62.4%) of VE was mediated by Day 29 cID80 titer	

#-Assay results from each study were included for every antibody type (i.e. – anti-S, anti-N, anti-RBD) and isotype (i.e. – IgG, IgM, IgA) measured. In instances where more than one assay target was used to measure the same antibody target in the same study (i.e. – both PRNT and pseudoneutralization results, or anti-S results from two different assays), we included only one of these results. Full data extraction for every study can be accessed in Supplementary File 3.

Definitions: anti-S = anti-spike, anti-N = anti-nucleocapsid, anti-RBD = anti-receptor binding domain, PRNT = plaque reduction neutralization test, LDT= laboratory-determined test, ELISA = enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay, OD = optical density, IRR = incidence rate ratio, HCW = health care worker, LTC = long term care, HCS = human convalescent sera, NAAT = nucleic acid amplification testing

Identification of studies via databases and registers

Identification of studies via other methods

