

1 Occurrence and significance of Omicron BA.1 infection followed by
2 BA.2 reinfection

3
4 Marc Stegger¹, Sofie Marie Edslev¹, Raphael Niklaus Sieber¹, Anna Cäcilia Ingham¹, Kim
5 Lee Ng¹, Man-Hung Eric Tang¹, Soren Alexandersen^{2,3}, Jannik Fonager⁴, Rebecca Legarth⁵,
6 Magdalena Utko⁷, Bartłomiej Wilkowski^{6,7}, Vithiagaran Gunalan⁴, Marc Bennedbæk⁴, Jonas
7 Byberg-Grauholm⁸, Camilla Holten Møller⁵, Lasse Engbo Christiansen⁹, Christina Wiid
8 Svarrer¹, Kirsten Ellegaard¹, Sharmin Baig¹, Thor Bech Johannesen¹, Laura Espenhain⁵,
9 Robert Skov⁵, Arieh Sierra Cohen⁶, Nicolai Balle Larsen⁶, Karina Meden Sørensen⁷, Emily
10 Dibba White⁵, Troels Lillebæk^{10,11}, Henrik Ullum¹², Tyra Grove Krause⁵, Anders
11 Fomsgaard⁴, Steen Ethelberg^{5,13}, Morten Rasmussen^{4*}

12
13 ¹Department of Bacteria, Parasites and Fungi, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

14 ²Division of Diagnostic Preparedness, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

15 ³School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia

16 ⁴Department of Virus and Microbiological Special Diagnostics, Statens Serum Institut,
17 Copenhagen, Denmark

18 ⁵Division of Epidemiological Infectious Disease Preparedness, Statens Serum Institut,
19 Copenhagen, Denmark

20 ⁶TestCenter Denmark, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

21 ⁷Danish National Biobank, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

22 ⁸Department for Congenital Disorders, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

23 ⁹Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Dynamical Systems, Technical
24 University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

25 ¹⁰International Reference Laboratory of Mycobacteriology, Statens Serum Institut,
26 Copenhagen, Denmark

27 ¹¹Global Health Section, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

28 ¹²Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

29 ¹³Department of Public Health, Global Health Section, University of Copenhagen,
30 Copenhagen, Denmark

31
32 * Corresponding author
33 Morten Rasmussen

34 Department of Virus and Microbiological Special Diagnostics, Statens Serum Institut,
35 Copenhagen, Denmark

36 Email: MOT@ssi.dk

37
38 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, Omicron, reinfection, BA.1, BA.2, WGS, disease,
39 Denmark, surveillance, subgenomic RNA, clinical symptoms

40
41

42 **Abstract**

43 The newly found Omicron SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern has rapidly spread worldwide.
44 Omicron carries numerous mutations in key regions and is associated with increased
45 transmissibility and immune escape. The variant has recently been divided into four
46 subvariants with substantial genomic differences, in particular between Omicron BA.1 and
47 BA.2. With the surge of Omicron subvariants BA.1 and BA.2, a large number of reinfections
48 from earlier cases has been observed, raising the question of whether BA.2 specifically can
49 escape the natural immunity acquired shortly after a BA.1 infection.

50 To investigate this, we selected a subset of samples from more than 1,8 million cases of
51 infections in the period from November 22, 2021, until February 11, 2022. Here, individuals
52 with two positive samples, more than 20 and less than 60 days apart, were selected.
53 From a total of 187 reinfection cases, we identified 47 instances of BA.2 reinfections shortly
54 after a BA.1 infection, mostly in young unvaccinated individuals with mild disease not
55 resulting in hospitalization or death.

56 In conclusion, we provide evidence that Omicron BA.2 reinfections do occur shortly after
57 BA.1 infections but are rare.

58

59

60 **Introduction**

61 Since the first report of a new SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern (VOC), Omicron (Pango
62 lineage B.1.1.529), on November 19, 2021¹, this VOC has rapidly disseminated globally and
63 now dominates in many countries. Omicron carries more than 30 mutations and deletions in
64 the spike gene compared to the original Wuhan strain and is associated with increased
65 transmissibility² and immune escape^{3,4}. Studies indicate that the Omicron variant results in
66 less severe disease outcomes than Delta⁵. Currently, Omicron is subdivided into four
67 subvariants, BA.1, BA.1.1, BA.2 and BA.3, where BA.1 is the dominating Omicron
68 subvariant worldwide (<https://outbreak.info>), and in Europe Omicron is estimated to account
69 for about 70% of all reported cases⁶. In Denmark, we have observed a dramatic increase in
70 Omicron BA.2 case number since the beginning of early 2022, and BA.2 now accounts for
71 88% of all cases. Omicron BA.2 case numbers are also increasing in countries like the United
72 Kingdom, South Africa and Norway currently. Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 differ by up to 40
73 non-synonymous mutations and deletions⁷ including key mutations in the N-terminal and the
74 receptor binding domains of the spike gene, both regions that influence the immune response.
75 The diversity between Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 in the spike protein exceeds the variation
76 between the Wuhan and the Alpha variant. With the surge of both BA.1 and BA.2, a large
77 number of reinfections, as defined by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and
78 Control (ECDC) as two positive tests >60 days apart, has been observed, raising the question
79 if BA.2 can escape the natural immunity acquired shortly after a BA.1 infection, and if so,
80 whether these cases are associated with changes in disease severity.

81 Using whole genome sequencing (WGS), we investigate whether Omicron BA.2 reinfections
82 occurred within 20-60 days following initial infections with BA.1 in the time period when
83 these two subvariants emerged and became dominant in Denmark. Here we present evidence
84 that Omicron BA.2 reinfections indeed do occur relatively shortly after a BA.1 infection,
85 causing mostly mild disease in unvaccinated young individuals.

86

87 **Methods**

88 *Epidemiological information*

89 For the SARS-CoV-2 cases, we obtained data up to and including February 15, 2022, from
90 the Danish COVID-19 surveillance which includes information from multiple national

91 registries including the National Microbiology Database (MiBa) with SARS-CoV-2 test
92 results, the National Patient Registry and the National Vaccination Registry. This data is
93 combined using the unique personal identification number given at birth to all Danish citizens
94 or at registration of residence⁸. It includes information on demographics, vaccination status,
95 previous SARS-CoV-2 infection(s), admissions to hospital and intensive care treatment⁸.
96 Summaries of demographic and clinical data were compiled in R (www.r-project.org).
97 Information about clinical signs, symptoms, date of onset, duration of symptoms, indication
98 for testing, and contact with the health care system for all investigated episodes, was
99 collected by the administration of a structured questionnaire in telephone interviews with the
100 individuals or, in the case of children under 18, their parents. Interviews were performed
101 between February 10, 2022, and February 15, 2022.

102

103 *General Data Protection Regulation*

104 This study was conducted using data from the Danish COVID-19 surveillance. According to
105 Danish law, ethics approval is not needed for this type of research but approved by the Legal
106 Advisory Board at Statens Serum Institut, a Danish sector research institute under the
107 auspices of the Danish Ministry of Health. The publication only contains aggregated results
108 without personal data. Therefore, the publication is in compliance with the European General
109 Data Protection Regulations.

110

111 *Identification of paired BA.1-BA.2 cases*

112 In Denmark, persons with symptoms suggestive of COVID-19, all patients requiring
113 hospitalization or outpatient treatment for any reason, and healthcare personnel, are tested in
114 the departments of clinical microbiology that serve both public and private hospitals and
115 primary care. In some cases, these departments perform the WGS locally. The Community
116 track, TestCenter Denmark (TCDK) provides large scale testing for SARS-CoV-2 for all
117 residents using RT-PCR through the free Danish universal health care system, providing easy
118 access to testing facilities across the country. Since the end of 2021, surveillance of SARS-
119 CoV-2 variants has been based on screening of ~15,000 positive samples per week using a
120 variant-specific RT-PCR⁹ and subsequent WGS as previously described¹⁰. Briefly, WGS was
121 performed using Illumina technology using the ARTIC v3 amplicon sequencing panel
122 (<https://artic.network>) with slight modifications. Samples were sequenced on either the
123 NextSeq or NovaSeq platforms (Illumina), and subvariants were called on subsequent
124 consensus sequences containing <3,000 ambiguous or missing sites using Pangolin (version
125 3.1.17) with the PangoLEARN assignment algorithm (version 2022-01-05)¹¹. In this study,
126 Omicron BA.1.1 was grouped with BA.1, both for genome and case analyses. Although only
127 a subset of samples are screened by variant PCR and/or WGS, all positive samples are
128 collected and stored in the Danish National Biobank.

129 Due to the high numbers of COVID-cases during the study period (November 21, 2021,
130 through February 11, 2022) just over 1.8 million, only a subset of cases were variant assigned
131 by PCR or WGS (<https://www.covid19genomics.dk/statistics>), and few cases therefor had
132 WGS analysis of repeated samples in the 2-month study period. In order to increase the
133 number of paired genome data for patients infected with Omicron lineages, samples were
134 selected for WGS from individuals with two SARS-CoV-2-positive samples 20 to 60 days
135 apart. From a total of 1,739 individuals that fulfilled the criteria, a subset of 984 samples
136 from individuals (n=492) without prior WGS results were randomly selected for sequencing.
137 Moreover, 74 individuals had at least one Omicron sample already confirmed by WGS and
138 the remaining samples were selected for WGS. In total, 1,056 samples were included (Figure
139 1). All samples were subjected to quantitative PCR for indication of viral load by cycle
140 threshold (Ct) value where a paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used for comparison

141 between the Omicron BA.1 to BA.2 reinfection episodes. Comparison of timespan between
142 reinfections for Omicron subvariants were investigated using a Mann-Whitney U test.

143

144 *Population structure of reinfection cases*

145 To investigate if specific unique subvariants of either Omicron BA.1 or BA.2 dominated in
146 reinfection cases, we randomly selected contemporary BA.1 (n=50) and BA.2 (n=50)
147 genomes from the national surveillance data. From these, a combined MAFFT¹² alignment,
148 also including the genomes from the Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 reinfection cases and the
149 Wuhan-Hu-1 reference sequence (GenBank accession ID NC_045512.2¹³), were used to
150 produce a rooted maximum-likelihood phylogeny with the GTR substitution model in IQ-
151 TREE¹⁴ with 1000 bootstraps.

152

153 *Viral activity in Omicron BA.2 reinfections*

154 The presence of subgenomic RNAs may not be a direct indication of active infection¹⁵, but it
155 does provide evidence to suggest that both replication and transcription have taken place in
156 the cytoplasm of infected cells in the sampled individuals. To substantiate that the secondary
157 Omicron BA.2 cases were in fact infected by SARS-CoV-2, we investigated the presence of
158 subgenomic RNAs in the diagnostic swabs. Briefly, from the output alignment of Illumina
159 sequencing data against the Wuhan-Hu-1 reference genome, we investigated reads containing
160 part of the 5'-untranslated region (UTR) leader sequence from position 55-69 using a *SARS-
161 CoV-2-leader* Jupyter Notebook available at <https://github.com/ssi-dk/SARS-CoV-2-leader>
162 modified from previous work¹⁵. The resulting mapped data was then filtered on previously
163 described sites of interest¹⁵ and converted into relative proportion per sample. Four samples
164 were excluded due to poor coverage, UTR amplicon drop out or no raw BA.1 reads being
165 available. For comparison, we analyzed the occurrence and relative proportions of
166 subgenomic RNAs in contemporary Omicron BA.1 (n=5,000) and BA.2 (n=5,000) samples
167 with no reporting of other positive samples within 60 days using a Wilcoxon signed-ranked
168 test.

169

170 *Data availability*

171 The data is available for research upon reasonable request to the Danish Health Data
172 Authority and Statens Serum Institut and within the framework of the Danish data protection
173 legislation and any required permission from authorities. Consensus genome data from the
174 Danish cases are routinely shared publicly at GISAID (www.gisaid.org), including
175 information on reinfections.

176

177 **Results**

178 Between November 21, 2021, and February 11, 2022, a total number of ~1.8 million
179 individuals (32% of the Danish population) tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 in Denmark by
180 PCR. In this period, WGS produced ~140,000 SARS-CoV-2 genomes at the time of analysis.
181 Based on the surveillance-based genome data, we identified 54 cases with high-quality
182 Omicron BA.1 sequences that also had a non-sequenced sample 20-60 days later, and 18
183 cases with a high-quality Omicron BA.2 sequence and a non-sequenced sample at 20-60 days
184 earlier within this period. Out of a total of 1,739 potential reinfection cases, 984 samples from
185 492 cases were selected. In total 1,056 samples were subjected to WGS, of which 613 were
186 successfully sequenced and identified 470 Omicron sequences that were used for further data
187 analysis (Figure 1). Combining these Omicron reinfection data, a total of 67 persons had a
188 pair of samples with adequate sequencing quality of which 64 had an Omicron BA.1
189 sequence identified in the first sample and 47 had a BA.2 sequence identified in the
190 subsequent sample, while only 17 had BA.1 identified also in the subsequent sample (Table

191 1). The paired samples from the BA.1 to BA.1 cases were on average collected within a
192 shorter timespan (median: 26 days) compared to samples collected from the BA.2 reinfection
193 cases (median: 36 days) ($p=0.002$, Supplementary Figure 1A), possibly representing residual
194 virus RNA (Supplementary Figure 2). Accordingly, when comparing the genomes of the
195 BA.1-BA.1 cases ($n=17$), the vast majority (88%, 15/17) were identical (0-1 SNP) and only
196 two cases showed a larger SNP difference of seven and eight SNPs. The changes were not
197 overall correlated to difference in sampling time. For the three Omicron BA.2 to BA.2 cases,
198 two were identical and one differed by four SNPs.

199 Examination of viral load showed that the Ct values for Omicron BA.2 reinfections were
200 higher, thus indicating a lower viral concentration as compared to the initial BA.1 infections
201 (p -value=0.006) (Supplementary Figure 1B and Supplementary Table 1). The same tendency
202 was observed for the Omicron BA.1 to BA.1 cases (Supplementary Figure 1C). In order to
203 validate if the reduced viral load of the Omicron BA.2 reinfection cases could be considered
204 as a general feature of BA.2 infections or was specific for this scenario, i.e. a BA.2 infection
205 emerging shortly after a BA.1 infection, we compared Ct values for the majority of Danish
206 BA.1 and BA.2 genomes ($n=58,015$). This analysis indicated no difference in viral load
207 between BA.1 and BA.2 in general (Supplemental Table 1).

208 The median age of the 47 cases was 15 years, and no cases were older than 38 at the time of
209 the Omicron BA.1 infection and the majority under the age of 20 (70%) (Table 2). The
210 overall vaccination status of cases showed that 42 (89%) were not vaccinated, three (6%)
211 were vaccinated twice, whereas two (4%) only had one vaccination. For the entire population
212 of Denmark, 81% are vaccinated twice and 62% have received the booster. The reinfection
213 cases were observed across Denmark with most occurring in the Greater Copenhagen region
214 that also had the most incidences during the study period
215 (<https://www.covid19genomics.dk/statistics>). Interestingly, when looking at the number of
216 Delta to Omicron reinfections in the same period, we observed 26 Delta to Omicron BA.1
217 and 140 Delta to Omicron BA.2 reinfections. The median age for cases with a Delta to BA.2
218 reinfection was 16 years, and the majority were unvaccinated (68%) (Supplementary Table
219 2).

220 None of the 47 individuals with Omicron BA.1 to BA2 reinfections had been hospitalized or
221 died during the follow-up study period. Detailed information of symptoms was obtained for
222 33 of the cases, whereof most of them reported symptoms during both infections (Figure 2,
223 Supplementary Table 3). Twenty-eight (85%) had symptoms during the Omicron BA.2
224 reinfection, though mainly mild disease (symptoms for a few days) (Figure 2A). The mean
225 duration of symptoms were four days for both infection rounds. The distribution of reported
226 symptoms did not differ markedly between the two infections (Figure 2B). For the first
227 infection, the most common indication for testing was exposure as close contact to a person
228 testing positive (53%) while the primary indication for testing for the second infection was
229 experiencing symptoms (47%).

230 The phylogeny of the paired Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 genomes with the randomly sampled
231 Danish BA.1 and BA.2 genomes, did not show any distinct variant(s) causing the reinfection
232 (BA.2) nor any primary Omicron BA.1 clusters that in some way could be related to later
233 reinfections (Figure 3). Despite differences in age group and vaccination status distributions
234 between the paired reinfection data and the randomly sampled data, no clustering of samples
235 by these parameters was evident. In addition, no mutations were observed in the spike protein
236 other than those seen in general among Omicron BA.2 cases. It appears that for the initial
237 Omicron BA.1 infection, the levels of genomic RNA (mapped at nucleotide 55) and for the
238 two mapped subgenomic RNAs for Spike and Nucleoprotein, respectively, did not differ
239 between the study population and the randomly selected BA.1 samples used for comparison
240 (Supplementary Figure 2). In contrast, for the subsequent Omicron BA.2 infection, the

241 findings in the study population indicate a particular dominance of virus genomic RNA and
242 relatively lower/decreased levels of Spike and Nucleoprotein subgenomic RNAs when
243 compared to the random BA.2 samples used for comparison (Supplementary Figure 2).
244 Further, the BA.2 samples, both the study population and the random selected samples,
245 tended to have more virus genomic RNA and lower levels of Spike and Nucleoprotein
246 subgenomic RNA than the included BA.1 study and random samples (Supplementary Figure
247 2).

248

249 **Discussion**

250 The present study confirms the occurrence of Omicron BA.2 reinfection shortly after a
251 previous BA.1 infection. This is to our knowledge the first study that reports aggregated
252 Omicron BA.2 reinfection cases and document a time interval as short as 20 days after initial
253 infection. Among the 1,848,466 million infected individuals in the study period, we identified
254 1,739 cases that fulfilled the criteria of two positive samples with more than 20 and less than
255 60 days apart. From a randomly selected group of 263 paired samples that were successfully
256 analyzed by WGS, we found 187 (71%) cases of reinfections and 47 (18%) of these were
257 Omicron BA.1-BA.2 reinfections. The reinfection rate appears to be low given the high
258 number of positive SARS-CoV-2 tests during the study period but still highlights the need for
259 continuous assessment of length of vaccine-induced and/or natural immunity. Given the short
260 time period between infections it could be reasonable to re-evaluate the definition by ECDC
261 that requires two positive samples with more than 60 days apart in order to consider
262 reinfection.

263 Omicron BA.2 reinfections after either Delta or BA.1 initial infections, were mainly observed
264 among young individuals below the age of 30 and the majority of these cases were not
265 vaccinated, further emphasizing the enhanced immunity obtained by the combination of
266 vaccination and infection compared to infection induced immunity only. For the Omicron
267 BA.1 infection to BA.2 reinfection among cases aged 15 or above, only 13% (3/24) had
268 completed the primary vaccination program contrary to the overall vaccination rate in
269 Denmark of >80%.

270 Reinfections were characterized by overall mild symptoms comparable to the initial infection
271 and did lead to neither hospitalization nor death. It is, however, striking that mainly children
272 and adolescents become reinfected, since children to a higher degree than adults develop a
273 sustained cross-reactive immunity¹⁶. This may be explained by the very high incidences
274 among children in the chosen study period, whereas adults and elderly had lower incidences.

275 A change in indication for testing was noted between the first and second infection, and this
276 may reflect a general change in why individuals are tested over time. With more widespread
277 infections and restrictions lifted, the urge to test due to exposure to a person testing positive
278 may have been reduced in general, leading to an increase in the proportion of individuals
279 tested because of symptoms.

280 To evaluate if cases of Omicron BA.2 reinfections are caused by a specific subset of BA.2
281 variants circulating with intrinsically different properties than BA.2 in general, we compared
282 the paired samples with randomly sampled Danish BA.1 and BA.2 genomes. Here we found
283 no sign of clustering among BA.2 or BA.1 variants involved in reinfection compared with the
284 randomly selected BA.1 and BA.2 sequences. The differences in age group and vaccination
285 status between the paired reinfection data and the randomly sampled data did not give rise to
286 any clustering either. This indicates that the capability of Omicron BA.2 to cause reinfections
287 in recently infected Omicron BA.1 cases with low or no vaccination protection may be an
288 intrinsic BA.2 property. For the Omicron BA.1-BA.1 cases, we found the genomes to be near
289 identical (0-1 SNP) in most cases, thus indicating a residual infection.

290 We observed significantly reduced overall viral load in secondary BA.2 infection samples
291 compared to initial infection together with a lower ratio of subgenomic to genomic RNA.
292 Taken together, this may indicate a more superficial and transient secondary infection that
293 could be explained by T cell-mediated immunity obtained during the first infection¹⁷. We
294 have previously speculated that infections in the early stage may be associated with the
295 pattern that we see here for the Omicron BA.2 study population¹⁸, and it is possible that the
296 BA.2 infection in these individuals, happening within a short window after an initial BA.1
297 infection, may somehow differ, perhaps by being more superficial or transient than the BA.2
298 infections observed in the randomly selected samples used for comparison.
299 In conclusion, we provide evidence that Omicron BA.2 reinfections are rare but can occur
300 relatively shortly after a BA.1 infection, causing mostly mild disease in unvaccinated young
301 individuals. The reinfections were identified among SARS-CoV-2 cases testing positive for
302 more than one time in a country with a high PCR test capacity and extensive community
303 transmission.

304
305

306 **Contributions**

307 CWS, JBG, BW, NBL, ASC, MU, CHM, LEC, KMS and RNS performed sample selection,
308 quantitatively PCR and WGS; KLN, MHET, SME, ACI, RNS, TBJ, ACI, JF, MS and SA
309 performed genome analyses; SME and ACI compiled the demographic information; ACI,
310 SME and MHET performed statistical analyses, TGK, SE and EDW designed and performed
311 the patient interviews; MS and MR wrote the first draft. All authors contributed to the
312 discussion and interpretation of data, revised the drafts and approved the submitted version.

313

314 **Acknowledgements**

315 The authors wish to thank the Danish Covid-19 Genome Consortium for genotyping
316 SARS-CoV-2 positive samples.

317

318 **Competing interests**

319 The authors declare no competing interests.

320 **Figures and Tables**

321 **Table 1.** Overview over all SARS-CoV-2 cases in Denmark with >1 positive sample collected 20 to
322 60 days apart where lineage information from WGS data were available

First infection	Second infection			Total
	BA.1	BA.2	Delta	
BA.1	17	47	0	64
BA.2	0	3	0	3
Delta	26	140	30	196
Total	33	190	30	263

323

324

325 **Table 2.** Age groups and vaccination status of the 47 cases with Omicron BA.2 reinfection

Age groups	N (%)	Vaccination status		
		Not vaccinated (N= 42; 89%)	Started primary vaccination program (N=2; 4%)	Full effect after primary vaccination program (N=3; 6%)
0-5 years	3 (6%)	3	0	0
6-9 years	9 (19%)	8	1	0
10-14 years	11 (23%)	10	1	0
15-19 years	10 (21%)	9	0	1
20-29 years	10 (21%)	8	0	2
30-39 years	4 (9%)	4	0	0

326

327

328 **Figure 1.** Flowchart representing sample selection and analysis flow. Outlined is the total
329 number of SARS-CoV-2 cases in the study period as is the number of samples selected from
330 cases with sequences partly available and samples being randomly selected to combined
331 investigate the occurrence and significance of Omicron BA.2 reinfections. The 47 resulting
332 cases represent a subset of available cases with >1 SARS-Cov-2 positive sample, which
333 combined only present a very small proportion of all SARS-CoV-2 cases in Denmark in the
334 study period. SARS-CoV-2: Abbreviations: Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2,
335 Delta and Omicron refers to variants of concern as defined by WHO, WGS: Whole genome
336 sequencing.

337

338 **Figure 2.** Frequency of self-reported symptoms of 33 individuals with a BA.1 to BA.2
339 reinfection. **A:** Bar plot showing frequency of cases reporting 'no symptoms', 'mild
340 symptoms' (mild symptoms lasting a few days) and 'moderate symptoms' (flu-like
341 symptoms) during the initial BA.1 infection (blue bars) and the secondary BA.2 infection
342 (red bars). **B:** Bar plot showing the frequency of cases experiencing frequently observed
343 symptoms during the initial BA.1 infection (blue bars) and the secondary BA.2 infection (red
344 bars).

345

346 **Figure 3.** Genetic diversity of Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 from reinfection. Rooted maximum-
347 likelihood phylogeny based on the 3,763 variable positions in the genomes from Danish
348 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 cases. The 'reinfection dataset' contains the 47 cases
349 with an infection with Omicron BA.1 followed by an infection with BA.2 within 20-60 days
350 (i.e., n=94 samples, yellow). The dataset called 'Random cases for comparison' (grey)
351 contains 50 randomly selected high-quality genomes of BA.1 and BA.2, respectively, from
352 the same period (December 1, 2021 - January 31, 2022). These belong to cases with no
353 previous or subsequent known infection with another or the same SARS-CoV-2
354 variant/lineage. 'Primary program full effect' refers to the first two vaccinations; 'Started
355 primary program' refers to have received only a single first vaccination dose, 'Booster
356 vaccinated full effect' refers to having received three vaccinations. Age group 80+ not shown
357 since it is not represented in the included samples. Scalebar represents substitutions per site.

358
359
360

Supplementary Table 1. Viral load, measured by RT-PCR Ct values, in Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 infections.

Study groups	Median Ct		Difference in Ct
	BA.1	BA.2	
Reference (n=58,015) ^a	27.6	27.2	-0.4
BA.1-BA.2 reinfection cases (n=45) ^b	26.8	28.5	1.7
Difference in Ct	-0.8	1.3	

361 a: All BA.1 and BA.2 cases with available Ct values from RT-PCR.
362 b: The BA.1 to BA.2 reinfection cases with available Ct values.

363
364
365
366
367

Supplementary Table 2. Age groups and vaccination status of 140 cases with Omicron BA.2 reinfection shortly after a Delta infection

Age groups	N (%)	Vaccination status			
		Not vaccinated (N= 95; 68%)	Started primary vaccination program (N=17; 12%)	Full effect after primary vaccination program (N=25; 18%)	Booster vaccinated (N=3; 2%)
0-5 years	9 (6%)	9	0	0	0
6-9 years	32 (23%)	25	7	0	0
10-14 years	27 (19%)	24	3	0	0
15-19 years	8 (6%)	6	1	1	0
20-29 years	18 (13%)	12	1	4	1
30-39 years	28 (20%)	15	5	8	0
40-49 years	14 (10%)	3	0	10	1
50-75 years	4 (3%)	1	0	2	1

368
369
370
371
372
373

Supplementary Table 3. Symptoms among 33 interviewed individuals with a BA.1 to BA.2 reinfection. ‘Mild symptoms’: mild symptoms lasting a few days; ‘Moderate symptoms’: flu-like symptoms.

First infection	Second infection			
	No symptoms	Mild Symptoms	Moderate Symptoms	Total
No symptoms	2	1	0	3
Mild Symptoms	2	13	2	17
Moderate Symptoms	1	9	3	13
Total	5	23	5	33

374
375

Supplementary Figure 1. A: Comparison of number of days between the sample dates for the first infection and second infection between BA.1 to BA.1 and BA.1 to BA.2 cases. **B:** Comparison of Ct values for cases with initial BA.1 infection followed by a secondary BA.2 infection. **C:** Comparison of Ct values for cases with initial BA.1 infection followed by a secondary BA.1 infection. Boxplots represent the median and interquartile range. Lines indicates paired samples. Asterisk indicates statistical significance, ** p<0.01.

376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389


Supplementary Figure 2. Genomic and subgenomic RNA frequencies in primary Omicron BA.1 infection, secondary BA.2 infection and contemporary randomly selected BA.1 and BA.2 cases. Position 55 shows the frequency of reads mapped to the leader sequence of genomic SARS-CoV-2 RNA, while 21552 shows frequency of reads mapped to the Spike (S) subgenomic RNA and 28256 the frequency of reads mapped to the Nucleoprotein (N) subgenomic RNA.

390 **References**


391 1. Viana R, Moyo S, Amoako DG, et al. Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV-2
392 Omicron variant in southern Africa. Nature 2022. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-022-04411-y.

- 393 2. Lyngse FP, Mortensen LH, Denwood MJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC
394 Transmission in Danish Households. medRxiv 2021:2021.12.27.21268278. DOI:
395 10.1101/2021.12.27.21268278.
- 396 3. Cele S, Jackson L, Houry DS, et al. Omicron extensively but incompletely escapes
397 Pfizer BNT162b2 neutralization. Nature 2021. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-021-04387-1.
- 398 4. Hu J, Peng P, Cao X, et al. Increased immune escape of the new SARS-CoV-2 variant
399 of concern Omicron. Cell Mol Immunol 2022;19(2):293-295. DOI: 10.1038/s41423-
400 021-00836-z.
- 401 5. Veneti L, Boas H, Brathen Kristoffersen A, et al. Reduced risk of hospitalisation
402 among reported COVID-19 cases infected with the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1
403 variant compared with the Delta variant, Norway, December 2021 to January 2022.
404 Euro Surveill 2022;27(4). DOI: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2022.27.4.2200077.
- 405 6. Control ECfDPa. Weekly epidemiological update: Omicron variant of concern (VOC)
406 – week 2 (data as of 20 January 2022) EU/EEA.
407 ([https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/news-events/weekly-epidemiological-update-
408 omicron-variant-concern-voc-week-2-data-20-january-2022](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/news-events/weekly-epidemiological-update-omicron-variant-concern-voc-week-2-data-20-january-2022)).
- 409 7. Majumdar S, Sarkar R. Mutational and phylogenetic analyses of the two lineages of
410 the Omicron variant. J Med Virol 2021. DOI: 10.1002/jmv.27558.
- 411 8. Schonning K, Dessau RB, Jensen TG, et al. Electronic reporting of diagnostic
412 laboratory test results from all healthcare sectors is a cornerstone of national
413 preparedness and control of COVID-19 in Denmark. APMIS 2021;129(7):438-451.
414 DOI: 10.1111/apm.13140.
- 415 9. Spiess K, Gunalan V, Marving E, et al. Rapid surveillance platforms for key SARS-
416 CoV-2 mutations in Denmark. medRxiv 2021:2021.10.25.21265484. DOI:
417 10.1101/2021.10.25.21265484.
- 418 10. Lyngse FP, Kirkeby CT, Denwood M, et al. Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
419 VOC subvariants BA.1 and BA.2: Evidence from Danish Households. medRxiv
420 2022:2022.01.28.22270044. DOI: 10.1101/2022.01.28.22270044.
- 421 11. O'Toole A, Hill V, Pybus OG, et al. Tracking the international spread of SARS-CoV-
422 2 lineages B.1.1.7 and B.1.351/501Y-V2 with grinch. Wellcome Open Res
423 2021;6:121. DOI: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.16661.2.
- 424 12. Katoh K, Standley DM. MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7:
425 improvements in performance and usability. Mol Biol Evol 2013;30(4):772-80. DOI:
426 10.1093/molbev/mst010.
- 427 13. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human respiratory
428 disease in China. Nature 2020;579(7798):265-269. DOI: 10.1038/s41586-020-2008-3.
- 429 14. Nguyen LT, Schmidt HA, von Haeseler A, Minh BQ. IQ-TREE: a fast and effective
430 stochastic algorithm for estimating maximum-likelihood phylogenies. Mol Biol Evol
431 2015;32(1):268-74. DOI: 10.1093/molbev/msu300.
- 432 15. Alexandersen S, Chamings A, Bhatta TR. SARS-CoV-2 genomic and subgenomic
433 RNAs in diagnostic samples are not an indicator of active replication. Nat Commun
434 2020;11(1):6059. DOI: 10.1038/s41467-020-19883-7.
- 435 16. Dowell AC, Butler MS, Jinks E, et al. Children develop robust and sustained cross-
436 reactive spike-specific immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Immunol
437 2022;23(1):40-49. DOI: 10.1038/s41590-021-01089-8.
- 438 17. Riou C, Keeton R, Moyo-Gwete T, et al. Escape from recognition of SARS-CoV-2
439 variant spike epitopes but overall preservation of T cell immunity. Sci Transl Med
440 2022;14(631):eabj6824. DOI: 10.1126/scitranslmed.abj6824.


- 441 18. Chamings A, Bhatta TR, Alexandersen S. Subgenomic and negative sense RNAs are
442 not markers of active replication of SARS-CoV-2 in nasopharyngeal swabs. medRxiv
443 2021:2021.06.29.21259511. DOI: 10.1101/2021.06.29.21259511.
444



A)



Infection lineage



B)

