

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

3  
4 Marc Stegger<sup>1</sup>, Sofie Marie Edslev<sup>1</sup>, Raphael Niklaus Sieber<sup>1</sup>, Anna Cäcilia Ingham<sup>1</sup>, Kim  
5 Lee Ng<sup>1</sup>, Man-Hung Eric Tang<sup>1</sup>, Soren Alexandersen<sup>2,3</sup>, Jannik Fonager<sup>4</sup>, Rebecca Legarth<sup>5</sup>,  
6 Magdalena Utko<sup>7</sup>, Bartłomiej Wilkowski<sup>6,7</sup>, Vithiagaran Gunalan<sup>4</sup>, Marc Bennedbæk<sup>4</sup>, Jonas  
7 Byberg-Grauholm<sup>8</sup>, Camilla Holten Møller<sup>5</sup>, Lasse Engbo Christiansen<sup>9</sup>, Christina Wiid  
8 Svarrer<sup>1</sup>, Kirsten Ellegaard<sup>1</sup>, Sharmin Baig<sup>1</sup>, Thor Bech Johannesen<sup>1</sup>, Laura Espenhain<sup>5</sup>,  
9 Robert Skov<sup>5</sup>, Arieh Sierra Cohen<sup>6</sup>, Nicolai Balle Larsen<sup>6</sup>, Karina Meden Sørensen<sup>7</sup>, Emily  
10 Dibba White<sup>5</sup>, Troels Lillebæk<sup>10,11</sup>, Henrik Ullum<sup>12</sup>, Tyra Grove Krause<sup>5</sup>, Anders  
11 Fomsgaard<sup>4</sup>, Steen Ethelberg<sup>5,13</sup>, Morten Rasmussen<sup>4\*</sup>

12  
13 <sup>1</sup>Department of Bacteria, Parasites and Fungi, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

14 <sup>2</sup>Division of Diagnostic Preparedness, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

15 <sup>3</sup>School of Medicine, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia

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

18 <sup>5</sup>Division of Epidemiological Infectious Disease Preparedness, Statens Serum Institut,  
19 Copenhagen, Denmark

20 <sup>6</sup>TestCenter Denmark, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

21 <sup>7</sup>Danish National Biobank, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

22 <sup>8</sup>Department for Congenital Disorders, Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

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

25 <sup>10</sup>International Reference Laboratory of Mycobacteriology, Statens Serum Institut,  
26 Copenhagen, Denmark

27 <sup>11</sup>Global Health Section, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark

28 <sup>12</sup>Statens Serum Institut, Copenhagen, Denmark

29 <sup>13</sup>Department 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, 2021<sup>1</sup>, 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 transmissibility<sup>2</sup> and immune escape<sup>3,4</sup>. Studies indicate that the Omicron variant results in  
66 less severe disease outcomes than Delta<sup>5</sup>. 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 cases<sup>6</sup>. 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 deletions<sup>7</sup> 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 residence<sup>8</sup>. It includes information on demographics, vaccination status,  
95 previous SARS-CoV-2 infection(s), admissions to hospital and intensive care treatment<sup>8</sup>.  
96 Summaries of demographic and clinical data were compiled in R ([www.r-project.org](http://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-PCR<sup>9</sup> and subsequent WGS as previously described<sup>10</sup>. 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)<sup>11</sup>. 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 MAFFT<sup>12</sup> 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\_045512.2<sup>13</sup>), were used to  
150 produce a rooted maximum-likelihood phylogeny with the GTR substitution model in IQ-  
151 TREE<sup>14</sup> 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 infection<sup>15</sup>, 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 work<sup>15</sup>. The resulting mapped data was then filtered on previously  
163 described sites of interest<sup>15</sup> 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](http://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 immunity<sup>16</sup>. 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 infection<sup>17</sup>. 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 population<sup>18</sup>, 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) <sup>a</sup>	27.6	27.2	-0.4
BA.1-BA.2 reinfection cases (n=45) <sup>b</sup>	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.

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)

