1	Title: Heterologous Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) / mRNA-1273 (Moderna) vaccination induces
2	a stronger humoral response than homologous Sputnik V in a real-world data analysis.
3	
4	Running title: Humoral response to the Sputnik V/Moderna vaccination.
5	
6	Authors: Matías J. PERESON <sup>a,b</sup> , Lucas AMAYA <sup>c</sup> , Karin NEUKAM <sup>d,e</sup> , Patricia BARE <sup>f</sup> , Natalia
7	ECHEGOYEN°, María Noel BADANO <sup>d</sup> , Alicia LUCERO°, Antonella MARTELLI°, Gabriel H.
8	GARCIA <sup>a</sup> , Cristina VIDELA <sup>c</sup> , Alfredo P. MARTÍNEZ <sup>c</sup> , Federico A. DI LELLO <sup>a,b,*</sup>
9	
10	Affiliations:
11	<sup>a</sup> Universidad de Buenos Aires. Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica. Instituto de Investigaciones
12	en Bacteriología y Virología Molecular (IBaViM). Buenos Aires, Argentina.
13	<sup>b</sup> Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Ciudad Autónoma de
14	Buenos Aires, Argentina.
15	°Virology Section, Centro de Educación Médica e Investigaciones Clínicas Norberto Quirno
16	"CEMIC". Buenos Aires, Argentina.
17	<sup>d</sup> Servicio de Enfermedades Infecciosas, UCEIMP. Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío. Seville,
18	Spain.
19	<sup>e</sup> Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla/CSIC/Universidad de Sevilla. Seville, Spain.
20	<sup>f</sup> Instituto de Medicina Experimental (IMEX), Academia Nacional de Medicina, Ciudad Autónoma
21	de Buenos Aires, Argentina.
22	*Corresponding Author: Dr. Federico Alejandro Di Lello, Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica,
23	Universidad de Buenos Aires, Junín 956, 4º piso, (1113), Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.
24	Phone: +54 11 5287 4472
25	Fax: +54 5287 4662, E-mail: fadilello@ffyb.uba.ar

#### 26 **ABSTRACT**

27 Introduction: Growing data are demonstrating safety and immunogenicity of heterologous 28 vaccination schemes against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) 29 infection. This strategy opens up the possibility of a shorter path towards the end of the pandemic. 30 **Objective:** To compare the homologous prime-boost vaccination scheme of Gam-COVID-Vac 31 (Sputnik V, SpV) to its heterologous combination with mRNA-1273 (Moderna, Mod) vaccine. 32 Methods: SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike (S)-receptor binding domain (RBD) IgG concentration was 33 assessed three to seven weeks after complete vaccination. Reactogenicity was evaluated by 34 declared side events and medical assistance required until day 7 post-boost. 35 **Results:** Of 190 participants enrolled, 105 received homologous SpV/SpV and the remaining 36 heterologous SpV/Mod vaccination scheme, respectively. Median (interguartile range, IQR) age 37 was 54 (37-63) years, 132 (69.5%) were female and 46 (24.2%) individuals had a prior confirmed 38 COVID-19. Anti-S-RBD IgG median (IQR) titers were significantly higher for SpV/Mod [2511 39 (1476-3992) BAU/mL] than for SpV/SpV [582 (209-1609) BAU/mL, p<0.001] vaccination scheme. 40 In a linear model adjusted for age, gender, time to the serological assay and time between doses, 41 SpV/Mod [4.154 (6.585-615.554), p<0.001] and prior COVID [3.732 (8.641-202.010), p<0.001] 42 were independently associated with higher anti-S-RBD IgG values. A higher frequency of mild-43 moderate adverse effects was associated with the heterologous scheme, although it was well 44 tolerated by all individuals and no medical assistance was required.

45 Conclusion: The heterologous SpV/Mod combination against SARS-CoV-2 is well tolerated and
46 significantly increases humoral immune response as compared to the homologous SpV/SpV
47 immunization.

48

49 Key Words: SARS-CoV-2; Vaccine; Heterologous scheme; Gam-COVID-Vac; mRNA-1273

### 50 INTRODUCTION

51 Vaccination is the best strategy to limit the pandemic caused by the severe acute respiratory 52 syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). The heterologous vaccination schemes approval 53 represents a valuable alternative to the fluctuating supply of the second doses of certain 54 homologous schemes and reliefs concerns about the side effects of heterologous schemes in 55 people at high risk of serious adverse effect<sup>1,2</sup>. Studies on the heterologous vaccination schemes 56 including the adenovirus vaccine ChAdOx1 (Vaxzevria, AstraZeneca, Oxford, UK) followed by the 57 mRNA vaccines Pfizer (BNT162b2 Comirnaty, BioNTech, Mainz, Germany) or the mRNA-1273 58 (Moderna, Cambridge, MA, USA) have yielded encouraging results. In this sense, robust humoral 59 and cellular immune response, safety, and enhanced neutralizing activity have been proved for these heterologous schemes<sup>3-8</sup>. 60

61 Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) is a Russian recombinant adenovirus-based vaccine (adenovirus 62 26 for prime and adenovirus 5 for boost) that has been approved for emergence use in more than 63 71 countries including Argentina<sup>9</sup>. Sputnik V has proven safety and efficacy (91.6%) in phase 2/3 64 clinical trials and effectiveness after the first (78.6-87.6%) and two components (75.5-100%) 65 administration in real-life studies<sup>10-13</sup>. The Gamaleya Research Centre recommended a 21-day 66 interval between the first and the second dose, but they also stated that it is possible to increase 67 the interval from the earlier approved 21 days to up to three months. Interval extension does not affect the vaccine-induced immune response<sup>14</sup>. 68

In Argentina, the Sputnik V second component delayed supply has led to the implementation
of a heterologous vaccination scheme with the Moderna vaccine. However, there is no information
about the heterologous Sputnik V/Moderna immune response.

Humoral immune response to vaccination represents the most used tool to evaluate vaccine performance; in addition, it has been correlated with protective effects against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>15</sup>. The aim of this study was to determine the immunogenicity and

75 reactogenicity of the Moderna vaccine administered as boost to individuals primed with Sputnik

76 V

### 77 MATERIAL AND METHODS

#### 78 Study design and population

79 In this observational cohort study, all subjects who attended to the Centro de Educación Médica 80 e Investigaciones Clínicas "Norberto Quirno" (CEMIC), Buenos Aires, Argentina, from December 81 2020 to August 2021 were included if i) they had received Sputnik V prime immunization, ii) they 82 had received a boost of either Sputnik V or Moderna within 18 weeks post-prime dose, and iii) 83 they presented to monitor their humoral immune response between 3-7 weeks after the boost 84 dose. Individuals who received Sputnik V as the boost dose represented the homologous 85 (SpV/SpV) group, while those who received the Moderna boost were included in the heterologous 86 (SpV/Mod) group. The vaccination scheme depended on dose availability and the prioritization of 87 risk populations, as established by the Argentine Ministry of Health at the time of boost.

88

### 89 Immunogenicity

90 Binding IgG antibodies against the spike (S) receptor-binding domain (RBD) of SARS-CoV-2 91 (anti-S-RBD) concentration was assessed at 3-7 weeks after boost. Anti-S-RBD antibodies were 92 quantified using the Abbott Diagnostics SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quant chemiluminescent 93 microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) on an Architect i2000 SR and an Alinity I analyzer (Abbott 94 Diagnostics, Abbott Park, Illinois, USA). To standardize the results to WHO binding antibody units 95 (BAU), a correction factor for Abbott arbitrary units (AU) was applied and where 1 BAU/mL=0.142 96 AU, as previously established by Abbott with the WHO international standard NIBSC 20–136<sup>16</sup>. 97 Following the manufacturer recommendations, samples were considered as reactive for anti-S-98 RBD when titers were above 50 AU/mL (7.2 BAU/mL). An 80% protective effect (PROT-80) 99 against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection was assumed when anti-S-RBD titers were ≥506 100 BAU/ml<sup>15</sup>.

101

102 Reactogenicity

All participants were invited to complete an online questionnaire to report all possible postboost vaccination adverse events, medication, and medical assistance required. The intensity of adverse effects was graded as mild, moderate, and severe depending on the interference with daily activities.

107

#### 108 Statistical analysis

109 Descriptive statistics and univariate analyses were performed to compare the study groups. 110 The outcome variable was the anti-S-RBD titer 3-7 weeks after the boost dose. Differences in 111 anti-S-RBD levels and PROT-80 between the SpV/SpV and the SpV/Mod prime-boost schemes 112 were evaluated. Categorical variables were expressed as number (percentage) and analyzed 113 using the Chi-square test or the Fisher's test while the student's t-test and the Mann-Whitney U 114 test were used for comparing continuous variables, which were expressed as median 115 (interguartile range, IQR). Associations between anti-S-RBD levels and the time intervals from 116 prime to boost (ΔP-B) and boost to anti-S-RBD IgG serological determination (ΔB-antiSRBD), as 117 well as the age, were evaluated by means of the Spearman correlation coefficient (p). Those 118 factors potentially associated with the outcome variable, such as age and sex, were evaluated in 119 a generalized linear model. Finally, multivariate logistic regression models were developed to 120 identify factors associated with PROT-80. Statistical analyses were carried out using the SPSS 121 statistical software package release 23.0 (IBM SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

122

### 123 Ethical aspects

The study was designed and performed according to the Helsinki declaration and all blood donors gave their written informed consent (Study protocol EX-2021-06438339- -UBA-DME#SSA\_FFYB, Ethics committee of the Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica, Universidad de Buenos Aires).

#### 128 **RESULTS**

#### 129 Study population

130 From December 2020 to August 2021, 190 subjects were included in the study, 105 in the 131 SpV/SpV group and 85 in the SpV/Mod group. Female participants were 132 (69.5%) and the 132 median (IQR) age was 54 (37-63) years. Overall, median time intervals were 33 (24-97) days for 133  $\Delta P$ -B and 23 (21-32) days for  $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD, respectively. Forty-six (24.2%) individuals had a 134 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to vaccination, with a median (IQR) time of 21 (7.3-27) 135 weeks between infection and prime dose as available data from 44 persons. Thus, 144 (75.8%) 136 were naïve to SARS-CoV-2 infection at vaccination time. Table 1 shows epidemiological and 137 vaccination-specific characteristics according to the vaccination group.

138

#### 139 Immunogenicity

140 Anti-S-RBD IgG was reactive in all 190 (100%) samples. In the overall population, median 141 (IQR) anti-S-RBD titers were 582 (209-1609) BAU/mL in individuals who received the SpV/SpV 142 scheme, and 2511 (1476-3992) BAU/mL in the SpV/Mod group, p<0.001. Among women, anti-S-143 RBD was 1377 (347-2639) BAU/mL as compared to 1343 (503-3513) BAU/mL in men (p=0.438). 144 In the bivariate correlation analyses among those who received the SpV/SpV or the SpV/Mod 145 vaccination scheme, there was no significant association between anti-S-RBD levels and ΔP-B 146  $[\rho=0.033 \ (p=0.739) \text{ and } -0.154 \ (p=0.160)], \Delta B-antiSRBD \ [\rho=-0.128 \ (p=0.192) \text{ and } -0.003$ 147 (p=0.981)] or age [p=-0.128 (p=0.192) and -0.003 (p=0.981)], respectively. Anti-S-RBD levels 148 according to epidemiological and vaccination-specific parameters for the homologous and 149 heterologous schemes are shown in Table 2.

In participants of the SpV/Mod group who had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to vaccination, the humoral response as measured by anti-S-RBD levels was 1.7-fold higher than that observed in the non-infected ones. Likewise, within the SpV/SpV group, a confirmed previous SARS-CoV-2 infection resulted in 8-fold higher anti-S-RBD levels as compared to participants

without prior infection (Table 2). Anti-S-RBD (IQR) levels were 2375 (722-4057) BAU/mL in
subjects with a time difference between SARS-CoV-2 infection to prime dose above the median
(21 weeks) as compared to 2618 (1712-4027) BAU/mL in patients who had suffered infection less
than 21 weeks prior to prime vaccination (p=0.372). Achievement of PROT-80 were 20 (91%)
versus 22 (100%), p=0.488, respectively.

159 Figure 1 shows the comparison of anti-S-RBD levels observed in SpV/SpV and SpV/Mod 160 groups according to whether the participants had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to 161 vaccination or not. The SpV/Mod vaccination scheme [B:2200; 95% confidence interval (CI):568-162 3832; p=0.009], as well as prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (B:1603; 95CI:1154-2051; p<0.001), were 163 independently associated with anti-S-RBD levels in a generalized linear model adjusted for age 164 (B:-1082; 95%CI:-17255-15089; p=0.895), gender (B:109076; 95%CI:-301717-519870), ΔP-B 165 (B:-14323; 95%Cl:-42977-14331; p=0.325) and ΔB-antiSRBD (B:-32095; 95%Cl:-71911-7720; 166 p=0.113).

167 The PROT-80 overall rate was 73.2%, as reached by 139 participants: 57 (54.3%) of the SpV/SpV 168 group and 82 (96.5%) of the SpV/Mod group, p<0.001. The PROT-80 rates according to age, sex, 169 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection,  $\Delta$ P-B, and  $\Delta$ B-antiSRBD are displayed in Table 3. Multivariate 170 analyses identified the SpV/Mod scheme and a previous infection with SARS-CoV-2 as 171 independent predictors to reach PROT-80 (Table 3).

172

#### 173 Reactogenicity

The analysis of the reactogenicity was evaluated in both groups during seven days after the boost. The homologous and heterologous immunization schemes were well tolerated, and no medical assistance or potentially life-threating events were reported. Adverse events, including local and systemic symptoms, were more frequent in the SpV/Mod group (72.9%) than in the SpV/SpV group (55.2%), p=0.012. Overall, the most frequent systemic adverse events were myalgia (26.8%), fever (21.6%), fatigue (19.5%), and headache (16.8%). The heterologous

- 180 vaccine scheme induced significantly more systemic adverse effects than the homologous one
- 181 (64.7% vs 36.2%, p<0.001). Table 4 shows the presence and intensity of systemic adverse effects
- 182 by vaccination scheme. Regarding local adverse events, pain at the injection site was frequently
- 183 reported (20.0%) and it was significantly more frequent for the homologous scheme than for the
- heterologous one (28.0% vs 11.8%, p=0.011). Figure 2 shows the reactogenicity by adverse effect
- 185 (local and systemic) according to the vaccination scheme.

#### 186 **DISCUSSION**

The present work shows that, in a real-life setting, the incorporation of heterologous primeboost vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 could be a valuable strategy in response to deficiencies in doses supply or the presence of serious adverse effects in the prime dose. Overall, the heterologous scheme showed significantly higher titers of anti-S-RBD IgG. Moreover, both vaccination schemes were well tolerated, and no medical assistance was required.

192 All the study participants presented anti-S-RBD IgG seroconversion after the complete 193 immunization with both boosts. These results were expected for the Sputnik V complete 194 scheme<sup>13,17</sup> and validated the immunogenicity achieved with the Moderna boost. Importantly, a 195 higher antibody titer was achieved with the heterologous scheme. Although a better humoral 196 response has been already described for mRNA vaccines as compared to adenovirus-197 based<sup>3,4,7,8,18</sup>, there is still no data validating this assumption for the SpV/Mod combination. Our 198 results support the use of the Moderna vaccine as an alternative to the homologous Sputnik V 199 scheme in general. Also, this would be of special interest during a supply shortage. Further cellular 200 studies are justified since the combination of vaccines appears to complement the characteristic 201 immune response triggered by each vaccine platform<sup>7,19</sup>. In this way, the SpV/Mod combination 202 could especially benefit certain risk groups through the development of a more robust and long-203 lasting immune response against SARS-CoV-2.

204

Although the threshold to confer protection against SARS-CoV-2 after COVID-19 vaccination depends on several factors, a randomized trial on the ChAdOx1 vaccine efficacy provides robust data to deduct the antibody levels associated with protection against SARS-CoV-2. In this trial, Feng et al identified 506 BAU/ml as the cut-off level for binding anti-S-RBD antibodies to provide a vaccine efficacy of 80% against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>15</sup>. According to this threshold, in the present study, almost 100% of the SpV/Mod group had a vaccine efficacy of 80% while only 54% of the SpV/SpV group achieved such protection. Moreover, in the multivariate

analysis, the vaccine efficacy of 80% was not associated with age, gender,  $\Delta P$ -B, and  $\Delta B$ antiSRBD. All this is in accordance with previous studies on homologous regimens that, when compared, suggest that Sputnik V is moderately less effective than Moderna vaccine in preventing symptomatic COVID-19<sup>13,18,20</sup>.

216

217 In the present study, no significant gender-specific differences in anti-S-RBD IgG titers were 218 observed. This result is in line with other studies where gender seems not to influence antibody 219 development against Sputnik V and Moderna vaccines<sup>10,17,21,22</sup>. In contrast, other studies have 220 reported higher antibody levels in women<sup>23-24</sup>, reflecting the need for further research in this field. 221 Likewise, contradictory results have been published related to the age of the vaccinees. While 222 some studies have reported higher antibody titers in young people<sup>24-26</sup>, Wheeler and colleagues 223 did not find an antibody response-age dependency after the second dose of the Moderna 224 vaccine<sup>22</sup>. In another study carried out in Argentina, involving a population with a mean age of 45 225 years, Rovere et al. also failed to detect an age-response correlation for the Sputnik V scheme<sup>17</sup>. 226 In accordance with the latter findings, we did not observed differences in the anti-S-RBD IgG titers 227 related to participants' age.

228

229 As expected, a significant correlation was found between higher anti-S-RBD IgG titers and a 230 confirmed prior infection with SARS-CoV-2 for both schemes. However, the impact of time 231 between infection and prime dose did not reach statistical significance. This finding is in line with 232 previous studies reporting an increased anti-S-RBD IgG response in subjects previously infected 233 with SARS-CoV-2<sup>10,17,27</sup>. Importantly, in the present setting, the difference between schemes was 234 more evident for the naïve individuals, reaching 8-fold higher anti-S-RBD IgG titers for the 235 heterologous scheme with respect to the homologous one. It can thus be concluded that 236 especially those without prior infection would benefit from a switch in the boost component.

237

238 Regarding reactogenicity, adverse events including local and systemic symptoms in participants who received SpV/Mod vaccination was slightly higher than for SpV/SpV, confirming 239 240 previously reported findings<sup>13,21</sup>. Importantly, these findings are derived mainly from participants 241 of a clinical trial and there is very little data on SpV/SpV reactogenicity under real-life conditions. 242 The present work therefore provides important contribution to the understanding of vaccination in 243 the clinical practice. In contrast, the higher rate of adverse events in the SpV/Mod scheme was 244 expected since it is well established that stronger side effects are associated with mRNA 245 platforms<sup>20,28,29</sup>. However, it is important to note that very similar severe adverse events were 246 observed (10% SpV/Mod vs 10.5% SpV/SpV) and no major effects requiring medical assistance 247 were reported in any of the schemes. Moreover, it should be considered that, since most serious 248 adverse effects have been reported in a very low frequency, even when no participant required 249 medical assistance, the small size of our sample could have influenced on this aspect<sup>30</sup>.

250

251 This study has some limitations. First, due to the observational, real-world design of our study, 252 the vaccination scheme distribution was not randomized and depended on the risk priorities 253 established by the Ministry of Health. Due to the limited availability of doses, the SpV/SpV group 254 was mostly formed by active healthcare-workers who were at highest priority for vaccination at 255 the time and benefited from the last available Sputnik V boost doses. In contrast, the SpV/Mod 256 scheme was mostly applied to individuals older than 60 years old who were at intermediate 257 priority. Apart from age distribution, the limited supply of the second component of Sputnik V led 258 to almost 4-fold differences in the median interval between prime and boost immunization, since 259 the Moderna vaccine was also not immediately available once the shortage of Sputnik V was 260 evident. However, there was no correlation between age or the time intervals used in this study 261 and the anti-S-RBD levels. As a result, when the samples were stratified according to age,  $\Delta P$ -B, 262 and AB-antiSRBD, no significant differences of the antibody titers were observed between 263 different levels of categorization within each vaccine scheme group, while the significant

difference in anti-S-RBD between the two vaccine scheme groups was maintained. Therefore, both populations can be regarded as comparable and an impact of differences in age and time intervals on the analyses is very unlikely in the present setting. Second, due to the lack of availability in Argentina, a homologous Moderna vaccination control group could not be included to determine whether the elevated anti-S-RBD levels were due to an additive or a synergistic effect of the two vaccines. However, data from other studies on Mod/Mod suggest a strong immune response to anti-S-RBD<sup>22</sup>. Still, future studies are warranted to clarify this issue.

271

In conclusion, the heterologous immunization with SpV/Mod is not only immunogenic and well tolerated but also induces a stronger humoral response than the homologous Sputnik V scheme. Further studies such as, the neutralization plaque assay against the current and emerging variants of SARS-CoV-2, are needed to investigate the efficacy of SpV/Mod vaccinations in the local realities of each population.

## 277 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

278 Matías J. Pereson, Patricia Bare, María Noel Badano and Federico A. Di Lello are members of 279 the National Research Council (CONICET) Research Career Program. Karin Neukam is the 280 recipient of a Miguel Servet contract by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III (grant number 281 CPII18/00033). We would like to thank to Mrs. Silvina Heisecke, from CEMIC-CONICET, for the 282 copyediting of the manuscript

- 283
- 284 **Conflict of Interest:** the authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.
- 285
- 286 **Funding:** none.
- 287
- 288 Authorship
- 289 Matías J. PERESON and Karin NEUKAM: Analysis and interpretation of data, Drafting the article.
- 290 Final approval of the version to be submitted.
- 291 Lucas AMAYA: Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data. Final approval of the version to
- be submitted.
- 293 Patricia BARE, Natalia ECHEGOYEN, María Noel BADANO, Alicia LUCERO, Antonella
- 294 MARTELLI: Acquisition of data, Final approval of the version to be submitted.
- 295 Gabriel H. GARCIA, Cristina VIDELA, Alfredo P. MARTÍNEZ: Analysis and interpretation of data,
- 296 Revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, Final approval of the version
- to be submitted.
- Federico A. DI LELLO: Conception and design of the study, Acquisition, Analysis, and interpretation of data, Drafting the article

1. European Medicines Agency. AstraZeneca's COVID-19 vaccine: EMA finds possible link

#### 300 **REFERENCES**

301

- 302 to very rare cases of unusual blood clots with low blood platelets. April 7, 2021. 303 https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-304 possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood (9 February 2022, date last 305 accessed). 306 2. European Medicines Agency. COVID-19 vaccines: update on ongoing evaluation of 307 myocarditis and pericarditis. June 11, 2021. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-308 19-vaccines-update-ongoing-evaluation-myocarditis-pericarditis (9 February 2022, date 309 last accessed). 310 3. Borobia, A. M., Carcas, A. J., Pérez-Olmeda, M., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity and 311 reactogenicity of BNT162b2 booster in ChAdOx1-S-primed participants (CombiVacS): a 312 multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. Lancet (London, England), 313 398(10295), 121-130. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01420-3 314 4. Fabricius, D., Ludwig, C., Scholz, J., et al. (2021). mRNA Vaccines Enhance Neutralizing 315 Immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Variants in Convalescent and ChAdOx1-Primed Subjects. 316 Vaccines, 9 (8), 918. https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9080918 317 5. Hillus, D., Schwarz, T., Tober-Lau, P., et al. (2021). Safety, reactogenicity, and 318 immunogenicity of homologous and heterologous prime-boost immunisation with 319 ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 and BNT162b2: a prospective cohort study. The Lancet. Respiratory medicine, 9(11), 1255–1265. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00357-X 320 321 6. Normark, J., Vikström, L., Gwon, Y. D., et al. (2021). Heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 322 and mRNA-1273 Vaccination. The New England journal of medicine, 385 (11), 1049-
  - 323 1051. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2110716

- 7. Pozzetto, B., Legros, V., Djebali, S., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity and efficacy of
  heterologous ChadOx1/BNT162b2 vaccination. *Nature*, 10.1038/s41586-021-04120-y.
  https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04120-y
- Schmidt, T., Klemis, V., Schub, D., et al. (2021)a. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of
   heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19/mRNA vaccination. *Nature medicine*, *27*(9), 1530–1535.
   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01464-w
- Ministerio de Salud de la República Argentina. Boletín oficial. Resolución 2784/2020.
   <u>https://www.boletinoficial.gob.ar/detalleAviso/primera/239160/20201224</u> (9 February
   2022, date last accessed).
- 10. Claro, F., Silva, D., Rodriguez, M., Rangel, H. R., & de Waard, J. H. (2021).
  Immunoglobulin G antibody response to the Sputnik V vaccine: previous SARS-CoV-2
  seropositive individuals may need just one vaccine dose. *International journal of infectious diseases: IJID: official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*, 111,
- 337 261–266. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.070</u>
- 11. González, S., Olszevicki, S., Salazar, M., et al. (2021). Effectiveness of the first
  component of Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) on reduction of SARS-CoV-2 confirmed
  infections, hospitalisations and mortality in patients aged 60-79: a retrospective cohort
  study in Argentina. *EClinicalMedicine*, 40, 101126.
  https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101126
- 343 12. Vokó, Z., Kiss, Z., Surján, G., et al. (2021). Nationwide effectiveness of five SARS-CoV-2
  344 vaccines in Hungary-the HUN-VE study. *Clinical microbiology and infection: the official*345 *publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*,
  346 S1198-743X(21)00639-X. Advance online publication.
  347 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.011

348	13. Logunov, D. `	Y., Dolzhikova, I. V., Shchebly	yakov, D. V., et al. (2021). Saf	ety and efficacy
349	of an rAd26	and rAd5 vector-based hete	rologous prime-boost COVID	-19 vaccine: an
350	interim analy	sis of a randomised controlle	ed phase 3 trial in Russia. I	Lancet (London,
351	England), 39	<i>7</i> (10275), 671–681. <u>https://doi</u>	i.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)	<u>00234-8</u>
352	14. The	Gamaleya	Research	Centre:
353	https://sputnil	vaccine.com/newsroom/pres	sreleases/the-gamaleya-cente	r-statement-on-
354	increasing-the	e-interval-between-first-and-se	econd-sputnik-v-vaccine-/. (9	February 2022,
355	date last acce	essed).		

- 15. Feng, S., Phillips, D. J., White, T., et al. (2021). Correlates of protection against
  symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature medicine*,
  10.1038/s41591-021-01540-1. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01540-1
- 359 16. Galli C., Daghfal D., and Averhoff, F. (2021). Antibody testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection,
- 360 quantitative determination, response to vaccines and viral variability.
- 361 <u>https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-</u>
- 362 <u>cms/public/60dcbed551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJkaXIiLCJlbmMiOiJBMTI</u>
- 363 <u>4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-</u>
- 364 NzdA.e5mgnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxIzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-
- 365 <u>c47joEl46OgfiQdEoako-TvRl4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcqnkBx9SFQlzw-</u>
- 366 nqvFqHkx\_WlydBAcI4ZA\_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-
- 367 <u>WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGlvM09-oxpfdsY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q</u> (9
- 368 February 2022, date last accessed).
- 369 17. Rovere P., Laurelli A., Diaz A., Dabusti G. and Valdez P. (2021). Seroprevalencia de
   370 anticuerpos Anti S1 SARS-CoV-2 en trabajadores vacunados con SPUTNIK V en un
   371 hospital público de la ciudad de Buenos Aires.

- 372 https://www.medicinabuenosaires.com/revistas/vol81-21/destacado/original\_7593.pdf (9
  373 February 2022, date last accessed).
- 37418. Fiolet, T., Kherabi, Y., MacDonald, C. J., et al. (2021). Comparing COVID-19 vaccines for375their characteristics, efficacy and effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2 and variants of
- 376 concern: A narrative review. *Clinical microbiology and infection: the official publication of*
- 377 the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, S1198-

378 743X(21)00604-2. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.10.005</u>

- 379 19. Schmidt, T., Klemis, V., Schub, D., Schneitler, S., Reichert, M. C., Wilkens, H., Sester, U.,
- 380 Sester, M., & Mihm, J. (2021)b. Cellular immunity predominates over humoral immunity
- 381 after homologous and heterologous mRNA and vector-based COVID-19 vaccine
- 382 regimens in solid organ transplant recipients. American journal of transplantation: official
- 383 journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant
- 384 Surgeons, 10.1111/ajt.16818. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.16818</u>.
- 20. Baden, L. R., El Sahly, H. M., Essink, B., et al. (2021). Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *The New England journal of medicine*, 384(5), 403–416.
  https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2035389
- 388 21. Babamahmoodi, F., Saeedi, M., Alizadeh-Navaei, R., et al. (2021). Side effects and
   389 Immunogenicity following administration of the Sputnik V COVID-19 vaccine in health care
   390 workers in Iran. *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 21464. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-</u>
- <u>391</u> <u>00963-7</u>
- Wheeler, S. E., Shurin, G. V., Yost, M., et al. (2021). Differential Antibody Response to
   mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines in Healthy Subjects. *Microbiology spectrum*, 9 (1), e0034121.
   <a href="https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.00341-21">https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.00341-21</a>
- 395 23. Grzelak, L., Velay, A., Madec, Y., et al. (2021). Sex Differences in the Evolution of
   396 Neutralizing Antibodies to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *The* 397 *Journal of infectious diseases*, 224 (6), 983–988. https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiab127

- 398 24. Kontou, E., Ranellou, K., Zoulas, D., et al. (2021). Antibody Response Following a Two-
- 399 Dose mRNA Vaccination Regimen, in Health Care Workers of a Tertiary Hospital in
- 400 Athens, Greece. *Journal of personalized medicine*, 11 (6), 576. 401 https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm11060576
- 402 25. Steensels, D., Pierlet, N., Penders, J., Mesotten, D., & Heylen, L. (2021). Comparison of
  403 SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Response Following Vaccination With BNT162b2 and mRNA404 1273. JAMA, 326(15), 1533–1535. https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.15125
- 40526. Yang, H. S., Costa, V., Racine-Brzostek, S. E., et al. (2021). Association of Age With406SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Response. JAMA network open, 4 (3), e214302.
- 407 https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.4302
- 27. Ebinger, J. E., Fert-Bober, J., Printsev, I., et al. (2021). Antibody responses to the
  BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine in individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Nature medicine*, 27(6), 981–984. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01325-6</u>
- 411 28. Normark, J., Vikström, L., Gwon, Y. D., et al. (2021). Heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19
- 412 and mRNA-1273 Vaccination. *The New England journal of medicine*, 385(11), 1049–1051.
- 413 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2110716
- 414 29. Powell, A. A., Power, L., Westrop, S., et al. (2021). Real-world data shows increased 415 reactogenicity in adults after heterologous compared to homologous prime-boost COVID-
- 416 19 vaccination, March-June 2021, England. *Euro surveillance: bulletin Europeen sur les*
- 417 *maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin*, 26(28), 2100634.
- 418 https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.28.2100634
- 41930. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021). Selected Adverse Events Reported420afterCOVID-19Vaccination.<a href="https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-">https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-</a>421ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html(9 February 2022, date last accessed).
- 422

## 423 **TABLES**

## 424 Table 1. Population epidemiological characteristics and vaccination-specific parameters

# 425 by vaccination scheme (n=190).

Characteriotia	Homologous	Heterologous		
Charactenstic	SpV/SpV (n=105)	SpV/Mod (n=85)	ρ	
Age* (years)	42 (33-54)	63 (56-66)	<0.001	
Female gender n (%)	80 (76.2)	52 (61.2)	0.025	
Prior confirmed COVID-19 n (%)	36 (34.3)	10 (11.8)	<0.001	
ΔP-B (days)*	25 (21-27)	97 (89-109)	<0.001	
ΔB-antiSRBD (days)*	26 (21-39)	22 (21-26)	0.001	

426 SpV = Sputnik V, Mod = Moderna

427 \*Median (interquartile range)

428 ΔP-B: time from prime to boost; ΔB-antiSRBD: time from boost to anti-S-RBD IgG serological

429 determination

	SpV/SpV				SpV/Mod		
Parameter	n=105 n=			n=85		Pintergroup	
		Anti-S-RBD		n	Anti-S-RBD	Anti-S-RBD	
	n	(BAU/mL)*	<b>P</b> intragroup		(BAU/mL)*	<b>P</b> intragroup	
Age			0.732			0.221	
24-45 years	64	517 (232-1991)		9	3285 (2678-3854)		<0.001
46-60 years	28	629 (135-1145)		25	2830 (1764-4446)		<0.001
>60 years	13	840 (150-1617)		51	1926 (1364-3631)		0.001
Gender			0.510			0.889	
female	80	642 (212-1874)		52	2313 (1514-3982)		<0.001
male	25	511 (173-1221)		33	2830 (1326-3992)		<0.001
Prior SARS-CoV-2			<0.001			0.019	
infection							
yes	36	2258 (901-2722)		10	3853 (2436-3852)		0.008
no	69	278 (121-659)		75	2257 (1391-3615)		<0.001
ΔР-В			0.903			0.750	
3-10 weeks	98	612 (189-1562)		5	2868 (1668-3389)		0.013
11-18 weeks	7	357 (242-2027)		80	2409 (1469-4022)		0.003
ΔB-antiSRBD			0.385			0.228	
2-4 weeks	55	656 (210-1897)		81	2252 (1448-3877)		<0.001
5-7 weeks	50	502 (200-1290)		4	3062 (2598-4522)		<0.001

# 430 Table 2. Anti-S-RBD IgG titer for homologous and heterologous vaccination schemes.

431 SpV = Sputnik V, Mod = Moderna

- 432 *P*-values refer to the comparisons of the titers observed in different categories for each parameter
- 433 within study groups (*p*<sub>intragroup</sub>), as well as for the comparisons of each category between the study
- 434 groups (*p*<sub>intergroup</sub>).
- 435 \*Median (interquartile range); time intervals from prime to boost ( $\Delta P$ -B) and boost to anti-S-RBD
- 436 IgG determination ( $\Delta$ B-antiSRBD).

## 437 Table 3. Univariate and multivariate analyses of potential predictors of the achievement

## 438 of 80% protection against CoVID-19 (PROT-80) (n=190).

Parameter	PROT-80, n (%)			<b>p</b> uv(overall)	Adjusted OR	<b>p</b> <sub>mv</sub>
	SpV/SpV	SpV/Mod	Overall		(95% CI)	
Vaccine scheme						
SpV/SpV			57 (54.3)	<0.001	Ref	<0.001
SpV/Mod	-	-	82 (96.5)		4.154	
					(6.585-	
					615.55)	
Age (years)*						
24-45	35 (54.7)	9 (100)	44 (60.3)	0.003	-0.007	0.993
46-60	15 (53.6)	25 (100)	40 (75.5)		(0.957-1.029)	
>60	7 (53.8)	48 (94.1)	55 (85.9)			
Gender						
Male	13 (52)	31 (9.9)	44 (75.9)	0.577	Ref	0.686
female	44 (55)	51 (98.1)	95 (72.0)		0.436	
					(0.545-4.387)	
Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection						
No	23 (33.3)	72 (96)	95 (66.0)	<0.001	Ref	<0.001
Yes	34 (94.4)	10 (100)	44 (95.7)		3.732	
					(8.641-	
					202.01)	

ΔP-B (weeks)						
11-18	3 (42.9)	77 (96.3)	81 (92.0)	<0.001	Ref	0.754
3-10	54 (55.1)	5 (100)	58 (56.9)		-0.004	
					(0.972-1.021)	
ΔB-antiSRBD (weeks)						
3-4	32 (58.2)	72 (96)	104 (80.0)	0.002	Ref	0.125
5-7	25 (/50)	10 (100)	35 (58.3)		-0.036	
					(0.921-1.01)	

439 SpV: Sputnik V; Mod: Moderna; uv: univariate; mv: multivariate; P: prime; B: boost. *P*-values for

440 age, gender, prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, ΔP-B and ΔB-antiSRBD were 0.955, 0.486, <0.001,

441 0.404 and 0.26 for the SpV/SpV group and 0.355, 0.333, 0.684, 0.832 and 0.684 for the SpV/Mod

442 group, respectively.

443 \*Entered as continuous variable in the multivariate analysis.

Intensity	Homologous	Heterologous	
of adverse event	SpV/SpV (n=105)	SpV/Mod (n=85)	р
No reaction	67 (63.8%)	30 (35.3%)	<0.001
Mild	13 (12.4%)	20 (23.5%)	0.043
Moderate	14 (13.3%)	27 (31.8%)	0.002
Severe	11 (10.5%)	8 (9.4%)	0.807

## 444 Table 4. Presence and intensity of adverse systemic effects by vaccination scheme

445 SpV = Sputnik V, Mod = Moderna

## 446 **FIGURES**

- 447 **Figure 1.** Anti-S-RBD IgG levels for homologous (SpV/SpV) and heterologous (SpV/Mod)
- scheme vaccinated subjects who had (A) or had not (B) a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior
- 449 to vaccination.



450

451 Figure 2. Reactogenicity: frequency of participants' reported local and systemic adverse effects for the SpV/SpV and SpV/Mod





Sputnik-V/Moderna