1 A boost with SARS-CoV-2 BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine elicits strong humoral responses 2 independently of the interval between the first two doses

Alexandra Tauzin^{1,2}, Shang Yu Gong^{1,3}, Mark M. Painter^{4,5,6}, Rishi R. Goel^{4,5}, Debashree
Chatterjee¹, Guillaume Beaudoin-Bussières^{1,2}, Lorie Marchitto^{1,2}, Marianne Boutin^{1,2}, Annemarie
Laumaea^{1,2}, James Okeny⁷, Gabrielle Gendron-Lepage¹, Catherine Bourassa¹, Halima
Medjahed¹, Guillaume Goyette¹, Justine C. Williams⁵, Yuxia Bo⁷, Laurie Gokool¹, Chantal
Morrisseau¹, Pascale Arlotto¹, Renée Bazin⁸, Judith Fafard⁹, Cécile Tremblay^{1,2}, Daniel E.
Kaufmann^{1,10}, Gaston De Serres¹¹, Marceline Côté⁷, Ralf Duerr¹², Valérie Martel-Laferrière^{1,2},

- 9 Allison R. Greenplate^{4,5}, E. John Wherry^{4,5,6} and Andrés Finzi^{1,2,3,13,*}
- 10 ¹Centre de Recherche du CHUM, Montreal, QC, H2X 0A9 Canada
- ²Département de Microbiologie, Infectiologie et Immunologie, Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC, H2X
 0A9, Canada
- 13 ³Department of Microbiology and Immunology, McGill University, Montreal, QC H3A 2B4, Canada
- 14 ⁴Institute for Immunology, University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 15 19104, USA
- 16 ⁵Immune Health[®], University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
- ⁶Department of Systems Pharmacology and Translational Therapeutics, University of Pennsylvania
 Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA
- ¹⁹⁷Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Immunology, and Center for Infection, Immunity, and
- 20 Inflammation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1H 8M5, Canada
- 21 ⁸Héma-Québec, Affaires Médicales et Innovation, Quebec, QC G1V 5C3, Canada
- 22 ⁹Laboratoire de Santé Publique du Québec, Institut national de santé publique du Québec, Sainte-Anne-
- 23 de-Bellevue, QC H9X 3R5, Canada
- 24 ¹⁰Département de Médecine, Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada
- 25 ¹¹Institut National de Santé Publique du Québec, Quebec, QC H2P 1E2, Canada
- 26 ¹²Department of Microbiology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, 10016, USA
- 27 28
- ¹³Lead contact
- 30 *Correspondence: andres.finzi@umontreal.ca (A.F.)
- 31 32

33 SUMMARY

34 Due to the recrudescence of SARS-CoV-2 infections worldwide, mainly caused by Omicron BA.1 35 and BA.2 variants of concern, several jurisdictions are administering a mRNA vaccine boost. 36 Here, we analyzed humoral responses induced after the second and third doses of mRNA vaccine 37 in naïve and previously-infected donors who received their second dose with an extended 16-38 week interval. We observed that the extended interval elicited robust humoral responses against 39 VOCs, but this response was significantly diminished 4 months after the second dose. 40 Administering a boost to these individuals brought back the humoral responses to the same levels 41 obtained after the extended second dose. Interestingly, we observed that administering a boost 42 to individuals that initially received a short 3-4 weeks regimen elicited humoral responses similar 43 to those elicited in the long interval regimen. Nevertheless, humoral responses elicited by the 44 boost in naïve individuals did not reach those present in previously-infected vaccinated 45 individuals.

Keywords: Coronavirus, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Spike glycoproteins, Long interval, Third
mRNA vaccine dose, Humoral responses, Variants of concern

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Two years after the coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) was declared pandemic by the 50 WHO, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) continues to circulate 51 worldwide and has evolved in several variants. The variants of concern (VOCs), defined as 52 variants with increased transmissibility, virulence and/or against which vaccines and monoclonal antibody treatments are less effective (WHO, 2022a), are now the main source of concern about 53 54 the evolving pandemic. Currently, the Delta and Omicron variants are the main circulating VOCs. 55 The Delta (B.1.617.2) variant was declared as a VOC on May 2021 and the Omicron (B.1.1.529) 56 variant in November 2021 (Choi and Smith, 2021; WHO, 2022a). Delta became the dominant 57 strain in the summer/autumn of 2021. Omicron is divided into several sub-lineages: BA.1 (the 58 main, named Omicron hereafter), BA.1.1, BA.2 and BA.3 (Kumar et al., 2022; Viana et al., 2022). 59 Due to its relatively high number of mutations, notably in the Spike (S) glycoprotein, Omicron is 60 more resistant to humoral responses elicited by vaccination or natural infection. This phenotype, 61 in combination with a higher transmissibility rate compared to Delta, likely explains why it became 62 the dominant strain worldwide by January 2022 (Chen et al., 2022; Dhar et al., 2021).

63 Vaccination campaigns began over a year ago and, in several parts of the world, public health authorities are administering a third dose of vaccine (boost). Vaccine scarcity at the 64 65 beginning of the vaccination campaign led some public health authorities to increase the interval 66 between the first two doses, notably in the province of Quebec, Canada, where this interval was 67 delayed to 16 weeks instead of 3-4 weeks. Several studies have now shown that this strategy 68 leads to improved humoral, T and B cell responses after the second dose in comparison to the 69 short vaccine regimen, in particular against VOCs including Delta and Omicron variants 70 (Chatterjee et al., 2021; Nayrac et al., 2021; Payne et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2022a).

A vaccine boost is now recommended in several jurisdictions worldwide in response to the Omicron wave (Ferdinands, 2022). Recent studies have shown that this boost, following the 3-4

- 73 weeks dose interval regimen, strongly improves humoral responses against VOCs, for which poor
- responses were observed after the second dose (Doria-Rose et al., 2021; Gruell et al., 2022;
- 75 Nemet et al., 2022; Schmidt et al., 2022). Here, we analyzed humoral responses elicited after the
- 76 second and the third dose of mRNA vaccine in a cohort of SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously
- infected donors who received their first two doses of Pfizer BioNTech mRNA vaccine with a 16-
- 78 weeks interval and compared to individuals receiving a short interval.

80 RESULTS

81 We analyzed humoral responses induced after the second and the third doses of 82 BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine in a cohort of donors who received their first two doses with an 83 extended interval of 16 weeks (median [range]: 111 days [76–134 days]). These donors received 84 their third dose around seven months after the second dose (median [range]: 219 days [167-235 days]). The cohort included 20 SARS-CoV-2 naïve and 11 previously infected (PI) individuals who 85 86 tested SARS-CoV-2 positive by nasopharyngeal swab PCR around 10 months before their first 87 dose (median [range]: 300 days [247-321 days]). Blood samples were analyzed three weeks (V3, 88 median [range]: 21 days [13-42 days]) and four months (V4, median [range]: 112 days [90-156 days]) after the second dose and four weeks (V5, median [range]: 27 days [19-38 days]) after the 89 90 third dose of mRNA vaccine. Basic demographic characteristics of the cohorts and detailed 91 vaccination time points are summarized in Table 1 and Figure 1A.

92

93 Anti-RBD IgG levels of vaccine-elicited antibodies

94 We first measured the level of anti-receptor-binding domain (RBD) IgG induced after the 95 second and the third doses of mRNA vaccine by ELISA assay (Anand et al., 2021; Beaudoin-96 Bussières et al., 2020; Prévost et al., 2020; Tauzin et al., 2021). Three weeks after the second 97 dose of mRNA vaccine (V3), both naïve and PI individuals presented high levels of anti-RBD IgG 98 (Figure 1B). Four months after the second dose (V4), the level of antibodies (Abs) decreased for 99 both groups reaching significantly lower levels for naïve individuals, in agreement with previous 100 observations (Tauzin et al., 2022a). The third dose (V5) led to an increase of anti-RBD IgG level, 101 similar in both groups, that reached the same levels than after the second dose (V3) (Figure 1B).

102

103

105 Recognition of SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants by plasma from vaccinated individuals

106 We evaluated the ability of plasma IgG to recognize SARS-CoV-2 full-length S variants 107 after the second and the third dose of vaccine (Figure 1 C-G). After the second dose, plasma from 108 naïve donors recognized the D614G S less efficiently than plasma from PI individuals (Figure 1C). 109 Four months after the second dose (V4), we observed a decreased recognition for both groups, 110 but more pronounced in the naïve group. The third dose (V5) increased D614G S recognition by 111 the naïve group, reaching levels similar to those achieved after the second dose (V3) (Figure 1C). 112 However, even after the boost, the level of recognition in naïve donors did not reach the same 113 level as in the PI group.

114 The original Wuhan strain was used to develop mRNA SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. Numerous 115 mutations, particularly in the S glycoprotein, reduced the ability of vaccine-induced Abs to 116 recognize currently circulating strains. We tested the S recognition of several VOCs in circulation 117 after mRNA vaccination (Figure 1D-G, S2C-E). For all the VOCs S tested, a similar pattern of 118 response than for D614G S was observed. Except for Omicron and BA.1.1 S at V5, plasma from 119 PI donors more efficiently recognized S variants than naïve donors at all time points. Again, 120 booster-elicited antibodies able to recognize the different S glycoproteins reached levels similar 121 as those obtained after the second dose (Figure 1D-G). Comparable responses were observed 122 when we measured the capacity of plasma to recognize the S2 subunit (Figure S1A).

We also evaluated whether the booster impacted the capacity of plasma to recognize the S glycoprotein of the endemic HKU1 human *Betacoronaviruses* (Figure S1B). We did not observe major changes in recognition after the second and third doses. However, for all time points plasma from PI donors always recognized better the HCoV-HKU1 S than the naïve group. This suggests that natural infection elicits more cross-reactive antibodies.

- 128
- 129
- 130

131 Functional activities of vaccine-elicited antibodies

We evaluated functional activities of vaccine-elicited Abs after the second and third doses 132 133 (Figure 2). We measured Fc-effector functions using a well-described antibody-dependent cellular 134 cytotoxicity (ADCC) assay (Anand et al., 2021; Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2020, 2021; Ullah et 135 al., 2021). Plasma from PI individuals presented significantly higher ADCC activity after the 136 second dose (V3 and V4) with naïve individuals reaching similar levels after the third dose (V5) 137 (Figure 2A). We noted that while ADCC remained relatively stable over time for PI individuals, it 138 significantly decreased 4 months after the second dose for naïve individuals (V4). A similar pattern 139 of responses was observed for the neutralizing activity against pseudoviruses carrying the D614G 140 S (Figure 2B). At the three time points, the neutralizing activity was better in the PI group 141 compared to naïve group. The level of neutralizing Abs remained stable in PI individuals whereas 142 it significantly decreased in naïve donors at V4 but was significantly increased by the boost.

When looking at the neutralizing activity against VOCs, we observed that plasma from PI group more efficiently neutralized all pseudoviruses than the naïve group after the second dose (Figure 2C-D, S2). Interestingly, this difference disappeared after the boost (V5) (Figure S2).

146

147 Integrated analysis of vaccine responses elicited by the second and third doses

148 We evaluated the network of pairwise correlations among all studied immune variables on 149 11 randomly selected naïve donors and the 11 PI individuals. For SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals 150 (Figure 3A), we observed a dense network of positive correlations after the second dose (V3) 151 involving all immune variables tested, except for HCoV-HKU1 S binding. Four months after the 152 second dose, this network became less dense, and the third dose did not substantially alter the 153 network of correlations except for improved correlations of neutralization responses against 154 Omicron and BA.1.1 with other anti-SARS-CoV-2 immune responses. Interestingly, in PI 155 individuals, the integrated network was less dense after the second dose compared to naïve 156 donors (Figure 3B), suggesting a less focused immune response possibly due to the

157 heterogenous immune stimulations by natural infection and vaccination. Whereas the network 158 became slightly denser among the S binding responses four months after the second dose, it 159 remained sparsely connected overall without major changes after the third dose of the mRNA 160 vaccine.

161

162 Evolution of anti-RBD avidity induced after a short or a long interval between mRNA 163 vaccine doses.

164 We and others previously described that an extended interval between the first two doses 165 of mRNA vaccine led to better humoral and cellular responses than the 3-4 weeks standard 166 regimen, especially against VOCs (Nayrac et al., 2021; Payne et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2022a). 167 However, whether the humoral advantages observed with the long interval persist after the boost 168 remains unclear. To address this important question, we measured longitudinally the level of anti-169 RBD IgG in cohorts of naïve and PI individuals that received their first two doses with the standard 170 (short interval, SI) or the extended regimen (long interval, LI). Basic demographic characteristics 171 of the cohorts and detailed vaccination time points are summarized in Table 2 and Figure 4A. 172 Collection time points did not perfectly match between the two cohorts rendering perilous a side-173 by-side comparison using assays that only measure antibody quantities rather than their quality. 174 We therefore decided to measure the avidity for the RBD of the induced IgG by a previously 175 described assay (Björkman et al., 1999; Fialová et al., 2017; Tauzin et al., 2022b). This assay 176 consists of parallel ELISAs with washing buffer having or not a chaotropic agent (8M urea). The 177 RBD-avidity index therefore becomes a surrogate of antibody maturation since only Abs with the 178 highest avidity remain attached to the RBD after 8M urea washing (Figure S3).

Anti-RBD antibodies reached their peak level faster with the SI compared to the LI in naïve individuals (Figure 4B). While antibody levels rapidly decreased after the second dose in the SI regimen, the decay in the LI group was slower. In both groups, a booster elicited the highest levels

182 of antibodies. Consistent with the proposed use of the RBD-avidity index as a surrogate for 183 antibody maturation, the kinetics differed from those of the regular ELISA that only measure total 184 levels of anti-RBD Abs. For example, 12 weeks after the first dose in the LI regimen, there was a 185 significant decline in anti-RBD IgG levels but the affinity of anti-RBD Abs likely improved as shown 186 by an increase in their avidity (Figure 4B and D), consistent with recent results (Tauzin et al., 187 2022b). We previously reported that several humoral responses, including RBD-avidity was lower 188 in individuals receiving a SI (Tauzin et al., CHM 2022). However, whether this difference remained 189 after the boost was unknown. Here we report that the boost brought the RBD-avidity index to the 190 same level, independent of the vaccine regimen, suggesting that the boost is required to further 191 improve antibody responses in naïve individuals that received the SI regimen (Figure 4D).

192 For the PI groups, the SI and LI led rapidly to high levels of IgG (Figure 4C). These levels 193 slightly decreased over time, however they remained more stable in the LI group, likely due to the 194 delayed dose. After the boost, we observed similar levels of IgG in both groups. Regarding the 195 avidity, the SI rapidly led to IgG with strong avidity which remained stable over time with only a 196 minor effect induced by the boost (Figure 4E). For the LI group, the first dose increased the avidity, 197 but to a lower extend than in the SI group. The second dose boosted the avidity to the same level 198 than in the SI group. As observed in the SI group, the boost did not improve the avidity, indicating 199 that individuals that developed hybrid immunity due to natural infection already had a higher 200 antibody avidity than naïve vaccinated individuals.

202 **DISCUSSION**

203 Currently, a large part of the world population has received two or three doses of SARS-204 CoV-2 mRNA vaccines (WHO, 2022b). These vaccines were based on the ancestral Wuhan 205 strain. One of the major challenges of the pandemic is the frequent emergence of variants that 206 are more resistant to vaccine-elicited humoral responses, thus fueling new waves. In this study, 207 we found that individuals who received their first two doses of mRNA vaccine with a 16-week 208 extended interval had strong humoral responses against VOCs induced after the second dose. 209 These responses significantly decreased 4 months later but came back to peak levels after the 210 boost.

211 Many studies have shown that an extended interval between doses elicits humoral 212 responses that outperform those elicited by a short interval in SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals. 213 Accordingly, we observed a network of correlation less dense after the second dose in individuals 214 vaccinated with a SI in comparison to a LI (Figure 3A and S4). However, the third dose of mRNA 215 vaccine, administered several months after the second dose in the SI regimen, strongly improved 216 the humoral responses against VOCs (Figure S5), and the network of correlations became 217 denser, as observed after the LI regimen (Figure 3A and S4), emphasising the importance of 218 administering the boost.

219 Antibody maturation is a complex process that takes place in the germinal center (Young 220 and Brink, 2021). This process is important for vaccine efficacy since it allows the immune system 221 to generate antibodies with greater potency for viral neutralization and Fc-effector functions. We 222 recently developed a high-throughput assay that could be used as a surrogate for antibody 223 maturation (Tauzin et al., 2022b). Using this assay, we observed that the avidity of anti-RBD Abs 224 was significantly higher in the LI after the second dose compared to the SI, suggesting that 225 increasing the time between exposure to the antigen led to a better maturation of the B cells and 226 so to Abs with higher avidity (Tauzin et al., 2022a). Here we report that a boost allows the SI

group to elicit Abs with the same avidity as in the LI group. Since the RBD is highly immunogenic, it is possible that humoral responses against this domain compromise responses against less immunogenic domains of the Spike. Thus, in future studies it would be interesting to measure the evolution of the avidity against other Spike domains.

231 Vaccinated PI individuals presented a better avidity than naïve individuals at all time 232 points. These results are consistent with previous observations indicating that hybrid immunity 233 led to broad and stronger humoral responses, but the mechanisms remain unclear (Andreano et 234 al., 2021; Crotty, 2021; Goel et al., 2021). In correlation networks after the second and third doses 235 of mRNA vaccine, we observed strikingly different profiles of correlations in naïve compared to PI 236 donors suggesting that infection primes the immune system in a different way than vaccination 237 does. Whether this is linked to the immune stimulation with all components of the entire virus or 238 the transmission mode of SARS-CoV-2 which infects host by the mucosa, therefore activating 239 resident immune cells, remains poorly understood.

240 While vaccination confers good protection against severe COVID-19, it is less efficient 241 against viral transmission. Thus, breakthrough infection in vaccinated individuals appears 242 frequently. It was recently shown that breakthrough infection in vaccinated individuals induced 243 strong neutralizing Abs efficient against VOCs, including Omicron (Miyamoto et al., 2022). 244 Interestingly, a LI between vaccination and breakthrough infection also induced better humoral 245 responses against VOCs than a SI, as observed for vaccination. It is possible that breakthrough 246 infection in fully vaccinated individuals led to hybrid immunity with humoral responses as strong 247 as those observed in infected-then-vaccinated individuals. Moreover, it will be interesting to see 248 the impact of breakthrough infection on the avidity of the Abs.

The third dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine led to high levels of humoral responses against VOCs, irrespective of the interval between the two first doses. We do not yet know about the durability of this immunity but epidemiological studies have shown a decline in vaccine

252 effectiveness against Omicron within a few months of the third dose (Andrews et al., 2022). We 253 observed a rapid decrease of Ab levels after the first and second dose with both intervals and to 254 a greater extent in SARS-CoV-2 naïve donors. However, it is possible that while humoral 255 responses rapidly decreased after vaccination, cellular responses remain stable. Monitoring the 256 evolution of humoral and cellular responses after the third dose of vaccine, and in particular in the numerous individuals who had Omicron or BA.2 breakthrough infection after their third dose, will 257 258 be necessary to determine the need for additional boosts, the best interval time between dose 259 injections, and the populations to be targeted (general population or only population at risk).

260

262 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

263 The authors are grateful to the donors who participated in this study. The authors thank 264 the CRCHUM BSL3 and Flow Cytometry Platforms for technical assistance. We thank Dr. Stefan 265 Pöhlmann (Georg-August University, Germany) for the plasmid coding for SARS-CoV-2 S 266 glycoproteins and Dr. M. Gordon Joyce (U.S. MHRP) for the monoclonal antibody CR3022. This 267 work was supported by le Ministère de l'Économie et de l'Innovation du Québec, Programme de 268 soutien aux organismes de recherche et d'innovation to A.F. and by the Fondation du CHUM. 269 This work was also supported by a CIHR foundation grant #352417, by a CIHR operating 270 Pandemic and Health Emergencies Research grant #177958, a CIHR stream 1 and 2 for SARS-271 CoV-2 Variant Research to A.F., and by an Exceptional Fund COVID-19 from the Canada 272 Foundation for Innovation (CFI) #41027 to A.F. and D.E.K. Work on variants presented was also 273 supported by the Sentinelle COVID Quebec network led by the LSPQ in collaboration with Fonds 274 de Recherche du Québec Santé (FRQS) to A.F. This work was also partially supported by a CIHR 275 COVID-19 rapid response grant (OV3 170632) and CIHR stream 1 SARS-CoV-2 Variant 276 Research to M.C. A.F. is the recipient of Canada Research Chair on Retroviral Entry no. 277 RCHS0235 950-232424. M.C is a Tier II Canada Research Chair in Molecular Virology and 278 Antiviral Therapeutics. V.M.L. is supported by a FRQS Junior 1 salary award. D.E.K is a FRQS 279 Merit Research Scholar. G.B.B. is the recipient of an FRQS PhD fellowship. A.L. was supported 280 by MITACS Accélération postdoctoral fellowships. This work was also supported by NIH grants 281 Al108545, Al155577, Al149680, and U19Al082630 (to E.J.W.), the University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine COVID Fund (to R.R.G. and E.J.W.); the University of Pennsylvania 282 283 Perelman School of Medicine 21st Century Scholar Fund (to R.R.G.): and the Paul and Daisy 284 Soros Fellowship for New Americans (to R.R.G). The funders had no role in study design, data 285 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. We declare no 286 competing interests.

287

288 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

- 289 A.T. and A.F. conceived the study. A.T., S.Y.G., D.C., G.B.B., L.M., M.B., A.L., C.B., 290 G.G.L, Y.B., and A.F. performed, analyzed, and interpreted the experiments. A.T. and R.D. 291 performed statistical analysis. S.Y.G., M.M.P., R.R.G, G.B.B., A.L., J.O., G.G.L., H.M., G.G., Y.B., 292 M.C, A.R.G., E.J.W. and A.F. contributed unique reagents. J.C.W., L.G., C.M., P.A., C.T., D.E.K., 293 and V.M.-L. collected and provided clinical samples. G.D.S., J.F., D.E.K., E.J.W., and R.B. 294 provided scientific input related to VOC and vaccine efficacy. A.T. and A.F. wrote the manuscript 295 with inputs from others. Every author has read, edited, and approved the final manuscript. 296 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS** 297
- A.R.G. is a consultant for Relation Therapeutics. E.J.W. is consulting for or is an advisor for Merck,
- 299 Marengo, Janssen, Related Sciences, Synthekine, and Surface Oncology. E.J.W. is a founder of
- 300 Surface Oncology, Danger Bio, and Arsenal Biosciences.

302 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. RBD-specific IgG and recognition of SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants by vaccine elicited antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously-infected individuals after the
 second and the third dose of mRNA vaccine.

306 (A) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine cohort design. The vellow box represents the period under study. (B) 307 Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve and PI donors collected 308 at V3, V4 and V5 with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected 309 using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit (RLU) values obtained with BSA 310 (negative control) were subtracted and further normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD 311 CR3022 mAb present in each plate. (C-G) 293T cells were transfected with the indicated full-312 length S from different SARS-CoV-2 variants S and stained with the CV3-25 Ab or with plasma 313 from naïve or PI donors collected at V3, V4 and V5 and analyzed by flow cytometry. The values 314 represent the median fluorescence intensities (MFI) normalized by CV3-25 Ab binding. (B-G) 315 (Left panels) Each curve represents the values obtained with the plasma of one donor at every 316 time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. (Right panels) Plasma samples 317 were grouped in different time points (V3, V4 and V5). Naïve and PI donors are represented by 318 red and black points respectively. Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and 319 limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 320 0.001; **** p < 0.0001; ns, non-significant). For naïve donors, n (number of individuals) = 20 and 321 for previously infected donors n=11.

322

323

Figure 2. Fc-effector functions and neutralization activities induced by mRNA vaccination in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously-infected individuals.

327 (A) CEM.NKr parental cells were mixed at a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr-Spike cells and were used 328 as target cells. PBMCs from uninfected donors were used as effector cells in a FACS-based 329 ADCC assay. (B-E) Neutralizing activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing 330 SARS-CoV-2 S glycoproteins, with serial dilutions of plasma for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-331 ACE2 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID₅₀) values were determined 332 using a normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. (A-B) (Left panels) 333 Each curve represents the values obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. 334 Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. (**Right panels**) Plasma samples were grouped 335 in different time points (V3, V4 and V5). (C-E) Neutralization activities against several SARS-CoV-336 2 variants S were analyzed at the different time points (V3 (C), V4 (D) and V5 (E)). Naïve and PI 337 donors are represented by red and black points respectively. Undetectable measures are 338 represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means ± 339 SEM. (* p < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; **** p < 0.0001; ns, non-significant). For naïve donors, 340 n=20 and for previously infected donors n=11.

341

Figure 3. Mesh correlations of humoral response variables after the second and third dose of the mRNA vaccine.

Edge bundling correlation plots where red and blue edges represent positive and negative correlations between connected variables, respectively. Only significant correlations (p < 0.05, Spearman rank test) are displayed. Nodes are color coded based on the grouping of variables according to the legend. Node size corresponds to the degree of relatedness of correlations. Edge bundling plots are shown for correlation analyses using six different datasets, i.e., SARS-CoV-2

naïve (A) or previously infected (B) individuals at V3, V4 and V5 respectively. For naïve and
 previously infected donors: n=11.

351

352 Figure 4. Evolution of the RBD-specific IgG and associated anti-RBD avidity in SARS-CoV-

353 **2** naïve and previously-infected individuals vaccinated with a short or a long interval.

354 (A) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine cohorts design. (B-E) Indirect ELISA were performed by incubating 355 plasma samples from naïve (B, D) and PI (C, E) donors vaccinated with a SI or a LI with 356 recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. The plasmas were collected at different time point from 357 prior vaccination to after the third dose of mRNA vaccine. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected 358 using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. (B-C) Relative light unit (RLU) values obtained were 359 normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. (D-E) 360 The RBD avidity index corresponded to the value obtained with the stringent (8M urea) ELISA 361 divided by that obtained without urea. (B-E) (Left panels) Each curve represents the values 362 obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. (**Right panels**) The bold line represents 363 the mean of each group. Naïve and PI donors vaccinated with the SI are represented by blue and 364 yellow lines respectively and naïve and PI donors vaccinated with the LI are represented by red 365 and black lines respectively. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by an associated 366 colour syringe. Limits of detection are plotted. For naïve donors, n= 45 for the SI and n=30 for the 367 LI and for previously infected donors n=16 for the SI and n=15 for the LI.

369

Table 1. Characteristics of the vaccinated SARS-CoV-2 cohorts

		SARS-CoV-2 Naïve	SARS-CoV-2 Previously infected	
Number		20	11	
Age		52 (33-64)	48 (39-65)	
Gender	Male (n)	8	8	
	Female (n)	12	3	
Days between symptom onset and the 1 st dose ^a		N/A	300 (247-321)	
Days between the 1 st and 2 nd dose ^a		111 (76-120)	110 (90-134)	
Days between the 2 nd and 3 rd dose ^a		219 (167-230)	219 (187-235)	
Days between the 2 nd dose and V3 ^a		21 (17-34)	22 (13-42)	
Days between the 2 nd dose and V4 ^a		112 (96-156)	113 (90-127)	
Days between the 3 rd dose and V5 ^a		27 (20-38)	27 (19-37)	

370

371 ^a Values displayed are medians, with ranges in parentheses.

373 Table 2. Characteristics of the longitudinal SARS-CoV-2 cohorts vaccinated with a

374 short or a long interval

		Short interval		Long interval	
		SARS-CoV-2 Naïve	SARS-CoV-2 Previously infected	SARS-CoV-2 Naïve	SARS-CoV-2 Previously infected
Number		45	16	30	15
Age		35 (22-67)	35 (23-59)	51 (21-64)	47 (29-65)
Gender	Male (n)	21	10	12	10
	Female (n)	24	6	18	5
Days between symptom onset and the 1 st dose ^a		N/A	102 (50-275)	N/A	274 (166-321)
Days between the 1 st and 2 nd dose ^a		21 (21-35)	21 (21-30)	111 (76-120)	110 (90-134)
Days between the 2 nd and 3 rd dose ^a		258 (183-342)	276 (244-308)	219 (167-230)	219 (187-235)

375

376 ^a Values displayed are medians, with ranges in parentheses.

377	STAR METHODS				
378					
379	RESOURCE AVAILABILITY				
380					
381	Lead contact				
382	Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be				
383	fulfilled by the lead contact, Andrés Finzi (andres.finzi@umontreal.ca).				
384					
385	Materials availability				
386	All unique reagents generated during this study are available from the Lead contact without				
387	restriction.				
388					
389	Data and code availability				
390	 All data reported in this paper will be shared by the lead contact 				
391	(andres.finzi@umontreal.ca) upon request.				
392	This paper does not report original code.				
393	• Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available				
394	from the lead contact (andres.finzi@umontreal.ca) upon request.				
395					
396	EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS				
397					
398	Ethics Statement				
399	All work was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki in terms of informed				
400	consent and approval by an appropriate institutional board. Blood samples were obtained from				
401	donors who consented to participate in this research project at CHUM (19.381) and University of				

402 Pennsylvania (University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board, IRB no. 845061). Plasmas
403 were isolated by centrifugation and Ficoll gradient, and samples stored at -80°C until use.

404

405 Human subjects

406 The study was conducted in 20 SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals (8 males and 12 females; age 407 range: 33-64 years) and 11 SARS-CoV-2 previously-infected individuals (8 males and 3 females; 408 age range: 39-65 years). All this information is summarized in table 1. For the comparison 409 between the SI and LI, the study was conducted in 45 SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals (21 males 410 and 24 females ; age range : 22-67 years) and 16 SARS-CoV-2 previously-infected individuals 411 (10 males and 6 females ; age range : 23-59 years) for the SI and in 30 SARS-CoV-2 naïve 412 individuals (12 males and 18 females; age range : 21-64 years) and 15 SARS-CoV-2 previously-413 infected individuals (10 males and 5 females; age range: 29-65 years) for the LI. All this 414 information is summarized in table 2. No specific criteria such as number of patients (sample 415 size), gender, clinical or demographic were used for inclusion, beyond PCR confirmed SARS-416 CoV-2 infection in adults and no detection of Abs recognizing the N protein for naïve donors.

417

418 Plasma and antibodies

419 Plasma from SARS-CoV-2 naïve and PI donors were collected, heat-inactivated for 1 hour at 420 56°C and stored at -80°C until ready to use in subsequent experiments. Plasma from uninfected 421 donors collected before the pandemic were used as negative controls and used to calculate the 422 seropositivity threshold in our ELISA, ADCC and flow cytometry assays (see below). The RBD-423 specific monoclonal antibody CR3022 was used as a positive control in ELISA assays, and the 424 CV3-25 antibody in flow cytometry assays and were previously described (Anand et al., 2020; 425 Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2020; Jennewein et al., 2021; Meulen et al., 2006; Prévost et al., 2020). 426 Horseradish peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated Abs able to detect the Fc region of human IgG

427 (Invitrogen) was used as secondary Abs to detect Ab binding in ELISA experiments. Alexa Fluor647-conjugated goat anti-human Abs able to detect all Ig isotypes (anti-human IgM+IgG+IgA;
429 Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) were used as secondary Ab to detect plasma binding in
430 flow cytometry experiments.

- 431
- 432 Cell lines

433 293T human embryonic kidney cells (obtained from ATCC) were maintained at 37°C under 5% 434 CO₂ in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) (Wisent) containing 5% fetal bovine serum 435 (FBS) (VWR) and 100 µg/ml of penicillin-streptomycin (Wisent). CEM.NKr CCR5+ cells (NIH AIDS 436 reagent program) were maintained at 37°C under 5% CO₂ in Roswell Park Memorial Institute 437 (RPMI) 1640 medium (Gibco) containing 10% FBS and 100 µg/ml of penicillin-streptomycin. 438 293T-ACE2 cell line was previously reported (Prévost et al., 2020). CEM.NKr CCR5+ cells stably 439 expressing the SARS-CoV-2 S glycoproteins were previously reported (Anand et al., 2021; 440 Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2021).

441

442 METHOD DETAILS

443 Plasmids

The plasmids encoding the SARS-CoV-2 S variants (D614G, Delta (B.1.617.2) and Omicron (B.1.1.529) and the S2 subunit were previously reported (Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2020; Chatterjee et al., 2021; Gong et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2022a). The HCoV-HKU1 S was purchased from Sino Biological. The plasmids encoding the BA.1.1 and BA.2 S were generated by overlapping PCR for mutagenesis of a codon-optimized wild-type SARS-CoV-2 S gene (GeneArt, ThermoFisher) that was synthesized (Biobasic) and cloned in pCAGGS as a template. All constructs were verified by Sanger sequencing.

- 451
- 452

453 **Protein expression and purification**

454 FreeStyle 293F cells (Invitrogen) were grown in FreeStyle 293F medium (Invitrogen) to a density 455 of 1 x 10⁶ cells/mL at 37°C with 8% CO₂ with regular agitation (150 rpm). Cells were transfected 456 with a plasmid coding for SARS-CoV-2 S RBD (Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2020) using 457 ExpiFectamine 293 transfection reagent, as directed by the manufacturer (Invitrogen). One week 458 later, cells were pelleted and discarded. Supernatants were filtered using a 0.22 µm filter (Thermo 459 Fisher Scientific). The recombinant RBD proteins were purified by nickel affinity columns, as 460 directed by the manufacturer (Invitrogen). The RBD preparations were dialyzed against 461 phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and stored in aliquots at -80°C until further use. To assess 462 purity, recombinant proteins were loaded on SDS-PAGE gels and stained with Coomassie Blue.

463

464 Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) and RBD avidity index

465 The SARS-CoV-2 RBD ELISA assay used was previously described (Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 466 2020; Prévost et al., 2020). Briefly, recombinant SARS-CoV-2 S RBD proteins (2.5 µg/ml), or 467 bovine serum albumin (BSA) (2.5 µg/ml) as a negative control, were prepared in PBS and were 468 adsorbed to plates (MaxiSorp Nunc) overnight at 4°C. Coated wells were subsequently blocked 469 with blocking buffer (Tris-buffered saline [TBS] containing 0.1% Tween20 and 2% BSA) for 1h at 470 room temperature. Wells were then washed four times with washing buffer (Tris-buffered saline 471 [TBS] containing 0.1% Tween20). CR3022 mAb (50 ng/ml) or a 1/500 dilution of plasma were 472 prepared in a diluted solution of blocking buffer (0.1 % BSA) and incubated with the RBD-coated 473 wells for 90 minutes at room temperature. Plates were washed four times with washing buffer 474 followed by incubation with secondary Abs (diluted in a diluted solution of blocking buffer (0.4% 475 BSA)) for 1h at room temperature, followed by four washes. To calculate the RBD-avidity index, 476 we performed in parallel a stringent ELISA, where the plates were washed with a chaotropic 477 agent, 8M of urea, added of the washing buffer. This assay was previously described (Tauzin et 478 al., 2022b). HRP enzyme activity was determined after the addition of a 1:1 mix of Western

Lightning oxidizing and luminol reagents (Perkin Elmer Life Sciences). Light emission was measured with a LB942 TriStar luminometer (Berthold Technologies). Signal obtained with BSA was subtracted for each plasma and was then normalized to the signal obtained with CR3022 present in each plate. The seropositivity threshold was established using the following formula: mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma + (3 standard deviation of the mean of prepandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma).

485

486 Cell surface staining and flow cytometry analysis

487 293T cells were co-transfected with a GFP expressor (pIRES2-GFP, Clontech) in combination 488 with plasmids encoding the full-length S of SARS-CoV-2 variants (D614G, Delta and Omicron, 489 BA.1.1 and BA.2), the S2 subunit or the HCoV-HKU1 S. 48h post-transfection, S-expressing cells 490 were stained with the CV3-25 Ab (Jennewein et al., 2021) or plasma (1/250 dilution). AlexaFluor-491 647-conjugated goat anti-human IgM+IgG+IgA Abs (1/800 dilution) were used as secondary Abs. 492 The percentage of transfected cells (GFP+ cells) was determined by gating the living cell 493 population based on viability dye staining (Agua Vivid, Invitrogen). Samples were acquired on a 494 LSRII cytometer (BD Biosciences) and data analysis was performed using FlowJo v10.7.1 (Tree 495 Star). The seropositivity threshold was established using the following formula: mean of pre-496 pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma + (3 standard deviation of the mean of pre-pandemic 497 SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma). The conformational-independent S2-targeting mAb CV3-25 was 498 used to normalize S expression. CV3-25 was shown to effectively recognize all SARS-CoV-2 S 499 variants (Chatterjee et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022).

500

501 ADCC assay

502 This assay was previously described (Anand et al., 2021; Beaudoin-Bussières et al., 2021). For 503 evaluation of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC), parental 504 CEM.NKr CCR5+ cells were mixed at a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr cells stably expressing a GFP-

505 tagged full length SARS-CoV-2 S (CEM.NKr.SARS-CoV-2.Spike cells). These cells were stained 506 for viability (AquaVivid; Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) and cellular dyes (cell 507 proliferation dye eFluor670; Thermo Fisher Scientific) to be used as target cells. Overnight rested 508 PBMCs were stained with another cellular marker (cell proliferation dye eFluor450; Thermo Fisher 509 Scientific) and used as effector cells. Stained target and effector cells were mixed at a ratio of 510 1:10 in 96-well V-bottom plates. Plasma (1/500 dilution) or monoclonal antibody CR3022 (1 511 µg/mL) were added to the appropriate wells. The plates were subsequently centrifuged for 1 min 512 at 300g, and incubated at 37°C, 5% CO₂ for 5 hours before being fixed in a 2% PBS-formaldehyde 513 solution. ADCC activity was calculated using the formula: [(% of GFP+ cells in Targets plus 514 Effectors) - (% of GFP+ cells in Targets plus Effectors plus plasma/antibody)]/(% of GFP+ cells in 515 Targets) x 100 by gating on transduced live target cells. All samples were acquired on an LSRII 516 cytometer (BD Biosciences) and data analysis was performed using FlowJo v10.7.1 (Tree Star). 517 The specificity threshold was established using the following formula: mean of pre-pandemic 518 SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma + (3 standard deviation of the mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-519 2 negative plasma).

520

521 Virus neutralization assay

522 To produce the pseudoviruses, 293T cells were transfected with the lentiviral vector pNL4.3 R-E-523 Luc (NIH AIDS Reagent Program) and a plasmid encoding for the indicated S glycoprotein 524 (D614G, Delta and Omicron, BA.1.1 and BA.2) at a ratio of 10:1. Two days post-transfection, cell 525 supernatants were harvested and stored at -80°C until use. For the neutralization assay, 293T-526 ACE2 target cells were seeded at a density of 1×10⁴ cells/well in 96-well luminometer-compatible 527 tissue culture plates (Perkin Elmer) 24h before infection. Pseudoviral particles were incubated 528 with several plasma dilutions (1/50; 1/250; 1/1250; 1/6250; 1/31250) for 1h at 37°C and were then 529 added to the target cells followed by incubation for 48h at 37°C. Then, cells were lysed by the 530 addition of 30 µL of passive lysis buffer (Promega) followed by one freeze-thaw cycle. An LB942

531 TriStar luminometer (Berthold Technologies) was used to measure the luciferase activity of each 532 well after the addition of 100 μ L of luciferin buffer (15mM MgSO₄, 15mM KPO₄ [pH 7.8], 1mM 533 ATP, and 1mM dithiothreitol) and 50 μ L of 1mM d-luciferin potassium salt (Prolume). The 534 neutralization half-maximal inhibitory dilution (ID₅₀) represents the plasma dilution to inhibit 50% 535 of the infection of 293T-ACE2 cells by pseudoviruses.

536

537 QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

538 Statistical analysis

539 Symbols represent biologically independent samples from SARS-CoV-2 naïve or SARS-CoV-2 540 PI individuals. Lines connect data from the same donor. Statistics were analyzed using GraphPad 541 Prism version 8.0.1 (GraphPad, San Diego, CA). Every dataset was tested for statistical normality 542 and this information was used to apply the appropriate (parametric or nonparametric) statistical 543 test. Differences in responses for the same patient before and after vaccination were performed 544 using Wilcoxon tests. Differences in responses between naïve and PI individuals at each time 545 point (V3, V4 and V5) were measured by Mann-Whitney tests. Differences in responses against 546 the different S for the same patient were measured by Friedman tests. P values < 0.05 were 547 considered significant; significance values are indicated as * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001, 548 **** p < 0.0001. Spearman's R correlation coefficient was applied for correlations. Statistical tests 549 were two-sided and p < 0.05 was considered significant.

550

551 Software scripts and visualization

Edge bundling graphs were generated in undirected mode in R and RStudio using ggraph, igraph,
tidyverse, and RColorBrewer packages (R Core Team, 2014). Edges are only shown if p < 0.05,
and nodes are sized according to the connecting edges' r values. Nodes are color-coded
according to groups of parameters.

557 **REFERENCES**

558 Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Richard, J., Perreault, J., Tremblay, T., Drouin, M., Fournier, M.-J., 559 Lewin, A., Bazin, R., and Finzi, A. (2020). High-throughput detection of antibodies targeting the 560 SARS-CoV-2 Spike in longitudinal convalescent plasma samples (Microbiology).

Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Nayrac, M., Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Benlarbi, M., Gasser, R., Brassard,
N., Laumaea, A., Gong, S.Y., Bourassa, C., et al. (2021). Longitudinal analysis of humoral
immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in convalescent individuals up to eight months postsymptom onset. Cell Rep. Med. 100290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2021.100290.

Andreano, E., Paciello, I., Piccini, G., Manganaro, N., Pileri, P., Hyseni, I., Leonardi, M., Pantano,
E., Abbiento, V., Benincasa, L., et al. (2021). Hybrid immunity improves B cells and antibodies
against SARS-CoV-2 variants. Nature *600*, 530–535. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-041177.

Andrews, N., Stowe, J., Kirsebom, F., Toffa, S., Rickeard, T., Gallagher, E., Gower, C., Kall, M.,
Groves, N., O'Connell, A.-M., et al. (2022). Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron
(B.1.1.529) Variant. N. Engl. J. Med. NEJMoa2119451. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2119451.

572 Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Laumaea, A., Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Gasser, R., Goyette, G., 573 Medjahed, H., Perreault, J., Tremblay, T., Lewin, A., et al. (2020). Decline of Humoral Responses 574 against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in Convalescent Individuals. MBio *11*. 575 https://doi.org/10.1128/mBio.02590-20.

576 Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Richard, J., Prévost, J., Goyette, G., and Finzi, A. (2021). A new flow 577 cytometry assay to measure antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity against SARS-CoV-2 Spike-578 expressing cells. STAR Protoc. *2*, 100851. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xpro.2021.100851.

Björkman, C., Näslund, K., Stenlund, S., Maley, S.W., Buxton, D., and Uggla, A. (1999). An IgG
Avidity ELISA to Discriminate between Recent and Chronic Neospora Caninum Infection. J. Vet.
Diagn. Invest. *11*, 41–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/104063879901100106.

582 Chatterjee, D., Tauzin, A., Marchitto, L., Gong, S.Y., Boutin, M., Bourassa, C., Beaudoin-583 Bussières, G., Bo, Y., Ding, S., Laumaea, A., et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Spike 584 recognition by plasma from individuals receiving BNT162b2 mRNA vaccination with a 16-weeks 585 interval between doses.

586 Chen, J., Wang, R., Gilby, N.B., and Wei, G.-W. (2022). Omicron Variant (B.1.1.529): Infectivity,
587 Vaccine Breakthrough, and Antibody Resistance. J. Chem. Inf. Model. acs.jcim.1c01451.
588 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jcim.1c01451.

589 Choi, J.Y., and Smith, D.M. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 Variants of Concern. Yonsei Med. J. *6*2, 961– 590 968. https://doi.org/10.3349/ymj.2021.62.11.961.

 591
 Crotty,
 S.
 (2021).
 Hybrid
 immunity.
 Science
 372,
 1392–1393.

 592
 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj2258.

 <t

593 Dhar, M.S., Marwal, R., Vs, R., Ponnusamy, K., Jolly, B., Bhoyar, R.C., Sardana, V., Naushin, S., 594 Rophina, M., Mellan, T.A., et al. (2021). Genomic characterization and epidemiology of an

595 emerging SARS-CoV-2 variant in Delhi, India. Science 374, 995–999. 596 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj9932.

Doria-Rose, N.A., Shen, X., Schmidt, S.D., O'Dell, S., McDanal, C., Feng, W., Tong, J., Eaton,
A., Maglinao, M., Tang, H., et al. (2021). Booster of mRNA-1273 Strengthens SARS-CoV-2
Omicron Neutralization. MedRxiv Prepr. Serv. Health Sci. 2021.12.15.21267805.
https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.15.21267805.

601 Ferdinands, J.M. (2022). Waning 2-Dose and 3-Dose Effectiveness of mRNA Vaccines Against 602 COVID-19–Associated Emergency Department and Urgent Care Encounters and 603 Hospitalizations Among Adults During Periods of Delta and Omicron Variant Predominance — 604 VISION Network, 10 States, August 2021–January 2022. MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 71. 605 https://doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7107e2.

Fialová, L., Petráčková, M., and Kuchař, O. (2017). Comparison of different enzyme-linked
immunosorbent assay methods for avidity determination of antiphospholipid antibodies. J. Clin.
Lab. Anal. *31*, e22121. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.22121.

Goel, R.R., Apostolidis, S.A., Painter, M.M., Mathew, D., Pattekar, A., Kuthuru, O., Gouma, S.,
Hicks, P., Meng, W., Rosenfeld, A.M., et al. (2021). Distinct antibody and memory B cell
responses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and recovered individuals following mRNA vaccination. Sci.
Immunol. 6. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciimmunol.abi6950.

Gong, S.Y., Chatterjee, D., Richard, J., Prévost, J., Tauzin, A., Gasser, R., Bo, Y., Vézina, D.,
Goyette, G., Gendron-Lepage, G., et al. (2021). Contribution of single mutations to selected
SARS-CoV-2 emerging variants spike antigenicity. Virology *563*, 134–145.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.virol.2021.09.001.

Gruell, H., Vanshylla, K., Tober-Lau, P., Hillus, D., Schommers, P., Lehmann, C., Kurth, F.,
Sander, L.E., and Klein, F. (2022). mRNA booster immunization elicits potent neutralizing serum
activity against the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. Nat. Med. 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591021-01676-0.

Jennewein, M.F., MacCamy, A.J., Akins, N.R., Feng, J., Homad, L.J., Hurlburt, N.K., Seydoux,
E., Wan, Y.-H., Stuart, A.B., Edara, V.V., et al. (2021). Isolation and characterization of crossneutralizing coronavirus antibodies from COVID-19+ subjects. Cell Rep. *36*, 109353.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2021.109353.

Kumar, S., Karuppanan, K., and Subramaniam, G. (2022). Omicron (BA.1) and Sub-Variants
(BA.1, BA.2 and BA.3) of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Infectivity and Pathogenicity: A Comparative
Sequence and Structural-based Computational Assessment. bioRxiv 2022.02.11.480029.
https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.02.11.480029.

Li, W., Chen, Y., Prévost, J., Ullah, I., Lu, M., Gong, S.Y., Tauzin, A., Gasser, R., Vézina, D.,
Anand, S.P., et al. (2022). Structural basis and mode of action for two broadly neutralizing
antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 emerging variants of concern. Cell Rep. *38*, 110210.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.celrep.2021.110210.

Meulen, J. ter, Brink, E.N. van den, Poon, L.L.M., Marissen, W.E., Leung, C.S.W., Cox, F., Cheung, C.Y., Bakker, A.Q., Bogaards, J.A., Deventer, E. van, et al. (2006). Human Monoclonal

Antibody Combination against SARS Coronavirus: Synergy and Coverage of Escape Mutants.
 PLOS Med. 3, e237. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0030237.

Miyamoto, S., Arashiro, T., Adachi, Y., Moriyama, S., Kinoshita, H., Kanno, T., Saito, S., Katano,
H., Iida, S., Ainai, A., et al. (2022). Vaccination-infection interval determines cross-neutralization
potency to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron after breakthrough infection by other variants. Med
S2666634022000897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.medj.2022.02.006.

Nayrac, M., Dubé, M., Sannier, G., Nicolas, A., Marchitto, L., Tastet, O., Tauzin, A., Brassard, N.,
Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Vézina, D., et al. (2021). Temporal associations of B and T cell immunity
with robust vaccine responsiveness in a 16-week interval BNT162b2 regimen. BioRxiv Prepr.
Serv. Biol. 2021.12.18.473317. https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.12.18.473317.

645 Nemet, I., Kliker, L., Lustig, Y., Zuckerman, N., Erster, O., Cohen, C., Kreiss, Y., Alroy-Preis, S., 646 Regev-Yochay, G., Mendelson, E., et al. (2022). Third BNT162b2 Vaccination Neutralization of 647 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Infection. Engl. Med. 386. 492-494. N. J. 648 https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2119358.

649 Payne, R.P., Longet, S., Austin, J.A., Skelly, D.T., Dejnirattisai, W., Adele, S., Meardon, N., Faustini, S., Al-Taei, S., Moore, S.C., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity of standard and extended 650 651 dosing intervals of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. Cell 184. 5699-5714.e11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2021.10.011. 652

653 Prévost, J., Gasser, R., Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Richard, J., Duerr, R., Laumaea, A., Anand, 654 S.P., Goyette, G., Benlarbi, M., Ding, S., et al. (2020). Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Humoral 655 SARS-CoV-2 Responses against Spike. Cell Rep. Med. 1, 100126. 656 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100126.

657 R Core Team (2014). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for 658 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-project.org/.

Schmidt, F., Muecksch, F., Weisblum, Y., Da Silva, J., Bednarski, E., Cho, A., Wang, Z., Gaebler,
C., Caskey, M., Nussenzweig, M.C., et al. (2022). Plasma Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2
Omicron Variant. N. Engl. J. Med. *386*, 599–601. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2119641.

Tauzin, A., Nayrac, M., Benlarbi, M., Gong, S.Y., Gasser, R., Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Brassard,
N., Laumaea, A., Vézina, D., Prévost, J., et al. (2021). A single dose of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine
BNT162b2 elicits Fc-mediated antibody effector functions and T cell responses. Cell Host Microbe *0.* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2021.06.001.

Tauzin, A., Gong, S.Y., Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Vézina, D., Gasser, R., Nault, L., Marchitto, L.,
Benlarbi, M., Chatterjee, D., Nayrac, M., et al. (2022a). Strong humoral immune responses
against SARS-CoV-2 Spike after BNT162b2 mRNA vaccination with a 16-week interval between
doses. Cell Host Microbe *30*, 97-109.e5. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2021.12.004.

Tauzin, A., Gendron-Lepage, G., Nayrac, M., Anand, S.P., Bourassa, C., Medjahed, H., Goyette,
G., Dubé, M., Bazin, R., Kaufmann, D.E., et al. (2022b). Evolution of Anti-RBD IgG Avidity
Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection. Viruses *14*, 532. https://doi.org/10.3390/v14030532.

Ullah, I., Prévost, J., Ladinsky, M.S., Stone, H., Lu, M., Anand, S.P., Beaudoin-Bussières, G.,
Symmes, K., Benlarbi, M., Ding, S., et al. (2021). Live imaging of SARS-CoV-2 infection in mice

675 reveals that neutralizing antibodies require Fc function for optimal efficacy. Immunity S1074-676 7613(21)00347-2. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2021.08.015.

Viana, R., Moyo, S., Amoako, D.G., Tegally, H., Scheepers, C., Althaus, C.L., Anyaneji, U.J.,
Bester, P.A., Boni, M.F., Chand, M., et al. (2022). Rapid epidemic expansion of the SARS-CoV2 Omicron variant in southern Africa. Nature 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04411-y.

- 680 WHO (2022a). Tracking SARS-CoV-2 variants, https://www.who.int/en/activities/tracking-SARS-681 CoV-2-variants/.
- 682 WHO (2022b). Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard | WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard
 683 With Vaccination Data, https://covid19.who.int/table.
- Young, C., and Brink, R. (2021). The unique biology of germinal center B cells. Immunity *54*,
 1652–1664. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2021.07.015.





























Figure 1



24.0 26.8

ns

V5

Previously infected

D614G

ns

ns

V4

ns

В

100000-

10000

1000

100

10

Neutralization (ID₅₀)







Mean:

100000-

1000

100

10-

Derthe Dette Derictor BA? BA.1.1

869 2218

D614G

191 1284









Figure 3



Figure 4

Naïve

Previously infected





293T cells were transfected with the S2 subunit (A) or the indicated full-length S from different SARS-CoV-2 variants (C-E) or the HCoV-HKU1 S (B) and stained with the CV3-25 Ab or with plasma from naive or PI donors collected at V3, V4 and V5 and analyzed by flow cytometry. The values represent the MFI (B) or the MFI normalized by CV3-25 Ab binding (A, C-E). (A-B) Left panel: Each curve represents the values obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. Right panel: Plasma samples were grouped in different time points (V3, V4 and V5). (C-E) Binding of plasma collected at V3 (C), V4 (D) and V5 (E). Naïve and PI donors are represented by red and black points respectively, undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; **** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant). For naïve donors, n=20 and for previously infected donors n=11.







Figure S2 :Neutralization activities in naive and previously-infected vaccinated individuals against several SARS-CoV-2 variants, Related to Figure 3.

(A-D) Neutralizing activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing SARS-CoV-2 Delta S (A), Omicron S (B), BA.1.1 S (C) or BA.2 S (D) with serial dilutions of plasma for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-ACE2 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID50) values were determined using a normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. Naive and PI donors are represented by red and black points, respectively. Plasma samples were grouped in different time points (V3, V4 and V5). Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM (*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ****p < 0.001; ns, non-significant). For naive donors, n = 20 and for PI donors, n = 11.



- + urea



Figure S3 : Comparison of the detection of RBD specific antibodies between ELISA and stringent ELISA in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously infected individuals vaccinated with a short or a long interval, Related to Figure 4.

(A-D) Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve (A-B) and PI (C-D) vaccinated donors after a short (A, C) or a long (B, D) interval with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit (RLU) values obtained were normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. For ELISA (black curves), all the wash steps were made with washing buffer and for stringent ELISA (green curves), the wash steps were supplemented with 8M of urea. Each curve represents the normalized RLUs obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. Limits of detection are plotted. For naïve donors n=46 for the short interval and n=30 for the long interval and for previously infected donors n=16 for the short interval and n=15 for the long interval.



Figure S4 : Mesh correlations of humoral response parameters after the second and the third dose of mRNA vaccine with the short interval regimen, Related to Figure 4.

Edge bundling correlation plots where red and blue edges represent positive and negative correlations between connected parameters, respectively. Only significant correlations (p < 0.05, Spearman rank test) are displayed. Nodes are color coded based on the grouping of parameters according to the legend. Node size corresponds to the degree of relatedness of correlations. Edge bundling plots are shown for correlation analyses using two different datasets; i.e., SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals vaccinated with the short interval at V3 and V5 respectively. n=20.



Figure S5 : Humoral responses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals that received a short dose interval, Related to Figure 4.

(A) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine cohort design. (**B**-**F**) Humoral responses were measured in plasma samples collected after the second (V3) and the third dose (V5) from naïve donors that received a short dose interval. (**B**) Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. RLU values obtained were normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. (**C**) Indirect ELISA and stringent ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. RBD avidity index corresponded to the value obtained with the stringent ELISA divided by that obtained with the ELISA. (**D**) CEM.NKr parental cells were mixed at a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr-S cells and were used as target cells. PBMCs from uninfected donors were used as effector cells in a FACS-based ADCC assay. (**E**) 293T cells were transfected with the indicated full-length S or the S2 subunit and stained with the CV3-25 Ab or with plasma and analyzed by flow cytometry. The values represent the MFI normalized by CV3-25 Ab binding. (**F**) Neutralizing activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing SARS-CoV-2 S glycoproteins with serial dilutions of plasma for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-ACE2 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID₅₀) values were determined using a normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM (*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ****p < 0.001; ****p < 0.0001; ns, non-significant). n = 20.