1	Reverse mutational scanning of spike BA.2.86 identifies the epitopes
2	contributing to immune escape from polyclonal sera
3	
4	Najat Bdeir ¹ , Tatjana Lüddecke ¹ , Henrike Maaß ¹ , Stefan Schmelz ² , Henning Jacobsen ¹ , Kristin
5	Metzdorf ¹ , Anne Cossmann ³ , Metodi V. Stankov ³ , Markus Hoffmann ^{4,5} , Stefan Pöhlmann ^{4,5} ,
6	Wulf Blankenfeldt ^{2,6} , Alexandra Dopfner-Jablonka ^{3,7} , Georg M.N. Behrens ^{3,7,8,#} , Luka Čičin-
7	Šain*1,7,8,#
8	
9	¹ Department of Viral Immunology, Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research Braunschweig,
10	Germany
11	² Department Structure and Function of Proteins, Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research
12	Braunschweig, Germany
13	³ Department of Rheumatology and Immunology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover,
14	Germany
15	⁴ Infection Biology Unit, German Primate Center – Leibniz Institute for Primate Research,
16	Göttingen, Germany
17	⁵ Faculty of Biology and Psychology, University Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany
18	⁶ Institute for Biochemistry, Biotechnology and Bioinformatics, Technische Universität
19	Braunschweig, Braunschweig, Germany
20	⁷ German Centre for Infection Research (DZIF), partner site Hannover-Braunschweig,
21	Hannover, Germany
22	⁸ Centre for Individualized Infection Medicine, a joint venture of HZI and MHH, Hannover,
23	Germany
24	# shared senior authorship
25	*For correspondence: Luka Čičin-Šain: <u>Luka.Cicin-Sain@helmholtz-hzi.de</u> NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to quide clinical practice.

26 SUMMARY

27 The recently detected Omicron BA.2.86 lineage contains more than 30 amino acid mutations relative to BA.2. Here, we identify the epitopes driving immune escape of 28 29 BA.2.86 and its derivative JN.1 (BA.2.86 + S455L) lineage. We investigated the cross-30 reactive humoral immunity within a cohort of health care workers against Omicron 31 BA.2.86 and JN.1 by employing pseudo-viral mutants. We demonstrate that BA.2.86 and 32 especially JN.1 evaded neutralization by serum antibodies of fully vaccinated individuals. 33 To discern the contribution of individual epitope mutations to immune escape, we 34 constructed a library of 33 BA.2.86 mutants, each of which harbored a single revertant 35 mutation going back to BA.2. This library was used in a reverse mutational scanning approach to define serum neutralization titers against each epitope separately. The 36 mutations within the receptor binding domain (RBD) at position K356T and to a lesser 37 38 extent the mutations N460K, V483A, A484K, and F486P enhanced the immune escape. More surprisingly, the mutation 16insMPLF within the spike N-terminal domain (NTD) 39 40 and the mutation P621S in S1/S2 significantly contributed to antibody escape of BA.2.86. Upon XBB.1.5 booster vaccination, neutralization titers against JN.1 and BA.2.86 41 improved relative to all ancestral strains, and the residual immune escape was driven by 42 43 mutations at positions 16insMPLF, Δ 144Y, E544K, P621S, and A484K.

45 INTRODUCTION

46 The emergence of new SARS-CoV-2 virus lineages continues to be a critical aspect of the ongoing epidemic viral spread. Among these lineages, BA.2.86, also known as Pirola, has 47 48 garnered recent attention owing to its significant antigenic shift away from the prevailing XBB 49 sub-lineage (1, 2). The earliest detection of BA.2.86 was in late July 2023 in Denmark (3-5). 50 By mid-august, it had been detected within several countries and WHO had classified it as a 51 variant of interest (4-6). An outbreak of BA.2.86 recorded in the United Kingdom with a high 52 attack rate (86.6%) within an elderly care home demonstrated the transmissibility of this 53 lineage (7). At present, the extent of disease severity exerted by BA.2.86 is unclear, but its 54 derivative sub-variant JN.1 is on track to become the globally dominant SARS-CoV-2 lineage. 55 The viral spike (S) protein mediates SARS-CoV-2 host cell entry through a multistep process. 56 The initial step involves binding of the S protein to angiotensin converting enzyme-2 receptors 57 (ACE2). This engagement is followed by S protein cleavage by host cell proteases, enabling 58 the S protein to drive fusion of the viral envelope with cellular membranes (8). The S1 domain 59 of the S protein entails an N-terminal domain (NTD) with somewhat unclear functions, and the receptor-binding domain (RBD), which directly binds to ACE2 and is the major target for 60 61 neutralizing antibodies (8-10). The transmembrane S2 domain drives viral fusion with the host cell membrane, which facilitates the release of viral genetic material into the cytoplasm, and 62 63 therefore plays an important role in infection. BA.2.86 harbors more than 30 mutations relative 64 to BA.2, encompassing 13 mutations in NTD, 14 in the RBD, and 7 within the pre S1/S2 and S2 domain (11). Furthermore, several BA.2.86 descendants have been identified, including 65 66 BA.2.86.1 (defining mutation ORF1a:K1973R), JN.1 (L455S), JN.2 (ORF1a:Y621C), JN.3 (ORF1a:T2087I), and BA.2.86.2 (ORF7a:E22D)(2). 67

68 The alarming number of BA.2.86 spike mutations has prompted several efforts to 69 characterize the antibody immune escape potential of this lineage. Recent studies demonstrate

70 reduced pseudo-virus neutralization of BA.2.86 and JN.1 in comparison to BA.2 and B.1 71 strains and that vaccination with the monovalent BNT162b2 XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine significantly enhances neutralization of BA.2.86 pseudo virus by serum antibodies (12-14). 72 73 However, the contribution of single mutations to the immune escape of BA.2.86 remains 74 unclear. Mutational scanning approaches, where libraries of viruses with single amino acid 75 mutations in the spike protein are compared to the wild-type virus are powerful tools for the 76 identification of epitopes recognized by monoclonal antibodies (15-17), but polyclonal serum 77 antibodies recognize numerous epitopes simultaneously and redundantly. Therefore, mutating 78 one out of 33 epitopes on an ancestral background may only marginally decrease the serum 79 neutralizing activity if some among the remaining 32 epitopes are recognized by independent 80 antibody clones. To overcome this limitation, we cloned a library of 33 reversion mutants on 81 the BA.2.86 background, each harboring a single mutation reverting the position back to the 82 amino acid in BA.2. This approach allowed us to observe a robust increase in neutralizing activity whenever an immunologically relevant epitope was reintroduced in the spike. We 83 84 tested this library of BA.2.86 mutants against serum samples collected from a cohort of 30 85 healthcare workers, before and after vaccination with the BNT162b2 XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine. 86 Our data showed that mutations ins16MPLF, K356T, N460K, V483A, A484K, F486P and S621P distributed across NTD, RBD, and S1/S2 domains, contribute to the immune escape of 87 88 BA.2.86. Additionally, we show that vaccination with the BNT162b2 XBB.1.5 adapted 89 vaccine increases substantially the neutralization titers against both BA.2.86 and the more 90 recent BA.2.86.1.1 (JN.1) descendant, and that the immune escape of JN.1 is more pronounced 91 than that of BA.2.86 before, but not after XBB.21.5 booster vaccination. Moreover, we 92 demonstrate that the deletion of the MPLF insertion at position 16, the reinsertion of the 93 tyrosine residue at position 144, as well as the reversions K544E, S621P, and K484A improves 94 neutralization of BA.2.86 upon the XBB.1.5 booster shot.

95 **RESULTS**

96 **BA.2.86** spike protein harbors a substantial amount of mutations within all domains

The analysis of the BA.2.86 spike sequence (specifically: hCoV-19/Denmark/DCGC-97 98 647694/2023, EPI ISL 18114953) revealed 33 mutations relative to BA.2 spike (Figure 1). 99 These include 13 mutations within the NTD, 14 mutations in the RBD, and 6 mutations within 100 the S2 and pre S1/S2 domain. Of these mutations, there are five deletions (H69 Δ , V70 Δ , 101 $Y144\Delta$, $N211\Delta$, and $V483\Delta$) and one insertion after V16 (V16insMPLF). Among mutations 102 that have been previously identified in other variants of interest are R21T (B.1.617). 103 H69Δ/V70Δ (B.1.1.7/Alpha), Y144Δ (XBB1.5; EG.5.1; BA.1), R158G (B.1.617.2/Delta), 104 E484K (B.1.351/Beta; P.1/Gamma) and P681R (B.1.617.2/Delta). Additionally, BA.2.86 105 harbors several mutations, which were rarely reported (V445H, N450D, N481K, V483A; and 106 E554K) (18-20). Among these mutations ins16MPLF, ΔY144, F157S, R158G, H245N, A264D 107 are located within the NTD antigenic supersite and may contribute to immune escape (21). 108 Additionally, several mutations within the RBD of BA.2.86 have been associated with antibody 109 resistance including K356T, A484K, and N450D (9, 22, 23), while several other mutations 110 R493Q, F486P, N460K, and V483∆ may alter ACE2 interactions (24, 25). Hence, BA.2.86 111 contains a plethora of mutations within the spike protein, which may alter key properties of 112 this virus in receptor binding and neutralizing antibody escape. To visualize the position of 113 mutations in the spike protein of BA.2.86 with respect to BA.2, we used 114 AlphaFold2/AlphaFold-Multimer (26, 27) to construct a structural model of the spike trimer of 115 BA.2.86. The model, which was obtained in a closed state with respect to the conformation of 116 the RBD, shows that mutations with respect to BA.2 are spread over the distal part of the 117 protein but otherwise do not cluster at specific positions (Fig. 1B-C).

118

120 BA.2.86 and JN.1 efficiently escape antibody neutralization

121 To assess the immune escape of the BA.2.86 and BA.2.86.1.1 (JN.1) lineages, we employed 122 pseudo-virus particles (pp) in neutralization assays. For comparison, we also included particles 123 harboring the spike protein of XBB.1.5 (XBB.1.5_{pp}), Wuhan-Hu-01 (WT_{pp}), BA.1 (BA.1_{pp}), 124 and BA.2 (BA.2_{pp}) (Figure 2A-B). We found that plasma obtained from a cohort of at least 125 double boostered individuals neutralized BA.1_{pp} and BA.2_{pp} with 2-fold and 3-fold reduced 126 efficiency as compared to the index WT_{pp}, respectively. However, the inhibition of BA.2.86_{pp} and XBB.1.5_{pp} was 40- and 30-fold reduced, respectively (Figure 2A). Antibody escape of 127 128 JN.1_{pp} was even more pronounced, with an ~80-fold reduction relative to WT_{pp} (Figure 2A). 129 Plasma acquired post vaccination with the XBB.1.5-adapted mRNA vaccine neutralized 130 XBB.1.5_{pp}, BA.2.86_{pp}, and JN.1_{pp} with almost comparable efficiency, whereby the mean 131 neutralization titer was 6-fold, 11-fold, and 12-fold lower than WT_{pp} , respectively (Figure 2B). 132 Collectively, BA.2.86 and JN.1 escaped neutralization by antibodies induced upon primary 133 vaccination series and boosters with immunogens predating XBB lineages, whereby this escape 134 was more pronounced in JN.1. However, a vaccination with the XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine 135 boosted the neutralizing titers against both variants to similar extents, reduced the gap in 136 neutralization efficiency between them and Omicron BA.2, and eliminated it completely 137 between JN.1 and BA.2.86.

Mutations ins16MPLF, K356T, N460K, V483Δ, A484K, F486P, and P621S contribute to BA.2.86 neutralizing antibody escape.

To investigate the effect of individual mutations within BA.2.86 on post-vaccination neutralizing antibody escape, we cloned a comprehensive library of 33 individual BA.2.86 mutants. Each of them contains a single reversion relative to the amino acid sequence of BA.2, while retaining the rest of the sequence as in BA.2.86. Geometric means of pseudo-virus

144 neutralization titers (PVNT50) against BA.2.86pp were ~18-fold lower than against BA.2pp prior 145 to vaccination with the XBB.1.5 vaccine (Figure 3A). Hence, we tested which mutations 146 decreased the gap between neutralization of BA.2_{pp} and BA.2.86_{pp}. Our data showed that 147 among the BA.2.86_{pp} mutants with single mutations within the NTD, only the insMPLF16 Δ_{pp} 148 reduced the gap to BA.2_{pp} to a mere 4-fold reduction (Figure 3A). The remaining NTD_{pp} single 149 mutants did not significantly contribute to neutralizing antibody escape, because their neutralization titers were comparable to that of BA.2.86_{pp} (Figure 3B). While the N-terminus 150 151 of BA.2.86 spike protein is modelled with lesser confidence than the core of the structure 152 (Figure S1A-C), it is interesting that the N-terminal 16MPLF insertion is predicted to interact 153 with a crevice in the N-terminal domain (NTD; Figure S1B-C). This is reminiscent of SARS-154 CoV spike protein (28), albeit here, the N-terminus is yet more extended and anchored via a 155 disulfide bridge to the core of the NTD (Figure S1D).

156 The neutralization capacity of serum samples against epitopes in the RBD of BA.2.86_{pp} was significantly affected prior to the XBB.1.5 booster by the mutation K356T, which was ~3-fold 157 158 more efficiently neutralized than BA.2.86_{pp} (Figure 4A and 4B). Additionally, our results 159 showed that K460N_{pp}, Δ V483_{pp}, K484A_{pp}, and P486F_{pp} had a 7-, 8-, 8-, and 10-fold reduced 160 neutralization efficiency, respectively, relative to BA.2pp, and thus much less than the 18-fold 161 reduction observed in BA.2.86_{pp}. While the latter results did not raise to statistical significance 162 over BA.2.86_{pp} (Fig. 4B), they indicated an improved neutralization in the presence of these 163 parental epitopes. In contrast, the remaining mutations within the RBD of BA.2.86 did not 164 enhance serum neutralization capacity.

In addition to the aforementioned RBD and NTD BA.2.86 mutants, we explored the contribution of mutations within the S1/S2 and S2 regions to antibody evasion. We report a significant increase in neutralization efficiency for BA.2.86 S621P_{pp}, whereby neutralization efficiency of BA.2.86 S621P_{pp}, was 3-fold lower than that of BA.2_{pp} and hence, significantly higher than for BA.2.86_{pp} (Figure 5A and 5B) In contrast, BA.2.86 K554E_{pp}, V570A_{pp},
R681H_{pp}, F939S_{pp}, L1143P_{pp} all showed comparable neutralization sensitivity as compared to
BA.2.86_{pp} (Figure 5A, and 5B).

172 Interestingly, the impact of NTD mutations on neutralization escape following vaccination with 173 the adapted XBB.1.5 immunogen revealed that the mutants where the MPLF insertion at 174 position 16 was removed (insMPLF16 Δ_{pp}), or the reinsertion of the of the Y at position 144 175 (ins144Y_{pp}) recovered the neutralization efficiency of plasma samples to the level of BA.2 176 neutralization (Figure 6). A similar effect was observed for BA.2.86 mutants $K554E_{pp}$ and 177 K484A_{pp}, which demonstrate neutralization efficiency comparable to BA.2_{pp} after XBB.1.5 178 booster vaccination. On the other hand, the neutralization of the BA.2.86 mutant S621P_{pp} was 179 not significantly increased after the XBB.1.5 booster vaccination (Figure 6). Since 180 neutralization efficiencies of BA.2.86pp and JN.1pp were comparable after the XBB.1.5 booster 181 vaccination, our data may argue that these positions are relevant for the residual immune escape 182 of JN.1 upon the XBB.1.5 booster as well.

183 **Discussion**

184 This work provides to our knowledge the first example of a reverse mutational scanning 185 strategy for the identification of epitopes that contribute to immune escape from vaccineinduced immunity. Strategies based on mutational scanning of the SARS-CoV-2 spike are not 186 187 new. Others and us have shown that such approaches can be used to generate libraries 188 containing individual mutations present in the Omicron, but not in the ancestral variants, and 189 thus identify epitopes that escape recognition by monoclonal antibodies (16, 17) and polyclonal 190 sera (15, 16, 29). A very comprehensive mutational scanning based on the XBB.1.5 spike has 191 been recently performed by the Bloom lab to introduce 9000 theoretical mutations on the XBB.1.5 background and thus predict future potential escape mutations (15). However, 192 193 forward mutational scanning cannot predict the emergence of lineages with big evolutionary

194 jumps, such as the Omicron BA.1 and BA.2.86 variants, where more than 30 mutations were 195 observed simultaneously, with no intermittent stages that are known. Moreover, such approaches are not ideal for the analysis of neutralizing potential of polyclonal sera, where 196 197 redundant epitope recognition may result in virus neutralization even if immunologically 198 relevant epitopes are mutated. By reverse mutational scanning, we provide here a loss-of-199 function genetic approach, allowing the identification of escape epitopes in polyclonal 200 responses to antigens with many simultaneous mutations. Thus, we identified a collection of 201 epitopes that contribute to immune escape from vaccine-induced immunity by BA.2.86 and its 202 derivative JN.1 lineage. This approach may also be rapidly deployed for subsequent lineages 203 with big evolutionary jumps that may emerge in the future.

204 The emergence of BA.2.86 harboring more than 30 mutations relative to BA.2 was reminiscent 205 of the Omicron appearance in 2021 and raised concerns regarding its antibody escape potential 206 (12, 13, 30). A number of these mutations (K356, V445, G446, N450, L452, and P621) were 207 also observed in omicron sub-lineages within immunocompromised patients. This may indicate 208 that reduced immune functions within some individuals may be a source of highly mutated 209 SARS-CoV2 lineages (31, 32). BA.2.86 has also evolved several descendants including JN.1 210 which harbors three mutations in non S-proteins and a hallmark S455L mutation in the spike 211 protein (2). In sera from a cohort that was at least double boostered, we observed that the S455L 212 mutation reduces the neutralization efficiency relative to BA.2.86 by a factor of ~2, but that 213 the XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine booster increases neutralization efficiency against both lineages 214 to similar levels, which were merely 2-fold lower than the neutralization of Omicron XBB.1.5. 215 Nevertheless, their neutralization titers remain 5-6 fold lower than that of BA.2 following 216 vaccination, in line with data reported in Stankov et al. (33) and Wang et al. (13). 217 Several mutations within BA.2.86 significantly increased the neutralizing antibody escape

218 prior to vaccination with the adapted XBB.1.5 vaccine. We found that the NTD mutation

219 ins16MPLF significantly affected neutralization sensitivity, and its reversion resulted in a 4-220 fold increase in neutralization titers relative to BA.2.86. While this region of the NTD is 221 disordered in published structures of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, indicating high intrinsic 222 flexibility, the MPLF insertion is somewhat reminiscent of the SARS-CoV spike protein, where 223 the N-terminus is yet more extended and anchored via a disulfide bridge to the core of the NTD 224 (Fig. S1D). It should be noted that several NTD-binding neutralizing antibodies have been 225 identified in the past (34, 35), indicating that mutations in this domain may indeed interfere 226 with the immune system's capacity to recognize the virus. Even more interestingly, we show 227 that the deletion of the MPLF insertion at position 16 or reinsertion of Y at position 144 228 increases neutralization efficiency after the adapted XBB.1.5 vaccination to BA.2 levels. Both 229 mutations are located within the NTD antigenic supersite, which is a key target for NTD 230 specific neutralizing antibodies (21). Moreover, in silico structural modeling of BA.2.86 231 performed by Colson et al. indicates that the MPLF insertion may mask a V-shaped 232 electronegative zone within the NTD, which is an unprecedented phenotype in SARS-CoV-2. 233 This zone may stabilize the virus onto target cells and may induce some long-range 234 conformational changes which affect the RBD with potential consequences on RBD-ACE2 235 interactions (36). However, our independent in silico analysis of this region of the NTD 236 structure argues that the changes at the N-terminal tip cannot be predicted with a high degree 237 of confidence. Therefore, the actual effects of this mutation on the NTD structure may only be 238 confirmed by empirical analysis in cryoelectron microscopy or similar approaches.

We also found that the mutation K356T within the RBD plays a contributing role to BA.2.86
escape of neutralization by polyclonal sera. This reduction in neutralization efficiency might
be attributed to the steric hindrance caused by the introduction of an additional glycosylation
site (37). Similarly, we demonstrate that mutations N460K, V483Δ, A484K, and F486P within
the RBD enhance neutralizing antibody escape. This is in line with reports from Wang et al,

244 which show that mutation N460K and F486P shared in XBB.1.5 and EG.5.1 cause resistance 245 to class 1 and 2 monoclonal antibodies (mAb) (38). Structural modelling has shown that the 246 mutation N460K, which was first identified in BA.2.75, disrupts a hydrogen bond formed 247 between the RBD and a class 1 mAb (VH3-53) (39) and a study by Wang et al. demonstrated 248 that the mutation A484K within BA.2.86 reduced the neutralizing activity of a subset of class 249 3 mAbs (13). The mutation V483 Δ has seldom been reported in circulating strains. Full spike 250 mutational scanning of BA.2.86 postulated that V483A may contribute to antibody escape but 251 experimental evidence for this has been lacking (15). Our data argue that such effects may be 252 present, albeit not very pronounced. We also show that the mutation P621S in the S1/S2 domain 253 of BA.2.86 contributed to significant neutralization escape and this phenotype, to our 254 knowledge has not been demonstrated previously. In sum, we have identified several mutations 255 that have significantly contributed to immune escape in our cohort. However, we cannot 256 exclude that additional mutations may result in immune escape in individuals whose repertoire differs from our cohort of double boostered individuals. This requires additional studies in 257 258 cohorts of elderly people or those with immune deficiencies.

259 In sum, BA.2.86 and its JN.1 descendent efficiently escape neutralization by polyclonal 260 serum antibodies of double boostered individuals, and our data argue that this is due to 261 mutations at positions N460K, V483A, A484K, F486P, K356T, P621S, and ins16MPLF. We 262 also observed that the S455N mutation provides a 2-fold increase in neutralization titres over 263 BA.2.86. However, neutralization titres of JN.1 and BA.2.86 were appreciably improved by 264 the XBB.1.5 vaccine booster to comparable levels. This may argue that the JN.1 lineage would 265 have no selective immunological advantage over BA.2.86 in an XBB.1.5-boostered population, 266 and that the residual immune escape of both lineages may rely on the shared epitopes at 267 positions ins16MPLF, Δ 144Y, E544K, P621S, and A484K.

269 Limitations of the Study

270 We have utilized the well-established pseudo-virus system to assess the contribution of single mutations to the antibody escape potential of BA.2.86. While formal verification would require 271 272 the use of authentic SARS-CoV-2 with spike mutations introduced by reverse genetics, 273 neutralization titers in pseudo-viral and authentic virus setups have been shown to be 274 comparable due to the immunodominance of spike over other structural elements (40-42). An 275 additional limitation in our study is the lack of information regarding hybrid immunity within 276 our cohort, whereby some participants may have experienced a prior unrecorded infection with 277 XBB sublineages, which may have elicited a humoral immune response similar to vaccination. 278 However, only 4 individuals have a recorded infection in 2023, when the XBB.1.5 lineage was 279 present at high levels. Furthermore, the neutralization sensitivity of BA2.86 and BA.2.86 280 mutant viruses may vary due to the heterogeneity of immune background within our cohort 281 and maybe distinct to cohorts outside the scope of our present study, including elderly or 282 immunocompromised individuals. An additional limitation is that we have only analyzed a 283 library of single mutants and have not explored the impact of combinations of spike protein 284 mutations on serum neutralization.

285 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

286 Conceptualization: L.C-S.; Methodology: L.C-S; N.B; Investigation: N.B, T.L, H.M, K.M, H.J,

S.S; Formal analysis: N.B, S.S, W.B, L.C-S; Resources: S.P., M.H., A.D-J., and G.M.N.B;
Funding acquisition: L.C-S; Writing – original draft: N.B.; Writing – review & editing: all
authors.

290

291 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

This research was funded by the Helmholtz Association through Helmholtz Campaign
COVIPA (KA1-Co-02) to L.C-S. and EU-Partnering grant MCMVaccine (PIE-008) to L.C-S.

and S.P. Funding to L.C-S and S.P. was also provided by the Ministry of Science and Culture

of Lower Saxony, through the COFONI Network, flex fund projects 6FF22 and 10FF22.

296 G.M.N.B. and A.D.-J. acknowledge funding from Ministry of Science and Culture of Lower

297 Saxony (14-76103-184, COFONI Network, project 4LZF23), G.M.N.B. acknowledges 298 funding by the European Regional Development Fund (ZW7-85151373), and A.D.-J.

acknowledge funding by European Social Fund (ZAM5-87006761).

We thank Ayse Barut, Yuliia Polianska, Inge Hollatz-Rangosch and Karina Watzke for expert technical assistance, Natascha Gödecke for support with biosafety compliance and Gert Zimmer (Institute of Virology and Immunology, Mittelhäusern, Switzerland) for providing the VSV pseudo-virus system. We also thank the CoCo Study participants for their support and the entire CoCo study team, especially Annika Heidemann and Luis Manthey, for technical and logistical support.

306

307 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

L.C-S. served as an advisor to Sanofi unrelated to this work. G.M.N.B. served as advisor for
Moderna unrelated to this work, A.D-J served as an advisor for Pfizer unrelated to this work,
S.P. and M.H. conducted contract research (testing of vaccinee sera for neutralizing activity
against SARS-CoV-2) for Valneva unrelated to this work. S.P. served as advisor for BioNTech,
unrelated to this work. H.J. served as advisor on COVID neutralization assays for WHO and
CEPI, unrelated to this work. The other authors declare no competing interests.

314

316 Key Resources table

317 Table 1: Bacterial and virus strains

Bacteria or virus	Source	Catalogue number (N/A=not applicable)
VSV*∆G-Fluc	Laboratory of Gert Zimmer	N/A
NEB [®] 10-beta Competent <i>E. coli</i>	New England BioLabs	С3019Н

318

319 **Table 2: Experimental Models- Cell lines**

Cell line	Source	Catalogue number (N/A=not applicable)
293T	DSMZ	Cat# ACC-635; RRID: CVCL_0063
Vero76	ATCC	Cat# CRL-1586

320

321 **Table 3: Oligonucleotides**

Oligos	Source	Catalogue number (N/A=not applicable)
SARS-2S (D264A) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(gctTACTATGTGGGGCTACCTGC)		
SARS-2S (D264A) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GGCGGCACCAGCTG)		
SARS-2-S (V570A) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(gccGATACCACAGACGCC)		
SARS-2-S (V570A) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GATATCCCGGCCAAAC)		
SARS-2-S (K554E) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(gagAGCAACAAGAAGTTCCTGC)		
SARS-2-S (K554E) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TGTCAGCACGCCGG)		
SARS-2-S (P486F) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ttcAACTGCTACTTCCCAC)		
SARS-2-S (P486F) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GCCCTTGCCCTTAC)		
SARS-2-S (H339G) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ggcGAGGTGTTCAATGCC)		
SARS-2-S (H339G) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GAAG		
SARS-2-S (S446G) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ggcGGCAACTACGATTACTG)		
SARS-2-S (S446G) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GTGTTTGGAGTCCAG)		

SARS-2-S (N245H) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cacAGAAGCTACCTGACACC)	Signa-Aldrich	11/11
SARS-2-S (N245H) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CAGGGCCAGCAGTG)	Signia i narion	1.1/1.1
SARS-2-S (V332I) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(atcACCAATCTGTGCCC)	~ .8	
SARS-2-S (V332I) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ATTGGGGAACCGCAC)		
SARS-2-S (Δ insMPLF) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ACCTGATCACAACAAC)		
SARS-2-S (A insMPLF) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TCACACACTGGCTG)	0	
SARS-2-S (T356K) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(aagCGGATCAGCAATTGCG)	C	
SARS-2-S (T356K) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CCGGTTCCAGGCGTAC)		
SARS-2-S (I212L) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CACCCCTATCctgGGGCGGGATT)		
SARS-2-S (I212L) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TGCTTGCTGTAGATCTTGAAG)		
SARS-2-S (F216L) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ctgCCTCAGGGCTTCTCTG)		
SARS-2-S (F216L) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ATCCCGCCCGATGATAG)		
SARS-2-S (W452L) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ttgTACCGGCTGTTCCG)		
SARS-2-S (W452L) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GTAATCGTAGTTGCCG)		
SARS-2-S (insN211) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(accTCGgGCGGGGATttcc)		
SARS-2-S (insN211) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(tGATAGGGGTGTGCTTG)		
SARS-2-S (D450N) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(aatTACTGGTACCGGCTG)		
SARS-2-S (D450N) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GTAGTTGCCGCTGTG)		
SARS-2-S (K460N) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(aacCTGAAGCCCTTCGAG)		
SARS-2-S (K460N) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GGACTTCCGGAACAG)		
SARS-2-S (K481N) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(aacGGCAAGGGCCCCAAC)		
SARS-2-S (K481N) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ACAAGGCTTGTTGCCG)		
SARS-2-S (S621P) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cccGTGGCCATTCACGC)		
SARS-2-S (S621P) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CACTTCGGTACAGTTCAC)		

SARS-2-S (L1143P) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cccGAGCTGGACAGCTTC)		
SARS-2-S (L1143P) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CTGCAGAGGGTCGTAC)		
SARS-2-S (Q493R) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cggTCCTACGGCTTTCG)		
SARS-2-S (Q493R) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CAGTGGGAAGTAGCAG)		
SARS-2-S (T21R) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cgcACCCAGTCCTACAC		
SARS-2-S (T21R) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TGTGATCAGGTTGAACAG)		
SARS-2-S (G158R) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cggGTGTACAGCAGCGC)		
SARS-2-S (K158R) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GGACTCGCTTTCCATC)		
SARS-2-S (K403R) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(aggGGAAATGAAGTGAGCC)		
SARS-2-S (K403R) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GATCACGAAGCTGTC)		
SARS-2-S (L50S) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(agcACCCAGGACCTGTTC)		
SARS-2-S (L50S) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GTGCAGCACGCTGG)		
SARS-2-S (F939S) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CCAGCACAGCAGCGC)	C' 411'1	
SAKS-2-S(F939S)F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CAGGCTGTCCTGGATC)	Signa Aldrich	
$(\Rightarrow CATCAAACTCTCCCACTTCC)$	Sigma-Aldrich	IN/A
(giCATCAAAGIGIGCGAGITCC)	Signa Aldrich	NI/A
$SARS-2-S(L125V) \Gamma$	Sigma-Aldrich	IN/A
(CACOTTOOTOOCOTTO)	Sigma Aldrich	NI/A
(atcAGCGGCAACTACGATTAC)	Sigilia-Aluricii	1N/A
(gitAOCOOCAACTACOATTAC)	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TTTGGAGTCCAGCTTG)	Sigilia-Aluricii	1N/TA
SARS-2-S (S157F) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(ttcGGGGTGTACAGCAG)	Signa-Aldren	
SARS-2-S (S157F) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/Δ
(CTCGCTTTCCATCC)	Signia / Harten	
SARS-2-S (insH69) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(cactCCGGCACCAATG)	Signia / Harten	10/11
SARS-2-S (insH69) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GATGGCGTGGAACCAg)	Signia / Harten	10/11
SARS-2-S (insH70) F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(gtctCCGGCACCAATG)		
SARS-2-S (insH70) R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(GATGGCGTGGAACCAg)		

SARS-2-S JN.1 F	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(CTGGTACCGGagcTTCCGGAAGTC)		
SARS-2-S JN.1 R	Sigma-Aldrich	N/A
(TAATCGTAGTTGCCG)	_	

322

323 **Table 4: Recombinant DNA**

Recombinant DNA	Source	Catalogue number
		(N/A=not applicable)
pCAGGS-DsRed	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86 S446G	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86 F939S	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
ΒΑ.2.86 Δ483Υ	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86 Δ144Y	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86 K484A	Pöhlmann	
pCG1-SARS-2-S∆18	Laboratory of Stefan	N/A
BA.2.86 R681H	Pöhlmann	
Remaining pCG1-SARS-2-	Laboratory of Luka Cicin-	N/A
$S\Delta 18$ (BA2.86) single point	Sain	
mutants		

324

325 **Table 5: Software and algorithms**

326

Software	Source	Version number
GraphPad Prism	GraphPad Software	9.0
Microsoft Office Standard	Microsoft Corporation	2010

327

Materials and Methods 328

329 **Cell lines**

- 330 All cell lines were maintained at 37 °C and 5% CO₂ in a humified environment. 293T (Human,
- kidney) and VeroE6 (African green monkey, kidney) cells were cultured in Dulbecco's 331
- 332 Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM, ThermoFisher Scientific) supplemented with 5% fetal
- bovine serum (FBS, ThermoFisher Scientific) and 100 U/ml penicillin and 0.1 mg/ml 333
- 334 Streptomycin (PAN-Biotec). Both cell lines were used to a maximum passage of 30. For
- 335 seeding and sub-cultivation, cells were washed with phosphate buffered saline (PBS, PAN-

Biotec) and then incubated with trypsin/EDTA (PAN-Biotec) until cell detachment. Cell lines
were routinely tested for mycoplasma. Transfection of 293T cells for the production of
pseudoviruses was carried out by calcium phosphate transfection.

339 Plasmids

340 The plasmid pCG1 SARS-2-Sdel18 (Codon-optimized) encoding the spike protein of the 341 Wuhan-Hu-1 SARS-CoV-2 has been previously reported (8). The pCG1 SARS-2-Sdel18 BA.1 and BA.2 expression plasmids are previously reported (29) and based on isolate hCoV-342 343 19/Botswana/R40B58 BHP 3321001245/2021 (GISAID Accession ID: EPI ISL 6640919) 344 and isolate hCoV-19/England/PHEC-4G0AFZF7/2021 (GISAID Accession ID: 345 EPI ISL 8738174) respectively. The pCG1 SARS-2-Sdel18 XBB expression plasmid was 346 generated by Gibson assembly based on the expression vector for the spike of Omicron BA.2 347 and site directed mutagenesis was done to generate XBB.1.5. Expression plasmids pCAGGS-348 DsRed and pCG1-SARS-2-SDel18 BA.2.86 (based on the isolate hCoV-19/Denmark/DCGC-349 647694/2023, EPI ISL 18114953) were kindly provided by the Laboratory of Stefan 350 Pöhlmann. Site directed mutagenesis (O5® High-Fidelity 2X Master Mix, New England 351 BioLabs) was utilized for the generation of the SARS-CoV-2 spike BA.2.86 expression 352 plasmid library containing single point mutations back to BA.2 spike. Primers are listed in 353 Table 3.

354 **Production of Pseudo-viruses and titration**

Production of pseudo-viruses was performed according to published protocol (43). In brief, 293T cells were seeded in 6 well plates at a confluency of 70%. The next day, cells were transfected with expression plasmids for pCG1-SARS-2-S Δ 18 WT,

358 pCG1-SARS-2-SΔ18 BA2.86, pCG1-SARS-2-SΔ18 BA2, pCG1-SARS-2-SΔ18 BA2.86

359 XBB or pCG1-SARS-2-SΔ18 BA2.86 single point mutants. At 24 hours post transfection, cells

360 were incubated for 1 hour with a replication deficient VSV (VSV* ΔG) expressing enhanced

361 green fluorescent protein (eGFP) and firefly luciferase at an MOI of 3. Subsequently, cells were 362 washed with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and incubated with anti-VSV-G antibody (mouse 363 hybridoma supernatant from CRL-2700; ATCC) in order to neutralize residual input virus. At 364 12 hours post infection, supernatants were harvested and cleared from cell debris by 365 centrifugation and stored at -80C for later use. All pseudo-viruses were titrated on VeroE6 366 confluent 96 well plates to ensure comparable infectivity according to a previously published 367 protocol (29).

368 Neutralization assay

369 Neutralization assays were based on a previously published protocol (29). All plasma samples 370 utilized in this study were heat inactivated at 56 °C for 30 minutes and stored at 4 °C for further 371 use. Pseudo-viral particles (600pfu/well± 30%) were incubated for one hour in a 96 well 372 microtiter plate with two-fold diluted serum samples in DMEM [1% Penicillin-Streptomycin, 373 1% L-Glu, 5% FBS] ranging from 1:10 to 1:5120. Pseudo-virus particles were incubated in the 374 absence of sera as controls indicating 0% inhibition. After incubation, the serum/virus samples 375 were transferred onto a confluent VeroE696 well plate. After a 24-hour incubation, plates were 376 fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) and stored at 4 °C until readout. GFP+ infected cells 377 were counted using an IncuCyte S3 (Sartorius) performing whole-well scans (4x) in phase 378 contrast and green fluorescence settings (300ms exposure). Automated segmentation and 379 counting of fluorescent foci defined as green fluorescent protein GFP+-single cells was 380 performed using the IncuCyte GUI software (versions 2019B Rev1 and 2021B). Pseudo-virus 381 neutralization titer 50 (PVNT50) values were determined by a non-linear regression model. 382 The lower limit of confidence (LLOC) was set at a PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Non-383 responders are defined as individuals below this threshold. All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 384 for visualization purposes. Due to technical limitations, sample numbers in our assays were 385 randomly distributed to have at least 20 individual sera within each group.

386 Ethics committee Approval

The collection of all plasma samples was approved by the research ethics committee of the
Institutional Review Board of Hannover Medical School (8973 BO K 2020). All donors
provided written consent for the blood donation and use for research purposes.

390 Plasma Samples

391 The number of participants within this analysis is n=30. Median age is 45 years (interquartile 392 range (IQR) 33 to 56.25) and mean age is 46 (SD=12.23). Male to female ratio is 1:3. Among 393 these participants, 30% were vaccinated with 3 vaccine doses, 63.3% were vaccinated with 394 four vaccine doses, and 6.6% were vaccinated with more than four doses. Ten participants 395 (33,3%) were vaccinated with the bivalent WT/BA.4/5 vaccine. The median time in months 396 since last recorded SARS-CoV-2 infection for the patients with known infection is 14.5 (IQR 397 10.75 to 18). The median number of months since the last known vaccination dates within our 398 cohort is 7 months (IQR 4 to 9). All participants are part of the COVID-19 contact study, to 399 monitor anti-SARS-CoV-2 immune responses in healthcare workers at the Hannover Medical 400 School (MHH). All participants donated blood directly prior to vaccination with 30µg of the 401 updated BNT162b2 Omicron XBB.1.5 vaccine (Raxtozinameran, BioNTech, Mainz, 402 Germany) in September 2023 and followed up for another blood collection two weeks post 403 vaccination (33). Plasma was separated from collected blood and stored at -80 °C for long term 404 storage and 4°C for immediate use. Detailed information is provided in Supplementary table 1.

405 Statistical analysis

406 Statistical analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 9.0 (GraphPad software). 407 Neutralization titers were plotted as geometric mean titers. Data distribution was tested by 408 Shapiro-Wilks. A paired non-parametric Friedman test was performed for non-normally 409 distributed data. In normally distributed data, paired T-tests were performed. P values less than 410 0.05 were considered significant ns, p > 0.05; *, $p \le 0.05$; **, $p \le 0.01$; ***, $p \le 0.001$).

411 FIGURES AND LEGENDS



412 413

414 Figure 1. Overview of BA.2.86 lineage specific spike protein mutations relative to BA.2

(A) Schematic representation of the SARS-CoV-2 spike domains and amino acid changes
indicated for BA.2.86, and shared by XBB.1.5, and EG.5.1 compared to the spike of BA.2. Nterminal domain (NTD, blue), receptor binding domain (RBD, green), Subdomains 1 and 2
(SD1 and SD2, orange), S2 subunit (orange). (B) Model of the trimeric spike protein of
BA.2.86, calculated with AlphaFold2/AlphaFold-Multimer (27, 44). The N-terminal secretion

420 signal (15 residues) and the C-terminal membrane-anchoring sequence (112 residues) were 421 omitted from calculations, leading to 3372 residues in the final model. Domains have been colored according to panel (A), and one of five independently calculated models is shown. 422 423 Spheres represent the location of mutations with respect to the spike protein of BA.2. The 424 positions of deletions are colored in green, red spheres indicate mutations that lead to enhanced immune escape of BA.2.86, other mutations are shown in blue. For clarity, mutations are only 425 426 shown in one chain of the spike trimer. (C) Magnified view of one trimer extracted from the model shown in (B) and shown in the same orientation. 427

428

Figure 2



429



433 37 °C with sera dilutions from double boostered health care workers (n=30) (2A) or with 434 plasma dilutions following vaccination with an adapted XBB.1.5 booster (n=26) (2B). Pseudo-

B) After XBB.1.5 booster

435 virus neutralization titer 50 (PVNT50) was calculated using the least squares fit using a variable 436 slope, using a four-parameter nonlinear regression model and values were plotted as geometric 437 mean. Geometric mean standard deviation bars are shown in black. The lower limit of 438 confidence (LLOC) was set at a PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Non responders are defined as 439 individuals below this threshold. All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 for visualization purposes. 440 The assay was performed in technical duplicates and with negative controls to assess the virus input of each used pseudo-virus in the absence of plasma antibodies. Percentage of positive 441 442 responders, geometric means, and fold change neutralization over WT-Wuhan_{pp} are shown on top. Friedman nonparametric paired test (ns, p > 0.05; *, $p \le 0.05$; **, $p \le 0.01$; ***, $p \le 0.001$). 443 Percentage of positive responders, geometric means, and fold change neutralization over WT-444 445 Wuhan_{pp} are shown on top.

Figure 3

Neutralisation titers for NTD specific BA.2.86pp mutants pre XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine



448 Figure 3. Mapping mutations in the NTD for effects of neutralization efficiency of BA.2.86

449 in double boostered individuals

(A) Neutralization assessment for particles pseudo-typed with mutations within the NTD of 450 451 BA.2.86. Each mutant shown contains a single mutation reverting the amino acid mutation in 452 BA.2.86 to the corresponding amino acid within BA.2. Particles pseudo-typed with the 453 indicated S proteins were preincubated for one hour at 37 °C with sera dilutions from double 454 boostered health care workers with non-adapted immunogens. Pseudo-virus neutralization titer 455 50 (PVNT50) was calculated using the least squares fit using a variable slope, using a four-456 parameter nonlinear regression model. The lower limit of confidence (LLOC) was set at a 457 PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Non responders are defined as individuals below this threshold. 458 All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 for visualization purposes. The assay was performed in 459 technical duplicates and with negative controls to assess the virus input of each used pseudo-460 virus in the absence of plasma antibodies. Percentage of positive responders, geometric means, and fold change neutralization over WT-Wuhan_{pp} are shown on top. Geometric mean standard 461 462 deviation bars are shown in black. (B) Individual neutralization data for particles pseudo-typed with mutations within the NTD of BA.2.86. Statistical significance was assessed by Friedman 463 nonparametric paired test (ns, p > 0.05; *, $p \le 0.05$; **, $p \le 0.01$; ***, $p \le 0.001$). 464

Figure 4



467 Figure 4. Mutation K356T and to lesser extent K460N, Δ V483, K484A, and P486F within

the RBD enhance neutralization efficiency of BA.2.86 in double boostered individuals 468

(A) Neutralization assessment for particles pseudo-typed with mutations within the RBD of 469 470 BA.2.86. Each mutant shown contains a single mutation reverting the amino acid mutation in 471 BA.2.86 to the corresponding amino acid within BA.2. Particles pseudo-typed with the 472 indicated S proteins were pre-incubated with serum dilutions from immunized health care workers for one hour at 37 °C. Pseudo-virus neutralization titer 50 (PVNT50) was calculated 473 474 using the least squares fit using a variable slope, using a four-parameter nonlinear regression 475 model. The lower limit of confidence (LLOC) was set at a PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Non 476 responders are defined as individuals below this threshold. All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 477 for visualization purposes. The assay was performed in technical duplicates and with negative 478 controls to assess the virus input of each used pseudo-virus in the absence of plasma antibodies. 479 Percentage of positive responders, geometric means, and fold change neutralization over 480 $BA.2_{pp}$ are shown on top. Geometric mean standard deviation bars are shown in black. (B) 481 Individual neutralization data for particles pseudo-typed with mutations within the RBD of 482 BA.2.86. Statistical significance was assessed by Friedman nonparametric paired test (ns, p > p) 483 0.05; *, $p \le 0.05$; **, $p \le 0.01$; ***, $p \le 0.001$).

Figure 5

Neutralisation titers for S1/S2 and S2 specific BA.2.86pp mutants pre XBB.1.5



485

486 Figure 5. Mutation S621P within the S1/S2 domain enhances neutralization efficiency of 487 BA.2.86 in double boostered immunized individuals

488 (A) Neutralization assessment for particles pseudo-typed with mutations within the S1/S2 and

489 S2 domain of BA.2.86. Each mutant shown contains a single mutation reverting the amino acid

490 mutation in BA.2.86 to the corresponding amino acid within BA.2. Particles pseudo-typed with 491 the indicated S proteins were preincubated for one hour at 37 °C with sera dilutions from double 492 boostered health care workers with non-adapted immunogens. Pseudo-virus neutralization titer 493 50 (PVNT50) was calculated using the least squares fit using a variable slope, using a four-494 parameter nonlinear regression model. The lower limit of confidence (LLOC) was set at a 495 PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Non responders are defined as individuals below this threshold. 496 All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 for visualization purposes. The assay was performed in 497 technical duplicates and with negative controls to assess the virus input of each used pseudo-498 virus in the absence of plasma antibodies. Percentage of positive responders, geometric means, 499 and fold change neutralization over BA.2_{pp} are shown on top. Geometric mean standard 500 deviation bars are shown in black. (B) Individual neutralization data for particles pseudo-typed 501 with mutations within the S1/S2 and S2 domain of BA.2.86. Statistical significance was assessed by Friedman nonparametric paired test (ns, p > 0.05; *, $p \le 0.05$; **, $p \le 0.01$; ***, p 502 503 \leq 0.001).

Figure 6

505



Neutralisation titers for BA.2.86pp mutants post XBB.1.5 adapted vaccine

Figure 6: Introduced mutations Δ insMPLF and Δ 144Y within BA.2.86 restores 506 neutralization capacity of sera post BNT162b2 XBB.1.5 vaccination to that of BA.2. 507

508 (A-E) Neutralization assessment for pseudo-typed particles with sera post BNT162b2 XBB.1.5 509 vaccination. Each mutant shown contains a single mutation reverting the amino acid mutation 510 in BA.2.86 to the corresponding amino acid within BA.2. Particles pseudo-typed with the 511 indicated S proteins were pre-incubated for one hour at 37 °C with sera dilutions from double 512 boostered health care workers. Pseudo-virus neutralization titer 50 (PVNT50) was calculated

using the least squares fit using a variable slope, using a four-parameter nonlinear regression model. The lower limit of confidence (LLOC) was set at a PVNT50 of 6.25 (dashed line). Nonresponders are defined as individuals below this threshold. All PVNT50 below 1 are set at 1 for visualization purposes. The assay was performed in technical duplicates and with negative controls to assess the virus input of each used pseudo-virus in the absence of plasma antibodies. Statistical significance was assessed by Friedman nonparametric paired test (ns, p > 0.05; *, p ≤ 0.05 ; **, p ≤ 0.01 ; ***, p ≤ 0.001).

521 References

- 522 Callaway E. Why a highly mutated coronavirus variant has scientists on alert. Nature. 1. 523 2023;620(7976):934.
- 524 Focosi D, Spezia PG, Maggi F. SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 ("Pirola"): Is it Pi or Just 2. 525 Another Omicron Sublineage? Vaccines (Basel). 2023;11(11).
- 526 3. Harris E. CDC Assesses Risk From BA.2.86, Highly Mutated COVID-19 Variant. 527 Jama. 2023;330(11):1029.
- 528 Rasmussen M, Møller FT, Gunalan V, Baig S, Bennedbæk M, Christiansen LE, et al. 4. 529 First cases of SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 in Denmark, 2023. Euro Surveill. 2023;28(36).
- 530 Wannigama DL, Amarasiri M, Phattharapornjaroen P, Hurst C, Modchang C, 5.
- 531 Chadsuthi S, et al. Tracing the new SARS-CoV-2 variant BA.2.86 in the community through 532 wastewater surveillance in Bangkok, Thailand. Lancet Infect Dis. 2023;23(11):e464-e6.
- 533 6. Lambrou AS, South E, Ballou ES, Paden CR, Fuller JA, Bart SM, et al. Early
- 534 Detection and Surveillance of the SARS-CoV-2 Variant BA.2.86 - Worldwide, July-October 535 2023. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep. 2023;72(43):1162-7.
- 536 7. Reeve L, Tessier E, Trindall A, Abdul Aziz NIB, Andrews N, Futschik M, et al. High 537 attack rate in a large care home outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86, East of England, August 538 2023. Euro Surveill. 2023;28(39).
- 539 Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Krüger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al. 8. 540 SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically 541 Proven Protease Inhibitor. Cell. 2020;181(2):271-80.e8.
- 542 9. Lusvarghi S, Wang W, Herrup R, Neerukonda SN, Vassell R, Bentley L, et al. Key
- 543 Substitutions in the Spike Protein of SARS-CoV-2 Variants Can Predict Resistance to
- 544 Monoclonal Antibodies, but Other Substitutions Can Modify the Effects. J Virol. 545 2022;96(1):e0111021.
- Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak 546 10. 547 associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. Nature. 2020;579(7798):270-3.
- 548 Yang S, Yu Y, Jian F, Song W, Yisimayi A, Chen X, et al. Antigenicity and 11.
- 549 infectivity characterisation of SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86. Lancet Infect Dis. 2023;23(11):e457-550 e9.
- 551 12. Uriu K, Ito J, Kosugi Y, Tanaka YL, Mugita Y, Guo Z, et al. Transmissibility,
- 552 infectivity, and immune evasion of the SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 variant. Lancet Infect Dis. 553 2023;23(11):e460-e1.
- 554 13. Wang Q, Guo Y, Liu L, Schwanz LT, Li Z, Nair MS, et al. Antigenicity and receptor 555 affinity of SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 spike. Nature. 2023.
- 556 Qian W, Yicheng G, Anthony B, Ian AM, Riccardo V, Carmen G, et al. XBB.1.5 14.
- 557 monovalent mRNA vaccine booster elicits robust neutralizing antibodies against emerging 558 SARS-CoV-2 variants. bioRxiv. 2023:2023.11.26.568730.
- 559 Dadonaite B, Brown J, McMahon TE, Farrell AG, Asarnow D, Stewart C, et al. Full-15. 560 spike deep mutational scanning helps predict the evolutionary success of SARS-CoV-2 561 clades. bioRxiv. 2023.
- 562 Pastorio C, Zech F, Noettger S, Jung C, Jacob T, Sanderson T, et al. Determinants of 16. Spike infectivity, processing, and neutralization in SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariants BA.1 563 564 and BA.2. Cell host & microbe. 2022;30(9):1255-68.e5.
- Abassi L, Bertoglio F, Mačak Šafranko Ž, Schirrmann T, Greweling-Pils M, Seifert 17. 565
- 566 O, et al. Evaluation of the Neutralizing Antibody STE90-C11 against SARS-CoV-2 Delta
- 567 Infection and Its Recognition of Other Variants of Concerns. Viruses. 2023;15(11).

568 569	18. Miller J, Hachmann NP, Collier AY, Lasrado N, Mazurek CR, Patio RC, et al. Substantial Neutralization Escape by SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variants BO 1 1 and XBB 1 N
570	Engl J Med. 2023:388(7):662-4.
571	19. Yue C, Song W, Wang L, Jian F, Chen X, Gao F, et al. ACE2 binding and antibody
572	evasion in enhanced transmissibility of XBB.1.5. Lancet Infect Dis. 2023;23(3):278-80.
573	20. Wang Q, Guo Y, Iketani S, Nair MS, Li Z, Mohri H, et al. Antibody evasion by
574	SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariants BA.2.12.1, BA.4 and BA.5. Nature. 2022;608(7923):603-
575	8.
576 577	21. McCallum M, De Marco A, Lempp FA, Tortorici MA, Pinto D, Walls AC, et al. N-terminal domain antigenic mapping reveals a site of vulnerability for SARS-CoV-2. Cell.
578	2021;184(9):2332-47.e16.
579	22. Vellas C, Trémeaux P, Del Bello A, Latour J, Jeanne N, Ranger N, et al. Resistance
580	mutations in SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant in patients treated with sotrovimab. Clin
581	Microbiol Infect. 2022;28(9):1297-9.
582	23. Mykytyn AZ, Fouchier RA, Haagmans BL. Antigenic evolution of SARS coronavirus
583	2. Curr Opin Virol. 2023;62:101349.
584	24. Huo J, Dijokaite-Guraliuc A, Liu C, Zhou D, Ginn HM, Das R, et al. A delicate
585	balance between antibody evasion and ACE2 affinity for Omicron BA.2.75. Cell Rep.
586	2023;42(1):111903.
587	25. Qu P, Evans JP, Zheng YM, Carlin C, Saif LJ, Oltz EM, et al. Evasion of neutralizing
588	antibody responses by the SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.75 variant. Cell Host Microbe.
589	2022;30(11):1518-26.e4.
590	26. Tunyasuvunakool K, Adler J, Wu Z, Green T, Zielinski M, Žídek A, et al. Highly
591	accurate protein structure prediction for the human proteome. Nature. 2021;596(7873):590-6.
592	27. Richard E, Michael ON, Alexander P, Natasha A, Andrew S, Tim G, et al. Protein
593	complex prediction with AlphaFold-Multimer. bioRxiv. 2022:2021.10.04.463034.
594	28. Yuan Y, Cao D, Zhang Y, Ma J, Qi J, Wang Q, et al. Cryo-EM structures of MERS-
595	CoV and SARS-CoV spike glycoproteins reveal the dynamic receptor binding domains.
596	Nature communications. 2017;8:15092.
597	29. Katzmarzyk M, Clesle DC, van den Heuvel J, Hoffmann M, Garritsen H, Pöhlmann
598	S, et al. Systematical assessment of the impact of single spike mutations of SARS-CoV-2
599	Omicron sub-variants on the neutralization capacity of post-vaccination sera. Front Immunol.
600	2023;14:1288/94.
601	30. Sheward DJ, Yang Y, Westerberg M, Oling S, Muschiol S, Sato K, et al. Sensitivity
602	of the SARS-CoV-2 BA.2.86 variant to prevailing neutralising antibody responses. Lancet
603	Infect Dis. $2023;23(11):e462-e3$.
604 605	31. Berknout B, Herrera-Carrillo E. SARS-Cov-2 Evolution: On the Sudden Appearance
605 606	of the Omicron Variant. J Virol. 2022;96(7):e0009022.
000 607	52. Ragiow Z, Surie D, Chappell JD, Zhu Y, Martin ET, Kwon JH, et al. SARS-Cov-2
609	shedding and evolution in minumocompromised nosis during the Omicron period: a
600	22 Stankov MV Hoffmann M Gutiarraz Jauragui P. Cossmann A Marillas Pamos G
610	Graalmann T, et al. Humoral and cellular immune responses following BNT162b2 XBB 1.5
611	vaccination I ancet Infect Dis 2023
612	34 Chi X Yan R Zhang I Zhang G Zhang Y Hao M et al. A neutralizing human
613	antibody binds to the N-terminal domain of the Spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 Science (New
614	York NY) 2020:369(6504):650-5
615	35. Survadevara N. Shiakolas AR. VanBlargan I.A. Binshtein E. Chen RE. Case IB. et al.
616	An antibody targeting the N-terminal domain of SARS-CoV-2 disrupts the spike trimer. J
617	Clin Invest. 2022;132(11).

618 36. Colson P, La Scola B, Beye M, Delerce J, Raoult D, Fantini J. Emergence of a second 619 SARS-CoV-2 variant with a tremendous genetic leap from its ancestors. J Med Virol. 620 2023;95(10):e29124. 621 37. Wang O, Li Z, Guo Y, Mellis IA, Iketani S, Liu M, et al. Evolving antibody evasion 622 and receptor affinity of the Omicron BA.2.75 sublineage of SARS-CoV-2. iScience. 623 2023;26(11):108254.

624 38. Wang O, Iketani S, Li Z, Liu L, Guo Y, Huang Y, et al. Alarming antibody evasion properties of rising SARS-CoV-2 BQ and XBB subvariants. Cell. 2023;186(2):279-86.e8. 625

626 Wang Q, Iketani S, Li Z, Guo Y, Yeh AY, Liu M, et al. Antigenic characterization of 39.

627 the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariant BA.2.75. Cell Host Microbe. 2022;30(11):1512-7.e4.

628 40. Lester S, Harcourt J, Whitt M, Al-Abdely HM, Midgley CM, Alkhamis AM, et al.

629 Middle East respiratory coronavirus (MERS-CoV) spike (S) protein vesicular stomatitis virus 630 pseudoparticle neutralization assays offer a reliable alternative to the conventional

631 neutralization assay in human seroepidemiological studies. Access Microbiol.

632 2019;1(9):e000057.

633 Tolah AMK, Sohrab SS, Tolah KMK, Hassan AM, El-Kafrawy SA, Azhar EI. 41.

634 Evaluation of a Pseudovirus Neutralization Assay for SARS-CoV-2 and Correlation with 635 Live Virus-Based Micro Neutralization Assay, Diagnostics (Basel), 2021:11(6).

636 42. Ouandt J, Muik A, Salisch N, Lui BG, Lutz S, Krüger K, et al. Omicron BA.1

637 breakthrough infection drives cross-variant neutralization and memory B cell formation 638 against conserved epitopes. Sci Immunol. 2022;7(75):eabq2427.

639 43. Berger Rentsch M, Zimmer G. A vesicular stomatitis virus replicon-based bioassay 640 for the rapid and sensitive determination of multi-species type I interferon. PLoS One. 641 2011;6(10):e25858.

642 44. Jumper J, Evans R, Pritzel A, Green T, Figurnov M, Ronneberger O, et al. Highly 643 accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. Nature. 2021;596(7873):583-9.

644

646 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

647

648 **Table S1: Detailed information on the plasma samples.**

649

650 Figure S1. Analysis of the structural model of the BA.2.86 spike protein

651 (A) AlphaFold2/AlphaFold-Multimer model of the trimeric spike protein, colored by per-652 residue model confidence score (pLDDT), with blue colors corresponding to high and red 653 colors corresponding to low confidence. The circle highlights the N-terminal domain NTD 654 further explored in the next panel. (B) The NTD of BA.2.86 spike protein colored by pLDDT 655 score. The circle highlights the N-terminal 16MPLF insertion of BA.2.86 and is further 656 explored in the next panel. (C) Predicted interactions of the 16MPLF insertion with a crevice 657 of the NTD. Colors correspond to the pLDDT score, N marks the position of the N-terminus 658 after cleavage of the signal peptide. (D) Comparison to the same region in the NTD of SARS-659 CoV (PDB-ID 5X4S) (28). Note that this virus, with respect to SARS-CoV-2, carried an 660 extended N-terminus as well. Here, the N-terminus was anchored by a disulfide bridge (C19-C133), which is not conserved in BA.2.86. 661