

Subclinical SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Endemic Human Coronavirus Immunity Shape SARS-CoV-2 Saliva Antibody Responses

Tonia L. Conner,¹ Emilie Goguet,^{1,2} Hannah Haines-Hull,^{1,2} Allison Segard,^{1,2} Emily S. Darcey,^{1,2} Priscilla Kobi,^{2,3} Bolatito Balogun,^{2,3} Cara Olsen,⁴ Dominic Esposito,⁵ Milissa Jones,⁶ Timothy H. Burgess,³ Robert J. O'Connell,³ Christopher C. Broder,¹ David Saunders,⁶ Simon Pollett,^{2,3} Eric D. Laing,¹ Edward Mitre*¹

¹Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD, USA

²Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc., Bethesda, MD, USA

³Infectious Diseases Clinical Research Program, Department of Preventive Medicine & Biostatistics, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD, USA

⁴Department of Preventive Medicine & Biostatistics, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD, USA

⁵NCI RAS Initiative, Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, Frederick, MD, USA

⁶Translational Medicine Unit, Department of Medicine, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, Bethesda, MD, USA

*Correspondence: edward.mitre@usuhs.edu

HIGHLIGHTS

Saliva anti-spike antibodies were present in > 90% of participants by spring 2022

Saliva anti-spike IgA was driven by subclinical and clinically evident infections

COVID-19 mRNA vaccination alone was a weak inducer of saliva IgA antibodies

HCoV immunity correlates with post-vaccine anti-spike saliva antibody levels

SUMMARY

This study characterized antibody responses induced by COVID-19 mRNA vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection in saliva. Utilizing multiplex microsphere-based immunoassays, we measured saliva anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike IgG, IgA, and secretory IgA in 1,224 saliva samples collected from healthcare workers in the Prospective Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion study between August of 2020 through December of 2022. By spring of 2022, most individuals had detectable spike-specific antibodies in saliva. Longitudinal measurements of saliva anti-SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid IgG revealed that most spike-specific IgA and secretory IgA detected in saliva was driven by subclinical and clinically-evident infections, rather than by vaccination alone. In contrast, saliva anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike IgG was strongly induced by vaccination and exhibited improved durability with hybrid immunity. Baseline levels of saliva antibodies to the endemic human coronaviruses positively correlated with post-vaccination anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike IgG levels. This study provides insights for development of vaccines that generate mucosal antibodies to respiratory pathogens.

KEYWORDS

Mucosal immunity, saliva antibodies, COVID-19 mRNA vaccine, SARS-CoV-2 infection, endemic human coronaviruses (HCoVs), secretory IgA (SIgA)

INTRODUCTION

Vaccines based on mRNA technology were the first approved for human use during the COVID-19 pandemic¹ and their implementation led to substantial reductions in mortality and morbidity during the pandemic.² However, while intramuscular (IM) mRNA vaccines reduced the severity of SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccine naïve recipients, protection against infection is incomplete, lacks durability against infection, and is not transmission-blocking.³⁻⁵ There were also concerns that pre-existing immunity to the endemic human coronaviruses (HCoVs) could impair vaccine efficacy due to cross-reactivity with SARS-CoV-2.^{6,7}

Effective vaccine platforms for SARS-CoV-2 interfere with critical elements of viral pathophysiology. SARS-CoV-2 initiates infection by binding angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptors expressed throughout the mucosal surfaces of the respiratory tract.⁸ The mucosal-associated lymphoid tissues (MALT), and specifically, the nasal-associated lymphoid tissues (NALT), produce the first adaptive immune response in the upper respiratory tract.⁹ After exposure to viral antigens, the NALT seeds tissues in the upper respiratory tract with mature B cells capable of rapidly producing antibodies into the nasal and saliva secretions.⁹⁻¹² The predominant antibody generated at mucosal sites is immunoglobulin A (IgA), produced as monomers (most common in the serum) or dimers (most common in mucosal secretions).¹³ Dimeric IgA has been shown to neutralize the SARS-CoV-2 virus more potently than monomeric IgA¹⁴ and is moved across epithelial cells of the mucosa by the polymeric IgA receptor (pIgR), which is cleaved once reaching the apical side of the cell.¹⁵ Once the pIgR is cleaved, a 5-domain protein remains, referred to as the secretory component (SC). The SC stabilizes the dimer contributing to agglutination and exclusion of pathogens.¹⁵ When the SC is bound to dimeric IgA, the molecule is referred to as secretory IgA (SIgA),^{16 11,15} and provides a total of four antigen-specific binding regions.¹⁵ The presence of dimeric IgA and SIgA in mucosal sites has been associated with early responses against viral pathogens, as well as lower viral load

and shorter duration of viral shedding.^{17,18} Consequently, mucosal antibody responses are likely integral to protective immunity against SARS-CoV-2 infections.¹⁹⁻²²

Understanding the predictors of mucosal immune responses in saliva and the kinetics of saliva antibody responses elicited by currently licensed IM COVID-19 mRNA vaccines is important for understanding vaccine control of viral shedding and transmission.^{5,23} This research is also central to the development of next generation COVID-19 vaccines which seek to block transmission and elicit robust mucosal immunity, including approaches which use a combination of IM and intranasal vaccines.⁴

While many studies have investigated circulating antibody levels in blood specimens after COVID-19 mRNA vaccination, relatively few have measured the effects mRNA vaccines have on saliva antibodies. Of those that have, most have found that COVID-19 mRNA vaccines induce spike-specific IgG antibodies in saliva.²⁴⁻²⁹ In contrast, results regarding induction of saliva IgA by mRNA vaccines have been diverse, with some reporting measurable increases in saliva IgA after initial or booster vaccinations²⁴⁻²⁹ and while other report minimal saliva IgA responses.^{25,30,31}

One particular challenge in addressing the knowledge gap of how well IM mRNA vaccines induce saliva antibodies is accounting for subclinical infections that may confound vaccine study results. Thus, a key goal of this study was to determine how COVID-19 mRNA vaccination alone shapes mucosal antibody responses by identifying timepoints when study participants experienced clinical and subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections and excluding these samples from longitudinal analyses. Another goal of this study was to determine whether pre-existing mucosal memory raised by prior endemic HCoV exposures influence saliva antibody responses induced by COVID-19 mRNA vaccination.

To achieve these goals, we characterized the patterns and predictors of longitudinal saliva antibody responses following COVID-19 mRNA vaccinations in a cohort of healthcare workers between August of 2020 through December of 2022. We incorporated evidence of both subclinical and clinical infections and observed remarkably different profiles of saliva antibody responses associated with infection alone, vaccination alone, and hybrid immunity. Additionally, we analyzed for predictors of vaccine elicited-saliva immunity by age, sex, and pre-vaccination (baseline) levels of saliva antibodies against the 4 major endemic HCoVs.

METHODS

Study Participants: Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria and COVID-19 testing

Participants were enrolled between August of 2020 and March of 2021 into the Prospective Assessment of SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion (PASS) study, an ongoing prospective study evaluating clinical and immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination. In-depth details of the PASS study methods have been published previously.³²

At time of enrollment, all participants were employed at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (WRNMMC) and met the inclusion criteria of being ≥ 18 years of age and generally healthy. Participants were excluded at enrollment if they were immunocompromised, had history of COVID-19 prior to enrollment, or were SARS-CoV-2 seropositive. Additionally, for this analysis of saliva antibodies, participants were excluded from the analysis set if their initial COVID-19 2-dose vaccine series was not Pfizer BNT162b2.

All participants were asked to test for SARS-CoV-2, by either PCR testing at the WRNMMC COVID-19 testing facility and/or by rapid antigen testing at home, whenever they experienced symptoms consistent with possible SARS-CoV-2 infection. Participants reported vaccination and infection events at study clinic visits held monthly between August of 2020 and August of 2021,

and then quarterly through December of 2022. Participants were classified as being uninfected until they either developed a positive SARS-CoV-2 test, or developed a doubling of their saliva IgG antibody levels against SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid (N) protein compared to their baseline level. Individuals that developed a doubling in saliva anti-SARS-CoV-2 (anti-SCV2) N IgG antibody levels, but had no history of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test, were categorized as having a “subclinical infection” based on a data-driven approach (see Results).

Saliva Collection

Saliva samples were collected at quarterly clinic visits until August of 2022, and semi-annually since. While the PASS study is still ongoing, for this analysis we evaluated saliva samples collected through December 6, 2022. Whole saliva samples were collected by the passive drool method³³⁻³⁶ using the Salimetrics Saliva Collection Aid in accordance with the package insert (Salimetrics, State College, PA, USA). Participants were instructed to rinse their mouth with water for 10-15 seconds followed by a 10-minute rest period before collection. Saliva was then pooled in the mouth and drooled into the saliva collection device. Samples were frozen immediately after collection at -20°C, and then transferred later that day to -80°C for long term storage.

Saliva antibody testing

On day of testing, saliva samples were thawed on ice and then centrifuged at 16,000 x g for 10 minutes at 4°C. Supernatant was transferred to a new tube, heat-inactivated for 30 minutes at 60°C, and then diluted 1:5 and 1:20 in phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Samples were tested for IgG, IgA, and SIgA using a well-described antigen-based multiplex microsphere immunoassay.³⁷⁻³⁹ Briefly, wild-type Wuhan-1 SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein, expressed as native-like prefusion stabilized ectodomain trimer, hereafter referred to as ‘spike’, was sourced

from Curia (Albany, NY, USA) and expression of trimeric ectodomain spike protein antigens of the four endemic human coronaviruses (HCoV-OC43, -HKU1, -NL63, -229E) have been previously described.^{37,40} The N protein was sourced from RayBiotech (Peachtree, GA, USA). S and N antigens (15 µg) were coupled to 100 µl of magnetic carboxylated beads (Luminex, Austin, TX, USA) and stored in accordance with the manufacturer's protocol. A master mix of 1:100 beads to PBS ratio was prepared for each antibody plate. Antigen-coupled beads were incubated with 100 µl of each diluted saliva sample at room temperature for 45 minutes, under agitation at 700 rpm. Plates were then washed with PBS + 0.05% of Tween 20 a total of 3 times. Biotinylated cross-adsorbed goat anti-human IgG (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA, USA) was then added at a 1:5000 dilution for detection of IgG, and biotinylated cross-adsorbed goat anti-human IgA (Invitrogen) was used at a 1:5000 dilution for detection of IgA. Goat anti-human SIgA (MyBioSource, San Diego, CA, USA) was biotinylated using a biotinylation kit (Abcam, Cambridge, UK), and diluted at 1:5000 for SIgA detection. Plates were then incubated again at room temperature for 45 minutes, under agitation at 700 rpm. Plates were washed 3 times prior to incubation with a 1:1000 dilution of streptavidin-phycoerythrin (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA, USA). After a final 3 washes, 100 µl of PBS + 0.05% of Tween 20 was added to each well and rocked at 700 rpm for 10 minutes prior to reading. Antigen-antibody levels were measured as a median fluorescence intensity (MFI) by a Bio-Plex 200 HTF multiplex system (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA). Arbitrary binding units (AU/mL) for saliva antibodies were calculated by interpolating MFI values against in-house standard curves generated using microspheres conjugated with known concentrations of purified human IgG, IgA, or SIgA and serially diluted.

Statistical Analysis

Comparisons were made using log-transformed data, with the Mann Whitney test for unpaired comparisons, and the Wilcoxon test for paired comparisons. The Kruskal-Wallis test followed by the Dunn's test were used for multiple comparisons of three or more groups. Correlations were

performed using Spearman's rank correlation. Geometric means (GM), medians and interquartile ranges (IQR) were calculated using Graph Pad Prism Software version 10.

Ethics

All participants provided informed consent and the protocol was approved by the Uniformed Services University Institutional Review Board in compliance with all applicable Federal regulations governing the protection of human participants.

RESULTS

Study demographics and vaccinations

The PASS study enrolled 271 participants from August of 2020 through March of 2021. Of these, 4 participants were excluded from this analysis: 1 participant was unable to provide saliva, 2 participants received the Moderna mRNA vaccine as their initial 2-dose vaccine series, 1 participant received the AstraZeneca vaccine, and 1 participant was found to be seropositive at baseline after repeat testing (Supplemental Figure 1). The self-reported demographics of the 266 included participants are presented in Supplemental Table 1. The majority were female (69.5%), white (71.4%), and non-Hispanic (92.1%), with a median age of 41 years (range 21-71; IQR 33.0-51.3). The most common occupations were nurse (32.7%), physician (25.9%), and occupational/physical/speech therapist (11.7%).

All participants who were vaccinated in this analysis received the Pfizer BNT162b2 WT spike COVID-19 mRNA vaccine as their initial 2-dose vaccination series (n=241). Of the 266 participants in the study, 22 only provided baseline samples and 2 participants did not get vaccinated. For the 3rd vaccine dose, 163 participants received the BNT162b2 WT spike mRNA vaccine, and 2 received the Moderna WT spike mRNA-1273 vaccine. A total of 76 did not get a 3rd dose during the study. Among the participants receiving a 4th dose of the vaccine, 29

received the ancestral monovalent WT Pfizer BNT162b2 vaccine, 22 received the bivalent (WT+BA.4/5) Pfizer mRNA vaccine, and 1 received the bivalent (WT+BA.4/5) Moderna mRNA vaccine.

Longitudinal anti-SCV2 spike and anti-SCV2 N saliva antibody levels

We evaluated the longitudinal kinetics of saliva IgG, IgA, and SIgA antibody responses to COVID-19 vaccination and SARS-CoV-2 infection over the course of the first 2 years of the pandemic (Figure 1). An increase in anti-SCV2 spike IgG was observed in the cohort around December of 2020 which aligned with the approval of the emergency use authorization for the first vaccines. By August of 2021, anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels in saliva declined, and continued to decline, until December of 2021 for those that had not yet received a 3rd dose of the vaccine. Anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels increased in December of 2021 for the participants that received a 3rd dose, but declined again by the following spring. Throughout 2022, we observed that most of the cohort had saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels that remained comparable to levels at 1 month after the initial 2-dose vaccine series (Figure 1A).

In comparison, only modest increases in anti-SCV2 spike IgA levels were seen during the vaccine roll-out in late 2020 and throughout 2021. Substantially elevated levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgA were not consistently observed until 2022, by which time many in the cohort had confirmed infections and many others likely had subclinical infections. Similar dynamics were seen in anti-SCV2 spike SIgA (Figure 1A), with increases observed starting in April of 2022. Increases in anti-SCV2 N IgG were most consistently observed in 2022 (Figure 1B). Overall, few changes were observed in the levels of anti-SCV2 N IgA and SIgA in saliva over the course of the study (Figure 1B).




Figure 1. Longitudinal observations of antibody levels in saliva among PASS participants

A) Anti-SCV2 spike and **B)** anti-SCV2 N IgG, IgA and SIgA levels in saliva between August of 2020 through December of 2022 for all participants. Blue = baseline saliva samples (n=261, n=5 saliva quantity not sufficient for testing at baseline timepoint), orange = saliva samples after the 2nd dose of mRNA vaccine (n=467), green = saliva samples after the 3rd dose of vaccine (n=263), pink = saliva samples after the 4th dose of vaccine (n=30), yellow = saliva samples tested after documented SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=199)

Longitudinal assessment of subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections

We suspected that the longitudinal increases in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels observed in participants without a known positive test for SARS-CoV-2, were due to subclinical infections that increased in frequency during the pandemic.

To determine a saliva antibody threshold to categorize individuals with a possible subclinical infection, we evaluated anti-SCV2 N IgG levels in saliva from participants who developed post-vaccine SARS-CoV-2 infections (PVI) and compared their baseline levels of anti-N IgG to their levels 1-3 months after a PVI. Of these 68 participants with saliva samples collected between 1 and 3 months after a confirmed PVI, 59 participants exhibited saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG levels at least 2-fold greater than their baseline values, resulting in a sensitivity of 86.8% (Supplemental Figure 2).

On this basis, we then defined all participants who experienced at least a doubling in their saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG levels compared to baseline, as having a subclinical infection. Participants were thus ultimately categorized as follows: pre-vaccine infection (PreVI) (n=17), post-vaccine infection (PVI, n=73), subclinical post-vaccine infection (n=98), and no infection (n=59) (Supplemental Table 2). Because of participant attrition throughout the study, we next analyzed the percentage of participants that fit into each category at roughly quarterly intervals through December of 2022. By the fall of 2022, only 7.5% of participants evaluated had never tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 and never had saliva antibody evidence of a subclinical infection (Table 1).

Table 1: Vaccination and infection categorization of participants at specific time intervals

Date intervals	Number of participants tested at each interval	Number of participants that tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 at least once during the study	Number of participants with saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG doubling but no prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test (subclinical infection)	Number of participants with no prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test and no doubling of saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG (no prior infection)
8/25/2020 - 10/30/2020	181	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	181 (100.0%)
11/1/2020 - 1/31/2021	112	10 (8.9%)	13 (11.6%)	89 (79.5%)
2/1/2021 - 4/40/2021	192	13 (6.8%)	65 (33.9%)	114 (59.4%)
5/1/2021 - 7/31/2021	158	8 (5.1%)	60 (38.0%)	90 (57.0%)
8/1/2021 - 10/31/2021	64	9 (14.1%)	22 (34.4%)	33 (51.6%)
11/1/2021 - 1/31/2022	163	16 (9.8%)	65 (39.9%)	82 (50.3%)
2/1/2022 - 4/30/2022	138	48 (34.8%)	59 (42.8%)	31 (22.5%)
5/1/2022 - 7/31/2022	135	61 (45.2%)	57 (42.2%)	17 (12.6%)
8/1/2022 - 12/6/2022	53	24 (45.3%)	25 (47.2%)	4 (7.5%)

COVID-19 mRNA vaccinations induce detectable saliva levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgG antibodies but minimal anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA antibody levels

Saliva antibody levels at specific timepoints after COVID-19 mRNA vaccination are shown in Figure 2. In analysis of all participants without a prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test at 1 month after the 2-dose initial vaccination series (1M PV2), we observed a substantial increase in anti-SCV2 spike IgG (15.2-fold increase compared to baseline), a modest increase in anti-SCV2 spike IgA (1.8-fold increase compared to baseline), and no measurable increase in anti-SCV2 spike SIgA (Figure 2A). Furthermore, we observed higher levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels after the 3rd vaccine dose (PV3) compared to the 2nd vaccine dose (PV2). Additionally, the rate of decline in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels appeared to decrease after the 3rd dose (PV3) compared to the 2nd dose (PV2). We also observed no appreciable increase in anti-SCV2 spike IgA or SIgA at 1 month after the 3rd dose (1M PV3) (Figure 2A). Because we observed increases in anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels at later timepoints after the 3rd vaccine dose (4-6M PV3 and 6-9M PV3), we posited that some participants were likely experiencing subclinical infections. In line with this, we also observed anti-SCV2 N IgG levels increase 2.4-fold in the 4-6M PV3 and 2.4-fold in the 6-9M PV3 groups (Supplemental Figure 3A).

Figure 2B shows saliva anti-SCV2 spike antibody responses to vaccination after removal of participants with known prior SARS-CoV-2 infection and participants with subclinical infections defined by doubling in anti-SCV2 N IgG. Overall, we observed only minor changes to anti-SCV2 spike IgA levels in saliva. A modest increase (1.6-fold increase compared to baseline) was observed in anti-SCV2 spike IgA levels in the 1M PV2 group, and the late (4-6M PV3 and 6-9M PV3) increases in anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA were no longer present. In contrast, anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels remained markedly increased by vaccination with levels 14.7-fold greater than baseline at 1M PV2 and 23.4-fold greater at 1M PV3 (Figure 2B). These results demonstrate

that while COVID-19 mRNA vaccination induces marked increases in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG, it induces only minimal increases in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA.




Figure 2. COVID-19 mRNA vaccinations induce detectable saliva levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgG antibodies but minimal anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA antibody levels

A) Anti-SCV2 spike IgG, IgA and SIgA saliva antibody responses at each timepoint after vaccination compared to baseline levels in samples of participants with no prior documented SARS-CoV-2 infection (BSL n=261, ≤14D PV2 n=17, 1M PV2 n=205, 4-6M PV2 n=174, 6-9M PV2 n=41, 9-12M PV2 n=30, 1M PV3 n=110, 4-6M PV3 n=93, 6-9M PV3 n=49, 9-12M PV3 n=12, 1M PV4 n=30). **B)** Anti-SCV2 N IgG, IgA and SIgA saliva antibody responses at each timepoint after vaccination compared to baseline levels after removal of participants with a subclinical infection as well as those with prior documented SARS-COV-2 infection (BSL n=261, ≤14D PV2 n=10, 1M PV2 n=129, 4-6M PV2 n=104, 6-9M PV2 n=23, 9-12M PV2 n=16, 1M PV3 n=61, 4-6M PV3 n=30, 6-9M PV3 n=12, 9-12M PV3 n=3, 1M PV4 n=3). Comparisons made using log-transformed data and Kruskal-Wallis analysis with Dunn's multiple comparison test.

Fold-change in geometric mean compared to baseline levels is indicated in the text above box and whisker plots. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay. (BSL = baseline, D = days, M = months, PV2 = post-2nd vaccine dose, PV3 = post-3rd vaccine dose, PV4 = post-4th vaccine dose).

Boosting increases magnitude and durability of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG, but does not result in increases to saliva IgA or SIgA

To optimally compare the effect that additional vaccine doses have on saliva antibody levels, we removed saliva samples from participants with any prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test or evidence of prior subclinical infection. Anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels at 1 month after the 3rd dose (1M PV3 = GM 747.1 AU/mL) were not statistically greater ($p = 0.1579$) than those obtained at 1 month after the 2nd dose (1M PV2 = 469.1 AU/mL, Supplemental Figure 4). However, after a 3rd dose, anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels in the 4-6M (4-6M PV3, GM = 471.4 AU/mL,) and 6-9M (6-9M PV3, GM = 413.3 AU/mL) groups were significantly greater ($p < 0.0001$ and $p=0.0008$, respectively) than those obtained at the same timepoints after initial 2-dose series (4-6M PV2 GM= 135.5 AU/mL and 6-9M PV2 GM = 95.31 AU/mL) (Figure 2B and Supplemental Figure 4). The trend showing improved durability over time in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels after a 3rd dose was observed up to 9-12 months (9-12M PV3 vs 9-12M PV2, Supplemental Figure 4), though the comparison did not reach statistical significance. These differences were also observed using one-phase decay modeling. We determined the half-life of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG after 2 doses to be 92.7 days, 95% CI (71.1-121.5) while the half-life after 3 doses was 159.5 days, 95% CI (75.6-621.4) (Supplemental Figure 5). No appreciable differences were observed in anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels at any timepoints after the 3rd (PV3) and 4th (PV4) doses (Figure 2B, Supplemental Figure 4).

Females produce higher levels of vaccine elicited anti-SCV2 spike IgG and IgA in saliva than males, whereas antibody levels do not differ across age groups

To analyze saliva antibody levels between sexes and age groups at 1 month after a 2nd vaccine dose (1M PV2), we again removed saliva samples from participants with any prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test or evidence of subclinical infection. Both anti-SCV2 S IgG and anti-SCV2 spike IgA levels were significantly greater in females compared to males (anti-SCV2 spike IgG GM = 525.4 AU/mL in females, GM = 364.5 AU/mL in males, $p = 0.0023$; anti-SCV2 spike IgA GM = 97.1 AU/mL in females, GM = 58.7 AU/mL in males, $p = 0.0118$, Figure 3A). No differences in saliva antibody levels were observed between age groups (Figure 3B).




Figure 3. Females produce higher levels of vaccine elicited anti-SCV2 spike IgG and IgA in saliva than males, whereas antibody levels do not differ across age groups

A) Comparison of female (n=89) and male (n=40) saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG, IgA and SIgA antibody responses 1 month after the 2nd vaccine dose (1M PV2) in individuals with no prior documented or subclinical infection. Mann Whitney analysis performed on log-transformed data.

Fold-change in geometric mean is indicated in the text above box and whisker plots. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay. B) Anti-SCV2 spike IgG, IgA and SIgA saliva antibody responses across age groups 1 month after the 2nd vaccine dose (1M PV2) in individuals with no prior documented or subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infection. Comparisons made using log-transformed data and Kruskal-Wallis analysis with Dunn's multiple comparison test. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay. (Age groups: 20-29, n=13; 30-39, n=31; 40-49, n=37; 50-59, n=31; 60 and above, n=17). * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$.

Pre-vaccine infection induces significantly greater levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA in saliva than two doses of mRNA vaccine

To assess the effects SARS-CoV-2 infection had on saliva antibody levels in the absence of pre-existing immunity, we conducted paired analyses of saliva antibody levels in all participants that developed pre-vaccination infections (PreVI) and had saliva samples available both at baseline and 1 month after infection (n=14). Significant increases from baseline were observed in anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels with a 9.4-fold increase ($p = 0.0002$), anti-SCV2 spike IgA with a 4.4-fold increase ($p = 0.0023$), and anti-SCV2 spike SIgA with a 1.7-fold increase ($p = 0.0039$) (Figure 4A). A modest, but significant, increase (1.9-fold, $p = 0.0203$) was also observed in saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG levels while no increases were observed in saliva anti-SCV2 N IgA or SIgA in the pre-vaccine infection group (Figure 4B).

We next compared saliva antibody levels measured 1 month after pre-vaccine infection (1M PreVI) with saliva antibody levels measured at 1 month after 2 vaccine doses (1M PV2) in individuals that had no prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test or evidence of subclinical infection. While vaccination and infection induced comparable levels of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG, the levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA were significantly greater after infection (anti-SCV2 spike IgA GM = 254.7 AU/mL in 1M PreVI, GM = 83.1 AU/mL in 1M PV2, $p < 0.001$; anti-SCV2 spike SIgA GM

= 391.9 AU/mL in 1M PreVI, GM = 238.6 AU/mL in 1M PV2, $p < 0.0001$) (Figure 4C). As expected, saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG levels were greater after infection than after vaccination (Figure 4D).




Figure 4: Pre-vaccine infection induces significantly greater levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA in saliva than two doses of mRNA vaccine

A) Anti-SCV2 spike and **B)** anti-SCV2 N IgG, IgA and SIgA responses in saliva at baseline (BSL) and 1 month after pre-vaccine infection (1M PreVI). Analysis performed on log-

transformed data using Wilcoxon paired test ($n=14$). Fold-change in geometric mean compared to baseline levels is indicated in the text above box and whisker plots. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay.

Comparisons of **C)** anti-SCV2 spike and **D)** anti-SCV2 N saliva antibody levels in saliva 1 month after 2nd dose of vaccine (1M PV2, $n=129$) and 1 month after pre-vaccine infection (1M PreVI, $n=15$). All PV2 samples were from participants with no prior documented or subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infection. Analysis performed on log-transformed data using Mann-Whitney test. Fold-change in geometric mean is indicated in the text above box and whisker plots. * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay.

Hybrid immunity induces higher anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels than 3rd vaccine dose

To evaluate the impact hybrid immunity has on mucosal antibody levels, we compared saliva antibody responses in uninfected participants at 1 month after a 3rd dose (1M PV3) to participants that had received 2 doses of vaccine and then developed a PVI (PV2+1M PVI) (Figure 5). A 3rd dose induced the same saliva levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgG as 2 doses followed by a PVI. In contrast, anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels were markedly higher in the hybrid immune group than in the 1M PV3 group. (anti-SCV2 spike IgA = 50.1 AU/mL in 1M PV3, and 328.3 AU/mL in PV2+1M PVI, $p < 0.0001$; anti-SCV2 spike SIgA = 246.0 AU/mL in 1M PV3, and 755.0 AU/mL in PV2+1M PVI, $p < 0.0001$) (Figure 5A). Anti-SCV2 N IgG and IgA levels were also significantly greater in the hybrid immunity group (Figure 5B).

Additionally, we also examined hybrid immunity by comparing uninfected participants that received a 4th dose of vaccine (1M PV4) with participants that received a 3rd dose of vaccine and then had a PVI (PV3+1M PVI) (Supplemental Figure 6). Individuals with hybrid immunity (PV3+1M PVI) exhibited greater saliva IgA responses compared to individuals that had received a 4th vaccine dose, but the differences were not statistically significant, likely due to the very small number of uninfected participants who received a 4th dose of vaccine (1M PV4). Of note, both anti-SCV2 spike IgG and IgA levels in saliva were 3.6-fold and 2.2-fold greater, respectively, at 1 month after last antigen exposure in hybrid immune participants when vaccination was followed by infection (VVVI = 3 vaccine doses then infection) than when infection was followed by vaccination (IVVV = infection followed by 3 vaccine doses) (Supplemental Figure 7).




Figure 5: Hybrid immunity induces higher anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA levels than 3rd vaccine dose

A) Anti-SCV2 spike and **B)** anti-SCV2 N IgG, IgA and SIgA responses in saliva at 1 month after 3rd vaccine dose in uninfected participants (1M PV2, n=61) compared with levels 1 month after infection in participants who received a 2nd dose of vaccine and then had a post-vaccine infection (PV2 + 1M PVI, n=6). Analysis performed on log-transformed data using a Mann-Whitney test. Fold-change in geometric mean is indicated in the text above box and whisker plots. ns, not significant; * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001; **** p < 0.0001. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay.

Vaccination results in boosting of saliva IgG against the spike protein of OC43

Prior studies have shown that COVID-19 mRNA vaccines boost serum levels of IgG antibodies against the spike protein of OC43, one of the four HCoV. ⁴¹⁻⁴³ To determine if a similar cross-reactive boosting phenomenon occurs in the saliva, we measured IgG, IgA, and SIgA levels in saliva against the spike proteins of OC43, 229E, HKU1, and NL63 at baseline and 1 month after

vaccination (1M PV2) in participants with no prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test or subclinical infection. Vaccination resulted in a modest (1.3-fold) increase in IgG saliva levels against OC43 spike protein ($p = 0.0006$, Supplemental Figure 8). No statistically significant increases were observed in saliva antibody levels against the spike proteins of 229E, HKU1, and NL63. In participants that were unvaccinated and infected, a similar increase (1.4-fold) was observed 1 month after infection (1M PreVI) in anti-OC43 spike IgG, though the increase was not statistically significant ($p = 0.3575$, Supplemental Figure 9).

Baseline saliva IgG levels against the spike proteins of all four HCoVs positively correlate with anti-SCV2 spike IgG saliva levels after vaccination

The BNT162b2 vaccine contains mRNA that codes for the WT SARS-CoV-2 spike protein. To determine if baseline mucosal immunity against HCoVs had an effect on vaccine-induced saliva antibody levels, we assessed for correlations between baseline saliva antibody levels to the spike proteins of the four HCoVs and 1-month post-vaccination (1M PV2) responses to the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 6). Again, this analysis was performed using samples from participants with no prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test or subclinical infection. We found saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels after vaccination positively correlated with baseline saliva IgG levels against the S proteins of all four HCoVs. A modest correlation was found with baseline anti-OC43 spike IgG levels (Spearman's $\rho = 0.4608$, $p < 0.0001$), and weak correlations were observed with baseline IgG levels against spike proteins of 229E, HKU1, and NL63 ($\rho = 0.2719$, $p = 0.0021$; $\rho = 0.2814$, $p = 0.0014$; $\rho = 0.2872$, $p = 0.0011$, respectively).




Figure 6: Baseline saliva IgG levels against the spike proteins of all four HCoVs positively correlate with anti-SCV2 spike IgG saliva levels after vaccination

Spearman correlations of paired baseline (BSL) saliva anti-spike (S) OC43, HKU1, 229E, and NL63 antibody levels with saliva anti-SCV2 spike (S) antibody levels 1 month after 2nd COVID-19 mRNA vaccine (1M PV2, n=126). * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$. Red dotted line represents lower limit of the assay.

DISCUSSION

In this prospective longitudinal analysis of 266 healthcare workers at the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland, USA, we observed that by the spring of 2022

most individuals had detectable anti-SCV2 spike IgG and IgA antibodies in saliva. Our results indicate that the detection of anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA in saliva was primarily driven by subclinical and clinically-evident infections. While COVID-19 mRNA vaccination alone was a weak inducer of saliva IgA antibodies, IgG was strongly induced in the saliva by vaccination and exhibited increased half-life after subsequent vaccinations and after a post-vaccine infection. Additionally, we observed that women generated greater levels of saliva IgG and IgA than men, and identified positive correlations between baseline saliva anti-HCoV spike IgG levels and anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels in saliva 1 month after vaccination.

A major challenge for evaluating how well COVID-19 mRNA vaccines induce mucosal antibodies is potential confounding by subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections. By the summer of 2022, 45% of participants still being followed in the PASS study reported having at least 1 known SARS-CoV-2 infection. Because individuals can have pauci- or asymptomatic infection, especially in the post-vaccine era, we also sought to exclude all individuals with immunological evidence of a possible subclinical infection. This was done by eliminating, from vaccine-only analyses, all samples obtained after individuals exhibited a doubling of saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG antibodies compared to their baseline levels. Longitudinal analyses revealed that by the summer of 2022, only 12.6% of participants remaining in the cohort had no evidence of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (45.2% with a known SARS-CoV-2 positive test and another 42.2% with saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG doubling without a prior positive SARS-CoV-2 test). This high rate of SARS-CoV-2 exposure is consistent with a Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report stating that 70% of blood donors through September 2022 had either a pre-vaccine infection or post-vaccine infection as well as another study which estimated that 97% of the US population was infected by November 2022.^{44,45}

Our study demonstrates that COVID-19 mRNA vaccination induces robust anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels in saliva but poor IgA responses in naïve individuals. After the initial 2-dose series, anti-SCV2 spike IgG antibodies were detectable in saliva as early as 14 days and peaked at 1 month to levels 14.7-fold greater than baseline. In contrast, anti-SCV2 spike IgA increased modestly, achieving a peak that was only 1.6-fold greater than baseline values, and anti-SCV2 spike SIgA never increased significantly above baseline.

We next evaluated how additional vaccine doses influenced the kinetics of saliva antibody levels. Our analysis of samples from infection naïve participants showed that a 3rd vaccine dose resulted in 8.7-fold higher levels of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG than 2 doses. Additionally, a 3rd vaccine dose improved the durability of the saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG response, with a half-life of 159.5 days determined by analyses performed through 9 months of follow-up. However, a 3rd vaccine dose resulted in no appreciable increases in saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgA or SIgA.

While there are many publications examining antibodies in the serum after mRNA vaccination, studies of saliva have been less frequent. There is overall agreement in the literature that mRNA vaccination induces IgG responses in saliva.²⁴⁻²⁹ However, reports on saliva IgA responses after COVID-19 mRNA vaccines have varied. Several studies have reported detectable increases in saliva IgA after initial and/or booster vaccination with COVID-19 mRNA vaccines.^{24,26-29,46} Others, more consistent with our findings, have observed only minimal IgA responses in uninfected individuals.^{25,30,31}

A potential limitation of COVID-19 vaccine studies is possible inclusion of individuals with prior subclinical infections, as vaccination after prior SARS-CoV-2 infection can induce significant saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgA responses.^{47,48} At least 2 studies that found increases in saliva IgA attempted to screen out unrecognized infections by testing for serum anti-SCV2 N IgG.^{24,29}

While serum anti-SCV2 N is often positive shortly after infection, the sensitivity of anti-SCV2 N IgG for diagnosing prior infection is highly variable (52% - 100%)^{49,50} and its half-life post-infection is short, with one study estimating it to be only 35 days.⁵¹ In this study, we utilized saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG as a marker for possible prior infection. Saliva anti-SCV2 N IgG has been reported to have a high sensitivity for prior SARS-CoV-2 infections,⁴⁹ and we found an 86% sensitivity for known post-vaccine infections in our cohort. Further, we obtained saliva antibody levels at baseline and then regularly (approximately 4 times a year), increasing the likelihood that we would not miss a transient infection-induced increase in saliva anti-SCV2 N antibodies. We believe the approach taken in our study convincingly demonstrates that COVID-19 mRNA vaccination (after the initial 2-dose series as well as after 3rd or 4th doses) induces only minimal increases in saliva IgA responses in the absence of prior infection. Of note, given that very few individuals remain that have not yet been infected at least once with SARS-CoV-2^{44,45}, it will be challenging for future studies to investigate the impact COVID-19 vaccines can have on immunologically naïve individuals.

With regards to saliva antibody durability, a large cross-sectional study found that the anti-SCV2 RBD/spike IgG half-life in saliva was 140 days after 2 doses of mRNA vaccine.⁵² We found the half-life of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG to be 92.7 days after 2 doses of vaccine and 159.5 days after a 3rd vaccine dose, analyzed through 9 months. Although reported half-lives in binding antibodies and neutralizing antibodies vary in the literature, the consensus is that a 3rd dose does extend the durability of anti-SCV2 spike IgG in serum,^{31,53-55} which is also reflected in our saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG data.

In addition to evaluating the effects of vaccine alone on saliva antibody responses, we also evaluated effects of pre-vaccine infection and post-vaccine infection. Pre-vaccine infection resulted in saliva IgG antibody levels that were similar to those induced by 2 doses of vaccine.

Additionally, post-vaccine infection (PV2 +1M PVI) resulted in saliva IgG antibody levels similar to those in naïve individuals after 3rd vaccine dose (1M PV3). In contrast, anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA were significantly greater after infection alone, and in the setting of hybrid immunity, compared to samples tested after vaccination alone, with the greatest values observed when infection occurred after vaccination. These results are consistent with other studies that have identified clear differences in humoral immune responses between vaccine-only groups and hybrid immune groups.^{47,56,57} These results suggest that development of anti-SCV2 spike IgA and SIgA in the saliva requires antigen exposure in the NALT to generate a local mucosal immune response through activation of tissue-resident memory B cells.

When COVID-19 vaccines were introduced, there was some concern that prior immunity to HCoVs could potentially impair vaccine-induced responses.^{6,7} To evaluate for this possibility, we conducted longitudinal measurements of saliva antibodies to the S proteins of the four HCoVs as well as to the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2. Rather than a negative effect, we observed a moderate positive correlation between baseline saliva anti-OC43 S IgG levels and saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels measured 1 month after the initial 2-dose BNT162b2 vaccine series. We observed weak, but significant, positive correlations of post-vaccine saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG with baseline saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG levels to the HCoVs (229E, HKU1, and NL63). Anti-OC43 spike IgG levels in saliva were also boosted at 1 month after COVID-19 mRNA vaccination. The cross-reactivity of the spike proteins of OC43 and SCV2 has been shown in several studies of serum antibodies, and is consistent with their high sequence homology.^{7,42,58-60} Results of serological studies between other endemic HCoV IgG levels and vaccination response in the literature has been varied and many of these studies were conducted after infection rather than vaccination.^{58,59,61-63} Like our findings with saliva antibody levels, one serological study in humans found positive correlations between pre-existing antibody levels to the spike proteins of 229E and NL63 and post-vaccine levels of anti-SCV2 spike IgG.⁵⁹ In

contrast to observations in humans, two recent studies using mouse models observed that pre-existing immunity to HCoVs did not affect serum anti-SCV2 spike IgG responses to COVID-19 mRNA vaccination.^{64,65} An alternative explanation for the correlations we observed between HCoVs and SARS-CoV-2 vaccine response could be cross reactive anti-SCV2 spike IgG from a prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. We believe this to be unlikely however, since all participants included had negative IgG serology to the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 upon enrollment in the study. Additionally, only participants without evidence of a subclinical infection, using the doubling of anti-SCV2 N IgG threshold, were used in the HCoV correlation analyses.

With regards to demographics, we observed that females produced higher saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG and IgA than males after vaccination, a finding that has also been observed in studies of humoral immunity.^{52,66} In contrast, we found no effect of age on saliva antibody responses 1 month after vaccination which differs from serum studies which have found reduced antibody responses after COVID-19 mRNA vaccination in older populations.⁶⁷⁻⁶⁹ We speculate our study may not have observed differences with age because the maximum age was only 71 years old and participants with major comorbidities were excluded from the study.

Limitations

Limitations of our study include small sample sizes for uninfected/unexposed participants at 9-12 months after the 3rd dose and after the 4th dose. Another limitation is that in this study we did not assess virus neutralization or other functional effects of saliva antibodies. However, in a recent publication by our group,³⁸ we found that antibody from serum functioned as well as neutralizing antibodies as correlates of protection.⁷⁰ Our study also was predominantly comprised of white females and was a single center study, both of which may impact the generalizability of our results.

Conclusions

Our results support the current literature highlighting the need for further research on the mucosal immune system and its activation through vaccination. While IM mRNA vaccinations have reduced the burden of COVID-19, they have also highlighted gaps in our knowledge regarding approaches that can be taken to optimize mucosal immunity. Further research is warranted in this area to improve our ability to protect individuals against viral respiratory pathogens.⁷¹⁻⁷⁴

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge all PASS study participants.

The authors wish to also acknowledge all who have contributed to the PASS study:

Uniformed Services University (USU) of the Health Sciences: Christopher Broder, Timothy H. Burgess, Si'Ana Coggins, Tonia L. Conner, Emily S. Darcey, Anuradha Ganesan, Emilie Goguet, Hannah Haines-Hull, Belinda Jackson-Thompson, Eric D. Laing, Alyssa Lindrose, Edward Mitre, Matthew Moser, Robert J. O'Connell, Simon Pollett, Marana Rekedal, Mark Simons, David Tribble

Uniformed Services University Translational Medical Center: Heidi Adams, Bolatito Balogun, Milissa Jones, Priscilla Kobi, Lakeesha Kosh, Raquel Martinez, Roshila Mohammed, David Saunders, Dutchabong Shaw

Henry M. Jackson Foundation, Inc.: Kimberly Blankenship, Julian Davies, Mark Fritschlanski, Tigiste Girma, Luca Illinik, Orlando Ortega, Sanjeev Oudit, Edward Parmelee, Jennifer Rothenberg, Mimi Sanchez, Marianne Spevak, Todd Stroberg

Leidos Biomedical Research, Inc., Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research: John H. Powers, III

Naval Medical Research Center-Clinical Trials Center: Yolanda Alcorta, Christopher A. Duplessis, Monique Hollis-Perry, Andrew Letizia, Santina E. Maiolatesi, Elaine Morazzani, Kathleen F. Ramsey, Anatalio E. Reyes, Greg Wang, and Mimi A. Wong.

Walter Reed National Military Medical Center: Wesley Campbell, Sara Robinson

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Formal Analysis, T.L.C., C.O. E.M.; Writing-original draft, T.C.; Methodology, T.L.C., E.G., H.H., E.S. D., M.J., D.S., E.D.L., E.M.; Investigation, T.L.C., E.G., H.H., A.S., E.S.D, P.K., B.B.; Visualization, T.L.C.; Conceptualization, T.L.C., E.G., C.C.B, S.P., E.L., E.M.; Project Administration, E.G., M.J., D.S., T.H.B., R.J.O., S.P., E.D.L., E.M.; Writing-review & editing, T.L.C., E.G., M.J., D.S., T.H.B., C.C.B., R.J.O., S.P., E.D.L., E.M.; Resources, H.H., E.G., M.J., D.S., R.J.O., S.P., E.L., E.M.; Data curation, T.L.C., E.G., H.H., S.P., E.M.; Validation, T.L.C., E.S.D., E.D.L.; Supervision, E.G., M.J., D.S., R.J.O., S.P., E.D.L., E.M.; Funding acquisition, T.H.B., R.J.O., S.P., E.M.

FUNDING

The protocol was executed by the Infectious Disease Clinical Research Program (IDCRP), a Department of Defense (DoD) program executed by the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS) through a cooperative agreement by the Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc. (HJF). This work was supported in

whole, or in part, with federal funds from the Defense Health Program (HU00012020067, HU00012120094) and the Immunization Healthcare Branch (HU00012120104) of the Defense Health Agency, United States Department of Defense, and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease (HU00011920111), under Inter-Agency Agreement Y1-AI-5072, by the Armed Forces Health Surveillance Division (AFHSD), Global Emerging Infections Surveillance (GEIS) Branch, under award ProMIS ID P0099_22_NM and Navy WUN A1417, and by the US Food and Drug Administration Medical Countermeasures Initiative grant # OCET, 2022-1750. The sponsors had no involvement in the study design, the collection of data, the analysis of data, the interpretation of data, the writing of the report, or in the decision to submit the article for publication.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The views expressed in this presentation are the sole responsibility of the presenter and do not necessarily reflect the views, opinions, or policies of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, the Department of Defense, the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, the Department of the Navy, Army, Air Force, the United States Government, or the Henry M. Jackson Foundation for the Advancement of Military Medicine, Inc. (HJF). Several of the authors are U.S. Government employees. This work was prepared as part of their official duties. Title 17 US.C. § 105 provides that “Copyright protection under this title is not available for any work of the United States Government”. Title 17 US.C. § 101 defines a U.S. Government work as a work prepared by a military service member or employee of the U.S. Government as part of that person’s official duties. Mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government. The study protocol was approved by the USUHS Institutional Review Board in compliance with all applicable federal regulations governing the protection of human subjects.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

S.P. and T.H.B. report that the USU IDCRP, a U.S. Department of Defense DoD Institution, and the HJF were funded under a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement to conduct an unrelated phase III COVID-19 monoclonal antibody immunoprophylaxis trial sponsored by AstraZeneca. The HJF, in support of the USU IDCRP, was funded by the DoD Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Defense to augment the conduct of an unrelated phase III vaccine trial sponsored by AstraZeneca. Both trials were part of the USG COVID-19 response. Neither is related to the work presented here.

The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Figure 1: Strobe chart

Supplemental Table 1: Study demographics

Supplemental Figure 2: Establishing the saliva anti-N IgG threshold for subclinical infections

Supplemental Table 2: Categorization of participants by infection and vaccination status

Supplemental Figure 3: Saliva anti-SCV2 N antibody levels at specific timepoints after vaccination

Supplemental Figure 4: : Boosting increases magnitude and durability of saliva anti-SCV2 spike IgG, but does not result in increases to saliva IgA or SIgA

Supplemental Figure 5: Half-life of salivary anti-spike IgG is increased after 3rd vaccine dose compared to 2nd vaccine dose

Supplemental Figure 6: Hybrid immunity induces higher anti-spike IgA and SIgA levels than 4 vaccine doses

Supplemental Figure 7 : Anti-spike IgA and SIgA levels in saliva were higher when vaccination preceded infection compared to infection followed by vaccination

Supplemental Figure 8: Vaccination results in boosting of saliva IgG against the spike protein of OC43

Supplemental Figure 9: Infection also results in boosting of saliva IgG against the spike protein of OC43

References

1. Mirtaleb, M.S., Falak, R., Heshmatnia, J., Bakhshandeh, B., Taheri, R.A., Soleimanjahi, H., and Zolfaghari Emameh, R. (2023). An insight overview on COVID-19 mRNA vaccines: Advantageous, pharmacology, mechanism of action, and prospective considerations. *Int Immunopharmacol* 117, 109934. 10.1016/j.intimp.2023.109934.
2. Tregoning, J.S., Flight, K.E., Higham, S.L., Wang, Z., and Pierce, B.F. (2021). Progress of the COVID-19 vaccine effort: viruses, vaccines and variants versus efficacy, effectiveness and escape. *Nat Rev Immunol* 21, 626-636. 10.1038/s41577-021-00592-1.
3. Mostaghimi, D., Valdez, C.N., Larson, H.T., Kalinich, C.C., and Iwasaki, A. (2022). Prevention of host-to-host transmission by SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. *Lancet Infect Dis* 22, e52-e58. 10.1016/s1473-3099(21)00472-2.
4. Christensen, D., Polacek, C., Sheward, D.J., Hanke, L., Moliner-Morro, A., McInerney, G., Murrell, B., Hartmann, K.T., Jensen, H.E., Jungersen, G., et al. (2022). Protection against SARS-CoV-2 transmission by a parenteral prime-Intranasal boost vaccine strategy. *eBioMedicine* 84. 10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104248.
5. Knisely, J.M., Buyon, L.E., Mandt, R., Farkas, R., Balasingam, S., Bok, K., Buchholz, U.J., D'Souza, M.P., Gordon, J.L., King, D.F.L., et al. (2023). Mucosal vaccines for SARS-CoV-2: scientific gaps and opportunities—workshop report. *npj Vaccines* 8, 53. 10.1038/s41541-023-00654-6.
6. Sette, A., and Crotty, S. (2020). Pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2: the knowns and unknowns. *Nat Rev Immunol* 20, 457-458. 10.1038/s41577-020-0389-z.
7. Wang, G., Xiang, Z., Wang, W., and Chen, Z. (2022). Seasonal coronaviruses and SARS-CoV-2: effects of preexisting immunity during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Zhejiang University-SCIENCE B* 23, 451-460. 10.1631/jzus.b2200049.

8. Ramasamy, R. (2022). Innate and Adaptive Immune Responses in the Upper Respiratory Tract and the Infectivity of SARS-CoV-2. *Viruses* 14, 933.
9. Brandtzaeg, P. (2011). Potential of Nasopharynx-associated Lymphoid Tissue for Vaccine Responses in the Airways. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 183, 1595-1604. 10.1164/rccm.201011-1783oc.
10. Brandtzaeg, P. (2010). Function of mucosa-associated lymphoid tissue in antibody formation. *Immunol Invest* 39, 303-355. 10.3109/08820131003680369.
11. Brandtzaeg, P. (2007). Induction of secretory immunity and memory at mucosal surfaces. *Vaccine* 25, 5467-5484. 10.1016/j.vaccine.2006.12.001.
12. Huang, N., Perez, P., Kato, T., Mikami, Y., Okuda, K., Gilmore, R.C., Conde, C.D., Gasmi, B., Stein, S., Beach, M., et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 infection of the oral cavity and saliva. *Nat Med* 27, 892-903. 10.1038/s41591-021-01296-8.
13. Steffen, U., Koeleman, C.A., Sokolova, M.V., Bang, H., Kleyer, A., Rech, J., Unterweger, H., Schicht, M., Garreis, F., Hahn, J., et al. (2020). IgA subclasses have different effector functions associated with distinct glycosylation profiles. *Nat Commun* 11, 120. 10.1038/s41467-019-13992-8.
14. Wang, Z., Lorenzi, J.C.C., Muecksch, F., Finkin, S., Viant, C., Gaebler, C., Cipolla, M., Hoffmann, H.-H., Oliveira, T.Y., Oren, D.A., et al. (2021). Enhanced SARS-CoV-2 neutralization by dimeric IgA. *Science Translational Medicine* 13. 10.1126/scitranslmed.abf1555.
15. Brandtzaeg, P. (2013). Secretory IgA: Designed for Anti-Microbial Defense. *Front Immunol* 4, 222. 10.3389/fimmu.2013.00222.
16. Sohaei, D., Uindrea, A., Mathew, A., Campbell, C., Stengelin, M., Sigal, G., Joe, J., Romero, D., Padmanabhan, N., Ren, A., et al. (2022). Sensitive Serology Measurements in the Saliva of Individuals with COVID-19 Symptoms Using a Multiplexed Immunoassay. *J Appl Lab Med* 7, 1354-1365. 10.1093/jalm/jfac073.

17. Sterlin, D., Mathian, A., Miyara, M., Mohr, A., Anna, F., Claër, L., Quentric, P., Fadlallah, J., Devilliers, H., Ghillani, P., et al. (2021). IgA dominates the early neutralizing antibody response to SARS-CoV-2. *Science Translational Medicine* 13, eabd2223. 10.1126/scitranslmed.abd2223.
18. Miyamoto, S., Nishiyama, T., Ueno, A., Park, H., Kuriyama, T., Nakamura, N., Ozono, S., Aihara, K., Takahashi, K., Tsuchihashi, Y., et al. (2023). Infectious virus shedding duration reflects secretory IgA antibody response latency after SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 120. 10.1073/pnas.2314808120.
19. Silva-Sanchez, A., and Randall, T.D. (2020). Anatomical Uniqueness of the Mucosal Immune System (GALT, NALT, iBALT) for the Induction and Regulation of Mucosal Immunity and Tolerance. In *Mucosal Vaccines*, pp. 21-54. 10.1016/b978-0-12-811924-2.00002-x.
20. Russell, M.W., Moldoveanu, Z., Ogra, P.L., and Mestecky, J. (2020). Mucosal Immunity in COVID-19: A Neglected but Critical Aspect of SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Frontiers in Immunology* 11. 10.3389/fimmu.2020.611337.
21. Fröberg, J., and Diavatopoulos, D.A. (2021). Mucosal immunity to severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 infection. *Curr Opin Infect Dis* 34, 181-186. 10.1097/qco.0000000000000724.
22. Russell, M.W., and Městecký, J. (2022). Mucosal immunity: The missing link in comprehending SARS-CoV-2 infection and transmission. *Frontiers in Immunology* 13. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.957107.
23. Puhach, O., Meyer, B., and Eckerle, I. (2023). SARS-CoV-2 viral load and shedding kinetics. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 21, 147-161. 10.1038/s41579-022-00822-w.
24. Azzi, L., Gasperina, D.D., Veronesi, G., Shallak, M., Maurino, V., Baj, A., Gianfagna, F., Cavallo, P., Dentali, F., Tettamanti, L., et al. (2023). Mucosal immune response after the

- booster dose of the BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine. *EBioMedicine* 88, 104435-104435. 10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104435.
25. Darwich, A., Pozzi, C., Fornasa, G., Lizier, M., Azzolini, E., Spadoni, I., Carli, F., Voza, A., Desai, A., Ferrero, C., et al. (2022). BNT162b2 vaccine induces antibody release in saliva: a possible role for mucosal viral protection? *EMBO Molecular Medicine* 14. 10.15252/emmm.202115326.
26. Faustini, S., Cook, A., Hill, H.J., Al-Taei, S., Heaney, J., Efstathiou, E., Tanner, C., Townsend, N., Ahmed, Z., Dinally, M., et al. (2023). Saliva antiviral antibody levels are detectable but correlate poorly with serum antibody levels following SARS-CoV-2 infection and/or vaccination. *Journal of Infection* 87, 328-335. 10.1016/j.jinf.2023.07.018.
27. Madsen, J.R., Holm, B.E., Pérez-Alós, L., Bayarri-Olmos, R., Rosbjerg, A., Fogh, K., Pries-Heje, M., Møller, D.L., Hansen, C.B., Heftdal, L.D., et al. (2023). Short-Lived Antibody-Mediated Saliva Immunity against SARS-CoV-2 after Vaccination. *Microbiology spectrum* 11. 10.1128/spectrum.04947-22.
28. Ota, K., Sakai, H., Sasaki, D., Mitsumoto-Kaseida, F., Sakamoto, K., Kosai, K., Hasegawa, H., Takazono, T., Izumikawa, K., Mukae, H., et al. (2024). Rapid increase in salivary IgA and broad recognition of spike protein following SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. *Virus Research* 339, 199294.
29. Stolovich-Rain, M., Kumari, S., Friedman, A., Kirillov, S., Socol, Y., Billan, M., Pal, R.R., Das, K., Golding, P.R., Oiknine-Djian, E., et al. (2023). Intramuscular mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 induces neutralizing salivary IgA. *Frontiers in Immunology* 13. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.933347.
30. Azzi, L., Gasperina, D.D., Veronesi, G., Shallak, M., Ietto, G., Iovino, D., Baj, A., Gianfagna, F., Maurino, V., Focosi, D., et al. (2022). Mucosal immune response in BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine recipients. *EBioMedicine* 75, 103788-103788. 10.1016/j.ebiom.2021.103788.

31. Lau, C.S., Oh, M.L.H., Phua, S.K., Liang, Y.L., and Aw, T.C. (2022). 210-Day Kinetics of Total, IgG, and Neutralizing Spike Antibodies across a Course of 3 Doses of BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccine. *Vaccines (Basel)* 10. 10.3390/vaccines10101703.
32. Goguet, E., Powers, J.H., Olsen, C.H., Tribble, D.R., Davies, J., Illinik, L., Jackson-Thompson, B.M., Hollis-Perry, M., Maiolatesi, S.E., Pollett, S., et al. (2022). Prospective Assessment of Symptoms to Evaluate Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections in a Cohort of Health Care Workers. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 9. 10.1093/ofid/ofac030.
33. Brandtzaeg, P. (2013). Secretory immunity with special reference to the oral cavity. *J Oral Microbiol* 5. 10.3402/jom.v5i0.20401.
34. Page, L.J., Lagunas-Acosta, J., Castellana, E.T., and Messmer, B.T. (2023). Accurate prediction of serum antibody levels from noninvasive saliva/nasal samples. *BioTechniques* 74, 131-136. 10.2144/btn-2022-0106.
35. Vohra, P., Belkhode, V., Nimonkar, S., Potdar, S., Bhanot, R., Izna, and Tiwari, R.V.C. (2020). Evaluation and diagnostic usefulness of saliva for detection of HIV antibodies: A cross-sectional study. *J Family Med Prim Care* 9, 2437-2441. 10.4103/jfmpc.jfmpc_138_20.
36. Azzi, L., Carcano, G., Gianfagna, F., Grossi, P., Gasperina, D.D., Genoni, A., Fasano, M., Sessa, F., Tettamanti, L., Carinci, F., et al. (2020). Saliva is a reliable tool to detect SARS-CoV-2. *J Infect* 81, e45-e50. 10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.005.
37. Laing, E.D., Sterling, S.L., Richard, S.A., Epsi, N.J., Coggins, S.A., Samuels, E.C., Phogat, S., Yan, L., Moreno, N., Coles, C.L., et al. (2021). Antigen-based multiplex strategies to discriminate SARS-CoV-2 natural and vaccine induced immunity from seasonal human coronavirus humoral responses. *medRxiv*, 2021.2002.2010.21251518. 10.1101/2021.02.10.21251518.

38. Goguet, E., Olsen, C.H., Meyer, W.A., Ansari, S., Powers, J.H., Conner, T.L., Coggins, S.A.A., Wang, W., Wang, R., Illinik, L., et al. (2024). Immune and behavioral correlates of protection against symptomatic post-vaccination SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Frontiers in Immunology* 15. 10.3389/fimmu.2024.1287504.
39. Laing, E.D., Weiss, C.D., Samuels, E.C., Coggins, S.A., Wang, W., Wang, R., Vassell, R., Sterling, S.L., Tso, M.S., Conner, T., et al. (2022). Durability of Antibody Response and Frequency of SARS-CoV-2 Infection 6 Months after COVID-19 Vaccination in Healthcare Workers. *Emerg Infect Dis* 28, 828-832. 10.3201/eid2804.212037.
40. Laing, E.D., Sterling, S.L., Richard, S.A., Phogat, S., Samuels, E.C., Epsi, N.J., Yan, L., Moreno, N., Coles, C., Mehalko, J., et al. (2020). A betacoronavirus multiplex microsphere immunoassay detects early SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion and controls for pre-existing seasonal human coronavirus antibody cross-reactivity. *medRxiv*. 10.1101/2020.10.14.20207050.
41. Asamoah-Boaheng, M., Grunau, B., Karim, M.E., Jassem, A.N., Bolster, J., Marquez, A.C., Scheuermeyer, F.X., and Goldfarb, D.M. (2022). Are higher antibody levels against seasonal human coronaviruses associated with a more robust humoral immune response after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination? *Frontiers in Immunology* 13. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.954093.
42. Hu, C., Wang, Z., Ren, L., Hao, Y., Zhu, M., Jiang, H., Wang, S., Li, D., and Shao, Y. (2022). Pre-existing anti-HCoV-OC43 immunity influences the durability and cross-reactivity of humoral response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. *Frontiers in Cellular and Infection Microbiology* 12. 10.3389/fcimb.2022.978440.
43. Grobden, M., van der Straten, K., Brouwer, P.J., Brinkkemper, M., Maisonnasse, P., Dereuddre-Bosquet, N., Appelman, B., Lavell, A.A., van Vught, L.A., Burger, J.A., et al. (2021). Cross-reactive antibodies after SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination. *Elife* 10. 10.7554/eLife.70330.

44. Klaassen, F., Chitwood, M.H., Cohen, T., Pitzer, V.E., Russi, M., Swartwood, N.A., Salomon, J.A., and Menzies, N.A. (2023). Changes in Population Immunity Against Infection and Severe Disease From Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Omicron Variants in the United States Between December 2021 and November 2022. *Clin Infect Dis* 77, 355-361. [10.1093/cid/ciad210](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciad210).
45. Jones JM, M.I., Stone MS, et al.. (2023). Estimates of SARS-CoV-2 Seroprevalence and Incidence of Primary SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among Blood Donors, by COVID-19 Vaccination Status — United States, April 2021–September 2022. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 72:601–605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm7222a3>.
46. Mancuso, R., Agostini, S., Citterio, L.A., Chiarini, D., Santangelo, M.A., and Clerici, M. (2022). Systemic and Mucosal Humoral Immune Response Induced by Three Doses of the BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccines. *Vaccines* 10, 1649-1649. [10.3390/vaccines10101649](https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10101649).
47. Sano, K., Bhavsar, D., Singh, G., Floda, D., Srivastava, K., Gleason, C., Amoako, A., Andre, D., Beach, K.F., Bermúdez-González, M.C., et al. (2022). SARS-CoV-2 vaccination induces mucosal antibody responses in previously infected individuals. *Nature Communications* 13. [10.1038/s41467-022-32389-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32389-8).
48. Cohen, J.I., Dropulic, L., Wang, K., Gangler, K., Morgan, K., Liepshutz, K., Krogmann, T., Ali, M.A., Qin, J., Wang, J., et al. (2022). Comparison of Levels of Nasal, Salivary, and Plasma Antibody to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 During Natural Infection and After Vaccination. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 76, 1391-1399. [10.1093/cid/ciac934](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciac934).
49. Pisanic, N., Randad, P.R., Kruczynski, K., Manabe, Y.C., Thomas, D.L., Pekosz, A., Klein, S.L., Betenbaugh, M.J., Clarke, W., Laeyendecker, O., et al. (2020). COVID-19 Serology at Population Scale: SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibody Responses in Saliva. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* 59. [10.1128/jcm.02204-20](https://doi.org/10.1128/jcm.02204-20).

50. Abdullahi, A., Frimpong, J., Cheng, M.T.K., Aliyu, S.H., Smith, C., Abimiku, A., Phillips, R.O., Owusu, M., and Gupta, R.K. (2023). Performance of SARS COV-2 IgG Anti-N as an Independent Marker of Exposure to SARS COV-2 in an Unvaccinated West African Population. *Am J Trop Med Hyg* 109, 890-894. 10.4269/ajtmh.23-0179.
51. Anna, F., Goyard, S., Lalanne, A.I., Nevo, F., Gransagne, M., Souque, P., Louis, D., Gillon, V., Turbiez, I., Bidard, F.C., et al. (2021). High seroprevalence but short-lived immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in Paris. *Eur J Immunol* 51, 180-190. 10.1002/eji.202049058.
52. Brown, A.C., Koshute, P.T., Cowley, H.P., Robinette, M.S., Gravelyn, S.R., Patel, S.V., Ju, E.Y., Frommer, C.T., Zambidis, A.E., Schneider, E.J., et al. (2023). A Saliva-Based Serological and Behavioral Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Prevalence in Howard County, Maryland. *Microbiol Spectr* 11, e0276522. 10.1128/spectrum.02765-22.
53. Mihaylova, A., Lesichkova, S., Baleva, M., Nikolova-Vlahova, M., Kundurzhiev, T., Kolevski, A., and Naumova, E. (2023). Durability of humoral and cell-mediated immune response after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine administration. *J Med Virol* 95, e28360. 10.1002/jmv.28360.
54. Arunachalam, P.S., Lai, L., Samaha, H., Feng, Y., Hu, M., Hui, H.S., Wali, B., Ellis, M., Davis-Gardner, M.E., Huerta, C., et al. (2023). Durability of immune responses to mRNA booster vaccination against COVID-19. *J Clin Invest* 133. 10.1172/jci167955.
55. Lo Sasso, B., Agnello, L., Giglio, R.V., Gambino, C.M., Ciaccio, A.M., Vidali, M., and Ciaccio, M. (2022). Longitudinal analysis of anti-SARS-CoV-2 S-RBD IgG antibodies before and after the third dose of the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Scientific Reports* 12, 8679. 10.1038/s41598-022-12750-z.
56. Denis, J., Garnier, A., Cheutin, L., Ferrier, A., Timera, H., Jarjaval, F., Hejl, C., Billon-Denis, E., Ricard, D., Tournier, J.-N., et al. (2023). Long-term systemic and mucosal

- SARS-CoV-2 IgA response and its association with persistent smell and taste disorders. *Frontiers in Immunology* 14. 10.3389/fimmu.2023.1140714.
57. Longet, S., Hargreaves, A., Healy, S., Brown, R., Hornsby, H.R., Meardon, N., Tipton, T., Barnes, E., Dunachie, S., Duncan, C.J.A., et al. (2022). mRNA vaccination drives differential mucosal neutralizing antibody profiles in naïve and SARS-CoV-2 previously-infected individuals. *Frontiers in Immunology* 13. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.953949.
58. Guo, L., Wang, Y., Kang, L., Hu, Y., Wang, L., Zhong, J., Chen, H., Ren, L., Gu, X., Wang, G., et al. (2021). Cross-reactive antibody against human coronavirus OC43 spike protein correlates with disease severity in COVID-19 patients: a retrospective study. *Emerg Microbes Infect* 10, 664-676. 10.1080/22221751.2021.1905488.
59. Asamoah-Boaheng, M., Grunau, B., Karim, M.E., Jassem, A.N., Bolster, J., Marquez, A.C., Scheuermeyer, F.X., and Goldfarb, D.M. (2022). Are higher antibody levels against seasonal human coronaviruses associated with a more robust humoral immune response after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination? *Front Immunol* 13, 954093. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.954093.
60. Fröberg, J., Gillard, J., Philipsen, R., Lanke, K., Rust, J., van Tuijl, D., Teelen, K., Bousema, T., Simonetti, E., van der Gaast-de Jongh, C.E., et al. (2021). SARS-CoV-2 mucosal antibody development and persistence and their relation to viral load and COVID-19 symptoms. *Nat Commun* 12, 5621. 10.1038/s41467-021-25949-x.
61. Crowley, A.R., Natarajan, H., Hederman, A.P., Bobak, C.A., Weiner, J.A., Wieland-Alter, W., Lee, J., Bloch, E.M., Tobian, A.A.R., Redd, A.D., et al. (2022). Boosting of cross-reactive antibodies to endemic coronaviruses by SARS-CoV-2 infection but not vaccination with stabilized spike. *Elife* 11. 10.7554/eLife.75228.
62. Miyara, M., Saichi, M., Sterlin, D., Anna, F., Marot, S., Mathian, A., Atif, M., Quentric, P., Mohr, A., Parizot, C., et al. (2022). Pre-COVID-19 Immunity to Common Cold Human

- Coronaviruses Induces a Recall-Type IgG Response to SARS-CoV-2 Antigens Without Cross-Neutralisation. *Frontiers in Immunology* 13. 10.3389/fimmu.2022.790334.
63. Ortega, N., Ribes, M., Vidal, M., Rubio, R., Aguilar, R., Williams, S., Barrios, D., Alonso, S., Hernández-Luis, P., Mitchell, R.A., et al. (2021). Seven-month kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies and role of pre-existing antibodies to human coronaviruses. *Nature Communications* 12. 10.1038/s41467-021-24979-9.
64. Amanat, F., Clark, J., Carreño, J.M., Strohmeier, S., Yellin, T., Meade, P.S., Bhavsar, D., Muramatsu, H., Sun, W., Coughlan, L., et al. (2023). Immunity to Seasonal Coronavirus Spike Proteins Does Not Protect from SARS-CoV-2 Challenge in a Mouse Model but Has No Detrimental Effect on Protection Mediated by COVID-19 mRNA Vaccination. *J Virol* 97, e0166422. 10.1128/jvi.01664-22.
65. Jeong, A.Y., Lee, P., Lee, M.S., and Kim, D.J. (2023). Pre-existing Immunity to Endemic Human Coronaviruses Does Not Affect the Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 Spike in a Murine Vaccination Model. *Immune Netw* 23, e19. 10.4110/in.2023.23.e19.
66. Fink, A.L., and Klein, S.L. (2018). The evolution of greater humoral immunity in females than males: implications for vaccine efficacy. *Curr Opin Physiol* 6, 16-20. 10.1016/j.cophys.2018.03.010.
67. Wang, J., Tong, Y., Li, D., Li, J., and Li, Y. (2021). The Impact of Age Difference on the Efficacy and Safety of COVID-19 Vaccines: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Front Immunol* 12, 758294. 10.3389/fimmu.2021.758294.
68. Collier, D.A., Ferreira, I., Kotagiri, P., Datir, R.P., Lim, E.Y., Touizer, E., Meng, B., Abdullahi, A., Elmer, A., Kingston, N., et al. (2021). Age-related immune response heterogeneity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine BNT162b2. *Nature* 596, 417-422. 10.1038/s41586-021-03739-1.
69. Mwimanzi, F., Lapointe, H.R., Cheung, P.K., Sang, Y., Yaseen, F., Umvilighozo, G., Kalikawe, R., Datwani, S., Omondi, F.H., Burns, L., et al. (2022). Older Adults Mount

- Less Durable Humoral Responses to Two Doses of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccine but Strong Initial Responses to a Third Dose. *J Infect Dis* 226, 983-994. 10.1093/infdis/jiac199.
70. Goguet, E., Olsen, C.H., Meyer, W.A., Ansari, S., Powers, J.H., Conner, T.L., Coggins, S.A.A., Wang, W., Wang, R., Illinik, L., et al. (2024). Immune and behavioral correlates of protection against symptomatic post-vaccination SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Frontiers in Immunology* 15. 10.3389/fimmu.2024.1287504.
71. Tsunetsugu-Yokota, Y., Ito, S., Adachi, Y., Onodera, T., Kageyama, T., and Takahashi, Y. (2022). Saliva as a useful tool for evaluating upper mucosal antibody response to influenza. *PLoS One* 17, e0263419. 10.1371/journal.pone.0263419.
72. Brandtzaeg, P. (2009). Mucosal immunity: induction, dissemination, and effector functions. *Scand J Immunol* 70, 505-515. 10.1111/j.1365-3083.2009.02319.x.
73. Alu, A., Chen, L., Lei, H., Wei, Y., Tian, X., and Wei, X. (2022). Intranasal COVID-19 vaccines: From bench to bed. *eBioMedicine* 76. 10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.103841.
74. Chavda, V.P., Vora, L.K., Pandya, A.K., and Patravale, V.B. (2021). Intranasal vaccines for SARS-CoV-2: From challenges to potential in COVID-19 management. *Drug Discovery Today* 26, 2619-2636. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drudis.2021.07.021>.