

1 **Title: SARS-CoV-2 correlates of protection from infection against** 2 **variants of concern**

3 **Author list:** Kaiyuan Sun^{1†*}, Jinal N. Bhiman^{2,3†}, Stefano Tempia^{4,5,6}, Jackie Kleynhans^{4,5}, Vimbai
4 Sharon Madzorera^{2,3}, Qiniso Mkhize^{2,3}, Haajira Kaldine^{2,3}, Meredith L McMorrow^{6,8}, Nicole
5 Wolter^{4,7}, Jocelyn Moyes^{4,5}, Maimuna Carrim^{4,7}, Neil A Martinson^{9,10}, Kathleen Kahn¹¹,
6 Limakatso Lebina⁹, Jacques D. du Toit¹¹, Thulisa Mkhencele⁴, Anne von Gottberg^{4,7}, Cécile
7 Viboud^{1‡}, Penny L. Moore^{2,3,12‡}, Cheryl Cohen^{4,5†*}, PHIRST-C group[#]

8 **Affiliations:**

9 ¹Division of International Epidemiology and Population Studies, Fogarty International Center, National
10 Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, United States of America.

11 ²SAMRC Antibody Immunity Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa

12 ³Centre for HIV and STIs, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory
13 Service, Johannesburg, South Africa

14 ⁴Centre for Respiratory Diseases and Meningitis, National Institute for Communicable Diseases of the
15 National Health Laboratory Service, Johannesburg, South Africa.

16 ⁵School of Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
17 Africa.

18 ⁶Influenza Division, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States of
19 America.

20 ⁷School of Pathology, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South
21 Africa.

22 ⁸COVID-19 Response, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, Georgia, United States.

23 ⁹Perinatal HIV Research Unit, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.

24 ¹⁰Johns Hopkins University Center for TB Research, Baltimore, Maryland, United States of America.

25 ¹¹MRC/Wits Rural Public Health and Health Transitions Research Unit (Agincourt), School of Public
26 Health, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa.

27 ¹²Centre for the AIDS Programme of Research in South Africa (CAPRISA), Durban, South Africa

28 †These authors contributed equally.

29 ‡These authors jointly supervised this work.

30 *Corresponding authors. Email: kaiyuan.sun@nih.gov (KS); cherylc@nicd.ac.za (CC)

31 #A list of authors and their affiliations appears at the end of the paper.

32

33

34 **Abstract**

35 Serum neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) induced by vaccination have been linked to protection
36 against symptomatic COVID-19 and severe disease. However, much less is known about the
37 efficacy of nAbs in preventing the acquisition of infection, especially in the context of natural
38 immunity and against SARS-CoV-2 immune-escape variants. In this study, we conducted
39 mediation analysis to assess serum nAbs induced by prior SARS-CoV-2 infections as potential
40 correlates of protection (CoPs) against Delta and Omicron BA.1/2 wave infections, in rural and
41 urban household cohorts in South Africa. We find that, in the Delta wave, anti-D614G nAbs
42 mediate 37% (95%CI 34% – 40%) of the total protection against infection conferred by prior
43 exposure to SARS-CoV-2, and that protection decreases with waning immunity. In contrast, anti-
44 Omicron BA.1 nAbs mediate 11% (95%CI 9 – 12%) of the total protection against Omicron
45 BA.1/2 wave infections, due to Omicron’s neutralization escape. These findings underscore that
46 CoPs mediated through nAbs are variant-specific, and that boosting of nAbs against circulating
47 variants might restore or confer immune protection lost due to nAb waning and/or immune escape.
48 However, the majority of immune protection against SARS-CoV-2 conferred by natural infection
49 cannot be fully explained by serum nAbs alone. Measuring these and other immune markers
50 including T-cell responses, both in the serum and in other compartments such as the nasal mucosa,
51 may be required to comprehensively understand and predict immune protection against SARS-
52 CoV-2.

53

54 **Main text**

55 The acute phase of the COVID-19 pandemic has waned with the development of SARS-CoV-2
56 population immunity in most individuals through repeated episodes of vaccination, infection, or
57 both^{1,2}. Owing to the unprecedented speed of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine development and distribution
58³, considerable numbers of people were primed by vaccination, averting substantial morbidity and
59 mortality⁴. However, due to immune evasive variants, vaccine hesitancy, and lack of global equity
60 in vaccine access⁵⁻⁷, a substantial proportion of the world's population acquired SARS-CoV-2
61 immunity through natural infections, especially in low- and middle-income countries^{8,9}. Immune
62 markers that reliably predict protection from infection or symptomatic disease are known as
63 “correlates of protection” (CoP). The post-pandemic era is marked by rapid antigenic drift of
64 Omicron subvariants leading to continued immune evasion¹⁰⁻¹³. Given this complex evolutionary
65 landscape, it remains important to identify CoPs induced by natural infections and/or vaccinations
66 against SARS-CoV-2 variants to monitor population susceptibility, anticipate future waves,
67 optimize rollout of existing vaccines, and facilitate design and approval of next generation
68 vaccines¹⁴. There has been significant progress in defining serum neutralizing or binding
69 antibodies to the spike protein as CoPs for COVID-19 vaccines, although most of the data are
70 derived from early randomized controlled trials focused on peak immune response shortly after
71 vaccination and measured against symptomatic disease caused by the ancestral strain, with updated
72 data on variants¹⁵⁻²⁴. In comparison, little is known about serum CoPs for infection-induced
73 immunity and protection against acquisition of subclinical infections.

74 CoPs may differ for immunity induced by infection vs. vaccination: SARS-CoV-2 infections
75 tend to induce more robust mucosal immunity despite lower serum antibody responses than
76 intramuscularly delivered mRNA vaccines, as shown in a mouse model²⁵, and mucosal immunity
77 may play a more important role in reducing risk of infection and transmission than systemic
78 immunity^{26,27}. Moreover, CoPs need to be interpreted in the context of viral evolution: in the pre-
79 Omicron era, SAR-CoV-2 variants of concerns emerged independently from one another, with the
80 Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, and Omicron variants exhibiting distinct phenotypic characteristics.
81 The Omicron variant stands out due to substantial genetic divergence from earlier strains and
82 significant immune evasion capabilities against antibody neutralization²⁸. Equivalent antibody
83 titers may not provide equivalent levels of protection against ancestral strains compared to more

84 transmissible and immune-evasive variants like Omicron, and CoPs may therefore be variant-
85 dependent. Furthermore, serum antibody titers against SARS-CoV-2 also wane with time.

86 The challenge of defining CoP for infection induced immunity partially stems from the difficulty
87 of tracking immune exposures to SARS-CoV-2 infections, given that a significant proportion of
88 infections are asymptomatic or subclinical and cannot be fully captured by traditional symptom-
89 based surveillance protocols. The SARS-CoV-2, influenza, and respiratory syncytial virus
90 community burden, transmission dynamics, and viral interaction in South Africa (PHIRST-C)
91 cohorts in South Africa ^{29,30} overcame this challenge by implementing a rigorous sampling
92 strategy, including collection of nasal swabs twice-weekly during a period of intense follow up,
93 along with a total of 10 sequential blood draws spanning the D614G, Beta, Delta, and Omicron
94 BA.1/2 waves. This high-intensity sampling scheme allowed us to reconstruct the cohort
95 participants' SARS-CoV-2 infection histories with high fidelity, and to monitor infection-induced
96 antibody responses over time ³⁰. Blood samples collected immediately prior to Delta and Omicron
97 waves offered a unique opportunity to investigate serum immune marker levels in close proximity
98 to the next SARS-CoV-2 exposure. Furthermore, vaccine-derived immunity remained low at the
99 onset of the Omicron BA.1/2 wave, with less than 25% of the population fully immunized with
100 Ad26.COV2.S (Janssen) and/or BNT162b2 (Pfizer BioNTech) vaccines ³¹. In this study, we
101 leveraged the PHIRST-C cohorts' unique serological and epidemiological data to perform
102 mediation analysis and assess neutralizing antibody (nAb) titers induced by prior infection as CoPs
103 against variants of concerns. Specifically, we evaluated the role of anti-D614G and anti-Omicron
104 BA.1 nAbs against the Delta and Omicron BA.1/2 variants.

105

106 **Results**

107 **Cohort description and antibody titer measurements**

108 We analyzed data from the multi-year PHIRST-C cohort study, covering the first four waves of
109 SARS-CoV-2 infections including the Delta and Omicron BA.1/2 waves ^{29,30}. The study included
110 a rural and an urban site in two provinces of South Africa. Households with more than two
111 members and where at least 75% of members consented to participate were eligible. A total of
112 1200 individuals from 222 randomly selected and eligible households among the two study sites
113 were longitudinally followed from June 2020 through April 2022. The study was characterized by

114 intense nasopharyngeal swab and serum sample collection from the peak of the SARS-CoV-2
115 D614G (1st) wave to after the peak of the Delta (3rd) wave. After this initial follow-up period,
116 nasopharyngeal swab sample collection stopped but serum samples continued with blood drawn
117 immediately following the Omicron BA.1/2 (4th) wave. The timing of the serum sample collection
118 is visualized in Fig. 1. We previously reconstructed the detailed SARS-CoV-2 infection history of
119 each individual in the cohort up to the Omicron BA1/2 wave and demonstrated that immunity
120 conferred by prior infection reduced the risk of reinfection^{30,32}. In this study, we extended this
121 work to investigate how infection-induced neutralizing antibody (nAb) titers correlate with
122 protection against SARS-CoV-2 reinfection with the Delta or Omicron BA.1/2 variants.

123 For the Delta wave, we focused on a subgroup of 797 participants from 196 households (Delta
124 wave subgroup, Table 1, Extended Data Fig. 1) who remained SARS-CoV-2 naïve or had a single
125 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection before the Delta wave (hence, removing vaccinated and repeatedly
126 infected individuals from the analysis; see Fig. 1 for the timing of the Delta wave). We define prior
127 infection as positivity on the Roche Elecsys anti-nucleocapsid assay (an assay was optimized to
128 detect prior infection³³), and/or rRT-PCR-positivity, at or before blood draw 5 (refer to BD5
129 hereafter). SARS-CoV-2 infections during the Delta wave were inferred based on the anti-
130 nucleocapsid antibody level of two pre- and one post- Delta wave serum samples, as previously
131 described³⁰. We focused on households with no more than six infected household members during
132 this wave, due to computational constraints of the transmission model (see Methods for details).
133 Among the 797 subgroup participants, 34% (273/797) were infected during the Delta wave, with
134 attack rates of 42% (229/544) and 17% (44/253) for naïve and previously infected participants,
135 respectively.

136 To identify CoPs against the Delta variant, for the 253 participants who had been previously
137 infected, we measured their anti-D614G nAb titers (measured as the inhibitory dilution at which
138 50% neutralization is attained, referred to as ID₅₀ hereafter), using the blood draw immediately
139 preceding the Delta wave (BD5). To evaluate the potential impact of antibody waning, we also
140 measured the peak nAb level for each participant (defined as the highest anti-D614G nAb titer
141 among the first 5 blood draws). We then calculated the degree to which nAbs had waned from
142 peak level to that at BD5 by calculating the difference between peak nAb titer and nAb titer at
143 BD5 (denoted as ΔnAb^W hereafter). If the peak response was already below the nAb assay
144 detection threshold (which is set at 20), then ΔnAb^W was also assigned to be below the threshold,

145 since further titer drop was not detectable. Notably, 28% (32/113) and 58% (81/140) of individuals
146 previously infected with D614G and Beta exhibited anti-D614G nAb titers below the detection
147 threshold at BD5, respectively (Extended Data Table 1). The proportion below the detection
148 threshold was higher for individuals previously infected with the Beta variant than the D614G
149 variant, given the Beta variant has eight amino acid difference in the spike, resulting in an
150 antigenically distinct receptor binding domain compared to the D614G variant used in the
151 neutralization assay. However, more than 90% of individuals remained positive on the Roche
152 Elecsys anti-nucleocapsid assay for both prior D614G and Beta exposed individuals³³, despite low
153 nAb titer level (Extended Data Table 1).

154 Fig. 2a shows the Delta wave participants anti-D614G nAb titers at peak and at BD5. The ID₅₀
155 geometric mean titer (GMT) was 125 (95% CI 97 – 161) at peak and waned to 85 (95% CI 69 –
156 104) at BD5, representing an average 1.47 (95% CI 1.32 – 1.67) fold reduction due to waning.
157 The anti-D614G nAb titers (in log scale) at peak and at BD 5 were highly correlated (Pearson
158 correlation coefficient 0.89, $p < 0.0001$). Comparing the nAb titers between individuals who were
159 infected during the Delta wave vs. those who were not infected, we found that the GMTs of
160 infected individuals was significantly lower than that of uninfected individuals for both anti-
161 D614G nAb at peak level and at BD5 (Fig. 2b-c). In contrast, we did not find a significant
162 difference in the degree of antibody loss due to waning (ΔnAb^W) between infected and uninfected
163 individuals (Fig. 2d).

164 Similarly, for the Omicron wave, we focused on a subgroup of 535 participants from 184
165 households who had only one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (vaccinated and repeatedly infected
166 individuals were removed from the analysis) or remained naïve just before the Omicron wave (see
167 Table 1 and Extended Data Fig. 2 for a description of participants and Fig. 1 for the timing of the
168 Omicron wave). Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection was ascertained in a similar fashion as for the Delta
169 wave (i.e., positivity by anti-nucleocapsid assay and/or rRT-PCR for the first 8 blood draws).
170 Infections during the Omicron wave were inferred based on the anti-nucleocapsid antibody level
171 of two pre- and one post- Omicron wave serum samples, as previously described³⁰. Two thirds,
172 or 67% (359/535), of participants included in the Omicron BA.1/2 wave analysis were infected by

173 these variants, with attack rates of 77% (149/193) and 61% (210/342) for naïve and previously
174 infected individuals, respectively.

175 To evaluate nAbs as CoP in the context of Omicron’s extensive immune escape, we measured
176 both the anti-D614G nAb titers and anti-Omicron BA.1 nAb titers for serum samples collected at
177 blood draw 8 (the blood draw taken shortly before the onset of the Omicron wave, referred to as
178 BD8 hereafter). Given that none of the participants had been infected by Omicron prior to BD8,
179 the anti-Omicron BA.1 neutralizing activity at this time point originated from cross-reactive
180 antibodies elicited by prior variant infections. Thus, the difference between anti-D614G and anti-
181 BA.1 nAb titers at BD8 represents the quantity of anti-D614G nAbs that failed to recognize
182 mutated epitopes on Omicron BA.1, resulting in a lack of neutralizing function against Omicron
183 BA.1. For the remainder of the manuscript, we will use ΔnAb^E to represent the quantity of
184 antibodies able to neutralize D614G but not Omicron BA.1 due to mutations in the Omicron spike.
185 Similarly to the Delta wave subgroup, a significant proportion of previously infected individuals
186 in the Omicron wave subgroup exhibited anti-D614G and anti-Omicron nAb titers below the
187 detection threshold at BD8 (Extended Data Table 1). The absence of detectable nAbs was also
188 more pronounced when the variant causing prior exposure and the spike used in the neutralization
189 assay were mismatched. (Extended Data Table 1). Roche Elecsys anti-nucleocapsid assay
190 remained robust in detecting prior infection³³, despite low nAb titer level (Extended Data Table
191 1).

192 Fig. 2e shows the anti-D614G and the anti-BA.1 nAb titers at BD8 for participants included in
193 the Omicron wave analysis. The nAb GMT against D614G was 122 (95% CI 103 – 145) and 30
194 (95% CI 27 – 34) for antibodies that could neutralize BA.1, representing an average 4.01 (95% CI
195 3.53 – 4.58) -fold reduction attributed to the immune evasive properties of Omicron. The anti-
196 D614G and anti-BA.1 nAb titers (in log scale) at BD 8 were modestly correlated (Pearson
197 correlation coefficient 0.64, $p < 0.0001$). Comparing the nAb titers between individuals who were
198 infected during the Omicron wave vs. those who were not infected, we did not find significant
199 differences in GMT levels for anti-D614G nAb, anti-BA.1 nAb, or ΔnAb^E (Fig. f-h). However, it

200 is worth noting that the point estimates of GMTs were higher for uninfected individuals compared
201 to infected individuals across all three measurements.

202

203 **Pre-exposure nAb titer as CoP against variant infection**

204 We conducted mediation analyses in a household transmission modelling framework to investigate
205 how nAb titers against SARS-CoV-2 variants at the onset of a SARS-CoV-2 wave mediate the
206 risk of infection during the corresponding epidemic wave^{34,35}. Specifically, following the causal
207 inference framework proposed by Halloran and Struchiner³⁶, we introduced SARS-CoV-2
208 transmission probabilities as causal parameters, representing either the risk of acquiring infection
209 from the general community or the per-contact transmission risk within the household.
210 Transmission probabilities were dependent on an individual's prior infection history, the level of
211 pre-existing nAb titers (mediators), and other confounding factors (age, gender, comorbidities).
212 We fitted a chain-binomial household transmission model, parametrized by the transmission
213 probabilities, to the infection outcomes of the Delta and Omicron waves among all subgroup
214 participants and evaluated how the level of nAb titers mediated SARS-CoV-2 transmission
215 probability. The details of the mediation analysis are described in the Methods.

216 For the Delta wave mediation analysis, we considered anti-D614G nAb titer at BD5 as candidate
217 mediator of protection and the quantity of antibodies that had waned from peak (ΔnAb^W) as
218 putative negative control (i.e., we hypothesize that antibodies lost due to waning could not
219 conceivably contribute to protection). For the Omicron wave, we considered anti-BA.1 nAb titer
220 at BD8 as candidate mediator of protection and the quantity of nAbs that escape Omicron
221 neutralization (ΔnAb^E) at BD8 as putative negative control. We used the term “direct effect” from
222 the causal inference framework to refer to the effect of exposure (prior infection) on the outcome
223 (repeat infection during the Delta or Omicron wave) absent the mediators (nAb titers). Conversely,
224 the term “indirect effect” represents the effect of exposure (prior infection) on the outcome (repeat
225 infection) that operates through the mediators (nAb titers). We estimated both the direct effect of
226 prior infection and effects mediated through specific nAb titers against serologically confirmed
227 SARS-CoV-2 infections. We report the estimates of the mediation analysis for both Delta and
228 Omicron wave in Table 2. For the ease of interpretation, we then translate the estimated odds ratios

229 into risk reductions ($1 - \text{odds ratio}$), along with other estimates in causal diagrams depicted in Fig.
230 3.

231 Our findings indicate that immunity derived from prior infection, overall, reduced the risk of
232 contracting a Delta wave infection by 61% (95%CI: 59% – 63%) (Fig 3a). Notably, nAbs
233 represented an important mediator of this overall protection: for every 10-fold increase in the anti-
234 D614G nAb titers at BD5, the risk of infection decreased by 40% (95% CI 19% – 56%). In contrast,
235 the decline in nAbs from peak levels to BD5 (ΔnAb^W) showed no contribution to the overall
236 protection, with a risk reduction per 10-fold increase of -1% (95%CI: -21% – 16%). This result
237 indicated that waning of neutralizing antibodies results in waning of protection, in agreement with
238 our hypothesis. Furthermore, we estimated that the protection mediated through anti-D614G nAbs
239 at BD5 accounted for 37% (95% CI: 34% - 40%) of the overall protection derived from prior
240 infection, suggesting that over half of the protection against Delta was not mediated by serum nAbs
241 against D614G. Lastly, our analysis indicated that individuals reinfected with the Delta variant
242 were 78% (95% CI: 24% – 94%) less likely to transmit the infection to other household members
243 compared to those who experienced primary infections (Fig. 3a). This finding suggested that even
244 in cases where prior immunity is not sufficient to block reinfection with the Delta variant,
245 infection-induced immunity still offered sizable mitigation against onward transmission.

246 The causal diagram depicting the mediation analysis for the Omicron wave is illustrated in Fig.
247 3b. Our findings indicate that, overall, prior infection-derived immunity resulted in a 37% (95%CI:
248 35% – 38%) reduction in the risk of contracting an Omicron wave infection, a notably lower effect
249 compared to that of the Delta wave. We observed that, anti-Omicron nAbs at BD8 significantly
250 mediated protection against the Omicron BA.1/2 variants: for every 10-fold increase in anti-
251 Omicron nAb titers, the risk of Omicron BA.1/2 infection decreased by 28% (95% CI: 6% – 44%).
252 Conversely, antibodies unable to neutralize Omicron due to immune escape (ΔnAb^E) did not
253 mediate protection against Omicron BA.1/2 infection, with risk reduction of -1% (95% CI: -21%
254 – 16%) per 10-fold titer increase. Furthermore, we estimated that the protection mediated through
255 anti-BA.1 nAbs at BD8 accounted for only 11% (95% CI: 9% - 12%) of the total protection
256 conferred by prior exposure. This, coupled with the observation that Omicron BA.1 caused an
257 average of 4.01-fold drop in nAb titers (Fig. 2e), underscores Omicron BA.1/2's ability to evade
258 host protective immunity mediated through nAbs. Additionally, in contrast to the Delta wave,

259 individuals reinfected with the Omicron variant were as likely to transmit the infection to other
260 household members compared to those who experienced primary infections (risk reduction: -17%,
261 (95% CI: -110% – 35%)). These observations suggested that Omicron not only evaded prior
262 immunity's protection against acquisition of infection but also escaped protection against onward
263 transmission.

264 Although neutralizing titers measured at BD5 and BD8 offered a temporally proximate
265 evaluation of protective immunity preceding the onset of the Delta and Omicron waves, we could
266 not identify the immune mediators responsible for the direct effects of prior immunity (i.e., the
267 fraction of protection that was not mediated by nAbs) due to lack of additional serum biomarkers.
268 We could however estimate the potential for these direct effects to wane over time. To do so, we
269 modeled an exponential decline for the direct effect based on the time elapsed since prior infection
270 and jointly estimated the duration of protection for both the Delta and Omicron waves' analysis.
271 We found that protection not mediated by nAbs decreased with time, with a waning half-life of
272 121 (95%CI: 72 – 242) days (Fig. 3, Table 2). After adjusting for waning, the effect sizes of
273 protection from direct effects were similar for both variants, with odds ratios of acquiring infection
274 (compared to naïve individuals) of 0.34 (95% CI: 0.17, 0.68) and 0.29 (95% CI: 0.17, 0.50) for the
275 Delta and Omicron wave, respectively, in the absence of waning (Table 2). These results suggested
276 that, while Omicron escaped pre-existing neutralizing antibodies, protection from other immune
277 effectors was preserved against this variant. The waning half-life of protection not mediated by
278 nAbs was estimated at approximately 4 months in our study, comparable to the reported waning
279 timescale of T-cell immunity^{37,38}. Several sensitivity analyses demonstrating the robustness of the
280 findings of the mediation analysis were reported in the Methods.

281

282

283 **Discussion**

284 In this cohort of unvaccinated individuals, we found that nAb titers immediately before the onset
285 of the Delta wave (i.e., anti-D614G nAb level at BD5) correlated with protection against Delta
286 wave infections. Moreover, we demonstrated that nAb titers lost over time due to waning (i.e.,
287 ΔnAb^W) were not associated with protection, aligning with the expectation that waning of nAbs
288 in serum corresponds to waning of clinical protection. For the Omicron wave subgroup, we further

289 investigated the impact of immune escape against protection mediated through nAbs. We found
290 that only anti-Omicron BA.1 nAbs correlated with protection against infection during the Omicron
291 BA.1/2 wave, whereas anti-D614G nAbs that were unable to neutralize Omicron BA.1 due to spike
292 escape mutations did not protect. This indicated that antibodies capable of neutralizing D614G but
293 not Omicron BA.1 *in vitro* translates to a diminished protection against Omicron BA.1/2 infection
294 among PHIRST-C participants. The identification of variant-neutralizing antibodies derived from
295 infection-induced immunity as CoPs against infections for both Delta and Omicron variants aligns
296 with findings from studies on variant-specific correlates for vaccine-induced or hybrid immunity
297 ²¹⁻²⁴. Considering that antibody-mediated protection against acquisition of infection likely operates
298 at the mucosal site rather than in serum, it is interesting that serum antibodies levels can anticipate
299 protection ²⁶. In a recent analysis of the data from the COVE trial, Zhang et. al. further
300 demonstrated that boosting of nAb titers against Omicron by a third dose of mRNA-1273 vaccine,
301 afforded additional protection against Omicron compared to individuals who only received 2 doses
302 of the mRNA-1273 vaccine. ²² Collectively, these empirical data lend support for using nAbs
303 against circulating variant as immuno-bridging markers for periodic vaccine updates.

304 While a comprehensive understanding of the role of nAbs in SARS-CoV-2 protection is
305 important, a key finding of our study is that nAb titers did not fully mediate protection conferred
306 by prior infection. In the case of the Delta wave subgroup, we estimate that anti-D614G nAbs
307 mediate 37% of protection, a proportion comparable to vaccine-induced nAbs ¹⁵. In contrast, for
308 the Omicron BA.1/2 wave subgroup, anti-Omicron BA.1 nAbs are estimated to mediate only 11%
309 of protection, which was substantially lower than that observed for the Delta wave. This low
310 percentage of protection mediated by nAbs for the Omicron BA.1/2 wave could be attributed to
311 the highly immune evasive nature of Omicron against neutralizing activity. Omicron effectively
312 rendered a significant proportion of serum anti-D614G nAbs nonfunctional against Omicron. The
313 large proportion of overall protection that was not mediated by nAbs could be explained by a
314 variety of immune mechanisms, including the Fc-effector function of binding antibodies, and T-
315 cell functions, both of which are resilient against mutations in VOCs ^{14,39}. Additionally, SARS-
316 CoV-2 initially infects and predominantly transmits through the upper respiratory tract. Mucosal
317 immunity in the upper respiratory tract therefore likely plays a key role in preventing SARS-CoV-
318 2 infection, and may not be fully represented by immune markers in serum ⁴⁰. Our study validates
319 the use of serum nAbs as CoP against reinfection but also suggests potential important roles for

320 other candidate functions that could act as “co-correlates” of protection ⁴¹. This is particularly
321 important because these mechanisms may be more broadly cross-protective against future variants
322 than neutralizing antibodies. Future CoP analyses incorporating measurements of T-cell immunity
323 and non-neutralizing antibody functions, ideally at the mucosal site, could potentially disentangle
324 these important protective mechanisms and inform design of next generation vaccines ^{26,42–44}.

325 Our study has several limitations. Firstly, the vaccination rate in the PHIRST-C cohort was low
326 at the time of the analysis; with <20% participants fully vaccinated prior to the Omicron BA.1/2
327 wave (thus excluded from our analysis). Consequently, we lacked sufficient statistical power to
328 assess CoPs for vaccine-induced (or hybrid) immunity and compare with our findings for
329 infection-induced immunity in the same cohort. Secondly, we focused on SARS-CoV-2 infections
330 that were ascertained by seroconversion or amnestic boosting of the anti-nucleocapsid antibodies.
331 However, not all PCR-positive SARS-CoV-2 infections led to systemic antibody response ^{30,45,46}.
332 Thus, our CoP analysis does not account for protection against abortive or transient infections that
333 do not lead to systemic antibody responses. We also could not evaluate CoPs against symptomatic
334 cases, as there was no systemic monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 symptoms for the cohort population
335 during the Omicron BA.1/2 wave. Further, severe outcomes (hospitalizations and deaths) due to
336 SARS-CoV-2 infections were rare throughout the course of the PHIRST-C study and evaluation
337 of protection against those outcomes is under-powered. Understanding protection against severe
338 outcomes is important from both clinical and public health prospective, thus warranting further
339 studies. Thirdly, the strains of antigens used in neutralization assay were not perfectly matched to
340 the circulating variants in the CoP analysis. For the Delta wave analysis, we evaluated anti-D614G
341 antibody titers (rather than anti-Delta titers). Although Delta is not as immune evasive as Omicron
342 with respect to D614G, there are substitutions on the spike of Delta (i.e., L452R, T478K) that are
343 linked to moderate antigenic escape ^{47,48}. In addition, though infections were predominantly caused
344 by the Delta variant during the Delta wave epidemic, other variants also circulated at low levels
345 during the same time period, including Alpha and C.1.2 ³⁰. Similarly, genomic surveillance
346 revealed that while Omicron BA.1 accounted for the majority of infections during the Omicron
347 wave, Omicron BA.2 also co-circulated, with potential antigenic spike substitutions (e.g., T376A,
348 D405N, R408S) that were not present in BA.1 ^{30,48,49}. Thus, using a BA.1-specific neutralizing
349 assay may introduce bias in our CoP analysis, particularly against Omicron BA.2. Lastly, we only
350 measured serum antibodies, but did not have any information on antibody response at the mucosal

351 site or on cell-mediated immunity. While serum IgG nAbs may transudate into the nasal mucosa
352 and thereby play a role in protection, the contribution of locally produced nasal IgA nAb remains
353 to be investigated.

354 Moving forward, future works focusing on understanding how protective immunity accumulates
355 through repeated infections, vaccinations, and hybrid immunity, and identifying a suite of
356 predictive markers of protection reflecting different arms of immune responses, are key to
357 anticipating long-term SARS-CoV-2 burden, optimizing vaccine boosters, and designing next
358 generation SARS-CoV-2 vaccines.

359

360 **Acknowledgment**

361 We are thankful to all the participants who kindly agreed to take part in the study, as well as to the
362 PHIRST group. We are grateful to Professor Benjamin J. Cowling and Professor M. Elizabeth
363 Halloran for their insightful feedback on the paper. We deeply appreciate the three anonymous
364 reviewers for their constructive review of the paper. The findings and conclusions in this report
365 are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the NIH or the U.S.
366 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. **Funding:** This work was supported by the National
367 Institute for Communicable Diseases of the National Health Laboratory Service and the U.S.
368 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [cooperative agreement number: 6 U01IP001048] and
369 Wellcome Trust (grant number 221003/Z/20/Z) in collaboration with the Foreign, Commonwealth
370 and Development Office, United Kingdom. PLM and JNB are supported by the Bill and Melinda
371 Gates Foundation through the Global Immunology and Immune Sequencing for Epidemic
372 Response (GIISER) program (INV-030570) and receive funding from the Wellcome Trust
373 (226137/Z/22/Z). PLM is supported by the South African Research Chairs Initiative of the
374 Department of Science and Innovation and National Research Foundation of South Africa and the
375 SA Medical Research Council SHIP program.

376 **Author Contributions Statement**

377 KS, JNB, ST, JK, AvG, MLM, NW, JM, NAM, KK, LL, CV, PLM, CC designed the experiments.
378 JNB, CC, JK, PLM and ST accessed and verified the underlying data. JNB, ST, JK, VSM, QM,

379 HK, AvG, MLM, NW, JM, MC, NAM, KK, LL, JdT, TM, PLM, CC collected the data and
380 performed laboratory experiments. KS, JNB, ST, JK, AvG, MLM, NW, JM, MC, NAM, KK, LL,
381 JdT, TM, CV, and CC analyzed the data and interpreted the results. KS, JNB, CV, PLM, and CC
382 drafted the manuscript. All authors critically reviewed the article. All authors had access to all the
383 data reported in the study.

384 **Competing Interests Statement**

385 CC has received grant support from Sanofi Pasteur, US CDC, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation,
386 the Taskforce for Global Health, Wellcome Trust and the South African Medical Research Council.
387 AvG has received grant support from Sanofi Pasteur, Pfizer related to pneumococcal vaccine, CDC
388 and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. NW reports grants from Sanofi Pasteur and the Bill &
389 Melinda Gates Foundation. NAM has received a grant to his institution from Pfizer to conduct
390 research in patients with pneumonia and from Roche to collect specimens to assess a novel TB
391 assay. JM has received grant support from Sanofi Pasteur. The remaining authors declare no
392 competing interests

393 **Consortia Authorship**

394 The PHIRST-C group: Jinal N. Bhiman^{2,3}, Amelia Buys⁴, Maimuna Carrim^{4,7}, Cheryl Cohen^{4,5},
395 Linda de Gouveia⁴, Mignon du Plessis^{4,7}, Jacques du Toit¹¹, Francesc Xavier Gómez-Olivé¹¹,
396 Kathleen Kahn¹¹, Kgaugelo Patricia Kgasago⁹, Jackie Kleynhans^{4,5}, Retshidisitswe Kotane⁴,
397 Limakatso Lebina⁹, Neil A Martinson^{9,10}, Meredith L McMorrow^{6,8}, Tumelo Moloantoa⁴, Jocelyn
398 Moyes^{4,5}, Stefano Tempia^{4,5,6}, Stephen Tollman¹¹, Anne von Gottberg^{4,7}, Floidy Wafawanaka¹¹,
399 Nicole Wolter^{4,7}

400

401 **Tables:**

402 **Table 1: Characteristics of the PHIRST-C cohort’s Delta wave subgroup and Omicron wave subgroup**
 403 **populations, respectively.** *PLWH: people living with HIV. **Here it indicates if a participant of the Delta/Omicron
 404 wave subgroup was infected (either primary or repeat infection) during the Delta/Omicron BA.1 wave.

	Delta wave subgroup 196 households	Omicron wave subgroup 184 households
Characteristics	Number of individuals (%)	Number of individuals (%)
All	797 (100)	535 (100)
Study site		
Rural	427 (54)	300 (56)
Urban	370 (46)	235 (44)
Age group, in years		
0-4	90 (11)	77 (14)
5-12	270 (34)	231 (43)
13-18	111 (14)	80 (15)
19-34	126 (16)	84 (16)
35-59	126 (16)	43 (8)
60+	74 (9)	20 (4)
Sex		
Male	324 (41)	229 (43)
Female	473 (59)	306 (57)
Household size		
3-5	372 (47)	254 (48)
6-8	264 (33)	197 (37)
9-12	124 (15)	72 (13)
13+	37 (5)	12 (2)
HIV status		
Negative	673 (85)	496 (93)
PLWH*	97 (12)	31 (6)
Unknown	27 (3)	8 (1)
Prior immunity		
Naive	544 (68)	193 (36)
Previously infected	253 (32)	342 (64)
Variant of prior infection:		
D614G	113 (14)	61 (11)
Beta	140 (18)	120 (22)
Delta	–	161 (31)
Infected**		
Yes	273 (34)	359 (67)
No	524 (66)	176 (33)


405 **Table 2: Mediation analysis for nAbs as CoPs against Delta and Omicron wave infections, with a waning model**
 406 **for direct effect.** Average and 95% CIs are provided for each of the model parameters. ΔnAb^W : the quantity of anti-
 407 D614G nAbs waned from peak level to that at BD5. ΔnAb^E : the quantity of antibodies that can neutralize D614G but
 408 fail to neutralize Omicron BA.1 at BD8 due to Omicron’s immune escape.

Wave		Delta	Omicron	
Protection against reinfection	Direct effect (Protection absent of nAbs)	Effect size (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.34 (0.17, 0.68)	0.29 (0.17, 0.50)
		Waning half-life (days)	121 (72, 242)	
	Mediators effect (Protection from nAbs)	Anti-D614G nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	0.60 (0.44, 0.81)	–
		ΔnAb^W (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	1.01 (0.74, 1.37)	–
		Anti-Omicron BA.1 nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	0.72 (0.56, 0.94)
		ΔnAb^E (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	1.01 (0.84, 1.21)
	Total protection (relative risk compared to naïve individuals)		0.39 (0.37, 0.41)	0.63 (0.62, 0.65)
	Proportion of protection mediated by nAbs		37% (34%, 40%)	11% (9%, 12%)
Protection against onward transmission (Odds ratio compared to naïve individuals)		0.22 (0.06, 0.76)	1.17 (0.65, 2.10)	

409


410

411 **Figures:**




412
413 **Fig. 1: Timing of cohort sample collections with respect to SARS-CoV-2 variants' circulations in the two study**
414 **sites. a,** Timing of the blood draws with respect to the SARS-CoV-2 epidemic waves in the rural site (Agincourt) of
415 the PHIRST-C cohort. Bar plot represents the weekly incidence (per 100,000 population) of SARS-CoV-2 cases from
416 routine surveillance data collected in Ehlanzeni District, Mpumalanga Province (where rural participants reside). The
417 shaded areas represent the timing of the serum sample collections for the 10 blood draws. Each curve within the shaded
418 area indicates the cumulative proportion of participants' serum samples collected over time. The Delta wave subgroup
419 analysis focuses on nAb titers among serum samples collected during blood draw 5 (blue shade); the Omicron BA.1
420 wave analysis focuses on nAb titers among serum samples collected during blood draw 8 (red shade). **b,** Same as (A),
421 but for the urban site (Klerksdorp). The routine surveillance data (bar plot) were collected from Dr. Kenneth Kaunda
422 District, North West Province (where urban participants reside).

423



424

425 **Fig. 2: Anti-D614G and anti-BA.1 nAb titers for the Delta wave and the Omicron wave analysis.** **a**, for Delta
 426 wave subgroup, the distribution of the peak anti-D614G nAb titer up to BD5 (light blue dots) and the anti-D614G nAb
 427 titer at BD5 (dark blue dots), among individuals who had one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection before blood draw 5. Each
 428 dot represents one individual, with two measurements of the same individual connected through a gray line. GMFC:
 429 geometric fold change from peak anti-D614G titer to that at BD5; GMT: geometric mean titer; r: Pearson correlation
 430 coefficient. **b**, for Delta wave subgroup, the distribution of the peak anti-D614G nAb titer up to BD5, stratified by
 431 individuals who were infected during the Delta wave (solid bar) vs those who were not infected (dashed bar).
 432 Independent samples t-test (two-sided) is used to determine the statistical significance (p-value reported on the legend)
 433 of difference between the GMT of the two groups. **c**, same as **b** but for anti-D614G nAb titers at BD5. **d**, same as **b**
 434 but for ΔnAb^W (defined as the difference between anti-D614G titers at peak and at BD5). **e**, for Omicron wave
 435 subgroup, the distribution of anti-D614G nAb titers (light red dots) and anti-BA.1 titers at BD8 (dark red dots), among
 436 individuals who had one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection before BD8. Each dot represents one individual, with two
 437 measurements of the same individual connected through a gray line. **f**, for the Omicron wave subgroup, the distribution
 438 of the anti-D614G nAb titer at BD5, stratified by individuals who were infected during the Omicron wave (solid bar)
 439 vs those who were not infected (dashed bar). Independent samples t-test (two-sided) is used to determine the statistical
 440 significance (p-value reported on the legend) of difference between the GMT of the two groups. **g**, same as **f** but for
 441 anti-BA.1 nAb titers at BD8. **d**, same as **f** but for ΔnAb^E (defined as the difference between anti-BA.1 and anti-D614G
 442 titers at BD8).



443

444 **Figure 3: Causal diagrams for the mediation analyses. a:** Causal diagram of the Delta wave mediation analysis
 445 showing the hypothesized relationship between prior immunity (induced by prior SARS-CoV-2 infection) and SARS-
 446 CoV-2 infection (outcome of interest) during Delta wave. The mediators of interest are anti-D614G nAbs at BD5 and
 447 ΔnAb^W (the quantity of anti-D614G nAbs waned from peak level to that at BD5). The direct effect represents
 448 protection operating through immune mechanisms other than the mediators of interest. We hypothesize that the direct
 449 effect could wane over time since the initial immune exposure. For the prospective cohort data, both mediator-outcome
 450 confounding and exposure-outcome confounding factors need to be adjusted for in the mediation analysis, as the
 451 immune exposure (prior SARS-CoV-2 infection) was not randomly assigned (unlike SARS-CoV-2 randomized-
 452 control vaccine trials where vaccination was randomly assigned to the participants). Furthermore, cohort participants
 453 may experience heterogenous levels of SARS-CoV-2 exposure due to different intensity SARS-CoV-2 transmission
 454 in their household settings. We adjust this by embedding the mediation analysis in a mechanistic household
 455 transmission model (detailed in Methods). We also look at the impact of prior immunity on the reduction of onward
 456 transmission, conditional on the failure of preventing reinfection. The estimates of the Delta wave mediation analysis
 457 are presented in Table 2. **b:** Same as a but for the Omicron wave analysis. The mediators of interest are anti-BA.1
 458 nAbs at BD8 and ΔnAb^E (the quantity of antibodies that can neutralize D614G but fail to neutralize Omicron BA.1 at
 459 BD8 due to Omicron's immune escape.). The estimates of the Omicron wave mediation analysis are presented in Table
 460 2.

461

462

463 **Reference:**

- 464 1. Statement on the fifteenth meeting of the IHR (2005) Emergency Committee on the
465 COVID-19 pandemic. [https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic)
466 [fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-\(2005\)-emergency-committee-](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic)
467 [regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-\(covid-19\)-pandemic.](https://www.who.int/news/item/05-05-2023-statement-on-the-fifteenth-meeting-of-the-international-health-regulations-(2005)-emergency-committee-regarding-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-19)-pandemic)
- 468 2. WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int/>.
- 469 3. WHO – COVID19 Vaccine Tracker. <https://covid19.trackvaccines.org/agency/who/>.
- 470 4. Watson, O. J. *et al.* Global impact of the first year of COVID-19 vaccination: a
471 mathematical modelling study. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* **22**, 1293–1302 (2022).
- 472 5. Gozzi, N. *et al.* Estimating the impact of COVID-19 vaccine inequities: a modeling study.
473 *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 3272 (2023).
- 474 6. Wang, Q. *et al.* Mapping global acceptance and uptake of COVID-19 vaccination: A
475 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Commun. Med.* **2**, 113 (2022).
- 476 7. Lazarus, J. V. *et al.* A survey of COVID-19 vaccine acceptance across 23 countries in 2022.
477 *Nat. Med.* **29**, 366–375 (2023).
- 478 8. Bergeri, I. *et al.* Global SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence from January 2020 to April 2022: A
479 systematic review and meta-analysis of standardized population-based studies. *PLoS Med.*
480 **19**, e1004107 (2022).
- 481 9. Lewis, H. C. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 infection in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis
482 of standardised seroprevalence studies, from January 2020 to December 2021. *BMJ Glob*
483 *Health* **7**, (2022).
- 484 10. Wang, Q. *et al.* Antibody evasion by SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariants BA.2.12.1, BA.4
485 and BA.5. *Nature* **608**, 603–608 (2022).

- 486 11. Ito, J. *et al.* Convergent evolution of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron subvariants leading to the
487 emergence of BQ.1.1 variant. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 2671 (2023).
- 488 12. Cao, Y. *et al.* BA.2.12.1, BA.4 and BA.5 escape antibodies elicited by Omicron infection.
489 *Nature* **608**, 593–602 (2022).
- 490 13. Cao, Y. *et al.* Imprinted SARS-CoV-2 humoral immunity induces convergent Omicron RBD
491 evolution. *Nature* **614**, 521–529 (2023).
- 492 14. Goldblatt, D., Alter, G., Crotty, S. & Plotkin, S. A. Correlates of protection against SARS-
493 CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease. *Immunol. Rev.* **310**, 6–26 (2022).
- 494 15. Gilbert, P. B. *et al.* Immune correlates analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine
495 efficacy clinical trial. *Science* **375**, 43–50 (2022).
- 496 16. Fong, Y. *et al.* Immune correlates analysis of the PREVENT-19 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy
497 clinical trial. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 331 (2023).
- 498 17. Fong, Y. *et al.* Immune correlates analysis of the ENSEMBLE single Ad26.COV2.S dose
499 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. *Nat Microbiol* **7**, 1996–2010 (2022).
- 500 18. Feng, S. *et al.* Correlates of protection against symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-
501 2 infection. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 2032–2040 (2021).
- 502 19. Khoury, D. S. *et al.* Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection
503 from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 1205–1211 (2021).
- 504 20. Earle, K. A. *et al.* Evidence for antibody as a protective correlate for COVID-19 vaccines.
505 *Vaccine* **39**, 4423–4428 (2021).
- 506 21. Atti, A. *et al.* Antibody correlates of protection against Delta infection after vaccination: A
507 nested case-control within the UK-based SIREN study. *J. Infect.* **87**, 420–427 (2023).

- 508 22. Zhang, B. *et al.* Omicron COVID-19 immune correlates analysis of a third dose of mRNA-
509 1273 in the COVE trial. *bioRxiv* (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.10.15.23295628.
- 510 23. Hertz, T. *et al.* Correlates of protection for booster doses of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine
511 BNT162b2. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 4575 (2023).
- 512 24. Gilboa, M. *et al.* Factors Associated With Protection From SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant
513 Infection and Disease Among Vaccinated Health Care Workers in Israel. *JAMA Netw Open*
514 **6**, e2314757 (2023).
- 515 25. Tang, J. *et al.* Respiratory mucosal immunity against SARS-CoV-2 after mRNA
516 vaccination. *Sci Immunol* **7**, eadd4853 (2022).
- 517 26. Knisely, J. M. *et al.* Mucosal vaccines for SARS-CoV-2: scientific gaps and opportunities-
518 workshop report. *NPJ Vaccines* **8**, 53 (2023).
- 519 27. Miyamoto, S. *et al.* Infectious virus shedding duration reflects secretory IgA antibody
520 response latency after SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **120**,
521 e2314808120 (2023).
- 522 28. Markov, P. V. *et al.* The evolution of SARS-CoV-2. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* **21**, 361–379
523 (2023).
- 524 29. Cohen, C. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 incidence, transmission, and reinfection in a rural and an
525 urban setting: results of the PHIRST-C cohort study, South Africa, 2020-21. *Lancet Infect.*
526 *Dis.* (2022) doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00069-X.
- 527 30. Sun, K. *et al.* Rapidly shifting immunologic landscape and severity of SARS-CoV-2 in the
528 Omicron era in South Africa. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 246 (2023).
- 529 31. Pulliam, J. R. C. *et al.* Increased risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection associated with emergence
530 of Omicron in South Africa. *Science* eabn4947 (2022).

- 531 32. Sun, K. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 transmission, persistence of immunity, and estimates of
532 Omicron's impact in South African population cohorts. *Sci. Transl. Med.* eabo7081 (2022).
- 533 33. Elecsys® Anti-SARS-CoV-2. *Diagnostics*
534 <https://diagnostics.roche.com/us/en/products/params/elecsys-anti-sars-cov-2.html>.
- 535 34. Cowling, B. J. *et al.* Influenza hemagglutination-inhibition antibody titer as a mediator of
536 vaccine-induced protection for influenza B. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **68**, 1713–1717 (2019).
- 537 35. Lim, W. W., Shuo, F., Wong, S.-S., Sullivan, S. G. & Cowling, B. J. Hemagglutination
538 inhibition antibody titers mediate influenza vaccine efficacy against symptomatic influenza
539 A(H1N1), A(H3N2), and B/Victoria infections. *J. Infect. Dis.* (2024)
540 doi:10.1093/infdis/jiae122.
- 541 36. Halloran, M. E. & Struchiner, C. J. Causal inference in infectious diseases. *Epidemiology* **6**,
542 142–151 (1995).
- 543 37. Cohen, K. W. *et al.* Longitudinal analysis shows durable and broad immune memory after
544 SARS-CoV-2 infection with persisting antibody responses and memory B and T cells. *Cell*
545 *Rep Med* **2**, 100354 (2021).
- 546 38. Dan, J. M. *et al.* Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after
547 infection. *Science* **371**, (2021).
- 548 39. Eser, T. M. *et al.* Nucleocapsid-specific T cell responses associate with control of SARS-
549 CoV-2 in the upper airways before seroconversion. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 2952 (2023).
- 550 40. Havervall, S. *et al.* Anti-Spike Mucosal IgA Protection against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
551 Infection. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **387**, 1333–1336 (2022).
- 552 41. Plotkin, S. A. Vaccines: correlates of vaccine-induced immunity. *Clin. Infect. Dis.* **47**, 401–
553 409 (2008).

- 554 42. Morens, D. M., Taubenberger, J. K. & Fauci, A. S. Rethinking next-generation vaccines for
555 coronaviruses, influenzaviruses, and other respiratory viruses. *Cell Host Microbe* **31**, 146–
556 157 (2023).
- 557 43. Topol, E. J. & Iwasaki, A. Operation Nasal Vaccine-Lightning speed to counter COVID-19.
558 *Science immunology* vol. 7 eadd9947 (2022).
- 559 44. Fact Sheet: HHS Details \$5 Billion ‘Project NextGen’ Initiative to Stay Ahead of COVID-
560 19. <https://aspr.hhs.gov/newsroom/Pages/ProjectNextGen-May2023.aspx>.
- 561 45. Liu, W. *et al.* Predictors of Nonseroconversion after SARS-CoV-2 Infection. *Emerg. Infect.*
562 *Dis.* **27**, 2454–2458 (2021).
- 563 46. Lindeboom, R. G. H. *et al.* Human SARS-CoV-2 challenge resolves local and systemic
564 response dynamics. *medRxiv* (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.04.13.23288227.
- 565 47. McCallum, M. *et al.* Molecular basis of immune evasion by the Delta and Kappa SARS-
566 CoV-2 variants. *Science* **374**, 1621–1626 (2021).
- 567 48. Wilks, S. H. *et al.* Mapping SARS-CoV-2 antigenic relationships and serological responses.
568 *Science* **382**, eadj0070 (2023).
- 569 49. Tegally, H. *et al.* Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and BA.5 in South
570 Africa. *Nat. Med.* (2022) doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01911-2.
- 571 50. Wibmer, C. K. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 escapes neutralization by South African
572 COVID-19 donor plasma. *Nat. Med.* (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01285-x.
- 573 51. Netzl, A. *et al.* Analysis of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Neutralization Data up to 2022-01-28.
574 *bioRxiv* 2021.12.31.474032 (2023) doi:10.1101/2021.12.31.474032.
- 575 52. Cox, D. R. Planning of experiments. **308**, (1958).

- 576 53. Imbens, G. W. & Rubin, D. B. *Causal Inference in Statistics, Social, and Biomedical*
577 *Sciences*. (Cambridge University Press, 2015).
- 578 54. Longini, I. M., Jr & Koopman, J. S. Household and community transmission parameters
579 from final distributions of infections in households. *Biometrics* **38**, 115–126 (1982).
- 580 55. Yang, Y., Longini, I. M., Jr, Halloran, M. E. & Obenchain, V. A hybrid EM and Monte Carlo
581 EM algorithm and its application to analysis of transmission of infectious diseases.
582 *Biometrics* **68**, 1238–1249 (2012).
- 583
- 584

585 **Methods**

586 **Ethics Statement**

587 The PHIRST-C protocol was approved by the University of Witwatersrand Human Research Ethics
588 Committee (Reference 150808) and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's
589 Institutional Review Board relied on the local review (#6840). The protocol was registered on
590 clinicaltrials.gov on 6 August 2015 and updated on 30 December 2020
591 (<https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02519803>). Participants receive grocery store vouchers of
592 ZAR50 (USD 3) per visit to compensate for time required for specimen collection and interview.
593 All participants provided written informed consent for study participation. For minors, consent
594 was obtained from the parent or guardian.

595 **Inferring Delta and Omicron wave infections based on longitudinal serum** 596 **samples.**

597 We have previously described the serologic inference method for SARS-CoV-2 infections among
598 the PHIRST-C cohort participants during the Delta wave (3rd SARS-CoV-2 wave) and the Omicron
599 wave (4th SARS-CoV-2 wave)³⁰. To briefly summarize, ascertainment of Delta wave infections
600 was based on the serial serologic readout of blood draws 5 and 6 (both before the Delta wave,
601 figure 1A-B), and 8 (post Delta wave), measured by the Roche Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2
602 nucleocapsid assay³³. The participants' serologic trajectories were then grouped into 13 categories
603 of distinct serum antibody patterns, reflecting the rise, waning, and/or amnesic boosting of anti-
604 nucleocapsid antibody levels. Because the Delta wave was also covered by intense virologic
605 sampling with twice-weekly nasopharyngeal swab collection, we grouped the 13 serologic
606 categories into indicators of either presence or absence of SARS-CoV-2 infection to achieve the
607 highest concordance with rRT-PCR-confirmed Delta infections. The Omicron wave was not
608 covered by the intense PCR testing; however, the timing of blood draws 8, 9, and 10 with respect
609 to the Omicron wave is similar to that of blood draws 5, 6, and 8 with respect to the Delta wave
610 (figure 1A-B). We thus apply the same classification method of serial serologic trajectories defined
611 by blood draws 8, 9, and 10 to infer SARS-CoV-2 infections during the Omicron BA.1/2 wave.

612 **Laboratory Methods**

613 **Serum nAb titers against SARS-CoV-2 D614G and BA.1 variants (Lentiviral Pseudovirus**
614 **Production and Neutralization Assay)**

615 Virus production and pseudovirus neutralization assays were done as previously described ⁵⁰.
616 Briefly, 293T/ACE2.MF cells modified to overexpress human ACE2 (kindly provided by M.
617 Farzan (Scripps Research)) were cultured in DMEM (Gibco BRL Life Technologies) containing
618 10% heat-inactivated serum (FBS) and 3 $\mu\text{g ml}^{-1}$ puromycin at 37 °C, 5% CO₂. Cell monolayers
619 were disrupted at confluency by treatment with 0.25% trypsin in 1 mM EDTA (Gibco BRL Life
620 Technologies). The SARS-CoV-2, Wuhan-1 spike, cloned into pCDNA3.1 was mutated using the
621 QuikChange Lightning Site-Directed Mutagenesis kit (Agilent Technologies) and NEBuilder HiFi
622 DNA Assembly Master Mix (NEB) to include D614G (wild-type) or lineage defining mutations
623 for Delta (T19R, 156-157del, R158G, L452R, T478K, D614G, P681R and D950N) and), Omicron
624 BA.1 (A67V, 69-70del, T95I, G142D, 143-145del, 211del, L212I, 214EPE, G339D, S371L, S373P,
625 S375F, K417N, N440K, G446S, S477N, T478K, E484A, Q493R, G496S, Q498R, N501Y, Y505H,
626 T547K, D614G, H655Y, N679K, P681H, N764K, D796Y, N856K, Q954H, N969K, L981F),
627 Omicron BA.2 (T19I, L24S, 25-27del, G142D, V213G, G339D, S371F, S373P, S375F, T376A,
628 D405N, R408S, K417N, N440K, S477N, T478K, E484A, Q493R, Q498R, N501Y, Y505H,
629 D614G, H655Y, N679K, P681H, N764K, D796Y, Q954H, N969K). Pseudoviruses were produced
630 by co-transfection in 293T/17 cells with a lentiviral backbone (HIV-1 pNL4.luc encoding the
631 firefly luciferase gene) and either of the full-length SARS-CoV-2 spike plasmids with PEIMAX
632 (Polysciences). Culture supernatants were clarified of cells by a 0.45 μm filter and stored at -70 °C.
633 Plasma samples were heat-inactivated and clarified by centrifugation. Pseudovirus and serially
634 diluted plasma/sera were incubated for 1 h at 37 °C, 5% CO₂. Cells were added at 1×10^4 cells per
635 well after 72 h of incubation at 37 °C, 5% CO₂, luminescence was measured using PerkinElmer
636 Life Sciences Model Victor X luminometer. Neutralization was measured as described by a
637 reduction in luciferase gene expression after single-round infection of 293T/ACE2.MF cells with
638 spike-pseudotyped viruses. Titers were calculated as the reciprocal plasma dilution (ID₅₀) causing
639 50% reduction of relative light units.

640 Noting that we measured neutralization titer using a lentiviral-backboned pseudovirus
641 neutralization assay. A systematic review of Omicron neutralization data showed that pseudovirus
642 neutralization assays tend to report higher neutralizing titers compared to live-virus assays. The

643 titer drops from wild type to Omicron also tend to be less pronounced for pseudovirus platforms,
644 suggesting the pseudovirus assay may underestimate Omicron's capability to escape neutralization
645 ⁵¹.

646 **SARS-CoV-2 spike enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)**

647 For ELISA, Hexapro SARS-CoV-2 full spike protein with the D614G substitution was expressed
648 in Human Embryonic Kidney (HEK) 293F suspension cells by transfecting the cells with the
649 respective expression plasmid. After incubating for 6 days at 37°C, proteins were first purified
650 using a nickel resin followed by size exclusion chromatography. Relevant fractions were collected
651 and frozen at -80°C until use. Two µg/mL of D614G spike protein was used to coat 96-well, high-
652 binding plates (Corning) and incubated overnight at 4°C. The plates were incubated in a blocking
653 buffer consisting of 1x PBS, 5% skimmed milk powder, 0.05% Tween 20. Plasma samples were
654 diluted to 1:100 starting dilution in a blocking buffer and added to the plates. IgG secondary
655 antibody (Merck) was diluted to 1:3000 in blocking buffer and added to the plates followed by
656 TMB substrate (ThermoFisher Scientific). Upon stopping the reaction with 1 M H₂SO₄, optical
657 density (OD) was measured at 450 nm. The monoclonal antibodies (mAbs) CR3022 and
658 Palivizumab were used as the positive and negative controls respectively.

659 **Statistical Analysis**

660 **Mediation analyses and household transmission model fitted to observed infections in the** 661 **cohort.**

662 Here we blend concepts from causal inference and infectious disease transmission models. The no
663 interference assumption in causal inference stipulates that the outcome of an individual does not
664 depend on the outcome of others, which is often violated in infectious disease dynamics ^{36,52,53}.
665 This is because the spread of infectious diseases requires pathogens to be transmitted from one
666 host to another. In other words, the infection outcome of one individual inherently depends on the
667 infection outcome of others, and this is particularly pronounced in a household setting ³⁶. The
668 “dependent happening” nature of infectious disease dynamics violates the no interference
669 assumption. As a result, the traditional regression approach for causal inference analysis cannot be
670 applied to infectious disease outcomes among individuals who can in theory transmit the disease
671 from one to another. To overcome this, Halloran and Struchiner. ³⁶ introduced the probability of

672 infection conditional on exposure to already infected individuals (transmission probability), as the
673 causal parameter. Using this proposed framework, we can investigate how the presence/absence
674 of pre-existing immunity along with the immunologic marker of interest could modulate
675 probability of infection, after adjusting for levels of exposure to the infectious source(s). The
676 corresponding causal inference framework requires modelling the transmission process explicitly.
677 Under this framework, we conduct mediation analyses to investigate how nAb titers against
678 variants at the start of a SARS-CoV-2 wave correlate with SARS-CoV-2 transmission risk, using
679 the Delta and Omicron BA.1/2 waves as examples^{34,35}. We focus on the Delta and Omicron
680 subgroup participants who have had a single or no prior infection, and fit a chain-binoal model to
681 their infection outcomes during the corresponding Delta/Omicron wave⁵⁴. Specifically, we
682 introduce the causal parameters:

- 683 • p_{ij}^k : the per-contact SARS-CoV-2 household transmission probability from infected
684 individual i to individual j in household k .
- 685 • q_j^k : the overall probability of acquiring SARS-CoV-2 infection from outside the household
686 by individual j of household k (probability of infection from the community).

687 We use e_j to indicate individual j 's prior SARS-CoV-2 infection history, with $e_j = 0$ representing
688 no prior infection reported before the start of Delta/Omicron BA.1/2 and $e_j = 1$ representing one
689 prior infection by the start of Delta/Omicron BA.1/2 wave. A prior SARS-CoV-2 infection ($e_j =$
690 1) would induce immunologic responses, measured by a set of immune markers (i.e., candidate
691 mediators) $\{m_j|e_j = 1\}$ (e.g., nAb titers level). Then the household transmission probability $p_{ij}^k =$
692 $p_{ij}^k(e_j, \{m_j|e_j = 1\}, \{c_i, c_j, c_k\})$ can be expressed as a function of prior infection status e_j ,
693 immunologic mediators of SARS-CoV-2 transmission probability $\{m_j|e_j = 1\}$ and additional
694 adjustment terms $\{c_i, c_j, c_k\}$, representing a set of potential confounding factors of individual i ,
695 individual j , and household k (eg, age of the donor and/or recipient, comorbidities, household size,
696 etc). Similarly, the community infection probability $q_j^k = q_j^k(e_j, \{m_j|e_j = 1\}, \{c_j\})$ can be
697 expressed as a function of individual j 's prior exposure history e_j , immunological markers
698 $\{m_j|e_j = 1\}$, and additional adjustment terms $\{c_j\}$, representing a set of potential confounding
699 factors of individual j (e.g., age or comorbidities).

700 The causal diagram of the mediation analysis framework is shown in Fig. 3. We fit a household
701 transmission model to the imputed household transmission chains based on an Expectation-
702 maximization (EM) algorithm (detailed in Section 4). Specifically, for the Delta/Omicron BA.1/2
703 wave, if we look into a specific household k of size N , there are a total of n individuals infected
704 belonging to L distinct chains of transmission due to L independent introductions of SARS-CoV-
705 2 into the household. The uninfected individuals are $N - n$. We denote P_j^k the likelihood of any
706 individual j of household k having the observed infection status over the Delta/Omicron BA.1/2
707 wave (i.e., either infected or not) in a particular realization of the model. There are a few scenarios
708 to write down P_j^k :

- 709 • Within a given transmission chain $l \in L$, the initial generation $g_j^l = 0$ always has an
710 individual j acquiring infection from the general community (outside the household k).
711 Thus, the probability of individual j being infected is $P_j^k = q_j^k$ if j is the first individual to
712 be infected in the chain.
- 713 • For infected individual j in the first generation of transmission chain l , i.e., $g_j^l = 1$, this
714 individual would have to escape infection risk from the general community but get infected
715 by the infected household member of $g_i^l = 0$. Thus, the probability of individual j being
716 infected can be written as $P_j^k = (1 - q_j^k)p_{ij}^k$.
- 717 • For infected individual j in transmission chain l with generation greater than 1, i.e., $g_l >$
718 1, this individual has escaped infection risk from the general community as well as infected
719 individuals i two generations away ($g_i^l \leq g_j^l - 2$) but got infected by an infector i' of j 's
720 previous generation on the same transmission chain l . Thus, the probability of individual j
721 being infected can be written as $P_j^k = (1 - q_j^k) \times \prod_{i \in \{g_i^l \leq g_j^l - 2\}} (1 - p_{ij}^k) \times p_{i'j}^k$.
- 722 • For uninfected individual j within household k , this individual has escaped infection risk
723 from the general community as well as all the n infected individuals within the same
724 household. Thus, the probability of individual j remaining uninfected can be written as
725 $P_j^k = (1 - q_j^k) \times \prod_{i \in \{n\}} (1 - p_{ij}^k)$.

726 Then, within household k of size N , we can express the likelihood of transmission chain l as
727 $\prod_{j \in l} P_j^k$; the likelihood of observing all infections within k can be expressed as $\prod_{l \in L} \prod_{j \in l} P_j^k$; the

728 likelihood of observing $N - n$ uninfected individuals can be expressed as $\prod_{j \in N-n} P_j^k$. Putting
 729 these together, the likelihood of observing one realization of the imputed (details of the EM
 730 imputation method described in the next section) households' transmission trees for Delta/Omicron
 731 wave can be expressed as:

$$732 \quad L^{Delta/Omicron} = \prod_k L_k^{Delta/Omicron} \quad (1)$$

733 Where the likelihood of a given household transmission chains configuration $L_k^{Delta/Omicron}$ can
 734 be expressed as:

$$735 \quad L_k^{Delta/Omicron} = \prod_{l \in L} \prod_{j \in l} P_j^k(p_{ij}^k, q_j^k) \times \prod_{j \in N-n} P_j^k(p_{ij}^k, q_j^k) \quad (2)$$

736 In the remainder of the section, we will consider a few versions of the transmission model with
 737 slightly different implementations for p_{ij}^k and q_j^k .

738 **Model 1: waning model for prior exposure with serologically ascertained Delta and Omicron**
 739 **wave infections.**

740 This is the transmission model presented in the main analysis of the manuscript (results of the
 741 model shown in Table 2. In this model, we consider that protection from prior infection
 742 unexplained by nAb titers wanes over time but is not dependent on the variant responsible for prior
 743 infection (i.e. prior D614G or Beta infections for the Delta wave analysis, and prior D614G, Beta,
 744 or Delta infections for the Omicron wave analysis). Additionally, in this model, both the Delta and
 745 Omicron wave infections were ascertained by serology based on approach describe in a prior
 746 session in Methods.

747 More specifically, for the Delta wave, p_{ij}^k and q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$748 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}} e_j + \left(\delta_{nAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s \right) \quad (3)$$

$$749 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\begin{array}{c} \epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}} e_j + \left(\delta_{nAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right) e_j + \\ \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s \end{array} \right) \quad (4)$$

750 As described before, e_j indicates individual j 's prior SARS-CoV-2 infection history, with $e_j = 0$
 751 representing uninfected individuals at the start of the Delta wave, $e_j = 1$ representing one prior
 752 infection, and ϵ representing the effect size of the immune protection by prior infection not
 753 mediated through anti-D614G nAbs (direct effect, Table 2). Δt is the elapsed time between prior
 754 infection and blood draw 5 (the blood draw taken prior to the Delta wave which we use in this
 755 model) and τ is the waning half-life of ϵ (direct effect, Table 2). m_j^{D614G} represents the anti-
 756 D614G nAb titer at blood draw 5 and δ_{nAb}^{D614G} represents the effect size of m_j^{D614G} in mediating
 757 infection probability p_{ij}^k against the Delta wave infection (mediator effect, Table 2) at blood draw
 758 5. While m_j^{waning} represents the quantity of anti-D614G nAbs waned from peak level (measured
 759 as the highest anti-D614G nAb titer level among the first 5 blood draws) to that at BD5 and
 760 $o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning}$ represents the effect size of m_j^{waning} in mediating transmission probability p_{ji}^k against the
 761 Delta wave infection (mediator effect, Table 2) at blood draw 5. Note that the term
 762 $\delta_{nAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning}$ only exists when $e_j = 1$.

763 We further evaluate whether breakthrough infections have reduced infectiousness compared to
 764 primary infections and may in turn affect p_{ij}^k . We use e_i to indicate individual i 's (the donor) prior
 765 SARS-CoV-2 infection history ($e_i = 0$ means no infection, and $e_i = 1$ represents one prior
 766 infection at the start of Delta wave). Further, λ represents the effect size of prior infection (in i) in
 767 reducing the infectiousness of reinfections.

768 We also consider confounding factors for donor i and recipient j , where c_i and γ_{c_i} represent
 769 infector i 's confounding factor (i 's age, sex) and effect size, respectively; c_j and γ_{c_j} represent j 's
 770 confounding factor (j 's age/sex-specific susceptibility (biology), age/sex- and site-specific
 771 susceptibility (behavioral), HIV infection status) and effect size, respectively; c_k and γ_{c_k} represent
 772 household k 's confounding factor (household size) and effect size, respectively. Lastly, α_s and β_s
 773 are logits of the baseline risks for household and community exposures. All parameters' effect sizes
 774 are measured in the log of odds ratios.

775 Similarly, for the Omicron BA.1/2 wave, p_{ij}^k and q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$776 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}} e_j + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s \right) \quad (5)$$

$$777 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\epsilon \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\frac{\Delta t}{\tau}} e_j + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s \right) \quad (6)$$

778 As described before, e_j indicates individual j 's prior SARS-CoV-2 infection history, with $e_j = 0$
 779 representing individual j remained naïve to SARS-CoV-2 at the start of Omicron BA.1/2 wave
 780 while $e_j = 1$ representing individual j had one prior infection at the start of Omicron BA.1/2 wave
 781 and ϵ represents the effect size of the immune protection by prior infection not mediated through
 782 anti-D614G nAbs (direct effect, Table 2). Δt is the elapsed time between prior infection and blood
 783 draw 8 (the blood draw taken prior to the Omicron BA.1/2 wave) and τ is the waning half-life of
 784 ϵ (direct effect, Table 2). Here we consider that parameter τ is shared between the Delta and
 785 Omicron wave and will be jointly estimated (described in the next session in Methods). m_j^{BA1}
 786 represents the anti-BA1 nAb titer at blood draw 8 and o_{nAb}^{BA1} represents the effect size of m_j^{BA1} in
 787 mediating transmission probability p_{ji}^k against the Omicron BA.1/2 wave infection (mediator
 788 effect, Table 2) at blood draw 8. While m_j^{escape} represents the difference in titer from anti-D614G
 789 nAb to anti-BA1 nAb at blood draw 8 and $o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape}$ represents the effect size of m_j^{escape} in
 790 mediating transmission probability p_{ji}^k against the Omicron BA.1/2 wave infection (mediator
 791 effect, Table 2) at blood draw 8. Note that the term $o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape}$ only exists when
 792 $e_j = 1$. All other parameters have the same definition of the Delta wave.

793 $\alpha_s, \beta_s, \epsilon, \tau, o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape}, o_{nAb}^{BA1}, \{\gamma_{c_i}\}, \{\gamma_{c_j}\}, \{\gamma_{c_k}\}$ are estimated through maximizing the likelihood
 794 function L for each of the 100 bootstrapped realizations and bootstrap mean and confidence
 795 intervals are calculated for each of the parameters.

796 Sensitivity analysis

797 **Model 2: Sensitivity analysis considering variant-specific prior exposure for the direct effects.**

798 A potential confounding factor in understanding the waning of protection through direct effects is
 799 the diversity of prior SARS-CoV-2 exposures, with the dominance of D614G variant in the first
 800 wave, Beta variant in the second wave, and Delta variant in the third wave (Fig. 1). The
 801 effectiveness of protection may vary depending on the specific variant of prior exposure that
 802 induced the immune response at play. We conducted a sensitivity analysis (Model 2) employing a
 803 variant-specific model for the direct effects, which accounted for distinct types of SARS-CoV-2
 804 variants conferring prior immunity, instead of considering generic a waning model. Specifically,
 805 in Model 2, we considered a more complex version of Model 1, where protection from prior
 806 infection depends on the type of infecting variant (i.e. prior D614G or Beta infections for the Delta
 807 wave analysis, and prior D614G, Beta, or Delta infections for the Omicron wave analysis). We
 808 consider waning in neutralizing titers as in Model 1, but we eliminate waning in the effect of prior
 809 infection that is not captured by neutralizing titers. More specifically, for the Delta wave, p_{ij}^k and
 810 q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$811 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\frac{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \left(\delta_{nAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s}{\sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s} \right) \quad (7)$$

$$812 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\frac{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \left(\delta_{nAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s}{\sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s} \right) \quad (8)$$

813

814 Here, $e_j^{D614G(Beta)} = 1$ indicates individual j , prior to the Delta wave, was infected with D614G
 815 (Beta) variant. If $e_j^{D614G} = e_j^{Beta} = 0$, individual j was naïve at the beginning of the Delta wave.
 816 ϵ^{D614G} and ϵ^{Beta} represent the effect size of immune protection by prior D614G and Beta infection
 817 not mediated through anti-D614G nAbs, respectively.

818 For the Omicron wave, p_{ij}^k and q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$819 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\frac{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s}{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s} \right) \quad (9)$$

$$820 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\frac{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s}{\epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + (o_{nAb}^{BA1} m_j^{BA1} + o_{\Delta nAb}^{escape} m_j^{escape})^{e_j} + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s} \right) \quad (10)$$

821 Here, $e_j^{D614G(Beta,Delta)} = 1$ indicates individual j , prior to the Omicron wave, was infected with
 822 D614G (Beta, Delta) variant. If $e_j^{D614G} = e_j^{Beta} = e_j^{Delta} = 0$, individual j was naïve at the
 823 beginning of the Omicron wave. ϵ^{D614G} , ϵ^{Beta} and ϵ^{Delta} represent the effect size of the immune
 824 protection by prior D614G, Beta and Delta infection not mediated through anti-D614G nAbs,
 825 respectively.

826 Additionally, similarly to Model 1, both the Delta and Omicron wave infections were ascertained
 827 by serology for Model 2. All other settings of Model 2 were kept the same as Model 1. The results
 828 of the Model 2 are presented in Extended Data Table 2.

829 Our analysis revealed that for both the Delta and Omicron waves, more recent variants conferred
 830 stronger protection than earlier variants, albeit with overlapping confidence intervals (Extended
 831 Data Table 2). This temporal trend aligns with the expectations of the waning model. Both waning
 832 and variant-specific immunity may modulate the direct effects of prior immunity; however, our
 833 study lacked sufficient statistical power to jointly estimate the relative contributions of these two
 834 factors. Full estimates of this sensitivity analyses are presented in Extended Data Table 2.

835

836 **Model 3: Sensitivity analysis with Delta wave infections ascertained by PCR and/or serology.**

837 For Model 1, both the Delta and Omicron wave infection outcomes were inferred using the kinetics
 838 of anti-nucleocapsid antibodies from longitudinal serologic sampling, as detailed in previously
 839 published studies of the PHIRST-C cohort^{30,32}. This approach for inferring infections based on
 840 serology was calibrated against virological evidence of infection during the Delta wave,
 841 established through twice-weekly rRT-PCR tests regardless of symptom presentation. However, it
 842 should be noted that this calibration did not achieve perfect concordance; the serology approach
 843 demonstrated 93% sensitivity and 89% specificity when compared to infections identified by rRT-

844 PCR tests³⁰. To address the uncertainties arising from the imperfect concordance between the two
 845 approaches for ascertaining infections, we conducted a sensitivity analysis (Model 3) for the Delta
 846 wave, where we considered infections based on rRT-PCR positivity and/or anti-nucleocapsid
 847 antibody serology. We identified an additional 17 infections during the Delta wave through this
 848 more sensitive infection ascertainment approach, bringing the total number of Delta wave
 849 infections to 290. All other settings of Model 3 were kept the same as Model 1. The results of the
 850 Model 3 are presented in Extended Data Table 3.

851 Notably, estimates of the direct and indirect effects of the mediation analysis were comparable
 852 between this sensitivity analysis and the main analysis (compare Extended Data Table 3 to Table
 853 1). These findings provide support for the utilization of anti-nucleocapsid serology to ascertain
 854 Omicron BA.1/2 wave infections in the studied cohorts, in a period where twice-weekly rRT-PCR
 855 testing was not available and confirms the robustness of our CoP analyses.

856 **Model 4: D614G spike binding antibodies as mediators of protection.**

857 We conducted sensitivity analysis (Model 4) to explore the role of D614G spike binding antibodies
 858 (referred to as bAb hereafter), as potential correlates of protection for both Delta and Omicron
 859 infections. Employing an in-house enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA), we quantified
 860 the level of D614G spike bAb based by measuring absorbance at 450nm at an optical density (OD)
 861 at peak levels and BD5 (DB8) for the Delta (Omicron) wave analysis (Extended Data Fig. 3). The
 862 reduction in binding antibody levels from peak (ΔbAb^W) was determined as the difference between
 863 OD values at peak and BD5 (BD8) for the Delta (Omicron) wave (Extended Data Fig. 3).

864 Model 4 builds on Model 2 but replaces nAb titers with D614G spiking binding ELISA readouts
 865 as mediators of protection, in order to compare the protection afforded by neutralizing vs binding
 866 antibodies. More specifically, for the Delta wave, p_{ij}^k and q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$867 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\begin{array}{c} \epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \left(\delta_{bAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \\ \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s \end{array} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$868 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\begin{array}{c} \epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \left(\delta_{bAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \\ \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s \end{array} \right) \quad (12)$$

869

870 Here, m_j^{D614G} represents the D614G spike binding antibodies ELISA readout at blood draw 5 and
 871 δ_{bAb}^{D614G} represents the effect size of m_j^{D614G} in mediating transmission probability p_{ij}^k against the
 872 Delta wave infection at blood draw 5. Further, m_j^{waning} represents the drop from peak D614G
 873 spike binding antibodies readout prior to blood draw 5 (measured as the highest D614G spike
 874 binding Ab titer level among the first 5 blood draws) to that at blood draw 5 and $o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning}$ represents
 875 the effect size of m_j^{waning} in mediating transmission probability p_{ji}^k against the Delta wave
 876 infection at blood draw 5.

877 For the Omicron wave, p_{ij}^k and q_j^k can be expressed as:

$$878 \quad p_{ij}^k = \text{expit} \left(\begin{array}{l} \epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + \\ \left(\delta_{bAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \lambda e_i + \\ \sum_{c_i \in \{c_i\}} \gamma_{c_i} c_i + \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \alpha_s \end{array} \right) \quad (13)$$

$$879 \quad q_j^k = \text{expit} \left(\begin{array}{l} \epsilon^{D614G} e_j^{D614G} + \epsilon^{Beta} e_j^{Beta} + \epsilon^{Delta} e_j^{Delta} + \\ \left(\delta_{bAb}^{D614G} m_j^{D614G} + o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning} m_j^{waning} \right)^{e_j} + \\ \sum_{c_j \in \{c_j\}} \gamma_{c_j} c_j + \sum_{c_k \in \{c_k\}} \gamma_{c_k} c_k + \beta_s \end{array} \right) \quad (14)$$

880 Here, m_j^{D614G} represents the D614G spike binding antibodies ELISA readout at blood draw 8 and
 881 δ_{bAb}^{D614G} represents the effect size of m_j^{D614G} in mediating transmission probability p_{ij}^k against the
 882 Omicron wave infection at blood draw 8. While m_j^{waning} represents the drop from peak D614G
 883 spike binding antibodies readout prior to blood draw 8 (measured as the highest D614G spike
 884 binding Ab titer level among the first 8 blood draws) to that at blood draw 8 and $o_{\Delta bAb}^{waning}$ represents
 885 the effect size of m_j^{waning} in mediating transmission probability p_{ji}^k against the Omicron wave
 886 infection at blood draw 8. All other settings of Model 4 were kept the same as Model 2. The results
 887 of the Model 4 are presented in Extended Data Table 4.

888 We found that binding antibody levels at BD5 (BD8) correlate with protection against Delta
 889 (Omicron) wave infections: the risk of infection decreased by 74% (95% CI 41% – 88%) and 40%
 890 (95% CI 33% – 54%) per unit increase in OD value for the Delta and Omicron wave analyses,

891 respectively. Conversely, the decline in bAbs from peak levels to BD5/BD8 (ΔbAb^W)
892 demonstrated no contribution to the overall protection, with risk reduction per 10-fold increase: -
893 2% (95%CI: -91% – 55%) for Delta wave infections and -2% (95%CI: -87% – 55%) for Omicron
894 wave infections. These findings underscore the correspondence between waning of binding
895 antibodies and a waning of protection. Furthermore, our estimations indicate that the proportion
896 of protection conferred through D614G spike bAbs at BD5 is 35% (95%CI: 32% – 38%) against
897 Delta wave infections, a figure comparable estimation based on anti-D614G nAbs (37%, 95%CI:
898 34% – 40%, Extended Data Table 4). Notably, D614G spike bAbs at BD8 accounted for 27% (95%
899 CI: 25% – 29%) of protection against Omicron wave infection, representing a larger proportion
900 compared to anti-BA.1 nAbs (11%, 95%CI: 9% – 12%, Extended Data Table 4).

901

902 **Transmission chains imputation and parameters estimation based on an** 903 **Expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm.**

904 Here we describe the process to fit the models described in Section 3 to the household infection
905 data. The serologic data available for the Delta and Omicron only provides information on the total
906 number of infections within the household between two blood draws collected before and after the
907 SARS-CoV-2 wave. The data does not provide the details of the transmission chains within the
908 household, the order of infections among infected individuals, nor the infection dates. To account
909 for the uncertainties of the transmission tree structure within households given only the total
910 number of infections, we enumerate and reconstruct all possible transmission chains among the
911 infected individuals, where each infected individual may have been infected by members of their
912 own household or the general community. Supplementary Fig. 1 illustrates all 16 possible
913 configurations of transmission chains for a household with 3 infected individuals. We limited our
914 analysis to households with no more than 6 infected individuals, as the possible configurations of
915 transmission chains among 6 infected individuals already reaches 16,807. Enumeration of all
916 possible transmission chain configurations would be computationally intractable for households
917 with more than 6 infected individuals. Additionally, the probability of each possible transmission
918 chain depends on the parameter estimates of the transmission model described in the previous
919 session in Methods. To address the statistical uncertainties due to unresolved transmission chains
920 (which would affect the statistical confidence of mediation analysis detailed in the prior section),

921 we jointly fit the household transmission model and impute the topological structure of the
922 transmission trees. We use an EM algorithm, as described below ⁵⁵.

923 To resolve who infected whom within the household in a probabilistic manner, we considered an
924 EM algorithm that iteratively estimates the transmission model parameters $\alpha_s, \beta_s, \epsilon, \tau, \delta_{nAb}^{D614G/BA1}$,
925 $O_{\Delta nAb}^{waning/escape}$, $\{\gamma_{c_i}\}, \{\gamma_{c_j}\}, \{\gamma_{c_k}\}$ through maximizing the likelihood function L as described in
926 Equation (1) in the previous section then updates the imputed probability of each transmission tree
927 configuration within each household based on the fitted transmission model. The process is as
928 follows:

929 (1) Initial imputation of the household transmission trees with equal sampling probability for
930 all configurations: For each household, we randomly sample one transmission tree with
931 equal probability among all transmission tree configurations that are compatible with the
932 number of infections. We iterate through all households so that each household has a
933 simulated transmission tree. We then repeat the imputation 1000 times to obtain 1000
934 realizations of each household's transmission tree.

935 (2) Maximization step: We consider the waning parameter τ a hyper-parameter (nonlinear term
936 in equations (3-6), cannot be estimated by logistic regression). For a fixed value of τ , for
937 each of the 1000 realizations of the simulated household transmission chains, we estimate
938 transmission model parameters $\alpha_s, \beta_s, \epsilon, \delta_{nAb}^{D614G/BA1}, O_{\Delta nAb}^{waning/escape}, \{\gamma_{c_i}\}, \{\gamma_{c_j}\},$
939 $\{\gamma_{c_k}\}$ through maximizing the likelihood function L described in Equation (1). The
940 maximization of the likelihood function is achieved through fitting a logistic regression of
941 the infection/exposure outcomes for all participants using R package “*brglm*” (version
942 0.7.2). We then pool the estimates from the 1000 realizations using the “*pool*” function in
943 the R package “*mice*” (version 3.16.0). The full likelihood of the combined Delta and
944 Omicron waves fitting in this EM step m can be expressed as $L_m(\tau) = L_m^{Delta}(\tau) \times$
945 $L_m^{Omicron}(\tau)$

946 (3) Expectation step: for a fixed value of hyper-parameter τ , based on the pooled estimates of
947 the transmission model parameters $\alpha_s, \beta_s, \epsilon, \delta_{nAb}^{D614G/BA1}, O_{\Delta nAb}^{waning/escape}, \{\gamma_{c_i}\}, \{\gamma_{c_j}\}, \{\gamma_{c_k}\},$
948 we calculate the likelihood all configurations of transmission chains within each household
949 based on Equation (2). We use these configuration-specific likelihoods to resample

950 transmission chains: For each household, we randomly sample one transmission tree
951 among all transmission tree configurations with probability proportional to transmission
952 tree likelihood prescribed in Equation (2), given the parameters estimated by the most
953 recent maximization step. We iterate through all households so that each household is
954 assigned one simulated transmission tree. We repeat the process 1000 times to obtain 1000
955 realizations of the household transmission trees.

956 (4) For each of the fixed value of hyper-parameter τ over a plausible range (30 - 500 days), we
957 iterate over the EM steps (2) and (3) until $L_m(\tau)$ converge to the maximum value of the
958 EM algorithm. We scan through the values of τ from 30 to 500 days at 10 days step. The
959 EM algorithm convergence curve is shown in Supplementary Fig. 2 for each of the τ values.
960 The EM algorithm converges at step 50, irrespective of the value of τ . The marginal
961 likelihood of the model at τ , $L(\tau)$ is estimated by taking the average of $L_m(\tau)$ for EM steps
962 50 through 100. Supplementary Fig. 3 shows the log of the likelihood $L(\tau)$ as a function
963 of τ , based on a spline interpolation. The point estimate of τ is taken from the maximum
964 of $\log(L(\tau))$ while the 95% confidence interval is estimated by finding τ values with log-
965 likelihood value at the maximum minus 1.92 (Supplementary Fig. 3).

966 (5) We then take the best estimate of hyper-parameter τ and repeat the EM algorithm till
967 convergence to estimate transmission model parameters α_s , β_s , ϵ , $\delta_{nAb}^{D614G/BA1}$,
968 $O_{\Delta nAb}^{waning/escape}$, $\{\gamma_{c_i}\}$, $\{\gamma_{c_j}\}$, $\{\gamma_{c_k}\}$ as show in Table 2. Same EM algorithm were applied to
969 Model 2-4 for the sensitivity analysis as well.

970 The “treatment effect” by prior infection is estimated by simulating from the best-fit model. We
971 first sample 1000 realizations of the imputed household transmission trees, with imputation
972 probability proportional to the best estimates of transmission model using the EM algorithm and
973 hyper-parameter τ . For each of the 1000 realizations, we focus on the subset of individuals who
974 had one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, denoted as $S_j = \{j | e_j = 1\}$. We use the fitted transmission
975 model to predict the probability of infection (i.e. $P_j = p_{ij}^k$ or q_j^k , with) of these non-naïve subsets
976 under three scenarios:

977 a. Scenario 1: the probability of infection estimated with predictors as reported in the
978 data, denoted as P_j^{obs} .

- 979 b. Scenario 2: a counterfactual scenario where the probability of infection is estimated
980 with predictor $e_j = 0$ (i.e. a counterfactual naïve individual) whereas all other
981 covariates (confounders) are the same as observed, removing both direct and
982 mediator effects. We denote the infection probability in this counterfactual scenario
983 as $P_j^{\text{counterfactual}}(e_j = 0)$.
- 984 c. Scenario 3: a counterfactual scenario where the probability of infection is estimated
985 with predictor $e_j = 1$, but setting $m_{nAb}^{BA1} = 0$ (or $m_{nAb}^{D614G} = 0$), effectively
986 removing the mediator effect of nAb on preventing transmission, but keeping the
987 direct effect. We denote the infection probability in this counterfactual scenario as
988 $P_j^{\text{counterfactual}}(e_j = 1; m_{nAb} = 0)$.

989 We then calculate the total protection conferred by prior infection as the population average of
990 $P_j^{\text{counterfactual}}(e_j = 0)/P_j^{\text{obs}}$, based on bootstrap resampling with replacement (maintaining the
991 same number of observations) of each of the 1000 realizations of the household transmission
992 chains. Point estimates and 95% confidence intervals are based on the median and 95% quantiles
993 of 1000 realizations' estimates.

994 Similarly, we calculate the proportion of protection mediated by nAbs as the population average
995 of $1 - \frac{P_j^{\text{counterfactual}}(e_j=1; m_{nAb}=0)/P_j^{\text{obs}}}{P_j^{\text{counterfactual}}(e_j=0)/P_j^{\text{obs}}}$. We use the same bootstrapping approach as for total
996 protection.

997

998 **Data availability**


999 Aggregate data to reproduce the figures are available at Zenodo (DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.11375487](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11375487)).
1000 Individual-level data cannot be publicly shared because of ethical restrictions and the potential for
1001 identifying included individuals. Accessing individual participant data and a data dictionary
1002 defining each field in the dataset would require provision of protocol and ethics approval for the
1003 proposed use. To request individual participant data access, please submit a proposal to C.C
1004 (cherylc@nicd.ac.za). who will respond within 1 month of request. Upon approval, data can be
1005 made available through a data sharing agreement.

1006 **Code availability**

1007 Code to reproduce the figures, using python version 3.8.11 and scipy version 1.7.1 is available at
1008 Zenodo (DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.11375487](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11375487)).

1009 **Extended Data Figures:**

1010




1011
1012 **Extended Data Fig. 1:** Flowchart of participants included in the Delta-wave subgroup analysis. Grey boxes represent
1013 participants excluded from the Delta-wave subgroup analysis.

1014 *Based on a previously published study ³⁰.

1015 †Household with more than 6 infected individuals would be computationally intractable to track all possible
1016 transmission chain configurations.

1017




1018

1019 **Extended Data Fig. 2:** Flowchart of participants included in the Omicron-wave subgroup analysis. Grey boxes
1020 represent participants excluded from the Omicron-wave subgroup analysis.

1021 *Based on a previously published study ³⁰.

1022 †Household with more than 6 infected individuals would be computationally intractable to track all possible
1023 transmission chain configurations.

1024



1025

1026 **Extended Data Fig. 3: D614G spike binding antibody (bAb) level for the Delta wave and the Omicron wave**
 1027 **analysis.** **a**, for Delta wave subgroup, the distribution of the peak bAb level to BD5 (light blue dots) and the D614G
 1028 spike bAb level at BD5 (dark blue dots), among individuals who had one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection before blood
 1029 draw 5. Each dot represents one individual, with two measurements of the same individual connected through a gray
 1030 line. OD: absorbance at 450 nm, measured in optical density; \overline{OD} : the average of OD; $\overline{\Delta OD}$: the average drop of OD.
 1031 **b**, for Delta wave subgroup, the distribution of the peak D614G spike bAb up to BD5, stratified by individuals who
 1032 were infected during the Delta wave (solid bar) vs those who were not infected (dashed bar). Independent samples t-
 1033 test (two-sided) is used to determine the statistical significance (anti reported on the legend) of difference between the
 1034 \overline{OD} of the two groups. **c**, same as **b** but for D614G spike bAb level at BD5. **d**, same as **b** but for ΔbAb^W . **e**, for Omicron
 1035 wave subgroup, the distribution of the peak bAb level to BD8 (light red dots) and the D614G spike bAb level at BD8
 1036 (dark red dots), among individuals who had one prior SARS-CoV-2 infection before BD8. Each dot represents one
 1037 individual, with two measurements of the same individual connected through a gray line. **f**, for the Omicron wave
 1038 subgroup, the distribution of the D614G spike bAb level at BD8, stratified by individuals who were infected during
 1039 the Omicron wave (solid bar) vs those who were not infected (dashed bar). Independent samples t-test (two-sided) is
 1040 used to determine the statistical significance (p-value reported on the legend) of difference between the \overline{OD} s of the
 1041 two groups. **g**, same as **f** but for D614G spike bAb level at BD8. **d**, same as **f** but for ΔbAb^W .

1042

1043 **Extended Data Tables:**

1044 **Extended Data Table 1: Positivity rate of different serologic assays by the variant type of prior exposure for the**
 1045 **Delta and Omicron wave subgroup.**

Delta wave subgroup			
Seropositivity	Prior D614G infection	Prior Beta infection	Prior Delta exposure
Anti-nucleocapsid assay were positive in at least one of the first 5 blood draws	109/113 (97%)	133/140 (95%)	–
Anti-nucleocapsid assay were positive at BD5	104/113 (92%)	129/140 (92%)	–
Anti-D614G nAb assay were positive for peak nAb response.	87/113 (77%)	60/140 (43%)	
Anti-D614G nAb were positive for nAb response at BD5	81/113 (72%)	59/140 (42%)	–
Omicron wave subgroup			
Seropositivity	Prior D614G exposure	Prior Beta exposure	Prior Delta exposure
Anti-nucleocapsid assay were positive in at least one of the first 8 blood draws	60/61 (98%)	116/120 (97%)	160/161 (99%)
Anti-nucleocapsid assay were positive at BD8	58/61 (95%)	108/120 (90%)	159/161 (99%)
Anti-D614G nAb were positive for nAb response at BD8	57/61 (93%)	71/120 (59%)	140/161 (87%)
Anti-BA.1 nAb were positive for nAb response at BD8	29/61 (48%)	36/120 (30%)	50/161 (31%)

1046

1047 **Extended Data Table 2: Mediation analysis for nAbs as CoPs against serologically ascertained Delta and**
 1048 **Omicron wave infections, with a variant-specific model for direct effect.** Average and 95% CIs are provided for
 1049 each of the model parameters. ΔnAb^W : the quantity of anti-D614G nAbs waned from peak level to that at BD5. ΔnAb^E :
 1050 the quantity of antibodies that can neutralize D614G but fail to neutralize Omicron BA.1 at BD8 due to Omicron's
 1051 immune escape.

Wave		Delta	Omicron	
Protection against reinfection	Direct effect (Protection absent of nAbs)	Prior D614G exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.76 (0.36, 1.61)	1.23 (0.63, 2.38)
		Prior Beta exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.47 (0.30, 0.76)	0.78 (0.50, 1.21)
		Prior Delta exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	–	0.47 (0.29, 0.76)
	Mediators effect (Protection from nAbs)	Anti-D614G nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	0.59 (0.43, 0.83)	–
		ΔnAb^W (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	1.00 (0.72, 1.39)	–
		Anti-BA.1 nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	0.73 (0.56, 0.95)
		ΔnAb^E (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	0.94 (0.76, 1.15)
	Total protection (relative risk compared to naïve individuals)		0.40 (0.38, 0.42)	0.70 (0.68, 0.72)
	Proportion of protection mediated by nAbs		37% (34%, 40%)	11% (9%, 12%)
	Protection against onward transmission (Odds ratio compared to naïve individuals)		0.20 (0.05, 0.72)	1.11 (0.62, 2.00)

1052

1053

1054 **Extended Data Table 3: Mediation analysis for nAbs as CoPs against Delta (ascertained by both serology and**
 1055 **PCR) and Omicron wave infections, with a waning model for direct effect.** Average and 95% CIs are provided for
 1056 each of the model parameters. ΔnAb^W : the quantity of anti-D614G nAbs waned from peak level to that at BD5. ΔnAb^E :
 1057 the quantity of antibodies that can neutralize D614G but fail to neutralize Omicron BA.1 at BD8 due to Omicron's
 1058 immune escape.

Wave		Delta	Omicron	
Protection against reinfection	Direct effect (Protection absent of nAbs)	Effect size (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.34 (0.17, 0.64)	0.29 (0.17, 0.51)
		Waning half-life (days)	128 (77, 261)	
	Mediators effect (Protection from nAbs)	Anti-D614G nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	0.65 (0.49, 0.86)	–
		ΔnAb^W (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	1.02 (0.78, 1.36)	–
		Anti-Omicron BA.1 nAb (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	0.73 (0.56, 0.95)
		ΔnAb^E (odds ratio, per 10-fold increase)	–	1.01 (0.84, 1.21)
	Total protection (relative risk compared to naïve individuals)		0.41 (0.40, 0.43)	0.62 (0.61, 0.64)
	Proportion of protection mediated by nAbs		33% (30%, 35%)	11% (9%, 12%)
Protection against onward transmission (Odds ratio compared to naïve individuals)		0.23 (0.08, 0.71)	1.19 (0.66, 2.13)	

1059

1060


1061 **Extended Data Table 4: Mediation analysis for D614G spike binding antibody as CoPs against serologically**
 1062 **ascertained Delta and Omicron wave infections, with a variant-specific model for direct effect.** Average and 95%
 1063 CIs are provided for each of the model parameters. ΔbAb^W : the quantity of D614G spike binding antibodies waned
 1064 from peak level to that at BD5 for Delta (at BD8 for Omicron).

Protection against reinfection		Delta (serology)	Omicron (serology)
Direct effect (Protection absent of nAbs)	Prior D614G exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.60 (0.24, 1.48)	1.38 (0.67, 2.84)
	Prior Beta exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	0.51 (0.32, 0.83)	0.91 (0.58, 1.45)
	Prior Delta exposure (odds ratio, absent of waning)	–	0.61 (0.38, 0.97)
Mediators effect (Protection from nAbs)	D614G binding Ab (odds ratio, per 10-unit increase)	0.26 (0.12, 0.59)	0.60 (0.46, 0.77)
	ΔbAb^W (odds ratio, per 10-unit increase)	1.02 (0.55, 1.91)	1.02 (0.55, 1.87)
Total protection (relative risk compared to naïve individuals)		0.40 (0.38, 0.42)	0.65 (0.63, 0.67)
Proportion of protection mediated by spike binding Ab		35% (32%, 38%)	27% (25%, 29%)
Protection against onward transmission (Odds ratio compared to naïve individuals)		0.22 (0.06, 0.74)	1.18 (0.65, 2.13)

1065

1066


1067 **Supplementary Information**



1068

1069 **Supplementary Fig. 1:** Visualization of all 16 possible transmission chains within a household of 3 infected
1070 individuals.

1071




1072

1073 **Supplementary Fig. 2: The log-likelihood of the transmission model fit, as a function of the EM steps.**

1074

1075



1076

1077 **Supplementary Fig. 3: The profile log-likelihood of the transmission model over hyper-parameter of waning**

1078 **half-life.** Solid vertical line indicates the waning half-life corresponding to maximum of the profile likelihood. Dashed

1079 horizontal line represent 1.92 below the maximum profile likelihood.