

1 Memory B cell proliferation drives differences in neutralising responses between ChAdOx1
2 and BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 vaccines

3

4 David Hodgson^{1*}, Yi Liu^{2,3}, Louise Carolan², Siddhartha Mahanty³, Kanta Subbarao^{2,5},
5 Sheena G. Sullivan^{2,3,4}, Annette Fox^{2,3}, Adam Kucharski¹

6

7 Affiliations

8

9 1Centre of Mathematical Modelling of Infectious Diseases, London School and Hygiene and
10 Tropical Medicine, London, UK.

11 2. WHO Collaborating Centre for Reference and Research on Influenza, Royal Melbourne
12 Hospital, at the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

13 3. Department of Infectious Diseases, University of Melbourne, at the Peter Doherty Institute
14 for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

15 4. School of Clinical Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

16 5. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, University of Melbourne, at the Peter
17 Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, Melbourne, Australia

18

19 *Corresponding author. david.hodgson@lshtm.ac.uk

20

21 Classification: Biological Sciences: Immunology

22 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, immunology, mathematical modelling, vaccination

23 ABSTRACT

24

25 Vaccination against COVID-19 has been pivotal in reducing the global burden of the
26 disease. However, Phase III trial results and observational studies underscore differences in
27 efficacy across vaccine technologies and dosing regimens. Notably, mRNA vaccines have
28 exhibited superior effectiveness compared to Adenovirus (AdV) vaccines, especially with
29 extended dosing intervals. Using in-host mechanistic modelling, this study elucidates these
30 variations and unravels the biological mechanisms shaping the immune responses at the
31 cellular level. We used data on the change in memory B cells, plasmablasts, and antibody
32 titres after the second dose of a COVID-19 vaccine for Australian healthcare workers.
33 Alongside this dataset, we constructed a kinetic model of humoral immunity which jointly
34 captured the dynamics of multiple immune markers, and integrated hierarchical effects into
35 this kinetics model, including age, dosing schedule, and vaccine type. Our analysis
36 estimated that mRNA vaccines induced 2.1 times higher memory B cell proliferation than
37 AdV vaccines after adjusting for age, interval between doses and priming dose. Additionally,
38 extending the duration between the second vaccine dose and priming dose beyond 28 days
39 boosted neutralising antibody production per plasmablast concentration by 30%. We also
40 found that antibody responses after the second dose were more persistent when mRNA
41 vaccines were used over AdV vaccines and for longer dosing regimens. Reconstructing in-
42 host kinetics in response to vaccination could help optimise vaccine dosing regimens,
43 improve vaccine efficacy in different population groups, and inform the design of future
44 vaccines for enhanced protection against emerging pathogens.

45

46

47

48 SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

49

50 There are differences in vaccine efficacy across different SARS-CoV-2 vaccine technologies
51 and dosing regimens. Using an in-host mechanistic model that describes antibody
52 production fitting to in-host immune markers, we found that mRNA vaccines are twice as
53 effective at stimulating memory B cell proliferation when compared to AdVs vaccines and
54 that a longer time between the second vaccine dose and priming dose increases the
55 neutralising antibody production per plasmablast concentration. These findings disentangle
56 the effect of vaccine type and time since the priming dose, aiding in the understanding of
57 immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination.

58 INTRODUCTION

59

60 Vaccination has been a crucial tool in the global reduction of the COVID-19 burden since the
61 approval of early vaccine candidates in December 2020. The earliest vaccines to be
62 approved included an adenoviral-vectored vaccine (i.e. ChAdOx1) and mRNA vaccines (i.e.
63 BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273). However, as Phase III trial results and observational studies
64 emerged, variation was observed in the estimated efficacy and effectiveness of different
65 vaccine types and their corresponding dosing schedules.[\(1\)](#) For example, the efficacy of
66 BNT162b2 against symptomatic COVID-19 after two doses given three weeks apart was
67 initially reported at 95.0% (95% CI 90.3–97.6) for a median follow-up of two months[\(2\)](#) and
68 91.3% (95% CI 89.0–93.2) after at least 6 months of follow up.[\(3\)](#) The efficacy of ChAdOx1
69 against symptomatic COVID-19 after two doses given ≤ 12 weeks apart was initially reported
70 at 62.1% (95% CI 41.0–75.7) after a 53–90 day follow-up.[\(4\)](#) Consistent with these findings,
71 observational studies have found higher effectiveness of the BNT162b2 vaccine compared
72 to the ChAdOx1 vaccine at preventing symptomatic COVID-19.[\(5\)](#) Moreover, the dosing
73 schedule has been shown to influence the vaccine effectiveness of both products, with
74 longer dosing schedules (time between first and second dose) seeing higher effectiveness
75 values than shorter dosing schedules. Specifically, for ChAdOx1, vaccine efficacy was
76 81.3% [95% CI 60.3–91.2] with a dosing schedule ≥ 12 weeks and 55.1% [33.0–69.9] at < 6
77 weeks.[\(4\)](#) For BNT162b2, lower risks of symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection have been
78 observed when the dosing schedule was extended from 17–25 days to 26–42 days.[\(6\)](#)

79

80 Despite these heterogeneous observations in efficacy, a comprehensive understanding of
81 the immunological processes underlying the effects of vaccine type and dosing schedule on
82 vaccine efficacy remains elusive. Both ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 elicit robust cellular
83 responses and cross-reactive neutralising antibodies against different SARS-CoV-2 variants,
84 promoting the persistence and maturation of memory B cells (MBC) over time, and
85 contributing to durable immunity.[\(7, 8\)](#) However, there are also notable differences in the
86 immunological responses. For example, ChAdOx1 triggers robust T cell and antibody
87 responses, particularly generating IgG and IgM antibodies along with Th1 cytokines such as
88 IL-2, TNF- α , and INF- γ .[\(9, 10\)](#) Whereas, BNT162b2 initiates potent B cell responses and
89 antibody secretion, particularly of IgA and IgG, usually at much higher levels than responses
90 to the ChAdOx1 vaccine.[\(10\)](#) When considering the dosing schedule, a longer dose
91 schedule for BNT162b2 resulted in higher neutralizing antibody titres, whilst maintaining
92 comparable T cell responses.[\(11, 12\)](#) Assessing variations in the immunological response to
93 vaccination presents challenges, as the schedules differed between ChAdOx1 and
94 BNT162b2 vaccines upon deployment, complicating the disentanglement of the impact of
95 vaccine type and dosing schedule on immunological kinetics.

96

97 Analysis of in-host immunological responses can be used to understand the dynamic
98 behaviour of the factors driving these responses, formalising correlates between immune
99 markers, and allowing identification of key factors that influence the timing and magnitude of
100 immune responses. Such analysis typically adopts a phenomenological approach, aiming to
101 formalise correlations between observed phenomena through a purely statistical approach
102 rather than explicitly elucidating underlying biological mechanisms.[\(13, 14\)](#) Mechanistic in-
103 host models, on the other hand, specify the detailed biological processes driving immune
104 responses, allowing deeper insights into the causal effects of antibody production and
105 immune cell kinetics.[\(13\)](#) However, a significant challenge with mechanistic models is their

106 susceptibility to identifiability issues; where due to limited or noisy data, multiple sets of
107 parameters can produce the same observed outcomes, making it difficult to determine the
108 true underlying biological mechanisms.⁽¹⁵⁾ Establishing a mechanistic model capable of
109 disentangling key processes can therefore enable a more accurate comparison of
110 immunogenicity between vaccine types.

111
112 In this study, we employ an in-host mechanistic model to reconstruct the unobserved kinetics
113 of SARS-CoV-2 immune markers and consider the influence of host factors on driving
114 immunological heterogeneity (Figure 1). Specifically, our investigation aims to elucidate
115 mechanistic explanations for differences in vaccine-neutralising activity and MBC kinetics in
116 response to second-dose vaccination against COVID-19. Our in-host model incorporates two
117 sources of antibody production: plasmablasts and plasma cells, both stemming from
118 vaccine-induced differentiation of MBC. By fitting our model to multiple biomarkers, including
119 concentrations of MBC and plasmablasts, as well as surrogate virus neutralisation test
120 (sVNT) titers against ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strains, we delineate the distinct
121 immunogenicity (characterised by the rate of MBC proliferation) and antibody affinity
122 (measured by neutralising sVNT per MBC) profiles associated with ChAdOx1 and
123 BNT162b2 vaccine types. Further, we validate this mechanistic model by predicting antibody
124 kinetics on unseen validation data and show that the predictions remain accurate providing
125 that baseline immune information can be measured for each individual. Finally, we
126 investigate the influence of host factors, such as the time elapsed since initial vaccination, as
127 well as demographic characteristics such as age, on the in-host kinetics of these
128 immunological responses

129
130

131 RESULTS

132

133 Model performance on calibration and validation data

134

135 We fitted the model to two different antigens expressed on the MBC and plasmablasts: the
136 ancestral spike antigen and the receptor binding domain (RBD) antigen. For each model, we
137 fit to the same antibody data, measured by sVNT assay, which measures antibodies that
138 inhibit RBD binding to ACE2. The sampled posterior distributions for both models were
139 effectively explored, with all parameters demonstrating convergence and the chains showing
140 good mixing (Figures S1–2). After calibrating the two models to the calibration dataset, we
141 found that immune trajectories could reproduce the observed dynamics in the data (Figure
142 2A). We calculated the Continuous Ranked Probability Score (CRPS) to assess the
143 goodness-of-fit between the two models and found that for all three immune markers (MBC,
144 plasmablasts and sVNT) similar scores were achieved for both models (Figure 2B). We then
145 evaluated the predictive accuracy of the fitted model by using baseline estimates from the
146 validation dataset (immune markers before vaccination) to predict the trajectories of each
147 biomarker and then assessed the fit using the CRPS. We found that the model predictions to
148 the validation dataset were reflective of the data and that both the spike and RBD models
149 provided similar fits in terms of CRPS (Figure 2C-D). From this, we cannot conclude that
150 either the spike or RBD model is better at describing sVNT in each individual. The individual-
151 level fits for each time point, and the resulting individual-level trajectories for each model are
152 provided in Figures S3–6. The posterior distributions for the fitted distributions of the
153 hierarchical and decay parameters are also provided in Figures S7–10.

154

155 Drivers of MBC proliferation and antibody production

156

157 By combining multiple biomarkers with a dynamic model, we were able to reconstruct
158 individual-level kinetics of MBC frequencies, plasmablast frequencies and sVNT as well as
159 estimate overall average population kinetics for these markers. In the process, we were able
160 to estimate three key mechanistic processes underlying the observed kinetics: the rate of
161 MBC proliferation (a_1), the antibody affinity of plasmablasts (a_3), and the antibody affinity of
162 plasma cells (a_4). For the spike model, we estimated that the BNT162b2 vaccine induced
163 substantially more MBC proliferation when compared to ChAdOx1, with ancestral spike
164 reactive MBC concentrations (of total MBC) increasing by 0.44% (95% PPI 0.28–0.58) vs.
165 0.21% (95% PPI 0.11–0.34) per day per vaccine unit (Figure 3A). Lower rates of MBC
166 proliferation were seen in the RBD model, with concentration increasing by 0.26 (95% PPI
167 0.16–0.25) and 0.13 (95% PPI 0.06–0.22) per day per vaccine unit for BNT162b2 and
168 ChAdOx1 respectively. We also estimated that age and the dosing schedule had little impact
169 on the rate of B cell proliferation after adjusting for vaccine type, with no notable trend
170 between age group levels (Figure 3B and Figure S11A).

171

172 However, for the rate of production of sVNT antibodies per plasmablast, we found that dose
173 interval had a notable impact, with those vaccinated <28 days prior seeing lower rates of
174 sVNT antibodies produced per plasmablast concentration per day (1.08 (95% PPI 0.74–
175 1.66) when compared to those vaccinated \geq 28 days prior) (1.30 (95% PPI 0.90–2.94)) for
176 the spike model. Similar estimates were also found for the RBD model with rates of antibody
177 production of 1.26 (95% PPI 0.67–2.96) for <28 days compared to 1.48 (95% PPI 0.80–3.26)
178 for RBD). We also found that the rate of production of neutralising antibodies per plasma cell
179 remains similar across vaccine type, time since last dose and age group. These
180 observations remained consistent for ancestral RBD.

181

182

183 Mechanistic predictions of antibody kinetics

184

185 By inferring underlying in-host kinetics, we could also estimate the temporal variation in the
186 origin of antibody production following vaccination with a second dose (Figure 4). For
187 ancestral spike, after vaccination with ChAdOx1, our findings reveal a peak in antibody titres
188 16 days post-vaccination with a \log_2 sVNT of 1.29 (95% PPI 0.97–1.66). These titres then
189 undergo a fast period of waning until around 50 days and then have a slower period of
190 waning driven by antibody production from plasma cells, gradually declining to an sVNT of
191 0.48 (95% PPI 0.21–0.74) by day 250 post-vaccination. For the BNT162b2 vaccine, we find
192 a peak antibody titre at day 17 post-vaccination with a \log_2 sVNT of 2.31 (95% PPI 2.13–
193 2.50), which then wane to an sVNT of 1.09 (95% PPI 0.80–1.40) at day 250 post-
194 vaccination. The time at which antibodies produced from plasmablasts dominate the sVNT
195 response (transition time in Figure 4A) is 54 and 51 days for ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2
196 vaccines, respectively. Similar trends are observed for the ancestral RBD model and are
197 summarised in Figure S12A.

198

199 We also estimated the duration after vaccination that an individual sVNT IC₅₀ titre remained
200 above 10 by assessing the proportion of the posterior distribution that is above this threshold
201 as a function of time since vaccination. We estimate that the median duration of time that

202 sVNT IC50 titres exceeded 10 was 290 (95% PPI 105–365) days and 34 (95% PPI 0–96)
203 days for BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1, respectively. When stratified by time since first dose, we
204 estimated that individuals who were vaccinated <28 days since their first dose maintained
205 IC50 titres in excess of 10 for shorter periods compared to those with longer time between
206 doses, i.e. 30 (95% PPI 0–90) and 50 (95% PPI 25–130) days for ChAdOx1 respectively,
207 and 247 (95% PPI 91–365) and 33 (95% PPI 88–365) days for BNT162b2 vaccine
208 respectively (Figure 4B and Figure S12B). No strong trend was seen with antibody
209 persistence with increasing age (Figure 4C and Figure 12C).

210

211 DISCUSSION

212

213 Using an in-host mechanistic model, we reconstructed the mechanisms driving the
214 production of antibodies from two MBC sources in response to a second dose of ChAdOx1
215 and BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. Our estimation of the MBC proliferation rate and
216 antibody production revealed significantly higher responses among BNT162b2 vaccinees
217 compared to ChAdOx1 vaccinees, but age and dosing schedule showed minimal impact on
218 MBC proliferation rates. Instead, we found that dosing interval affected the rate of
219 neutralising antibody production per plasmablast, with lower rates observed for those
220 receiving their second dose within 28 days of their first dose compared to those who
221 received their second dose after 28 days. In-host kinetic modelling made it possible to
222 reconstruct peak antibody titres and duration of antibody persistence, indicating longer
223 periods of protection with BNT162b2 when compared to ChAdOx1, and longer periods of
224 protection for individuals vaccinated more than 28 days since their first dose. These findings
225 suggest that vaccine implementation efforts should consider the intricate interplay between
226 dosing schedule and immune kinetics to optimise vaccine efficacy and durability.

227

228

229 DISCUSSION

230

231 Using an in-host mechanistic model, we reconstructed the mechanisms driving the
232 production of antibodies from two MBC sources in response to a second dose of ChAdOx1
233 and BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. Our estimation of the MBC proliferation rate and
234 antibody production revealed significantly higher responses among BNT162b2 vaccinees
235 compared to ChAdOx1 vaccinees, but age and dosing schedule showed minimal impact on
236 MBC proliferation rates. Instead, we found that dosing interval affected the rate of
237 neutralising antibody production per plasmablast, with lower rates observed for those
238 receiving their second dose within 28 days of their first dose compared to those who
239 received their second dose after 28 days. In-host kinetic modelling made it possible to
240 reconstruct peak antibody titres and duration of antibody persistence, indicating longer
241 periods of protection with BNT162b2 when compared to ChAdOx1, and longer periods of
242 protection for individuals vaccinated more than 28 days since their first dose. These findings
243 suggest that vaccine implementation efforts should consider the intricate interplay between
244 dosing schedule and immune kinetics to optimise vaccine efficacy and durability.

245

246 Serological analysis of antibody responses of cohorts with homologous two-dose vaccination
247 schedules shows that those with BNT162b2 have higher levels of sVNT to ancestral variants
248 compared to ChAdOx1.⁽¹⁰⁾ We find this difference is driven by 2.1 times higher rates of
249 MBC proliferation caused by BNT162b2, compared to ChAdOx1, and not by differences in

250 antibody affinity per antibody-secreting cell. This could indicate that mRNA vaccines are
251 better at stimulating B cells, potentially due to the amount of antigen produced or to co-
252 stimulatory and inflammatory signals.[\(16\)](#) We present findings from our study of a healthy
253 cohort aged 18–60, revealing no correlation between the in-host kinetics of vaccine-induced
254 humoral responses and age. This observation aligns with broader immunological insights,
255 which show that age-related variations in the immune response to vaccination are exhibited
256 primarily in children and adults aged 65 years and older.[\(17–20\)](#)

257
258 Our study also revealed that delaying the time until the second dose led to higher affinity
259 antibodies from plasmablasts, causing more robust post-vaccination sVNT. A longer dosing
260 schedule has previously been shown to lead to higher sVNT and a greater magnitude of
261 mature MBC post-vaccination.[\(11, 12, 21\)](#) This is likely driven by increased affinity
262 maturation in B cells, which continues up to 6 months after vaccination.[\(22, 23\)](#). Vaccinating
263 individuals whilst affinity maturation is ongoing could lead to sub-optimal antibody repertoires
264 being proliferated in-host and thus lead to reduced antibody affinity compared to those with
265 longer dosing schedules.[\(24\)](#) Whilst the dosing schedule influences antibody affinity, we
266 found it had little impact on the rate of proliferation of B cells or the antibody affinity of
267 plasma cells. Given its notable influence on antibody affinity, public health strategies should
268 consider the importance of the dosing schedule when offering boosting campaigns to
269 maximize vaccine-induced protection, particularly for those where strong and lasting
270 immunity is critical.

271
272 We were able to mechanically describe the kinetics of antibody responses following a
273 second dose of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. Peak antibody levels were observed at 17 days
274 post-vaccination (consistent with previous modelling estimates of 15 days [\(25\)](#)) and plasma
275 cell responses were found to dominate the sVNT response after approximately 50 days. Our
276 model also estimated that plasmablast concentration peaked at five days after a second
277 vaccine dose and returned to baseline at 19 days. These dynamics are corroborated by
278 observational studies, such as Pape et al. (2021),[\(26\)](#) which reported a peak in spike-binding
279 plasmablasts to second dose mRNA vaccines at 5 days post-vaccination, returning close to
280 baseline by day 11. Similarly, Turner et al. (2021),[\(27\)](#) found plasmablast responses to
281 vaccine doses returning to baseline by 2 weeks. In addition, our hierarchical regression
282 analysis allowed us to consider marginal posterior distributions and account for potential
283 confounding with dosing schedules, estimating the relative impact of adenovirus (AdV)
284 vaccines if dosing schedules were shorter. By estimating the antibody persistence if the
285 ChAdOx1 dosing schedule was less than 28 days, a counterfactual outcome, we can
286 disentangle the effect of vaccine type and time since the priming dose, aiding in the
287 understanding of immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination

288
289 Our study has some limitations. Firstly, the sample size was relatively small, comprising only
290 41 participants in the calibration dataset and 22 in the validation dataset, and both cohorts
291 remained infection naive throughout, making it difficult to generalise these results to other
292 populations who may have had prior infections, which are known to change immune kinetics
293 compared to those who are infection naive.[\(28\)](#) Additionally, our measured observations of
294 immune markers were confined to peripheral blood, potentially overlooking critical immune
295 dynamics within lymphoid organs which may influence antibody kinetics. Further, this study
296 also did not account for Helper T cell interactions, which play a crucial role in regulating the
297 memory immune response. Finally, there are host factors not included in this analysis which

298 could have influenced in-host immune heterogeneity, including age, genetic polymorphism,
299 epigenetic factors and variations in cellular immunity.[\(29, 30\)](#)

300

301 Our study highlights the importance of understanding in-host immunological kinetics in future
302 vaccine development instead of relying just on Phase III endpoints. Understanding how age,
303 vaccine type and dose schedule impact immune kinetics allows for the customisation of
304 vaccination strategies tailored to different demographic groups, optimising protection across
305 diverse populations. Furthermore, our findings underscore the importance of ongoing
306 monitoring and surveillance post-vaccination to assess the persistence of immune
307 responses. By integrating real-time data on immune kinetics into vaccine development and
308 deployment strategies, stakeholders can make informed decisions regarding doses, vaccine
309 updates to address emerging variants and allocation of resources in response to developing
310 public health needs. These could be particularly useful in emergency contexts such as the
311 Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) 100-day mission, which aims to
312 develop and deploy vaccines in lower and middle-income countries in a very short
313 timeframe.[\(31\)](#)

314

315 In this study we reconstructed unobserved immunological kinetics and accounted for host
316 factors which vary between individuals. This model extends previous humoral kinetics
317 frameworks by fitting to multiple humoral biomarkers and incorporating hierarchical effects.
318 We have shown that this framework can provide valuable insights into the mechanisms
319 underlying vaccine-induced immune responses and aid in the development of more effective
320 vaccination strategies and the impact of dosing schedules. In turn, a better understanding of
321 in-host immunological kinetics in response to vaccination could help optimise vaccine dosing
322 regimens to maximise vaccine efficacy in different population groups and inform the design
323 of future vaccines for enhanced protection against other emerging pathogens.

324

325

326

327 MATERIALS AND METHODS

328

329 Study design of calibration dataset

330

331 In April 2020, a prospective, open cohort study (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05110911)
332 was established to investigate influenza vaccine immunogenicity among Health Care
333 Workers (HCWs) at six health services across Australia (Alfred Hospital, Melbourne;
334 Children's Hospital Westmead, Sydney; John Hunter Hospital, Newcastle; Perth Children's
335 Hospital, Perth; Queensland Children's Hospital, Brisbane; and the Women's and Children's
336 Hospital, Adelaide). Commencing April 2021, the study pivoted to enable follow-up of
337 COVID-19 vaccination. HCWs, including medical, nursing, and allied health staff, students
338 and volunteers aged 18Y to 60Y, were recruited at each hospital's staff influenza vaccination
339 clinic or responded to recruitment advertising. Those on immunosuppressive treatment
340 (including systemic corticosteroids) within the past 6 months, and contraindicated for
341 vaccination were excluded. Enrolled participants provided a 9ml blood sample for serum
342 collection prior to a first dose and ~14 days after their second dose of COVID-19 vaccine
343 (suggested range 10-21 days) and at the end of the year. Pre-vaccination blood samples
344 were collected from participants upon enrolment for participants newly enrolled in 2021, or
345 samples collected in late 2020 were used for participants already enrolled in the influenza

346 vaccination cohort in 2020. End-of-year sera were collected October through November
347 2021. A subset of 41 participants provided additional blood samples for peripheral blood
348 mononuclear cell (PBMC) recovery on day 0 if enrolled prior to receiving their first vaccine
349 dose and ~ 7 and 14 days after vaccination.

350

351 The study protocol and protocol addendums for follow-up of COVID-19 vaccinations and
352 SARS-CoV-2 infections were approved by The Royal Melbourne Hospital Human Research
353 Ethics Committee (HREC/54245/MH-2019). LSHTM Observational Research Ethics
354 Committee of London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine gave ethical approval for the
355 use of this data for analysis (ref 22631).

356

357 Study design of validation dataset

358

359 Samples for the validation dataset (n=22) were collected in a prospective observational
360 study of immune responses to COVID-19 vaccines conducted at the Royal Melbourne
361 Hospital and the Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity in Melbourne from June
362 2020 to December, 2022, funded by the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD (the
363 DISCOVER-HCP-BOOSTER study, HHSN272201400005C). In this study in health care
364 providers (including clinical and allied health staff at the two institutions), after informed
365 consent was obtained, blood samples (~50 ml/sample) were collected before the first dose
366 of either ChAdOx1 (n=15) or BNT162b2 vaccines (n=10), then 3-4 weeks after the first dose,
367 just before the second dose (which occurred 3 weeks after the first dose for BNT162b2
368 recipients) and 11 weeks after the first dose for ChAdOx1 recipients) and 2-4 weeks after the
369 second dose for all vaccine recipients. PBMC were isolated within 6 hours of collection and
370 cryopreserved in liquid nitrogen until analysis.

371

372 The study protocol and all samples collected in the DISCOVER-HCP-BOOSTER study were
373 approved after review by the RMH Human Research and Ethics Committee
374 (HREC/63096/MH-2020).

375

376 Surrogate Virus Neutralization Test (sVNT) assay

377

378 The SARS-CoV-2 sVNT assay described by Tan et al([32](#)) was adapted to utilize
379 commercially available SARS-CoV-2 spike receptor binding domain (RBD) protein
380 (SinoBiological, 40592-V27H-B) representative of the ancestral strain (YP_009724390.1).
381 Sera were serially diluted 3-fold from 1:10 to 1:21870 for testing. GraphPad Prism version
382 9.5.1 for Windows (GraphPad Software, California USA) was used to fit sigmoidal curves of
383 OD450 values against log₁₀ serum dilutions and to interpolate 50% inhibition titres. Sera
384 that had no detectable inhibition at the lowest dilution were assigned a value of 1. Full details
385 are provided in a prior publication.[\(8\)](#)

386

387 SARS-CoV-2 spike- and RBD-reactive B cell analysis

388

389 PBMCs were recovered using Lymphoprep (STEMCELL Technologies, Vancouver, Canada)
390 and LEUCOSEP tubes (Greiner); cryopreserved in FCS containing 10% DMSO; and thawed
391 into RPMI containing DENARASE (cLEcta, Leipzig Germany). Biotinylated spike and RBD
392 were labelled with Streptavidin-fluorochromes (SA-F). PBMCs were incubated with

393 fluorescent-labeled recombinant spike and RBD proteins and with a cocktail of mAbs to
394 detect activated MBC. Full details are provided in a prior publication.[\(8\)](#)

395

396 Dynamic modelling of in-host kinetics to vaccination

397

398 Our aim was to develop a mechanistic model of antibody production to gain a deeper
399 understanding of the relationship between antibody-secreting cells, such as plasma cells and
400 plasmablasts, and the changes in serum antibody concentrations over time following a
401 second dose of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. Our objectives were threefold: i) Establish a
402 mechanistic model of antibody production in response to COVID-19 vaccination, ii)
403 Determine the host factors driving immune heterogeneity to vaccination and iii) Determine
404 the temporal variation in the origin of antibody production over time.

405

406 For the measured biomarkers, we devised an in-host mathematical model of humoral
407 immunity to assess the kinetics of antibody production for each vaccine type. We assume
408 that the vaccine antigen stimulates the proliferation of memory B cells. After this stimulation,
409 these cells differentiate along one of two pathways. They can either become short-lived
410 plasmablasts, which secrete an initial burst of antibodies in response to vaccination, or they
411 can migrate to the germinal centre. In the germinal centre, they remain for approximately two
412 weeks before differentiating into long-lived plasma cells, which also secrete antibodies.
413 Incorporating hierarchical effects into the model will help us assess the impact of host factors
414 on the kinetics of memory B cells and antibodies. Identifying how previous vaccination
415 history—considering vaccine type and timing—affects immune responses will inform
416 improvements in vaccine formulations. Understanding the variability in immune responses
417 due to host factors will enable personalised vaccination strategies to enhance overall
418 vaccine effectiveness. Finally, by analysing the kinetics within the fitted dynamic models, we
419 aim to understand the timeline of antibody production, including the transition from short-
420 term to long-term immunity and the roles of different immune cells and organs over time.
421 This temporal analysis will help predict the duration of immunity provided by the vaccine,
422 thereby informing public health policies on optimal vaccination schedules and the frequency
423 of booster doses.

424 Likelihood Function

425 The likelihood function assumes that measured biomarkers are subject to normal distribution
426 errors. The combined likelihood relates the data for MBC, plasmablasts, and antibodies to
427 their model-predicted quantities. The details of the likelihood equations are given in the
428 Supplementary Information. Priors for the dynamic system parameters are based on
429 immunological observations. For instance, the decay rates of various cell types and
430 antibodies are assigned priors reflecting their known biological behaviour. Non-informative
431 and weakly informative priors are used for other parameters to ensure flexibility while
432 maintaining biological plausibility. A full list of priors and their derivations is given in the
433 Supplementary Information.

434 Implementation

435 The model is implemented using Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) via Stan. The ODEs are
436 solved at each Markov chain step using the Runge-Kutta method. The analysis is conducted
437 on two datasets: one using memory B cells and plasmablasts for ancestral spike, and the
438 other for ancestral RBD, combined with sVNT. The model is run for 4,000 steps with 2,000
439 burn-in for 4 chains. The convergence diagnostics indicate good mixing and convergence,
440 with effective sample sizes (ESS) ranging from 1,000 to 6,500 and Potential Scale Reduction

441 Factor (PSRF) <1.1 for all parameters. The code for this analysis and for the figures of the
442 manuscript and appendix can be found at <https://github.com/dchodge/covidbcell>.

443

444

445 Acknowledgements

446

447 Thank you to A Jessica Hadiprodjo, Dilini Rathnayake, Honghua Ding, and Louise Randall
448 for helping with study procedures, sample collection and processing.

449

450 Author contributions

451 DH: Conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, software, visualisation,
452 writing—original draft, writing—review and editing.

453 LY: Validation, investigation, resources.

454 LC: Validation, investigation, resources.

455 SM: Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing.

456 KS: Funding acquisition, writing—review and editing.

457 SGS: Conceptualisation, project administration, funding acquisition, writing—review and
458 editing.

459 AF: Data Curation, Conceptualisation, project administration, funding acquisition, writing—
460 review and editing.

461 AK: Conceptualisation, project administration, funding acquisition, writing—review and
462 editing.

463

464 Competing interest statement

465 DH: None

466 LY: None

467 LC: None

468 SM: None

469 KS: None

470 SGS: Reports advisory board participation and/or consulting for Moderna, Pfizer, Novavax,
471 CSL Seqirus and Sanofi.

472 AF: Funding from Sanofi

473 AK: None

474

475 Funding sources

476

477 This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health [R01AI141534 to SGS, AF,
478 AJK, DH]. The WHO Collaborating Centre for Reference and Research on Influenza is
479 funded by the Australian Government Department of Health. This work was also supported
480 by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health,
481 Department of Health and Human Services Centers of Excellence for Influenza Research
482 and Response [CEIRR] grant number HHSN272201400005C to the University of Rochester
483 and a subcontract to KS.

484

485 REFERENCES

486

487

- 488 1. [T. Fiolet, Y. Kherabi, C.-J. MacDonald, J. Ghosn, N. Peiffer-Smadja, Comparing](#)
489 [COVID-19 vaccines for their characteristics, efficacy and effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2](#)
490 [and variants of concern: a narrative review. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. 28, 202–221 \(2022\).](#)
- 491 2. [Polack Fernando P., et al., Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19](#)
492 [Vaccine. N. Engl. J. Med. 383, 2603–2615 \(2020\).](#)
- 493 3. [Thomas Stephen J., et al., Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19](#)
494 [Vaccine through 6 Months. N. Engl. J. Med. 385, 1761–1773 \(2021\).](#)
- 495 4. [M. Voysey, et al., Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine \(AZD1222\)](#)
496 [against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South](#)
497 [Africa, and the UK. Lancet 397, 99–111 \(2021\).](#)
- 498 5. [J. Wei, et al., Comparative effectiveness of BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19](#)
499 [vaccines against COVID-19. BMC Med. 21, 78 \(2023\).](#)
- 500 6. [K. Shioda, et al., Comparative effectiveness of alternative intervals between first and](#)
501 [second doses of the mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. Nat. Commun. 15, 1214 \(2024\).](#)
- 502 7. [N. Ahmed, et al., To be remembered: B cell memory response against SARS-CoV-2](#)
503 [and its variants in vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals. Scand. J. Immunol. 99, e13345](#)
504 [\(2024\).](#)
- 505 8. [Y. Liu, et al., Superior immunogenicity of mRNA over adenoviral vectored COVID-19](#)
506 [vaccines reflects B cell dynamics independent of anti-vector immunity: Implications for future](#)
507 [pandemic vaccines. Vaccine 41, 7192–7200 \(2023\).](#)
- 508 9. [K. J. Ewer, et al., T cell and antibody responses induced by a single dose of](#)
509 [ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 \(AZD1222\) vaccine in a phase 1/2 clinical trial. Nat. Med. 27, 270–278](#)
510 [\(2021\).](#)
- 511 10. [M. Müller, et al., Single-dose SARS-CoV-2 vaccinations with either BNT162b2 or](#)
512 [AZD1222 induce disparate Th1 responses and IgA production. BMC Med. 20, 29 \(2022\).](#)
- 513 11. [V. G. Hall, et al., Delayed-interval BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccination](#)
514 [enhances humoral immunity and induces robust T cell responses. Nat. Immunol. 23, 380–](#)
515 [385 \(2022\).](#)
- 516 12. [N. D. Almeida, et al., The effect of dose-interval on antibody response to mRNA](#)
517 [COVID-19 vaccines: a prospective cohort study. Front. Immunol. 15, 1330549 \(2024\).](#)
- 518 13. [I. Garcia-Fogeda, et al., Within-host modeling to measure dynamics of antibody](#)
519 [responses after natural infection or vaccination: A systematic review. Vaccine 41, 3701–](#)
520 [3709 \(2023\).](#)
- 521 14. [A. M. Smith, Decoding immune kinetics: unveiling secrets using custom-built](#)
522 [mathematical models. Nat. Methods 21, 744–747 \(2024\).](#)
- 523 15. [I. Balelli, et al., A model for establishment, maintenance and reactivation of the](#)
524 [immune response after vaccination against Ebola virus. J. Theor. Biol. 495, 110254 \(2020\).](#)
- 525 16. [F. X. Heinz, K. Stiasny, Distinguishing features of current COVID-19 vaccines:](#)
526 [knowns and unknowns of antigen presentation and modes of action. NPJ Vaccines 6, 104](#)
527 [\(2021\).](#)
- 528 17. [S. P. Weisberg, et al., Distinct antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in children and](#)
529 [adults across the COVID-19 clinical spectrum. Nat. Immunol. 22, 25–31 \(2021\).](#)
- 530 18. [A. C. Dowell, et al., Children develop robust and sustained cross-reactive spike-](#)
531 [specific immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat. Immunol. 23, 40–49 \(2022\).](#)

- 532 19. [D. A. Collier, et al., Age-related immune response heterogeneity to SARS-CoV-2](#)
533 [vaccine BNT162b2. Nature 596, 417–422 \(2021\).](#)
- 534 20. [J. Wei, et al., Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in 45,965 adults from the](#)
535 [general population of the United Kingdom. Nat Microbiol 6, 1140–1149 \(2021\).](#)
- 536 21. [A. Nicolas, et al., An extended SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine prime-boost interval](#)
537 [enhances B cell immunity with limited impact on T cells. iScience 26, 105904 \(2023\).](#)
- 538 22. [Z. Wang, et al., Naturally enhanced neutralizing breadth against SARS-CoV-2 one](#)
539 [year after infection. Nature 595, 426–431 \(2021\).](#)
- 540 23. [M. Sakharkar, et al., Prolonged evolution of the human B cell response to SARS-](#)
541 [CoV-2 infection. Sci Immunol 6 \(2021\).](#)
- 542 24. [A. Sette, S. Crotty, Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19](#)
543 [vaccines. Immunol. Rev. 310, 27–46 \(2022\).](#)
- 544 25. [P. Dogra, et al., A modeling-based approach to optimize COVID-19 vaccine dosing](#)
545 [schedules for improved protection. JCI Insight 8 \(2023\).](#)
- 546 26. [K. A. Pape, et al., High-affinity memory B cells induced by SARS-CoV-2 infection](#)
547 [produce more plasmablasts and atypical memory B cells than those primed by mRNA](#)
548 [vaccines. Cell Rep. 37, 109823 \(2021\).](#)
- 549 27. [J. S. Turner, et al., SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines induce persistent human germinal](#)
550 [centre responses. Nature 596, 109–113 \(2021\).](#)
- 551 28. [R. Keeton, et al., Impact of SARS-CoV-2 exposure history on the T cell and IgG](#)
552 [response. Cell Rep Med 4, 100898 \(2023\).](#)
- 553 29. [J. S. Tsang, et al., Improving Vaccine-Induced Immunity: Can Baseline Predict](#)
554 [Outcome? Trends Immunol. 41, 457–465 \(2020\).](#)
- 555 30. [M. R. Castrucci, Factors affecting immune responses to the influenza vaccine. Hum.](#)
556 [Vaccin. Immunother. 14, 637–646 \(2018\).](#)
- 557 31. [D. Gouglas, M. Christodoulou, R. Hatchett, The 100 Days Mission—2022 Global](#)
558 [Pandemic Preparedness Summit. Emerg. Infect. Dis. 29 \(2023\).](#)
- 559 32. [C. W. Tan, et al., A SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization test based on](#)
560 [antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2-spike protein-protein interaction. Nat. Biotechnol. 38,](#)
561 [1073–1078 \(2020\).](#)

562


563

564

565


566 FIGURES

567




568
569
570
571
572

Figure 1. Illustration of the link between the immunological assumptions, dynamic model and the hierarchical effects on the parameters of interest.



573
574
575
576
577
578

Figure 2. Comparison of the fitted models and raw data from the calibration dataset (A, B) and the validation dataset (C, D). (A, C) Comparison of model posterior predictive trajectories, fitted to each antigen (rows), for the biomarker type (columns) for time post-vaccination (x-axis). (B, D) The distribution of the CRPS for both models fits for each biomarker for the calibration dataset.




579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586


Figure 3. Posterior predictive distributions of the parameters driving the in-host mechanistic model according to key covariates for ancestral spike and RBD stratified by time since the first dose. (A) Posterior predictive distributions for the impact of time since the first dose on the rate of MBC proliferation (a1), the rate of sVNT antibody production from plasmablasts (a3), the rate of sVNT antibody production from plasma cells (a4). (B) Posterior predictive distributions for the age on a1, a3, and a4.

Ancestral spike


A



B



C



587

588

589

590

591

592

Figure 4. A) Source of sVNT antibodies by days post-vaccination for ancestral RBD. Line and ribbons show the mean and 95% posterior predictive interval (PPI) and dots represent the sVNT from data. (B–C) Complementary CDF of the marginal posterior distributions for the time antibody titres remain above an IC50 threshold of 10 stratified by vaccine type and B) time since the last dose or C) age group.