Predicting immune protection against outcomes of infectious disease from population-level effectiveness data with application to COVID-19

Tianxiao Hao^{1,2}, Gerard E. Ryan^{1,2}, Michael J. Lydeamore³, Deborah Cromer⁴, James Wood⁵, Jodie McVernon⁶, James M. McCaw^{2,7}, Freya M. Shearer^{2,1}, and Nick Golding^{1,2,8}

¹The Kids Research Institute, Nedlands, Western Australia, Australia ²Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

³Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Victoria, Australia

⁴Kirby Institute, University of New South Wales, New South Wales, Australia

⁵School of Population Health, University of New South Wales, New South Wales, Australia

⁶The Peter Doherty Institute for Infection and Immunity, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

⁷School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia ⁸School of Population Health, Curtin University, Western Australia, Australia

Abstract

Quantifying the extent to which previous infections and vaccinations confer protection against future infection or disease outcomes is critical to managing the transmission and consequences of infectious diseases.

We present a general statistical model for predicting the strength of protection conferred by different immunising exposures (numbers, types, and variants of both vaccines and infections), against multiple outcomes of interest, whilst accounting for immune waning. We predict immune protection against key clinical outcomes: developing symptoms, hospitalisation, and death. We also predict transmission-related outcomes: acquisition of infection and onward transmission in breakthrough infections. These enable quantification of the impact of immunity on population-level transmission dynamics. Our model calibrates the level of immune protection, drawing on both population-level data, such as vaccine effectiveness estimates, and neutralising antibody levels as a correlate of protection. This enables the model to learn realised immunity levels beyond those which can be predicted by antibody kinetics or other correlates alone.

We demonstrate an application of the model for SARS-CoV-2, and predict the individual-level protective effectiveness conferred by natural infections with the Delta and the Omicron B.1.1.529 variants, and by the BioNTech-Pfizer (BNT162b2), Oxford-AstraZeneca (ChAdOx1), and 3rd-dose mRNA booster vaccines, against outcomes for both Delta and Omicron. We also demonstrate a use case of the model in late 2021 during the emergence of Omicron, showing how the model can be rapidly updated with emerging epidemiological data on multiple variants in the same population, to infer key immunogenicity and intrinsic transmissibility characteristics of the new variant, before these can be directly observed via vaccine effectiveness data.

This model provided timely inference on rapidly evolving epidemic situations of significant concern during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic. The general nature of the model enables it to be used to support management of a range of infectious diseases.

1 Introduction

Immune landscapes against infectious diseases are complex but vital to understand for infectious disease management [1]. The level of immune protection against an infectious disease conferred to an individual by vaccines and previous infections depends on many factors, including: the disease outcomes to be protected against (e.g., the likelihood of acquiring an infection or progression to severe disease), the source of immunity (differing by the type of vaccine or the variant of an natural immunising exposure), time since immunising exposure, and the variant of the infecting pathogen against which an immune response must be mounted. The ability to predict the level of protection from a combination of these factors for a real-world population helps inform public health response strategies, including designing vaccination programmes to achieve reduction targets in both mortality and morbidity burdens and in community transmission [2-5]. As most recently demonstrated by experiences with the COVID-19 pandemic, this ability to quantify the populationlevel impact of immunity from natural infections or from vaccination programmes is also critical for assessing if and when economically and socially costly [6-12] non-pharmaceutical interventions, such as lock-downs, can be relaxed without compromising public health goals [3, 13].

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The level of protection from specific sources against specific outcomes at specific time-since-immunisation can be empirically observed through two sources: 1) vaccine *efficacy* trials, e.g., [14–18]; and 2) observed protection *effectiveness* from convalescent and vaccinated real-world populations, e.g., [19, 20]. Since efficacy and effectiveness data are rarely available for all combinations of outcome, source, and time since immunisation, a modelling framework is required to collate and standardise these sources of data, and to enable interpolation and extrapolation of protection, i.e., turning time-point estimates of immune protection into timecontinuous curves against multiple outcomes, which can then further be used as inputs to risk assessments, or scenario projections.

Work by Khoury et al. [21] and Cromer et al. [22] have shown that a measurable 29 and commonly reported correlate of protection (i.e., titres of neutralising antibodies 30 against SARS-CoV-2) can be a useful intermediary quantity for 1) standardising 31 efficacy estimates across clinical trials to enable comparison of efficacy across dif-32 ferent sources of immunity, and 2) for generating continuous curves of predicted 33 efficacy against various outcomes. However, only using clinically measured corre-34 lates of protection to predict efficacy has some limitations. First, modelling the 35 level of immunity from one correlate of protection does not capture other mecha-36 nisms of immune response. For example, although titres of neutralising antibodies 37 are identified as an effective correlate of protection against some outcomes from 38 diseases such as influenza [23] and COVID-19 [21, 22, 24, 25], they only represent 39 one aspect of the overall immune response, and other immune mechanisms, such as 40 T-cells, make different contributions to immunity whose durability over time is not 41 necessarily correlated with neutralising antibody levels [24-27]. This means that 42 predicting immunity purely based on neutralising antibodies kinetics would likely 43 underestimate long-term immunity provided by more enduring T-cells. Second, 44

> clinically measured vaccine efficacy is often an imperfect reflection of real-world effectiveness, limited by how representative (of real-world populations) the immune responses of the study cohort are, although collecting real-world effectiveness data has its own challenges too. Third, clinical efficacy and observational effectiveness data may be available for different combinations of immunising exposures and infecting pathogens/variants. Finally, rare but significant outcomes of public health importance, including mortality, are difficult to observe in clinical trials.

To improve upon an efficacy model parameterised on clinical measures of correlates of protection, we demonstrate in this work an expanded modelling framework incorporating both vaccine efficacy data and observational population-level effectiveness estimates. The ability to use both sources overcomes the aforementioned limitations of a clinical-efficacy-only model.

Here we present the use of the model for COVID-19 to demonstrate its methodology and utility in policy-making, and make available the code for adapting the model for other diseases, vaccines, and outcomes of interest. In our COVID-19 case study, we base our work on the model in Khoury et al.and Cromer et al.which links the degree of protection to titre counts of neutralising antibodies. However, rather than predicting directly from levels of neutralising antibodies, we predict the levels of protection from a latent quantity which we refer to as immunity level. We assume immunity level decays from its peak with a shape resembling antibody kinetics, but we calibrate the level of protection conferred by immunity levels with populationlevel effectiveness observations. Using the late-2021 detection and global spread of the Omicron variant as a case study on emerging variants, we also demonstrate how emerging data on variant-differentiated reinfection and effective reproduction rates can be incorporated as parameters in the model to infer possible ranges of key epidemiological parameters. Namely, we predict the level of immune evasion of the Omicron variant relative to the Delta variant and the Omicron basic reproduction number. This model extension allows us to rapidly estimate the likely levels of protection against outcomes of an Omicron infection, prior to the availability of any direct effectiveness and efficacy estimates.

2 Methods

2.1 Immune protection model definition

Our model assumes that the level of immune protection (immune effectiveness hereafter) against a pathogen conferred by vaccines and natural infections can be predicted from a latent parameter representing the level of immunity against the pathogen. We refer to these latent parameters, for different levels of existing immunity, as 'immunity levels'. The decay of this latent parameter over time since peak immunity is set to follow the general shape of decay of clinically-measured correlates of protection from studies such as Khoury *et al.* [21], but the specific values of immunity level at different times since peak immunity are calibrated to match observational effectiveness data.

We assume that each immune individual *i* in a population has some immunity

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

> level $n_{i,v}$ to variant v. An individual's immunity level is assumed to be drawn from 87 a normal distribution with mean $\mu_{s,d,v}$ based on the source of their immunity s88 (which may differ by vaccine dose or product, or in the case of natural immunity 89 differ by infecting variant, or combinations thereof), the number of days d post 90 peak immunity (i.e., the degree of waning), and the variant to be protected against 91 v, and variance σ^2 , giving the inter-individual variation in immunity levels, which 92 we assume to be constant across variants, sources of immunity and levels of waning 93 (Equation 1). 94

$$n_{i,v} \sim N(\mu_{s,d,v}, \sigma^2). \tag{1}$$

For each individual and for each type of outcome o, be that acquisition of infection, 95 death, hospitalisation, symptomatic infection, or onward transmission, the probabil-96 ity that the outcome is averted, E_o , is given by a sigmoid function, parameterised 97 by a threshold immunity level T_o , at which 50% of outcome events of type o are 98 prevented, and a slope parameter k determining the steepness of this relationship 99 (Equation 2). These parameters are assumed to be independent of the variant to be 100 protected against and the source of immunity, which enables prediction of immune 101 effectiveness to new situations such as new disease variants. 102

$$E_o(n_{i,v}) = (1 + \exp(-k(n_{i,v} - T_o)))^{-1}$$
(2)

At the population-level, the immune effectiveness from a given source against a given outcome from a variant in a cohort with mean immunity level $\mu_{s,d,v}$ is the average probability over the whole population of the outcome being averted, $P_{s,d,o,v}$. The population-level immune effectiveness as a function of immunity level is computed by integrating the sigmoid function with respect to the normal distribution of immunity levels (Equation 3).

$$P_{s,d,o,v} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} E_o(n_v) N(n_v | \mu_{s,d,v}, \sigma^2) dn_v$$
(3)

This integral has no known closed form and so a numerical approximation is computed in our implementation by Gauss-Legendre quadrature [28].

The mean immunity level, $\mu_{s,d,v}$ for a cohort with immunity source s and number of days d since peak immunity from that source is assumed to decay exponentially with time-since-peak-immunity, with half-life H days, from a peak mean immunity level against that variant of $\mu_{s,v}^*$ for each source (Equation 4)

$$\mu_{s,d,v} = \log_{10} \left(10^{\mu_{s,v}^*} \exp(-d/H) \right)$$
(4)

When extending the model to multiple variants, the peak mean immunity level 115 against a given variant is then modelled as a \log_{10} fold increase or decrease in 116 immunity level of that variant, relative to an index variant (Equation 5).

$$\mu_{s,v}^* = \mu_{s,0}^* + F^v \tag{5}$$

where for the index variant $F^v = 0$, for a variant with level of immune evasion relative to the index, $F^v < 0$, and for a variant more susceptible to immune protection than the index, $F^v > 0$.

> Similar to the way we model variants, the peak immunity levels of different doses 121 of the same vaccine are also modelled with \log_{10} fold increase $G^{booster}$ or decrease 122 G^{single} in immunity level relative to the standard schedule (Equation 6). 123

$$\mu_{s_{single},v}^{*} = \mu_{s,v}^{*} - G^{single}$$

$$\mu_{s_{booster},v}^{*} = \mu_{s,v}^{*} + G^{booster}$$
(6)

where $\mu_{s,v}^*$ is the peak immunity level of the standard schedule, and G^{single} and $G^{booster}$ are constrained to be non-negative, enforcing the level of immunity to be a monotonically increasing function of the number of doses. This allows us to use additional effectiveness estimates from studies that include partial first doses [29,30] and third 'booster' doses [19] in addition to standard schedules. We assume the increase in immunity level as doses increase is consistent across vaccine types, as there are typically insufficient data to parameterise them separately. 120

The decision to model peak immunity levels against different variants and from different vaccine dose numbers as relative to an index variant and a standard dose number enables the model to share information across different pairs of dose numbers and infecting variants. Importantly, this allows the model to e.g., predict protection against a new variant from estimates against an index variant and the estimated relative change parameter F^v .

To fit the model to observational vaccine effectiveness estimates, we complete 137 the model with a likelihood term. For vaccine effectiveness estimates provided as 138 a point estimate and confidence interval, we define the the likelihood for vaccine 139 effectiveness estimate j as a normal distribution over the logit-transformed estimate 140 VE_j , with mean given by the logit-transformed predicted effectiveness for that 141 combination of source, days post-peak-immunity, outcome, and variant P_{s_i,d_i,o_i,v_i} 142 and with variance given by the sum of the square of the standard error of the estimate 143 on the logit scale logit- SE_j^2 (approximated from provided uncertainty intervals of 144 the source data), and an additional variance term σ_{ve}^2 , to represent any additional 145 errors in these estimates arising from the observation process (Equation 7). 146

$$\operatorname{logit}(VE_j) \sim N(\operatorname{logit}(P_{s_i, d_i, o_i, v_i}), \operatorname{logit}-SE_i^2 + \sigma_{ve}^2)$$
(7)

2.2 Model applications

2.2.1 Fitting to vaccine effectiveness data against SARS-CoV-2

We demonstrate application of the model to population-level effectiveness estimates available in late 2021 of partial one-dose and primary two-dose course of the BioNTech-Pfizer (BNT162b2; Pfizer hereafter) and Oxford-AstraZeneca (ChAdOx1; AstraZeneca hereafter) vaccines against clinical outcomes of infections by the Delta variant of SARS-CoV-2 (death, severe disease, symptomatic infection) [20], and to estimates against acquisition of Delta infection (both symptomatic and asymptomatic), and onward transmission of breakthrough Delta infections [29, 30].

We then demonstrate an extended model, fitted to these data and to new effectiveness data available in early 2022 [19] of third-dose 'booster' mRNA vaccines

147 148

149

150

151

152

153

154

> against symptomatic Delta infections, and to estimates of two-dose Pfizer and As-158 traZeneca, and 3rd dose booster vaccines against hospitalisation and symptomatic 159 infections by the Omicron B.1.1.529 (referred to as Omicron hereafter) variant of 160 SARS-CoV-2. 161

> Note that because the only data for booster dose effectiveness available at the 162 time of model fitting in late 2021 were of Pfizer boosters [19], we assumed that Pfizer 163 booster immunity level is representative of any mRNA-based 3rd dose, irrespective 164 of booster vaccine brand or the individual's vaccine history. Finally, while immunity 165 from natural infections is not represented in these vaccine effectiveness estimates, 166 they can be predicted by extrapolating from the relative levels of immunity across 167 different sources estimated in Khoury et al.. Hence, we also predict 1) the level 168 of protection conferred by convalescence from natural Delta/wild-type (assumed to 169 confer the same degree of immunity against Delta) infections against outcomes of 170 Delta infections, and 2) protection conferred by Omicron infections, on its own or in 171 combination with vaccines, against future Omicron infections — this is of interest 172 because Omicron is assumed to possess evasion against all modelled sources of 173 immunity, except previous exposures to Omicron itself.

> All vaccine effectiveness estimates used to fit the model in the application we 175 describe reported vaccine effectiveness for individuals pooled over a short period 176 of time rather than a single day, so d_i was taken as the midpoint of that period. 177 Although we model decay exponentially, the brevity of these time periods meant 178 that using midpoints is an acceptable approximation. 179

174

Rapid analysis of immune evasive variants: a case study on Omicron 2.2.2 180

When the Omicron variant first emerged as a public health concern in late 2021, 181 early risk assessment and response planning were hindered by a lack of estimates 182 on two key characteristics of Omicron: immunogenicity (i.e., the level of immune 183 evasion possessed by Omicron, F^{O} , relative to the then-dominant Delta variant) and 184 intrinsic transmissibility $(R_0^{\rm O})$. Importantly, there was also a lack of any datasets 185 that could be used to estimate these key characteristics directly (e.g., neutralisation 186 assays against Omicron to estimate F^{O} or transmission studies in immune-naïve 187 households to estimate R_0^{O}), which only became available after widespread Omicron 188 transmission globally. 189

To respond to these urgent inference needs in the earliest days of Omicron 190 epidemic wave, we adapted the model to provide earliest available estimates on 191 the immunogenicity and intrinsic transmissibility of Omicron, first using data that 192 indirectly infers these quantities, then, as soon as they became available, using 193 vaccine effectiveness and household transmission estimates on Omicron. The de-194 tails of model adaptations, including additional parameters and uncertainties, data 195 sources, and the chronological time of these methodological changes, are described 196 in Appendix 1. Here, we provide a brief summary: we added F^{O} and R_{0}^{O} as latent 197 parameters in the model. Then, taking advantage of the model's ability to map be-198 tween immune effectiveness for different variants, outcomes, sources of immunity, 199 and degrees of waning, we fitted the model to the known intrinsic transmissibility 200 of Delta, and a range of emerging data informing the relative immunogenicity and 201

Parameter	Prior distribution	Equation	Informed by	Description
k	N(0, 1)	2	Naïve***	slope parameter in the logistic curve linking the probability of averting an in-
				fection outcome to an immunity level
To	N(0, 1)	2	Naïve	threshold immunity level at which 50% of outcome events are prevented
Н	N(108, 10)	4	[21]	half-life of immunity level decay
$\mu^*_{AZ,\Delta}$	$\mathcal{N}(-0.331, 0.0814)$	4	[21]	standard two-dose schedule immunity levels (on \log_{10} scale) of the AstraZeneca vaccine against the Delta variant at peak immunity, indexed on wild-type convalescent immunity level
$\mu^*_{Pfizer,\Delta}$	$\mathcal{N}(0.327, 0.0775)$	4	[21]	standard two-dose schedule immunity levels (on \log_{10} scale) of the Pfizer vaccine against the Delta variant at peak immunity, indexed on wild-type convalescent immunity level
$G^{booster}$	$Lognormal(5,1)^{(0,\inf)**}$	6	[19]	immunity level increase from a booster dose relative to a standard two-dose schedule
G_{single}	$\mathcal{N}(1,0)^{ig(0,\inf)}$	6	Naïve	immunity level decrease relative to a standard two-dose schedule from a single dose of vaccine
σ^2	$N(0, 1)^{(0, inf)}$	7	Naïve	additional variance term for observational vaccine effectiveness estimates

Table 1: Prior distributions for parameters as part of the immune effectiveness model.

Superscripts denote the range of values permitted for parameter distributions. *Naïve implies that the priors are not informed by a specific literature source, but their distributions are selected to be relatively broad and fit to the data reasonably in prior simulations.

intrinsic transmissibility between the Omicron and the Delta variants. This allowed 202 us to 1) jointly estimate F^{O} and R_{0}^{O} , with appropriate representation of uncertain-203 ties in these data, and 2) predict immune protection against outcomes of Omicron 204 infection. 205

2.3 Fitting the Model

Amongst model parameters, $\mu_{s,0}^*$, H and σ^2 may either be inferred from clinical 207 assays on correlates of protection, or calibrated against observational effectiveness 208 data. The parameters T_o and k must be learned by fitting the model to effec-209 tiveness data. We keep the parameter σ^2 fixed at the value estimated by Khoury 210 et al.(0.465). We assign informative priors to $\mu_{s,0}^*$, and H based on estimates 211 from Khoury *et al.*, and to $G^{booster}$ based on estimates from UK Health Security 212 Agency [19] after it had become available. The remaining parameters are given less 213 informative priors. This enables the model to update these parameters based on the 214 data, and fully incorporate uncertainty in these parameters into predictions. The 215 prior distributions for all parameters in the main model are listed in Table 1 and 216 additional parameters for the Omicron extension are listed in Appendix Table S1. 217

All analyses were performed in R version 4.1.0 [31], using the greta package 218 version 0.4.3 for model specification, inference, and predictions [32]. Inference was 219 performed using 10 independent chains of Hamiltonian Monte Carlo, each run for 220 1000 samples after discarding 1000 warm-up iterations. Convergence was assessed 221 by the potential scale reduction factor statistic (1.01 or less for all parameters), the 222 effective sample size (greater than 500 for all parameters), and visual inspection 223 of trace plots. Code used for this work is available at: https://github.com/idem-224 lab/neuts2efficacy.

The posterior distributions over immune effectiveness for different outcomes, 226 vaccines, doses, and degrees of waning are computed to predict the range of im-227

206

> mune effectiveness estimated for Delta and predicted for Omicron. Joint predictions 228 of Omicron immune evasion and intrinsic transmissibility are also computed, for mul-229 tiple iterations of the model fitted to different data, described in detail in Appendix 230 1. 231

3 Results

232

233

249

3.1 Immune protection predictions against the Delta variant

Figure 1 shows the estimated protection against the Delta variant over time since 234 peak immunity, for various outcomes of interest: death, hospitalisation, symp-235 tomatic infection, acquisition of infection and onward transmission (given infection, 236 i.e., breakthrough cases). The predicted immune effectiveness over time is consis-237 tent with the data (Figure 1), with the only notable difference being that the model 238 predicts a slightly higher immune effectiveness from two-dose AstraZeneca vaccine 239 against symptoms at around 100 to 150 days post peak compared to the immune 240 effectiveness estimates from Andrews et al., 2021 [20]. 241

The model predicts that two doses of the mRNA Pfizer vaccine confer a higher 242 protection than both two doses of the AstraZeneca vaccine and convalescence. 243 Boosting with an mRNA product provides even higher protection than two doses 244 of Pfizer vaccine, although the absolute differences in immune effectiveness is small 245 for severe (death and hospitalisation) outcomes, since two doses of Pfizer vaccine 246 already confers a very high degree of protection. 247

3.2 Predicting immune evasion and intrinsic transmissibility of 248 Omicron from epidemiological data

The joint posterior distributions over the degree of immune evasion and the rela-250 tive intrinsic transmissibility of the Omicron variant versus Delta (Figure 2) show 251 how these estimated quantities changed as the model was re-parameterised with 252 new, and increasingly informative, data. With only South African reinfection and 253 reproduction rates data (left panel), the model estimated the Omicron variant to 254 most likely be intrinsically less transmissible than the Delta variant, but possess a 255 high degree of immune evasion (albeit with significant uncertainty on the strength 256 of evasion). Incorporating the UK vaccine effectiveness estimates (middle panel) 257 enabled the model to exclude very high levels of immune evasion from the plausi-258 ble parameter space. Finally, when fitted to UK vaccine effectiveness estimates and 259 Danish household attack rate data (right panel), the model estimated that Omicron 260 is both intrinsically more transmissible, with a basic reproduction number around 261 1.2 times higher, and possesses a moderate to significant degree of immune evasion, 262 capable of reducing immune effectiveness against transmission by 20-60% compared 263 to the Delta variant. As the model was iteratively fitted to newer data, note that 264 uncertainty in posterior distributions has decreased, although there was significant 265 uncertainty even in the final iteration. 266



Figure 1: Estimated immune protection against the Delta variant over time since peak immunity (following administration of the first or second dose of either AstraZeneca (AZ) or Pfizer vaccines, or after boosting with an mRNA vaccine). WT = wild-type virus, which is assumed to confer the same level of immunity against the Delta variant as a Delta infection. Estimates of vaccine effectiveness from various observational studies are indicated by dots (point estimates) and vertical bars (95% confidence intervals), with horizontal bars indicating the range of days since peak immunity for individuals included in the study.



Figure 2: The joint posterior distributions over level of immune evasion and intrinsic transmissibility of the Omicron variant, relative to the Delta variant. The dark and light green areas show 95% and 50% density regions respectively. Joint parameter estimates are from three iterations of the model fitted to the latest data sources: left — South African reinfection and reproduction rates data, middle — South African data and UK vaccine effectiveness estimates, right — UK vaccine effectiveness estimates and Danish household attack rate data.

3.3 Immune protection predictions against the Omicron variant 267

Figure 3 shows predicted protection against the Omicron variant over time-since-269 peak-immunity, for various outcomes of interest, as predicted by the final iteration 270 of the model in early 2022, including vaccine effectiveness data for both Delta and 271 Omicron. Note that immune effectiveness predictions of single dose Pfizer and AZ 272 vaccines are not shown here to assist visualising the more protective immunity pro-273 files. When comparing the effectiveness predictions against symptomatic infections 274 to the data in Andrews et al., 2022 [19] shown in Figure 3, the model is more 275 pessimistic for two-dose AstraZeneca vaccines, especially in early phases of waning. 276 The model is likewise more pessimistic for Pfizer effectiveness at peak protection, 277 but it also predicts a more linear waning pattern compared to the data in Andrews 278 et al., 2022, which appears more biphasic with more rapid decline in the first 100 279 days and minimal waning thereafter. For an mRNA booster, the model prediction 280 against symptoms is consistent with the data up to around day 75, but it predicts 281 slower waning compared to the data point around day 100. Note that the outlying 282 data point for mRNA booster against symptoms at around day 150 was reported in 283 the UK report at the time of analysis and thus was included in the example analysis 284 representing this period of time, but it has since been removed in the published 285 version of Andrews et al., 2022. 286

Compared to immune effectiveness against the Delta variant, predicted immune effectiveness of mRNA booster, two-dose Pfizer, and two-dose AstraZeneca vaccines are all lower against the Omicron variant. However, the relative ranking of these three vaccine sources remains consistent, due to the assumption that the degree of immune evasion is constant across the modelled immunity sources. Infection with the Omicron variant confers greater immunity to subsequent Omicron



Figure 3: Estimated immune protection against the Omicron variant over time since peak immunity following administration of the second dose of either AstraZeneca or Pfizer vaccines, after boosting with an mRNA vaccine, and/or Omicron infection. Estimates of vaccine effectiveness from various observational studies are indicated by dots (point estimates) and vertical bars (95% confidence intervals), with horizontal bars indicating the range of days since immune event for individuals included in the study. Omicron sub-lineages BA.1 and BA.2 are assumed interchangeable both in the immune protection conferred by infections, and the level of protection against them.

exposure than any level of vaccination alone, due to the assumption that the level of immune protection from Omicron against Omicron reinfection is equivalent to that of previous wild-type infection against subsequent exposure to wild-type virus. Third dose ("booster dose") combined with infection gives a further substantial increase in effectiveness, although at this point protection against severe outcomes cannot increase much further since it is close to 100% effective.

4 Discussion

The model presented in this work uses a combination of correlates of protection and vaccine effectiveness data to predict the level of protection conferred by vaccines and prior infections, against various outcomes of interest. Our model extends upon the neutralisation-level-to-clinical-efficacy model in Khoury *et al.* [21] by fitting the level of protection directly against observed real-world effectiveness data. Our

> approach is similar to that used by Hogan et al. [33], although the two models 305 focus on different outcomes of infection. Hogan et al. focus on clinically relevant 306 endpoints for evaluating vaccine effectiveness, including hospitalisation, death, and 307 mild disease (mild symptomatic infection with some asymptomatic cases detected 308 through routine screening). Among these, predicted protection against death is 309 a particularly desirable addition to the outputs of Khoury et al. model as it has 310 not been tested in clinical trials [22]. Our model also predicts protection against 311 these outcomes, but by calibrating to a wider range of input data sources, our 312 model additionally predicts the level of protection against all infections irrespective 313 of clinical presentation and against onward transmission of breakthrough infections. 314 This ability to predict protection against onward transmission is important because 315 it can be combined with protection against acquisition of infection to calculate 316 the reductive (time-dependent) effect of immunity on community transmission (as 317 demonstrated in the Omicron extension in Appendix 1), which can be used in a 318 range of subsequent analyses such as informing transmission parameters in dynamics 319 models. 320

> A powerful feature of our model is the flexibility to incorporate new types of pa-321 rameters and data as needs arise. This was demonstrated in the Omicron adaptation 322 case study detailed in Appendix 1 where we extend the model to fit to non-vaccine-323 effectiveness data (i.e., variant-differentiated reinfection and reproduction rates of 324 Delta and Omicron and Omicron household secondary attack rates) and predict new 325 outputs in addition to immune protection (i.e., immune evasion and intrinsic trans-326 missibility of Omicron). By accurately representing the high degree of uncertainty 327 in the new parameters, e.g., by assuming the proportion of the modelled South 328 African population with immunity is between a broad range of 70-90% (the use of 329 this parameter is described in detail in Appendix 1), we ensure the posterior esti-330 mations of the quantities of interest accurately reflect a large degree of uncertainty, 331 given the indirect and limited nature fo these data sources for inferring immune 332 responses. The flexibility of the modelling framework is also demonstrated in its 333 ability to be rapidly updated in the Omicron case study, utilising newer and better 334 data as they become available, to update risk assessments to inform public health 335 policy. These evolving estimates were reported to the Australian Commonwealth 336 government in near real-time, and helped inform key vaccine rollout policy changes 337 during this critical period, which saw the largest COVID-19 wave in the country to 338 date. 339

> Our application of this model for epidemic analytics during the COVID-19 pan-340 demic provided time-continuous and outcome-comprehensive predictions on the 341 likely impacts of vaccine programmes. The model predictions showed that full-342 schedule vaccinations with either the Pfizer or AstraZeneca vaccines are effective 343 against severe infection outcomes from both the Delta and Omicron variants of 344 COVID-19, therefore demonstrating that vaccination is an effective tool for man-345 aging morbidity and mortality burdens. These findings are in broad agreement with 346 similar estimates elsewhere [33, 34]. 347

> Before the widespread transmission of the immune evasive Omicron variant, a 348 key aim of some COVID-19 vaccine programmes, in addition to alleviating mortality 349 and morbidity burdens, was to achieve sustained reduction in community transmis-

350

> sions. This aim was for a time achieved in some populations such as in Australia in 351 late 2021 [3,35]. Important to this aim, our model predicts a fast rate of waning in 352 protection against the two transmission-related outcomes of acquiring infections and 353 onward transmissions. This suggests that the effectiveness of vaccine programmes 354 in reducing transmission likely depends on repeated admissions of additional doses 355 over time, broadly consistent with recommendations elsewhere [22, 36]. By linking 356 protection against acquisition and onward transmission estimates from our model 357 to information on the population-level immunity profile (proportions of the popula-358 tion with different types of immunity, from vaccination or prior infection), one can 359 also predict reduction in community transmission due to immunity over continuous 360 time or in hypothetical scenarios. An example of potential application is in Ryan et 361 al. [3], where predicted reduction in transmission due to immunity is combined with 362 vaccine uptake scenarios to simulate the levels of community transmission under 363 different vaccination programme targets. An important finding of that study, which 364 informed the Australian government's vaccination uptake thresholds for national 365 reopening of jurisdictional and international borders [35, 37], was determining the 366 levels of vaccine coverage required to achieve targets in community transmission, 367 and in turn whether and when non-pharmaceutical interventions could be relaxed, 368 whilst still retaining control on transmission mainly through immunity. This po-369 tential use shows that the ability to estimate the reduction in transmission due to 370 immunity is a major strength of our model with demonstrated wide-reaching policy 371 impacts. 372

> Due to its active use in risk assessment and policy planning objectives focusing 373 on short-term impacts of immunity, our model was developed with an emphasis 374 on short-term predictive accuracy. A further enhancement of the model would be 375 to calibrate to effectiveness estimates over longer time since peak immunity, which 376 were not available when the model was first developed. The model could also be re-377 parameterised with a bi-phasic waning curve [33], where a more rapidly waning first 378 phase corresponds to rapid changes in antibody kinetics post immunising exposure, 379 and a more stable second phase reflecting when other more enduring mechanisms 380 such as T-cells play a bigger role in immunity [27]. Implementing bi-phasic waning 381 will likely bring the model's prediction closer to the data for two-dose Pfizer vaccines 382 against Omicron in Figure 3. 383

> Another potential extension, should relevant data be available, is to model differ-384 ent levels of immune evasion in protection against different outcomes. For example, 385 immune evasion could lead to increased transmissibility but not pathogenicity. The 386 Omicron variant of SARS-CoV-2 demonstrates such a scenario, where mutations in 387 spike epitopes of the virus enable it to evade neutralisation by antibodies and infect 388 those with immunity, but the severity of these breakthrough infections is attenuated 389 by other more robust mechanisms such as T cells [38,39]. At the time of fitting our 390 model, there was insufficient knowledge on the protection against severe outcomes 391 from Omicron infections, so our model makes the necessary assumption of equal 392 immune evasion against all outcomes, and learns effectiveness against Omicron 393 mostly from the available data on symptomatic non-severe infections. Therefore, 394 the model likely predicts a degree of immune evasion more consistent with non-395 severe outcomes (i.e., higher degree of immune evasion), likely explaining why the 396

> model under-predicted mRNA booster effectiveness against hospitalisation at around day 120 in Figure 3. With available future data, the interaction between immune evasion and outcomes can be explicitly modelled, for example with the addition of learned interaction coefficients $\alpha_{v,o}$ between pairs of variants and outcomes in Equation 5 (replacing the term $n_{i,v} - T_o$ with $n_{i,v} - T_o + \alpha_{v,o}$).

> As the code for implementing the model presented in this work is open source, 402 it can be readily adapted for other research uses, such as modelling another dis-403 ease, other vaccine types, or other outcomes of interest such as protection against 404 developing 'Long COVID' (i.e., post-acute sequelae of COVID-19, [40]). A fur-405 ther avenue of research here is to develop the code-base into a software package 406 with functions specifically designed to interface with a range of relevant data. This 407 would increase the accessibility of the model to the pandemic preparedness research 408 community, and enables its rapid deployment in public health response situations. 409

> In conclusion, we present a model predicting the level of immune protection against various outcomes of infection using vaccine effectiveness data, and demonstrate its use for COVID-19. We showcase how the model outputs provide valuable and timely information on a range of epidemic response questions, and we further discuss potential improvements and extensions to the model that can be implemented with future data.

5 Acknowledgements

This work received funding from the Department of Health and Aged Care Australia and the SPECTRUM Centre of Research Excellence funded by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC; grant no. 1170960). T. Hao was supported by NHMRC Ideas Grant (grant no. 2019093), F. M. Shearer was supported by an NHMRC Investigator Grant (no. 2010051), D. Cromer was supported by an NHMRC Investigator Grant (no. 1173528).

References

- J. M. Fonville, S. H. Wilks, S. L. James, A. Fox, M. Ventresca, M. Aban, L. Xue, T. C. Jones, N. M. H. Le, Q. T. Pham, N. D. Tran, Y. Wong, A. Mosterin, L. C. Katzelnick, D. Labonte, T. T. Le, G. van der Net, E. Skepner, C. A. Russell, T. D. Kaplan, G. F. Rimmelzwaan, N. Masurel, J. C. de Jong, A. Palache, W. E. P. Beyer, Q. M. Le, T. H. Nguyen, H. F. L. Wertheim, A. C. Hurt, A. D. M. E. Osterhaus, I. G. Barr, R. A. M. Fouchier, P. W. Horby, and D. J. Smith. Antibody landscapes after influenza virus infection or vaccination. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 346(6212):996–1000, November 2014.
- [2] Eamon Conway, Camelia R Walker, Christopher Baker, Michael J Lydeamore, Gerard E Ryan, Trish Campbell, Joel C Miller, Nic Rebuli, Max Yeung, Greg Kabashima, et al. Covid-19 vaccine coverage targets to inform reopening plans in a low incidence setting. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 290(2005):20231437, 2023.

- [3] Gerard E. Ryan, Freya M. Shearer, James M. McCaw, Jodie McVernon, and Nick Golding. Estimating measures to reduce the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in Australia to guide a 'National Plan' to reopening. *Epidemics*, 47:100763, June 2024.
- [4] Thao P Le, Eamon Conway, Edifofon Akpan, Isobel Abell, Patrick Abraham, Christopher M Baker, Patricia T Campbell, Deborah Cromer, Michael J Lydeamore, Yasmine McDonough, et al. Cost-effective boosting allocations in the post-omicron era of covid-19 management. *medRxiv*, pages 2023–11, 2023.
- [5] Caroline E. Wagner, Chadi M. Saad-Roy, and Bryan T. Grenfell. Modelling vaccination strategies for COVID-19. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, 22(3):139– 141, March 2022. Number: 3 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [6] N. Ferguson, D. Laydon, G. Nedjati Gilani, N. Imai, K. Ainslie, M. Baguelin, S. Bhatia, A. Boonyasiri, Z. Cucunuba Perez, G. Cuomo-Dannenburg, A. Dighe, I. Dorigatti, H. Fu, K. Gaythorpe, W. Green, A. Hamlet, W. Hinsley, L. Okell, S. Van Elsland, H. Thompson, R. Verity, E. Volz, H. Wang, Y. Wang, P. Walker, C. Walters, P. Winskill, C. Whittaker, C. Donnelly, S. Riley, and A. Ghani. Report 9: Impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions (NPIs) to reduce COVID19 mortality and healthcare demand. Report, March 2020. Accepted: 2020-03-17T09:57:15Z Publication Title: 20.
- [7] Nicola Perra. Non-pharmaceutical interventions during the COVID-19 pandemic: A review. *Physics Reports*, 913:1–52, May 2021.
- [8] Seth Flaxman, Swapnil Mishra, Axel Gandy, H. Juliette T. Unwin, Thomas A. Mellan, Helen Coupland, Charles Whittaker, Harrison Zhu, Tresnia Berah, Jeffrey W. Eaton, Mélodie Monod, Azra C. Ghani, Christl A. Donnelly, Steven Riley, Michaela A. C. Vollmer, Neil M. Ferguson, Lucy C. Okell, and Samir Bhatt. Estimating the effects of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 in Europe. *Nature*, 584(7820):257–261, August 2020. Number: 7820 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [9] Yong Ge, Wen-Bin Zhang, Xilin Wu, Corrine W. Ruktanonchai, Haiyan Liu, Jianghao Wang, Yongze Song, Mengxiao Liu, Wei Yan, Juan Yang, Eimear Cleary, Sarchil H. Qader, Fatumah Atuhaire, Nick W. Ruktanonchai, Andrew J. Tatem, and Shengjie Lai. Untangling the changing impact of non-pharmaceutical interventions and vaccination on European COVID-19 trajectories. *Nature Communications*, 13(1):3106, June 2022. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [10] Solomon Hsiang, Daniel Allen, Sébastien Annan-Phan, Kendon Bell, Ian Bolliger, Trinetta Chong, Hannah Druckenmiller, Luna Yue Huang, Andrew Hultgren, Emma Krasovich, Peiley Lau, Jaecheol Lee, Esther Rolf, Jeanette Tseng, and Tiffany Wu. The effect of large-scale anti-contagion policies on the COVID-19 pandemic. *Nature*, 584(7820):262–267, August 2020. Number: 7820 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.

- [11] Shengjie Lai, Nick W. Ruktanonchai, Liangcai Zhou, Olivia Prosper, Wei Luo, Jessica R. Floyd, Amy Wesolowski, Mauricio Santillana, Chi Zhang, Xiangjun Du, Hongjie Yu, and Andrew J. Tatem. Effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions to contain COVID-19 in China. *Nature*, 585(7825):410–413, September 2020. Number: 7825 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [12] The Lancet Infectious Diseases. The intersection of COVID-19 and mental health. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases*, 20(11):1217, November 2020. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [13] Alicia Blair, Mattia de Pasquale, Valentin Gabeff, Mélanie Rufi, and Antoine Flahault. The End of the Elimination Strategy: Decisive Factors towards Sustainable Management of COVID-19 in New Zealand. *Epidemiologia*, 3(1):135– 147, March 2022. Number: 1 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- [14] Merryn Voysey, Sue Ann Costa Clemens, Shabir A. Madhi, Lily Y. Weckx, Pedro M. Folegatti, Parvinder K. Aley, Brian Angus, Vicky L. Baillie, Shaun L. Barnabas, Qasim E. Bhorat, Sagida Bibi, Carmen Briner, Paola Cicconi, Andrea M. Collins, Rachel Colin-Jones, Clare L. Cutland, Thomas C. Darton, Keertan Dheda, Christopher J. A. Duncan, Katherine R. W. Emary, Katie J. Ewer, Lee Fairlie, Saul N. ... Faust, and Peter Zuidewind. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. The Lancet, 397(10269):99–111, January 2021. Publisher: Elsevier.
- [15] Qiang Bi, Lindsey R Baden, Emily Yahiro, and et al. Efficacy and effectiveness of the bnt162b2 mrna covid-19 vaccine. New England Journal of Medicine, 384(9):890–901, 2021.
- [16] Lindsey R Baden, Darin Shibata, Michael T Osterholm, and et al. Protection against sars-cov-2 in households following pfizer-biontech vaccination. New England Journal of Medicine, 385(1):11–20, 2021.
- [17] Lisa A. Jackson, Evan J. Anderson, Nadine G. Rouphael, Paul C. Roberts, Mamodikoe Makhene, Rhea N. Coler, Michele P. McCullough, James D. Chappell, Mark R. Denison, Laura J. Stevens, Andrea J. Pruijssers, Adrian Mc-Dermott, Britta Flach, Nicole A. Doria-Rose, Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Kaitlyn M. Morabito, Sijy O'Dell, Stephen D. Schmidt, Phillip A. Swanson, Marcelino Padilla, John R. Mascola, Kathleen M. Neuzil, Hamilton Bennett, Wellington Sun, Etza Peters, Mat Makowski, Jim Albert, Kaitlyn Cross, Wendy Buchanan, Rhonda Pikaart-Tautges, Julie E. Ledgerwood, Barney S. Graham, and John H. Beigel. An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 — Preliminary Report. New England Journal of Medicine, 383(20):1920– 1931, November 2020. Publisher: Massachusetts Medical Society _eprint: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2022483.

- [18] Karin Bok, Sandra Sitar, Barney S. Graham, and John R. Mascola. Accelerated COVID-19 vaccine development: milestones, lessons, and prospects. *Immunity*, 54(8):1636–1651, August 2021.
- [19] Nick Andrews, Julia Stowe, Freja Kirsebom, Samuel Toffa, Tim Rickeard, Eileen Gallagher, Charlotte Gower, Meaghan Kall, Natalie Groves, Anne-Marie O'Connell, David Simons, Paula B. Blomquist, Asad Zaidi, Sophie Nash, Nurin Iwani Binti Abdul Aziz, Simon Thelwall, Gavin Dabrera, Richard Myers, Gayatri Amirthalingam, Saheer Gharbia, Jeffrey C. Barrett, Richard Elson, Shamez N. Ladhani, Neil Ferguson, Maria Zambon, Colin N.J. Campbell, Kevin Brown, Susan Hopkins, Meera Chand, Mary Ramsay, and Jamie Lopez Bernal. Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. New England Journal of Medicine, 386(16):1532–1546, April 2022. Publisher: Massachusetts Medical Society.
- [20] Nick Andrews, Elise Tessier, Julia Stowe, Charlotte Gower, Freja Kirsebom, Ruth Simmons, Eileen Gallagher, Meera Chand, Kevin Brown, Shamez N. Ladhani, Mary Ramsay, and Jamie Lopez Bernal. Vaccine effectiveness and duration of protection of Comirnaty, Vaxzevria and Spikevax against mild and severe COVID-19 in the UK. *medRxiv*, page 2021.09.15.21263583, October 2021.
- [21] David S. Khoury, Deborah Cromer, Arnold Reynaldi, Timothy E. Schlub, Adam K. Wheatley, Jennifer A. Juno, Kanta Subbarao, Stephen J. Kent, James A. Triccas, and Miles P. Davenport. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Medicine*, 27(7):1205–1211, July 2021.
- [22] Deborah Cromer, Megan Steain, Arnold Reynaldi, Timothy E. Schlub, Adam K. Wheatley, Jennifer A. Juno, Stephen J. Kent, James A. Triccas, David S. Khoury, and Miles P. Davenport. Neutralising antibody titres as predictors of protection against SARS-CoV-2 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe*, 3(1):e52–e61, January 2022.
- [23] D. Hobson, R. L. Curry, A. S. Beare, and A. Ward-Gardner. The role of serum haemagglutination-inhibiting antibody in protection against challenge infection with influenza A2 and B viruses. *Epidemiology & Infection*, 70(4):767–777, December 1972. Publisher: Cambridge University Press.
- [24] David Goldblatt, Galit Alter, Shane Crotty, and Stanley A. Plotkin. Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease. *Immunological Reviews*, page 10.1111/imr.13091, June 2022.
- [25] Nick Pooley, Salim S. Abdool Karim, Behazine Combadière, Eng Eong Ooi, Rebecca C. Harris, Clotilde El Guerche Seblain, Masoumeh Kisomi, and Nabila Shaikh. Durability of Vaccine-Induced and Natural Immunity Against COVID-19: A Narrative Review. *Infectious Diseases and Therapy*, 12(2):367–387, February 2023.

- [26] S. O Minka and F. H Minka. A tabulated summary of the evidence on humoral and cellular responses to the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron VOC, as well as vaccine efficacy against this variant. *Immunology Letters*, 243:38–43, March 2022.
- [27] E. John Wherry and Dan H. Barouch. T cell immunity to covid-19 vaccines. Science, 377(6608):821–822, 2022.
- [28] Gene H. Golub and John H. Welsch. Calculation of Gauss quadrature rules. Mathematics of Computation, 23(106):221–230, 1969.
- [29] Koen B. Pouwels, Emma Pritchard, Philippa C. Matthews, Nicole Stoesser, David W. Eyre, Karina-Doris Vihta, Thomas House, Jodie Hay, John I. Bell, John N. Newton, Jeremy Farrar, Derrick Crook, Duncan Cook, Emma Rourke, Ruth Studley, Tim E. A. Peto, Ian Diamond, and A. Sarah Walker. Effect of Delta variant on viral burden and vaccine effectiveness against new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the UK. *Nature Medicine*, 27(12):2127–2135, December 2021. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [30] David W. Eyre, Donald Taylor, Mark Purver, David Chapman, Tom Fowler, Koen B. Pouwels, A. Sarah Walker, and Tim EA Peto. The impact of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination on Alpha & Delta variant transmission. *medRxiv*, page 2021.09.28.21264260, October 2021.
- [31] R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2021.
- [32] Nick Golding. greta: simple and scalable statistical modelling in r. Journal of Open Source Software, 4(40):1601, 2019.
- [33] Alexandra B Hogan, Patrick Doohan, Sean L Wu, Daniela Olivera Mesa, Jaspreet Toor, Oliver J Watson, Peter Winskill, Giovanni Charles, Gregory Barnsley, Eleanor M Riley, et al. Estimating long-term vaccine effectiveness against sars-cov-2 variants: a model-based approach. *Nature Communications*, 14:4325, 2023.
- [34] Giorgia Vattiato, Audrey Lustig, Oliver J Maclaren, and Michael J Plank. Modelling the dynamics of infection, waning of immunity and re-infection with the omicron variant of sars-cov-2 in aotearoa new zealand. *Epidemics*, 41:100657, 2022.
- [35] Series of weekly COVID-19 epidemic situational assessment reports submitted to the Australian Government Department of Health Office of Health Protection from April 2020 to December 2023., December 2023.
- [36] Santenna Chenchula, Padmavathi Karunakaran, Sushil Sharma, and Madhavrao Chavan. Current evidence on efficacy of COVID-19 booster dose vaccination against the Omicron variant: A systematic review. Journal of Medical Virology, 94(7):2969–2976, 2022. _eprint: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jmv.27697.

- [37] Australian Government. National Plan to transition Australia's National COVID-19 Response. Technical report, 2021.
- [38] Laura Bergamaschi, Federica Mescia, Lorinda Turner, Aimee L. Hanson, Prasanti Kotagiri, Benjamin J. Dunmore, Hélène Ruffieux, Aloka De Sa, Oisín Huhn, Michael D. Morgan, Pehuén Pereyra Gerber, Mark R. Wills, Stephen Baker, Fernando J. Calero-Nieto, Rainer Doffinger, Gordon Dougan, Anne Elmer, Ian G. Goodfellow, Ravindra K. Gupta, Myra Hosmillo, Kelvin Hunter, Nathalie Kingston, Paul J. Lehner, Nicholas J. Matheson, Jeremy K. Nicholson, Anna M. Petrunkina, Sylvia Richardson, Caroline Saunders, James E. D. Thaventhiran, Erik J. M. Toonen, Michael P. Weekes, Cambridge Institute of Therapeutic Immunology and Infectious Disease-National Institute of Health Research (CITIID-NIHR) COVID BioResource Collaboration, Berthold Göttgens, Mark Toshner, Christoph Hess, John R. Bradley, Paul A. Lyons, and Kenneth G. C. Smith. Longitudinal analysis reveals that delayed bystander CD8+ T cell activation and early immune pathology distinguish severe COVID-19 from mild disease. *Immunity*, 54(6):1257–1275.e8, June 2021.
- [39] Yanchun Peng, Alexander J. Mentzer, Guihai Liu, Xuan Yao, Zixi Yin, Danning Dong, Wanwisa Dejnirattisai, Timothy Rostron, Piyada Supasa, Chang Liu, César López-Camacho, Jose Slon-Campos, Yuguang Zhao, David I. Stuart, Guido C. Paesen, Jonathan M. Grimes, Alfred A. Antson, Oliver W. Bayfield, Dorothy E. D. P. Hawkins, De-Sheng Ker, Beibei Wang, Lance Turtle, Krishanthi Subramaniam, Paul Thomson, Ping Zhang, Christina Dold, Jeremy Ratcliff, Peter Simmonds, Thushan de Silva, Paul Sopp, Dannielle Wellington, Ushani Rajapaksa, Yi-Ling Chen, Mariolina Salio, Giorgio Napolitani, Wayne Paes, Persephone Borrow, Benedikt M. Kessler, Jeremy W. Fry, Nikolai F. Schwabe, Malcolm G. Semple, J. Kenneth Baillie, Shona C. Moore, Peter J. M. Openshaw, M. Azim Ansari, Susanna Dunachie, Eleanor Barnes, John Frater, Georgina Kerr, Philip Goulder, Teresa Lockett, Robert Levin, Yonghong Zhang, Ronghua Jing, Ling-Pei Ho, Richard J. Cornall, Christopher P. Conlon, Paul Klenerman, Gavin R. Screaton, Juthathip Mongkolsapaya, Andrew McMichael, Julian C. Knight, Graham Ogg, and Tao Dong. Broad and strong memory CD4+ and CD8+ T cells induced by SARS-CoV-2 in UK convalescent individuals following COVID-19. Nature Immunology, 21(11):1336–1345, November 2020. Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [40] Hannah E. Davis, Lisa McCorkell, Julia Moore Vogel, and Eric J. Topol. Long COVID: major findings, mechanisms and recommendations. *Nature Reviews. Microbiology*, 21(3):133–146, 2023.