

1 **Strong humoral immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike after BNT162b2 mRNA**
2 **vaccination with a 16-week interval between doses**

3 Alexandra Tauzin^{1,2}, Shang Yu Gong^{1,3}, Guillaume Beaudoin-Bussi eres^{1,2}, Dani V ezina¹, Romain
4 Gasser^{1,2}, Lauriane Nault^{1,2}, Lorie Marchitto^{1,2}, Mehdi Benlarbi¹, Debashree Chatterjee¹, Manon
5 Nayrac^{1,2}, Annemarie Laumaea^{1,2}, J er emie Pr evost^{1,2}, Marianne Boutin^{1,2}, G er emy Sannier^{1,2},
6 Alexandre Nicolas^{1,2}, Catherine Bourassa¹, Gabrielle Gendron-Lepage¹, Halima Medjahed¹,
7 Guillaume Goyette¹, Yuxia Bo⁴, Jos e Perreault⁵, Laurie Gokool¹, Chantal Morrisseau¹, Pascale
8 Arlotto¹, Ren e Bazin⁵, Mathieu Dub e¹, Gaston De Serres⁶, Nicholas Brousseau⁶, Jonathan
9 Richard^{1,2}, Roberta Rovito⁷, Marceline C ot e⁴, C ecile Tremblay^{1,2}, Giulia C. Marchetti⁷, Ralf Duerr⁸,
10 Val erie Martel-Laferrierre^{1,2,*}, Daniel E. Kaufmann^{1,9,*}, and Andr es Finzi^{1,2,3,10,*}

11 ¹Centre de Recherche du CHUM, Montreal, QC, H2X 0A9 Canada

12 ²D epartement de Microbiologie, Infectiologie et Immunologie, Universit e de Montr al, Montreal, QC, H2X
13 0A9, Canada

14 ³Department of Microbiology and Immunology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, H3A 2B4, Canada

15 ⁴Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Immunology, and Center for Infection, Immunity, and
16 Inflammation, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON K1H 8M5, Canada

17 ⁵H ema-Qu ebec, Affaires M edicales et Innovation, Quebec, QC G1V 5C3, Canada

18 ⁶Institut National de Sant e Publique du Qu ebec, Quebec, QC, H2P 1E2, Canada

19 ⁷Clinic of Infectious Diseases, Department of Health Sciences, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, University of
20 Milan, Milan, Italy.

21 ⁸Department of Microbiology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, 10016, USA

22 ⁹D epartement de M edecine, Universit e de Montr al, Montreal, QC, H3T 1J4, Canada

23

24

25 ¹⁰Lead contact

26 *Correspondence: valerie.martel-laferrierre.med@ssss.gouv.qc.ca (V.M.L.),

27 daniel.kaufmann@umontreal.ca (D.E.K.), andres.finzi@umontreal.ca (A.F.)

28

29 Summary word count: **148**

30

31 Character count: **41931**

32 **SUMMARY**

33 While the standard regimen of the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine includes two doses
34 administered three weeks apart, some public health authorities decided to space them, raising
35 concerns about vaccine efficacy. Here, we analyzed longitudinal humoral responses including
36 antibody binding, Fc-mediated effector functions and neutralizing activity against the D614G strain
37 but also variants of concern and SARS-CoV-1 in a cohort of SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously
38 infected individuals, with an interval of sixteen weeks between the two doses. While the
39 administration of a second dose to previously infected individuals did not significantly improve
40 humoral responses, we observed a significant increase of humoral responses in naïve individuals
41 after the 16-weeks delayed second shot, achieving similar levels as in previously infected
42 individuals. We compared these responses to those elicited in individuals receiving a short (4-
43 weeks) dose interval. For the naïve donors, these responses were superior to those elicited by
44 the short dose interval.

45 **KEYWORDS:** Coronavirus, COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Spike glycoproteins, Delayed mRNA
46 vaccine regimen, Variants of concern, Variants of interest, Humoral responses, Neutralization,
47 ADCC

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Since the end of 2019, the etiological agent of the Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19),
50 the Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) has spread worldwide
51 causing the current pandemic (Dong et al., 2020; World Health Organization). In the last months,
52 several vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 have been approved in many countries, including the
53 Pfizer/BioNtech BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. This vaccine targets the highly immunogenic trimeric
54 Spike (S) glycoprotein that facilitates SARS-CoV-2 entry into host cells via its receptor-binding
55 domain (RBD) that interacts with angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE-2) (Hoffmann et al.,
56 2020; Walls et al., 2020) and has shown an important vaccine efficacy (Polack et al., 2020;
57 Skowronski and De Serres, 2021).

58 The approved BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine regimen comprises two doses administered 3-4
59 weeks apart (WHO, 2021). However, at the beginning of the vaccination campaign (Winter/Spring
60 2021) vaccine scarcity prompted some public health agencies to extend the interval between
61 doses in order to maximize the number of immunized individuals. This strategy was supported by
62 results indicating that a single dose affords ~90% protection starting two weeks post vaccination,
63 concomitant with the detection of some vaccine-elicited immune responses (Baden et al., 2021;
64 Pilishvili, 2021; Polack et al., 2020; Skowronski and De Serres, 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021).

65 The rapid emergence of several variants of concerns (VOCs) and variants of interest (VOIs),
66 which are more transmissible and in some cases more virulent (Allen et al., 2021; Brown et al.,
67 2021; Davies et al., 2021; Fisman and Tuite, 2021; Pearson et al., 2021) remains a major public
68 health preoccupation as the vaccine campaign advances worldwide. For example, the mutation
69 D614G in the S glycoprotein which appeared very early in the pandemic is now present in almost
70 all circulating strains (Isabel et al., 2020). The B.1.1.7 (Alpha) variant emerged in late 2020 in the
71 United Kingdom and due to its increased affinity for the ACE2 receptor that leads to increased
72 transmissibility (Davies et al., 2021), it became in just a few months a predominant strain

73 worldwide (Davies et al., 2021; Prévost et al., 2021; Rambaut et al., 2020). The B.1.351 (Beta)
74 and P.1 (Gamma) variants that first emerged in South Africa and Brazil respectively have largely
75 spread and are now circulating in many countries (ECDC, 2021; Tang et al., 2021). The B.1.526
76 (Iota) variant first identified in New York in early 2021 is in an upward trajectory in the United
77 States (Annavajhala et al., 2021). More recently, the B.1.617.2 (Delta) variant which emerged in
78 India and has a high transmissibility is now the dominant strain in several countries (Allen et al.,
79 2021; Dagpunar, 2021). Although several studies have shown that mRNA vaccines protect
80 against severe disease caused by these variants, it has also been shown that some of them
81 present resistance to some vaccine-elicited immune responses, notably against neutralizing
82 antibodies (Annavajhala et al., 2021; Goel et al., 2021a; Planas et al., 2021a; Puranik et al., 2021;
83 Wall et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021a). Most of these studies were based on the analysis of plasma
84 samples collected from vaccinees following a short (3-4 weeks) interval between doses. Little is
85 known about vaccine-elicited immune responses with longer dose intervals. Here, we
86 characterized vaccine-elicited humoral responses in a cohort of SARS-CoV-2 naïve and
87 previously infected individuals that received the two doses with an extended interval of sixteen
88 weeks.

89

90

91 RESULTS

92 We analyzed the longitudinal humoral responses after vaccination with the BNT162b2
93 mRNA vaccine in blood samples, with an interval of around 16 weeks between the two doses
94 (median [range]: 111 days [76–134 days]). The cohort included 26 SARS-CoV-2 naïve and 27
95 previously infected (PI) donors tested SARS-CoV-2 positive by nasopharyngeal swab PCR
96 around 9 months before their first dose (median [range]: 281 days [116–342 days]). In the cohort
97 of PI individuals, 12 donors did not receive the second injection, leaving 15 PI donors with two
98 doses. The blood samples were collected at different time points: prior the first dose of vaccine
99 (V0), three weeks (V1, median [range]: 20 days [13–28 days]) and three months (V2, median
100 [range]: 84 days [67–104 days]) after the first dose of vaccine, and three weeks (V3, median
101 [range]: 22 days [13–51 days]) and four months (V4, median [range]: 113 days [90–127 days])
102 after the second vaccine injection. Data collected at V0 and V1 have been previously described
103 (Tauzin et al., 2021). Basic demographic characteristics of the cohorts and detailed vaccination
104 timepoints are summarized in Table 1 and Figure 1A.

105

106 Elicitation of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies against the full Spike and its receptor-binding 107 domain

108 To evaluate vaccine responses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and PI individuals, we first
109 measured the presence of SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies (Abs) (IgG, IgM, IgA) recognizing the
110 receptor-binding domain (Figure 1B-E) using an ELISA RBD assay or the native full-length S
111 glycoprotein expressed at the cell surface (Figure S1A-D) using a cell-based ELISA assay. Both
112 assays have been previously described (Anand et al., 2021; Beaudoin-Bussi eres et al., 2020;
113 Pr evost et al., 2020). Prior to vaccination (V0), no SARS-CoV-2 specific Abs were detectable in
114 SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals, except for anti-Spike IgM (26.9% seropositivity) which are likely
115 to be cross-reactive antibodies against the S2 subunit (Fraley et al., 2021; Hicks et al., 2021; Ng

116 et al., 2020). SARS-CoV-2 PI individuals still had detectable Abs several months post-symptoms
117 onset, especially IgG, in agreement with previous observations (Anand et al., 2021; Dan et al.,
118 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2021b). For both groups, the first dose of vaccine induced
119 a significant increase of total immunoglobulins (Igs) recognizing the RBD or the Spike protein
120 three weeks post-vaccine (V1), with a significantly higher response for the PI group (Figure 1B-E
121 and S1A-D). At V2 (i.e., 12 weeks post vaccination), while anti-Spike total Ig levels remained
122 stable, we observed a decrease in anti-RBD total Ig levels in both groups, with the exception of
123 some naïve donors where we observed an increase. We did not detect Abs recognizing the N
124 protein for these donors (not shown), suggesting that they had not been infected between the two
125 doses. This increase could therefore be linked to a delayed response or affinity maturation of the
126 antibodies in the germinal center between V1 and V2. The second dose, which was administered
127 ~16 weeks after the first one, strongly boosted the induction of anti-RBD Igs in the SARS-CoV-2
128 naïve group, particularly IgG and IgA which reached higher levels (Figure 1D and E). For the PI
129 group, the second dose also led to an increase in the level of total anti-RBD Igs similar to that
130 achieved after the first dose. Of note, the second dose in the naïve group elicited anti-RBD IgG
131 levels that reached the same levels than in the PI group receiving one or two doses (Figure 1D).
132 However, four months after the second dose (V4), we observed a decrease in anti-RBD Igs that
133 was more important in the naïve group compared to the PI groups. Also, we noted that PI
134 individuals always had a higher level of anti-RBD IgA than naïve individuals at every time point
135 (Figure 1E). Similar patterns of responses were observed when we measured the level of Abs
136 recognizing the full-length S glycoprotein (Figure S1A-D).

137

138 **Recognition of SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants and other *Betacoronaviruses***

139 The BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine has been developed against the original Wuhan strain.
140 However, SARS-CoV-2 is evolving, and many variants have emerged and spread rapidly
141 worldwide. Some harbor specific mutations in S that are associated with increased transmissibility

142 and/or immune evasion (Davies et al., 2021; Sabino et al., 2021; Tegally et al., 2020; Volz et al.,
143 2021). Here, we evaluated the ability of Abs elicited by the Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine to recognize
144 different S proteins of VOCs (B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1 and B.1.612.2) and the VOI B.1.526 expressed
145 at the cell surface of 293T cells by flow cytometry, using a method we have previously described
146 (Figure 2, S2) (Gong et al., 2021; Prévost et al., 2020; Tauzin et al., 2021).

147 As expected, none of the SARS-CoV-2 naïve plasma samples collected at V0 were able
148 to recognize the SARS-CoV-2 S (D614G) or any of the variants tested here (B.1.1.7, B.1.351,
149 B.1.617.2, P.1, B.1.526) (Figure 2A-C and S2A). In contrast, plasma from PI individuals
150 recognized all tested SARS-CoV-2 variants at V0 (Figure 2A-C, S2A). The first dose of vaccine
151 strongly enhanced the recognition of the full D614G S and all the tested variants in both groups
152 (Figure 2A-C and S2B). Three months after the first dose, the recognition slightly decreased but
153 not significantly. As expected, the second dose strongly increased recognition of all VOC Spikes
154 in the naïve group and reached levels that were significantly higher than after the first dose. In
155 contrast, for the PI group, the second dose did not result in a better recognition than after the first
156 dose. Of note, we observed no significant differences at V3 between PI individuals who received
157 one or two doses, despite a shorter period since the last dose for PI individuals who received two
158 doses. The recognition of all VOCs was slightly lower at V3 by the naïve group compared to the
159 PI that received two doses (Figure 2A-C). When we compared Spike recognition between the
160 SARS-CoV-2 variants, we observed that plasma from PI individuals before vaccination
161 recognized less efficiently the different S variants compared to the D614G S (Figure S2A). After
162 the first and second dose, only B.1.351 and B.1.617.2 S were less efficiently recognized by
163 plasmas from PI individuals (Figure S2B-D). For naïve individuals, even if the vaccination strongly
164 increased the recognition of every VOC Spike tested, we observed that plasmas recognized the
165 different SARS-CoV-2 variants less efficiently compared to D614G S except for the B.1.1.7 S after
166 the second dose (Figure S2). As observed for the level of anti-RBD Igs, (Figure 1), while the

167 recognition of the different SARS-CoV-2 Spikes at V4 (i.e., 4 months after the second dose)
168 remained stable in the PI group, it decreased in the naïve group at V4 (Figure 2A-C).

169 We also evaluated whether vaccination elicited Abs that were able to recognize S
170 glycoproteins from endemic human *Betacoronaviruses*, (HCoV-HKU1). Interestingly, we
171 observed that the first but not the second dose enhanced the recognition of HCoV-HKU1 S in the
172 naïve group (Figure 2D). Moreover, we observed that plasma from PI donors better recognized
173 HCoV-HKU1 S than plasma from naïve donors at every time point studied, suggesting that natural
174 infection induced cross reactive Abs more efficiently than vaccination.

175 We then evaluated the capacity of the different plasma samples to bind S from another
176 highly pathogenic human coronavirus (SARS-CoV-1). We observed that plasma from PI
177 individuals had Abs able to recognize to some extent SARS-CoV-1 S (Figure 2E). This is likely
178 related the close genetic relationship between SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV-1 (Rabaan et al.,
179 2020; Sarkar et al., 2021). As previously observed (Tauzin et al., 2021), both vaccine doses
180 significantly increased the level of recognition of the SARS-CoV-1 Spike in the naïve group
181 (Figure 2E). In the PI group, only the first dose significantly improved the recognition. We note
182 that the long interval between doses brings SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals to recognize the
183 different variant Spikes and related HCoV to the same extent than previously-infected individuals
184 shortly after the second dose (V3) but followed by a decline to significantly lower levels than PI
185 individuals at V4.

186

187 **Functional activities of vaccine-elicited antibodies**

188 We (Tauzin et al., 2021) and others (Collier et al., 2021; Goel et al., 2021b; Planas et al.,
189 2021b; Sahin et al., 2020) reported that three weeks post first Pfizer/BioNTech dose, SARS-CoV-
190 2 S specific Abs with weak neutralizing properties are elicited. Nevertheless, these Abs present
191 robust Fc-mediated effector functions as measured by their capacity to mediate antibody-

192 dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC) (Tauzin et al., 2021). To obtain a better understanding of
193 this functional property over time, we tested all plasma samples with our previously reported
194 ADCC assay (Anand et al., 2021; Beaudoin-Bussieres et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021; Ullah et
195 al., 2021). As expected, and in agreement with the absence of SARS-CoV-2 S specific Abs at
196 baseline, no ADCC activity was observed for the naïve group before vaccination (Figure 3A).
197 Plasma from the PI group maintained some levels of ADCC activity before vaccination, in
198 agreement with a longitudinal study following immune responses in convalescent donors (Anand
199 et al., 2021). Three weeks after the first dose, ADCC activity was elicited in both groups, but was
200 significantly higher in the PI group. A decline in ADCC responses was observed in both groups
201 nine weeks after V1 (V2, i.e., 12 weeks post vaccination). The second dose strongly boosted
202 ADCC activity in the naïve group but remained stable for the PI groups. In agreement with the
203 recognition of different hCoV Spikes presented in Figure 2, the capacity of PI to mediate ADCC
204 remained relatively stable at V4 but significantly declined for naïve individuals. We note that the
205 levels of ADCC activity were significantly higher in the PI group at all timepoints (Figure 3A).

206 Neutralizing activity in plasma is thought to play an important role in vaccine efficacy
207 (Jackson et al., 2020; Muruato et al., 2020; Polack et al., 2020). Accordingly, it has been recently
208 identified as an immune-correlate of protection in the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy trial
209 (Gilbert et al., 2021). To evaluate the vaccine neutralizing response over time, we measured the
210 capacity of plasma samples to neutralize pseudoviral particles carrying the SARS-CoV-2 S
211 D614G glycoprotein (Figure 3B). We did not detect a significant increase in neutralization in
212 plasma isolated three weeks post vaccination of the naïve group, as previously described (Tauzin
213 et al., 2021). Interestingly, nine weeks later (V2, i.e., 12 weeks post vaccination), we observed
214 increased neutralizing activity in a few donors (Figure 3B). All donors presented a significant
215 increase in neutralizing activity three weeks after the second dose. Importantly, the level of
216 neutralizing activity of double vaccinated naïve individuals reached the same levels than in the PI
217 group after one or two doses. In this latter group (PI), we measured low neutralizing activity before

218 vaccination, consistent with remaining neutralizing activity in convalescent donors after several
219 months post symptoms onset (Anand et al., 2021; Gaebler et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021). As
220 previously described, the first dose strongly increased neutralization activity (Stamatatos et al.,
221 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021), but this activity significantly decreased a few weeks after (V2, i.e., 12
222 weeks post vaccination). The second dose boosted the neutralizing activity to the levels reached
223 three weeks after the first dose. No difference in neutralization was observed between V1 and V3
224 for PI individuals. In contrast, in naïve individuals we observed a significantly higher neutralizing
225 activity after the second dose compared to the first one (Figure 3B). Thus, while one dose is
226 required to reach maximum neutralization activity in PI individuals, this activity decays over time
227 and a second dose is required to bring back its maximum potential. On the other hand, naïve
228 individuals requires both doses to achieve the same level of PI vaccinated individuals three weeks
229 after the second dose. However, the neutralizing activity declined more rapidly in the naïve group
230 compared to PI individuals. Again, we observed no differences between PI that received one or
231 two doses.

232

233 **Neutralizing activity against variants of concern**

234 SARS-CoV-2 is evolving, and variants of concern are emerging globally (Davies et al.,
235 2021; Prévost and Finzi, 2021; Sabino et al., 2021; Tegally et al., 2020; Volz et al., 2021). To
236 evaluate whether the long interval between the two doses impacted the capacity of vaccine-
237 elicited antibodies to neutralize VOCs and VOI, we measured the neutralizing activity against
238 pseudoviral particles bearing selected variant Spikes (Figure S3). For all the variants tested, we
239 observed a similar pattern than for the D614G S, with neutralizing Abs mainly induced after the
240 second dose in the naïve group (Figure S3A-E). Previously-infected individuals followed a
241 different pattern. While their plasma had some levels of neutralizing activity at baseline, it gained
242 potency and breadth after the first dose. A second dose did not further enhance this activity.

243 We also noted that, with the exception of B.1.1.7, plasma from the PI group prior to
244 vaccination (V0) neutralized less efficiently all pseudoviral particles bearing variant Spikes
245 compared to the D614G (Figure S3A). Importantly, both doses boosted the neutralizing activity
246 against all variants and SARS-CoV-1 Spike at V3 (Figure S2D). As observed with the D614G S,
247 the neutralizing activity decreased at V4 for all VOCs tested (Figure S3E).

248 Vaccination of PI individuals was shown to increase neutralization against pseudoviral
249 particles bearing the SARS-CoV-1 Spike (Stamatatos et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021). This Spike
250 is used as a representative variant that is even more dissimilar to the vaccine, which was based
251 on the ancestral Wuhan strain. While only one dose was sufficient to provide SARS-CoV-1
252 neutralizing capacity in PI individuals, two were required in naïve individuals. Three weeks after
253 the second dose (V3), plasma from naïve individuals reached the same level of neutralizing
254 activity against pseudoviral particles bearing the SARS-CoV-1 Spike than PI. Thus, suggesting
255 that the delayed boosting in naïve individuals allows antibody maturation resulting in enhanced
256 breath (Figure S3).

257

258 **RBD avidity of vaccine-elicited antibodies**

259 To gather evidence of vaccine-elicited antibodies maturation over time, we longitudinally followed
260 RBD avidity. Briefly, we modified our ELISA assay by adding a chaotropic agent (8 M urea) to the
261 washing buffer, as reported (Björkman et al., 1999; Fialová et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2019). By
262 performing the ELISA assay in parallel, with washing steps having or not urea (see STAR Methods
263 for details), we established an RBD avidity index (Figures 4 and S4) , which provides an overall
264 idea of the accumulated strength of vaccine-elicited antibodies affinities over time (Rudnick and
265 Adams, 2009). For PI individuals, we observed that the first dose significantly increased the RBD
266 avidity index. The second dose did not further improve the avidity. We observed no significant
267 differences between PI donors who received one or two doses at V3 and V4. No RBD avidity

268 index could be established at V0 for naïve individuals since they don't have anti-RBD antibodies.
269 However, the first dose elicited anti-RBD antibodies with a low RBD avidity index as compared to
270 the PI group. Remarkably, the second dose increased RBD avidity to the same level than for PI
271 individuals at V3 and remained relatively constant over time (V4, Figure 4).

272

273 **Humoral responses in individuals receiving a short dose interval regimen**

274 We also analyzed the humoral responses of 12 SARS-CoV-2 naïve donors from a
275 separate cohort who received their two doses of Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA vaccine four weeks apart
276 (median [range]: 30 days [22–34 days]) (Table 1 and Figure 5A). For these donors, blood samples
277 were only collected at V3, three weeks (median [range]: 24 days [12–37 days]) after the first dose,
278 allowing a direct side-by-side comparison of humoral responses at V3 with our cohort of naïve
279 individuals that received the two doses 16 weeks apart (Figure 1A and 5A). Naïve individuals that
280 received the long interval regimen had more anti-RBD IgG (Figure 5B) and presented a
281 significantly higher RBD-avidity index (Figure 5C) than naïve donors who received their two doses
282 4 weeks apart. We also observed major differences related to their capacity to recognize the full
283 Spike of different variants. Plasma from short interval vaccinated individuals was significantly less
284 efficient at recognizing the D614G S and all other S variants tested, except for the B.1.526 S
285 (Figure 5D). Their capacity to mediate ADCC was also lower, albeit didn't reach statistical
286 significance (Figure 5E). Remarkably, the neutralization of pseudoviral particles bearing D614G
287 or almost all the variant Spike tested was significantly lower for individuals that received the two
288 doses with a short interval (Figure 5F). No neutralizing activity against SARS-CoV-1 was
289 observed after a short interval (Figure 5F). In contrast, plasmas from naïve individual who
290 received their two doses sixteen weeks apart presented a strong neutralizing activity against all
291 the SARS-CoV-2 variants but also the SARS-CoV-1 pseudoviruses (Figure 5F).

292

293

294 **Integrated analysis of vaccine responses elicited with a sixteen-weeks interval between**
295 **doses**

296 When studying the network of pairwise correlations among all studied immune variables
297 in SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals (Figure 6A), we observed a sparsely interconnected network
298 after the first vaccine dose with focused clusters among binding and neutralization responses,
299 respectively. Over time, the network induced upon the 1st vaccination slightly collapsed until the
300 delayed 2nd vaccination triggered a dense network of positive correlations involving binding, RBD
301 avidity, neutralization responses against several SARS-CoV-2 variants and SARS-CoV-1, ADCC,
302 and memory B cell responses. Importantly, this network remained associated 4 months after the
303 second dose. As expected, for PIs individuals we observed an integrated network at baseline (i.e.,
304 before vaccination). Natural infection critically primes the quality of anti-SARS-CoV-2 humoral
305 responses in infected hosts, and successive vaccination seems to increase certain titers (Figures
306 1-4) but does not essentially change the quality/relatedness of the induced responses.
307 Associations remained relatively stable across all timepoints (Figure 6B).

308

309

310

311 **DISCUSSION**

312 The approved regimen of the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine is the administration of two doses
313 within a short interval of 3-4 weeks. Despite the rapid approval of different vaccine platforms,
314 generating the required doses to immunize the world population represents a daunting task
315 (Moore and Klasse, 2020). Confronted to vaccine scarcity, some jurisdictions decided to increase
316 the interval between doses in order to increase the number of immunized individuals. This
317 decision led to concerns about vaccine efficacy, notably against emergent variants rapidly
318 spreading worldwide and more resistant notably against neutralizing Abs induced by vaccination
319 (Annavajhala et al., 2021; Planas et al., 2021a; Puranik et al., 2021; Wall et al., 2021; Wang et
320 al., 2021a). Here, we measured the humoral responses of SARS-CoV-2 naïve and SARS-CoV-2
321 PI individuals who received their two doses sixteen weeks apart.

322 We observed that in the SARS-CoV-2 naïve group the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine elicited
323 antibodies with weak avidity for the RBD and neutralizing activity but strong Fc-mediated functions
324 three weeks after the first dose (Tauzin et al., 2021). These functional responses declined in the
325 following weeks in the absence of a boost. This is consistent with an overall decline in the anti-
326 RBD and anti-Spike antibodies before the delayed boost. However, our results support antibody
327 maturation during this same period with a significant increase in RBD avidity. Administration of
328 the second dose sixteen weeks later strongly enhanced antibody levels but also functional
329 responses, notably neutralization against some VOCs/VOIs and even the divergent SARS-CoV-
330 1. Therefore, despite initial concerns, the long interval between the doses did not result in poor
331 immune responses, A limitation of our study is the relatively low number of individuals analyzed
332 however, we note that our results are in agreement with recent findings (Parry et al., 2021; Payne
333 et al., 2021). Our results further support the conclusions of a recent study suggesting that
334 extending the interval between first and second doses may have optimized booster dose
335 protection in Canada (Skowronski et al., 2021). The idea behind the strategy of delaying the

336 second dose was to provide some level of immunity to a larger number of individuals than if the
337 second dose would have been saved to administer them three weeks later. However, despite the
338 immunological benefits of increasing the interval between the two doses, this also increases the
339 probability of being infected before the boost.

340 Several studies have shown that vaccination of previously-infected individuals elicits
341 strong cellular and humoral responses (Efrati et al., 2021; Lozano-Ojalvo et al., 2021; Stamatatos
342 et al., 2021; Tauzin et al., 2021; Urbanowicz et al., 2021). In agreement with these studies, we
343 found that vaccination of these individuals resulted in the induction of strong humoral responses.
344 These responses remained relatively stable over time. We noticed that the second dose did not
345 result in a significant enhancement of these responses, even with a long interval of 16 weeks
346 between doses. Our results demonstrate that, while the second dose boosts the humoral
347 response, PI individuals reach their peak of immunity after the first dose and these responses
348 remained relatively stable for at least 8 months. Altogether, these results suggest that a second
349 dose for PI individuals might be delayed beyond sixteen weeks after the first dose. These
350 observations are in agreement with recent studies showing that PI individuals had maximal
351 humoral and CD4+ and CD8+ T cell responses after the first dose of an mRNA vaccine; the
352 second did not strongly boost these responses (Goel et al., 2021a; Lozano-Ojalvo et al., 2021;
353 Painter et al., 2021).

354 In contrast, here we show that a delayed second vaccine boost in naïve individuals
355 significantly enhances several immune responses and tightens the network of linear correlations
356 among those. The involved immune variables were humoral and cellular responses directed
357 against SARS-CoV-2, including diverse variants, and SARS-CoV-1, but not or marginally against
358 HCoV-HKU1. Thus, the potency, quality, and concerted triggering of immune responses appear
359 enhanced in naïve individuals vaccinated with a prolonged interval of 16 weeks between first and
360 second shot. Shortly after the boost, these responses were comparable to those obtained after

361 vaccination of previously infected individuals. However, these responses declined more rapidly in
362 naïve individuals than in PI individuals, suggesting the natural infection associated with
363 vaccination leads to a longer immunity.

364

365 We also analyzed humoral responses in a cohort of naïve donors who received their two
366 doses according to the approved short three-four-week interval. Plasma collected three weeks
367 post second dose, had significantly lower humoral activities notably neutralizing activity against
368 D614G strain and some VOCs/VOIs compared to naïve donors receiving the long interval. These
369 results are in agreement with recent studies showing that increasing the interval between the two
370 doses led to significant higher immune responses and vaccine effectiveness (Payne et al., 2021;
371 Skowronski et al., 2021). Importantly, we observed a significant difference in the RBD avidity of
372 the IgG, suggesting that increasing the time between the two doses facilitates antibody
373 maturation, consistent with a better maturation of B cells in the germinal center (Kim et al., 2021).

374

375 Field effectiveness studies in Israël and the USA, where a short interval between doses is
376 recommended, suggest waning protection of the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine series against non-
377 severe disease after a period of approximately 5 months (CDC, 2021; Goldberg et al., 2021; JCVI,
378 2021; Tartof et al., 2021). However, SARS-CoV-2 specific memory B cell and CD4+ T cell
379 responses remains stable for the following 6 months, likely protecting from severe disease (Goel
380 et al., 2021a). It will be of critical importance to monitor immune responses and vaccine
381 effectiveness of extended vaccine schedules over time. If the strong humoral response seen with
382 this extended schedule is longer-lasting than immune responses following the authorized
383 schedule, the need of a third dose might be delayed and this could have significant implications
384 regarding control of COVID-19.

385

386 To end this pandemic, it will be necessary to rapidly vaccinate the world's population,
387 including in countries where vaccines are poorly available. The research community around the
388 globe rapidly generated a wealth of data related to vaccine-elicited immune responses and
389 vaccine efficacy. Globally, these results suggest that the current vaccine strategy that was initially
390 deployed could be improved. Our results suggest that modifying the interval at which the two
391 doses are administered might be an important factor to take into account. It will be important to
392 keep in mind that a fine balance needs to be achieved in order to avoid infection between the two
393 doses and at the same time provide sufficient time to elicit optimal humoral responses.

394

395

396 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

397 The authors are grateful to the donors who participated in this study. The authors thank
398 the CRCHUM BSL3 and Flow Cytometry Platforms for technical assistance. We thank Dr. Stefan
399 Pöhlmann (Georg-August University, Germany) for the plasmid coding for SARS-CoV-2 and
400 SARS-CoV-1 S glycoproteins and Dr. M. Gordon Joyce (U.S. MHRP) for the monoclonal antibody
401 CR3022. We also thank Amélie Boivin and Yves Grégoire at Héma-Québec for helping to access
402 the samples from the PLASCOV Biobank and all the plasma donors who participate in this
403 biobank. Plasma Donor Biobank at Hema-Quebec was supported by funding from the Public
404 Health Agency of Canada, through the Vaccine Surveillance Reference group and the COVID-19
405 Immunity Task Force. The views expressed here do not necessarily reflect those of the Public
406 Health Agency of Canada. The graphical abstract was prepared using images
407 from [BioRender.com](https://www.biorender.com/). This work was supported by le Ministère de l'Économie et de l'Innovation
408 du Québec, Programme de soutien aux organismes de recherche et d'innovation to A.F. and by
409 the Fondation du CHUM. This work was also supported by a CIHR foundation grant #352417, by
410 a CIHR operating Pandemic and Health Emergencies Research grant #177958, a CIHR stream
411 1 and 2 for SARS-CoV-2 Variant Research to A.F., and by an Exceptional Fund COVID-19 from
412 the Canada Foundation for Innovation (CFI) #41027 to A.F. and D.E.K. Work on variants
413 presented was also supported by the Sentinelle COVID Quebec network led by the LSPQ in
414 collaboration with Fonds de Recherche du Québec Santé (FRQS) to A.F. This work was also
415 partially supported by a CIHR COVID-19 rapid response grant (OV3 170632) and CIHR stream 1
416 SARS-CoV-2 Variant Research to MC. A.F. is the recipient of Canada Research Chair on
417 Retroviral Entry no. RCHS0235 950-232424. MC is a Tier II Canada Research Chair in Molecular
418 Virology and Antiviral Therapeutics. V.M.L. is supported by a FRQS Junior 1 salary award. D.E.K.
419 is a FRQS Merit Research Scholar. G.B.B. is the recipient of a FRQS PhD fellowship and J.P. is
420 the recipient of a CIHR PhD fellowship. G.S. is supported by a scholarship from the Department

421 of Microbiologie, Infectiologie et Immunology of Université de Montréal. R.G. and A.L. were
422 supported by MITACS Accélération postdoctoral fellowships. The funders had no role in study
423 design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. We
424 declare no competing interests.

425

426 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS**

427 A.T. and A.F. conceived the study. A.T., G.B.B., R.G., J.Prévost, M.N., J.R., D.E.K., and
428 A.F. designed experimental approaches. A.T., S.Y.G., G.B.B., D.V., R.G., L.N., L.M., M.Benlarbi,
429 D.C., M.N., A.L., J.Prévost, M.Boutin, G.S., A.N., C.B., Y.B., M.D., D.E.K., and A.F. performed,
430 analyzed, and interpreted the experiments. A.T. and R.D. performed statistical analysis. S.Y.G.,
431 G.B.B., A.L., J.Prévost, G.G.L., H.M., G.G., Y.B., J.R., M.C and A.F. contributed unique reagents.
432 J.Perreault, L.G., C.M., P.A., R.B., R.R., G.C.M., C.T. and V.M.-L. collected and provided clinical
433 samples. G.D.S., and N.B. provided scientific input related to VOC and vaccine efficacy. A.T., and
434 A.F. wrote the manuscript with inputs from others. Every author has read, edited, and approved
435 the final manuscript.

436

437 **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

438 The authors declare no competing interests.

439

440 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

441 **Figure 1. Elicitation of RBD-specific antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously-**
442 **infected individuals.**

443 (A) SARS-CoV-2 vaccine cohort design. (B-E) Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating
444 plasma samples from naïve and PI donors collected at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 with recombinant
445 SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated (B) anti-
446 human IgM+IgG+IgA (C) anti-human IgM, (D) anti-human IgG, or (E) anti-human IgA. Relative
447 light unit (RLU) values obtained with BSA (negative control) were subtracted and further
448 normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. Naïve
449 and PI donors with a long interval between the two doses are represented by red and black points
450 respectively and PI donors who received just one dose by blue points. (Left panels) Each curve
451 represents the normalized RLUs obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean
452 of each group is represented by a bold line. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by
453 black triangles. (Right panels) Plasma samples were grouped in different time points (V0, V1,
454 V2, V3 and V4). Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection
455 are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P <
456 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

457

458 **Figure 2. Binding of vaccine-elicited antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants and other**
459 ***Betacoronaviruses*.**

460 293T cells were transfected with the indicated full-length S from different SARS-CoV-2 variants
461 and other human *Betacoronavirus* Spikes and stained with the CV3-25 Ab or with plasma from
462 naïve or PI donors collected at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 and analyzed by flow cytometry. The values
463 represent the median fluorescence intensities (MFI) (D) or the MFI normalized by CV3-25 Ab

464 binding (**A-C, E**). Naïve and PI donors with a long interval between the two doses are represented
465 by red and black points respectively and PI donors who received just one dose by blue points.
466 (**Left panels**) Each curve represents the MFI or the normalized MFIs obtained with the plasma of
467 one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. The time of
468 vaccine dose injections is indicated by black triangles. (**Right panels**) Plasma samples were
469 grouped in different time points (V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4). Undetectable measures are represented
470 as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* P <
471 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

472

473 **Figure 3. Fc-effector function and neutralization activities in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and**
474 **previously-infected individuals before and after Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA vaccine.**

475 (**A**) CEM.NKr parental cells were mixed at a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr-Spike cells and were used
476 as target cells. PBMCs from uninfected donors were used as effector cells in a FACS-based
477 ADCC assay. (**B**) Neutralizing activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing SARS-
478 CoV-2 S glycoproteins, with serial dilutions of plasma for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-ACE2
479 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID₅₀) values were determined using a
480 normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. Naïve and PI donors with a
481 long interval between the two doses are represented by red and black points respectively and PI
482 donors who received just one dose by blue points. (**Left panels**) Each curve represents the values
483 obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by
484 a bold line. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by black triangles. (**Right panels**)
485 Plasma samples were grouped in different time points (V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4). Undetectable
486 measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars
487 indicate means \pm SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

488

489

490 **Figure 4. RBD avidity of vaccine-elicited antibodies.**

491 Indirect ELISA and stringent ELISA were performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve
492 and PI donors collected at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein.
493 Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit
494 (RLU) values obtained were normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb
495 present in each plate. The RBD avidity index corresponded to the value obtained with the stringent
496 (8M urea) ELISA divided by that obtained with the ELISA. Naïve and PI donors with a long interval
497 between the two doses are represented by red and black points respectively and PI donors who
498 received just one dose by blue points. **(Left panels)** Each curve represents the values obtained
499 with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold
500 line. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by black triangles. **(Right panels)** Plasma
501 samples were grouped in different time points (V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4). Undetectable measures
502 are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means
503 \pm SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

504

505 **Figure 5. Humoral responses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals that received a short dose**
506 **versus a long dose interval.**

507 **(A)** SARS-CoV-2 vaccine cohort design. **(B)** Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating plasma
508 samples from naïve donors collected at V3 with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-
509 RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit (RLU)
510 values obtained with BSA (negative control) were subtracted and further normalized to the signal
511 obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. **(C)** Indirect ELISA and stringent

512 ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve donors collected at V3 with
513 recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-
514 conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit (RLU) values obtained were normalized to the
515 signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. RBD avidity index
516 corresponded to the value obtained with the stringent ELISA divided by that obtained with the
517 ELISA. **(D)** 293T cells were transfected with the indicated full-length S and stained with the CV3-
518 25 Ab or with plasma from naïve donors collected at V3 and analyzed by flow cytometry. The
519 values represent the MFI normalized by CV3-25 Ab binding. **(E)** CEM.NKr parental cells were
520 mixed at a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr-Spike cells and were used as target cells. PBMCs from
521 uninfected donors were used as effector cells in a FACS-based ADCC assay. **(F)** Neutralizing
522 activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing SARS-CoV-2 S glycoproteins or
523 SARS-CoV-1 S glycoprotein, with serial dilutions of plasma for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-
524 ACE2 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID₅₀) values were determined
525 using a normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. Naïve donors
526 vaccinated with a short or a long interval between the two doses are represented by yellow or red
527 points respectively. Plasma samples were grouped at V3. Undetectable measures are
528 represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means ±
529 SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

530

531 **Figure 6. Mesh correlations of humoral response parameters in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and**
532 **previously-infected individuals before and after Pfizer/BioNTech mRNA vaccine.**

533 Edge bundling correlation plots where red and blue edges represent positive and negative
534 correlations between connected parameters, respectively. Only significant correlations (p < 0.05,
535 Spearman rank test) are displayed. Nodes are color coded based on the grouping of parameters
536 according to the legend. Node size corresponds to the degree of relatedness of correlations. Edge

537 bundling plots are shown for correlation analyses using ten different datasets; i.e., SARS-CoV-2
538 naive (**A**) or previously infected (**B**) individuals at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 respectively.

539

540

541

Table 1. Characteristics of the vaccinated SARS-CoV-2 cohorts

		SARS-CoV-2 Naïve		SARS-CoV-2 Previously infected		
		Two doses Short interval (n=12)	Two doses Long interval (n=26)	Two doses Long interval (n=15)	One dose (n=12)	Entire cohort (n=27)
Age		45 (24-60)	50 (21-62)	47 (29-65)	51 (21-65)	48 (21-65)
Gender	Male (n)	8	11	10	4	14
	Female (n)	4	15	5	8	13
Days between symptom onset and the 1 st dose ^a		N/A	N/A	274 (166-321)	288 (116-342)	281 (116-342)
Days between the 1 st and 2 nd dose ^a		30 (22-34)	111 (76-120)	110 (90-134)	N/A	N/A
Days between V0 and the 1 st dose ^a		N/A	1 (0-86)	24 (0-95)	18 (1-117)	23 (0-117)
Days between the 1 st dose and V1 ^a		N/A	21 (16-28)	20 (17-25)	20 (13-21)	20 (13-25)
Days between the 1 st dose and V2 ^a		N/A	83 (67-92)	89 (82-104)	90 (80-104)	89 (80-104)
Days between V2 and the 2 nd dose ^a		N/A	28 (9-38)	23 (2-42)	N/A	N/A
Days between the 1 st dose and V3 ^a		54 (41-65)	133 (102-144)	138 (103-161)	132 (120-146)	136 (103-161)
Days between the 2 nd dose and V3 ^a		24 (12-37)	21 (14-34)	22 (13-51)	N/A	N/A
Days between the 1 st dose and V4 ^a		N/A	224 (215-237)	225 (215-248)	231 (222-248)	225 (215-248)
Days between the 2 nd dose and V4 ^a		N/A	112 (103-125)	113 (90-127)	N/A	N/A

542

543 ^a Values displayed are medians, with ranges in parentheses.

544 **STAR METHODS**

545

546 **RESOURCE AVAILABILITY**

547

548 **Lead contact**

549 Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be

550 fulfilled by the lead contact, Andrés Finzi (andres.finzi@umontreal.ca)

551

552 **Materials availability**

553 All unique reagents generated during this study are available from the Lead contact without
554 restriction.

555

556 **Data and code availability**

557 The published article includes all datasets generated and analyzed for this study. Further

558 information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by

559 the Lead Contact Author (andres.finzi@umontreal.ca).

560

561 **EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS**

562

563 **Ethics Statement**

564 All work was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki in terms of informed
565 consent and approval by an appropriate institutional board. Blood samples were obtained from

566 donors who consented to participate in this research project at CHUM (19.381) and from plasma

567 donors who consented to participate in the Plasma Donor Biobank at Hema-Quebec (PLASCOV;

568 REB-B-6-002-2021-003). Plasma and PBMCs were isolated by centrifugation and Ficoll gradient,

569 and samples stored at -80°C and in liquid nitrogen, respectively, until use.

570 **Human subjects**

571 No specific criteria such as number of patients (sample size), clinical or demographic were used
572 for inclusion, beyond PCR confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection in adults.

573

574 **Plasma and antibodies**

575 Plasma from SARS-CoV-2 naïve and PI donors were collected, heat-inactivated for 1 hour at
576 56°C and stored at -80°C until ready to use in subsequent experiments. Plasma from uninfected
577 donors collected before the pandemic were used as negative controls and used to calculate the
578 seropositivity threshold in our ELISA, cell-based ELISA, ADCC and flow cytometry assays (see
579 below). The RBD-specific monoclonal antibody CR3022 was used as a positive control in our
580 ELISA, cell-based ELISA, and flow cytometry assays and was previously described (Anand et al.,
581 2020; Beaudoin-Bussi eres et al., 2020; Meulen et al., 2006; Pr evost et al., 2020). Horseradish
582 peroxidase (HRP)-conjugated Abs able to detect all Ig isotypes (anti-human IgM+IgG+IgA;
583 Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) or specific for the Fc region of human IgG (Invitrogen),
584 the Fc region of human IgM (Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) or the Fc region of human
585 IgA (Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) were used as secondary Abs to detect Ab binding
586 in ELISA and cell-based ELISA experiments. Alexa Fluor-647-conjugated goat anti-human Abs
587 able to detect all Ig isotypes (anti-human IgM+IgG+IgA; Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories)
588 were used as secondary Ab to detect plasma binding in flow cytometry experiments.

589

590 **Cell lines**

591 293T human embryonic kidney and HOS cells (obtained from ATCC) were maintained at 37°C
592 under 5% CO₂ in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) (Wisent) containing 5% fetal
593 bovine serum (FBS) (VWR) and 100 µg/ml of penicillin-streptomycin (Wisent). CEM.NKr CCR5+
594 cells (NIH AIDS reagent program) were maintained at 37°C under 5% CO₂ in Roswell Park
595 Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 medium (Gibco) containing 10% FBS and 100 µg/ml of penicillin-

596 streptomycin. 293T-ACE2 cell line was previously reported (Prévost et al., 2020). HOS and
597 CEM.NKr CCR5+ cells stably expressing the SARS-CoV-2 S glycoproteins were previously
598 reported (Anand et al., 2021).

599

600 **METHOD DETAILS**

601 **Plasmids**

602 The plasmids expressing the human coronavirus Spike glycoproteins of SARS-CoV-2, SARS-
603 CoV-1 (Hoffmann et al., 2013, 2020), HCoV-OC43 (Prévost et al., 2020) and MERS-CoV (Park
604 et al., 2016) were previously reported. The HCoV-HKU1 S expressing plasmid was purchased
605 from Sino Biological. The plasmids encoding the different SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants (D614G,
606 B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1, B.1.526 and B.1.617.2) were previously described (Beaudoin-Bussi eres et
607 al., 2020; Gong et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021; Tausin et al., 2021).

608

609 **Protein expression and purification**

610 FreeStyle 293F cells (Invitrogen) were grown in FreeStyle 293F medium (Invitrogen) to a density
611 of 1×10^6 cells/mL at 37°C with 8 % CO₂ with regular agitation (150 rpm). Cells were transfected
612 with a plasmid coding for SARS-CoV-2 S RBD (Beaudoin-Bussi eres et al., 2020) using
613 ExpiFectamine 293 transfection reagent, as directed by the manufacturer (Invitrogen). One week
614 later, cells were pelleted and discarded. Supernatants were filtered using a 0.22 µm filter (Thermo
615 Fisher Scientific). The recombinant RBD proteins were purified by nickel affinity columns, as
616 directed by the manufacturer (Invitrogen). The RBD preparations were dialyzed against
617 phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and stored in aliquots at -80°C until further use. To assess
618 purity, recombinant proteins were loaded on SDS-PAGE gels and stained with Coomassie Blue.

619

620 **Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) and RBD avidity index**

621 The SARS-CoV-2 RBD ELISA assay used was previously described (Beaudoin-Bussi eres et al.,
622 2020; Pr evost et al., 2020). Briefly, recombinant SARS-CoV-2 S RBD proteins (2.5 µg/ml), or
623 bovine serum albumin (BSA) (2.5 µg/ml) as a negative control, were prepared in PBS and were
624 adsorbed to plates (MaxiSorp Nunc) overnight at 4°C. Coated wells were subsequently blocked
625 with blocking buffer (Tris-buffered saline [TBS] containing 0.1% Tween20 and 2% BSA) for 1h at
626 room temperature. Wells were then washed four times with washing buffer (Tris-buffered saline
627 [TBS] containing 0.1% Tween20). CR3022 mAb (50 ng/ml) or a 1/250 dilution of plasma were
628 prepared in a diluted solution of blocking buffer (0.1 % BSA) and incubated with the RBD-coated
629 wells for 90 minutes at room temperature. Plates were washed four times with washing buffer
630 followed by incubation with secondary Abs (diluted in a diluted solution of blocking buffer (0.4%
631 BSA)) for 1h at room temperature, followed by four washes. To calculate the RBD-avidity index,
632 we performed a stringent ELISA, where the plates were washed with a chaotropic agent, 8M of
633 urea, added of the washing buffer. HRP enzyme activity was determined after the addition of a
634 1:1 mix of Western Lightning oxidizing and luminol reagents (Perkin Elmer Life Sciences). Light
635 emission was measured with a LB942 TriStar luminometer (Berthold Technologies). Signal
636 obtained with BSA was subtracted for each plasma and was then normalized to the signal
637 obtained with CR3022 present in each plate. The seropositivity threshold was established using
638 the following formula: mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma + (3 standard
639 deviation of the mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma).

640

641 **Cell-Based ELISA**

642 Detection of the trimeric SARS-CoV-2 S at the surface of HOS cells was performed by a
643 previously-described cell-based enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) (Anand et al.,
644 2021). Briefly, parental HOS cells or HOS-Spike cells were seeded in 96-well plates (4×10⁴ cells
645 per well) overnight. Cells were blocked with blocking buffer (10 mg/ml nonfat dry milk, 1.8 mM
646 CaCl₂, 1 mM MgCl₂, 25 mM Tris [pH 7.5], and 140 mM NaCl) for 30 min. CR3022 mAb (1 µg/ml)

647 or plasma (at a dilution of 1/250) were prepared in blocking buffer and incubated with the cells for
648 1h at room temperature. Respective HRP-conjugated Abs were then incubated with the samples
649 for 45 min at room temperature. For all conditions, cells were washed 6 times with blocking buffer
650 and 6 times with washing buffer (1.8 mM CaCl₂, 1 mM MgCl₂, 25 mM Tris [pH 7.5], and 140 mM
651 NaCl). HRP enzyme activity was determined after the addition of a 1:1 mix of Western Lightning
652 oxidizing and luminol reagents (PerkinElmer Life Sciences). Light emission was measured with
653 an LB942 TriStar luminometer (Berthold Technologies). Signal obtained with parental HOS was
654 subtracted for each plasma and was then normalized to the signal obtained with CR3022 mAb
655 present in each plate. The seropositivity threshold was established using the following formula:
656 mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma + (3 standard deviation of the mean of pre-
657 pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma).

658

659 **Cell surface staining and flow cytometry analysis**

660 293T cells were co-transfected with a GFP expressor (pIRES2-GFP, Clontech) in combination
661 with plasmids encoding the full-length Spikes of SARS-CoV-2 variants or Spikes from different
662 *Betacoronaviruses*. 48h post-transfection, S-expressing cells were stained with the CV3-25 Ab
663 (Jennewein et al., 2021) or plasma (1/250 dilution). AlexaFluor-647-conjugated goat anti-human
664 IgM+IgG+IgA Abs (1/800 dilution) were used as secondary Abs. The percentage of transfected
665 cells (GFP+ cells) was determined by gating the living cell population based on viability dye
666 staining (Aqua Vivid, Invitrogen). Samples were acquired on a LSRII cytometer (BD Biosciences)
667 and data analysis was performed using FlowJo v10.7.1 (Tree Star). The seropositivity threshold
668 was established using the following formula: (mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative
669 plasma + (3 standard deviation of the mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma). The
670 conformational-independent S2-targeting mAb CV3-25 was used to normalize Spike expression.
671 CV3-25 was shown to effectively recognize all SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants (Li et al., 2021).

672

673 **ADCC assay**

674 This assay was previously described (Anand et al., 2021). For evaluation of anti-SARS-CoV-2
675 antibody-dependent cellular cytotoxicity (ADCC), parental CEM.NKr CCR5+ cells were mixed at
676 a 1:1 ratio with CEM.NKr cells stably expressing a GFP-tagged full length SARS-CoV-2 Spike
677 (CEM.NKr.SARS-CoV-2.Spike cells). These cells were stained for viability (AquaVivid; Thermo
678 Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) and cellular dyes (cell proliferation dye eFluor670; Thermo
679 Fisher Scientific) to be used as target cells. Overnight rested PBMCs were stained with another
680 cellular marker (cell proliferation dye eFluor450; Thermo Fisher Scientific) and used as effector
681 cells. Stained target and effector cells were mixed at a ratio of 1:10 in 96-well V-bottom plates.
682 Plasma (1/500 dilution) or monoclonal antibody CR3022 (1 µg/mL) were added to the appropriate
683 wells. The plates were subsequently centrifuged for 1 min at 300g, and incubated at 37°C, 5%
684 CO₂ for 5 hours before being fixed in a 2% PBS-formaldehyde solution. ADCC activity was
685 calculated using the formula: $[(\% \text{ of GFP+ cells in Targets plus Effectors}) - (\% \text{ of GFP+ cells in}$
686 $\text{Targets plus Effectors plus plasma/antibody})]/(\% \text{ of GFP+ cells in Targets}) \times 100$ by gating on
687 transduced live target cells. All samples were acquired on an LSRII cytometer (BD Biosciences)
688 and data analysis was performed using FlowJo v10.7.1 (Tree Star). The specificity threshold was
689 established using the following formula: (mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma +
690 (3 standard deviation of the mean of pre-pandemic SARS-CoV-2 negative plasma).

691

692 **Virus neutralization assay**

693 To produce the pseudoviruses, 293T cells were transfected with the lentiviral vector pNL4.3 R-E-
694 Luc (NIH AIDS Reagent Program) and a plasmid encoding for the indicated S glycoprotein
695 (D614G, B.1.1.7, P.1, B.1.351, B.1.617.2, B.1.526 and SARS-CoV) at a ratio of 10:1. Two days
696 post-transfection, cell supernatants were harvested and stored at -80°C until use. For the
697 neutralization assay, 293T-ACE2 target cells were seeded at a density of 1×10^4 cells/well in 96-
698 well luminometer-compatible tissue culture plates (Perkin Elmer) 24h before infection.

699 Pseudoviral particles were incubated with several plasma dilutions (1/50; 1/250; 1/1250; 1/6250;
700 1/31250) for 1h at 37°C and were then added to the target cells followed by incubation for 48h at
701 37°C. Then, cells were lysed by the addition of 30 μ L of passive lysis buffer (Promega) followed
702 by one freeze-thaw cycle. An LB942 TriStar luminometer (Berthold Technologies) was used to
703 measure the luciferase activity of each well after the addition of 100 μ L of luciferin buffer (15mM
704 MgSO₄, 15mM KPO₄ [pH 7.8], 1mM ATP, and 1mM dithiothreitol) and 50 μ L of 1mM d-luciferin
705 potassium salt (Prolume). The neutralization half-maximal inhibitory dilution (ID₅₀) represents the
706 plasma dilution to inhibit 50% of the infection of 293T-ACE2 cells by pseudoviruses.

707

708 **SARS-CoV-2-specific B cells characterization**

709 To detect SARS-CoV-2-specific B cells, we conjugated recombinant RBD proteins with Alexa
710 Fluor 488 or Alexa Fluor 594 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer's protocol.
711 Approximately 2×10^6 frozen PBMCs from SARS-CoV-2 naïve and prior infection donors were
712 prepared in Falcon® 5ml-round bottom polystyrene tubes at a final concentration of
713 4×10^6 cells/mL in RPMI 1640 medium (GIBCO) supplemented with 10% of fetal bovine serum
714 (Seradigm), Penicillin- Streptomycin (GIBCO) and HEPES (GIBCO). After a rest of 2h at 37°C
715 and 5% CO₂, cells were stained using Aquavid viability marker (Biosciences) in DPBS (GIBCO)
716 at 4°C for 20 min. The detection of SARS-CoV-2-antigen specific B cells was done by adding the
717 RBD probes to the antibody cocktail (IgM BUV737, CD24 BUV805, IgG BV421, CD3 BV480,
718 CD56 BV480, CD14 BV480, CD16 BV480, CD20 BV711, CD21 BV786, HLA DR BB700, CD27
719 APC R700; CD19 BV650, CD38 BB790, CD138 BUV661, CCR10 BUV395, IgD BUV563 and IgA
720 PE). Staining was performed at 4°C for 30 min and cells were fixed using 1% paraformaldehyde
721 (Sigma-Aldrich) at 4°C for 15 min. Stained PBMC samples were acquired on FACSymphony™
722 A5 Cell Analyzer (BD Biosciences) and analyzed using FlowJo v10.7.1 software.

723

724 **QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

725 **Statistical analysis**

726 Symbols represent biologically independent samples from SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals or
727 SARS-CoV-2 PI individuals. Lines connect data from the same donor. Statistics were analyzed
728 using GraphPad Prism version 8.0.1 (GraphPad, San Diego, CA). Every dataset was tested for
729 statistical normality and this information was used to apply the appropriate (parametric or
730 nonparametric) statistical test. Differences in responses for the same patient before and after
731 vaccination were performed using Kruskal-Wallis tests. Differences in responses between naïve
732 and PI individuals at each time point were measured by Mann-Whitney (V0, V1 and V2) or
733 Kruskal-Wallis (V3 and V4) tests. Differences in responses against the different Spikes for the
734 same patient were measured by Friedman tests. P values < 0.05 were considered significant;
735 significance values are indicated as * p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001, **** p < 0.0001.
736 Spearman's R correlation coefficient was applied for correlations. Statistical tests were two-sided
737 and p < 0.05 was considered significant.

738

739 **Software scripts and visualization**

740 Edge bundling graphs were generated in undirected mode in R and RStudio using ggraph, igraph,
741 tidyverse, and RColorBrewer packages (R; R studio). Edges are only shown if p < 0.05, and nodes
742 are sized according to the connecting edges' r values. Nodes are color-coded according to groups
743 of parameters.

744

745 **SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION**

746 Supplemental information can be found online at ...

747 REFERENCES

- 748 Allen, H., Vusirikala, A., Flannagan, J., Twohig, K.A., Zaidi, A., Chudasama, D., Lamagni, T.,
749 Groves, N., Turner, C., Rawlinson, C., et al. (2021). Household transmission of COVID-19 cases
750 associated with SARS-CoV-2 delta variant (B.1.617.2): national case-control study. *Lancet Reg.*
751 *Health – Eur.* 0.
- 752 Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Richard, J., Perreault, J., Tremblay, T., Drouin, M., Fournier, M.-J.,
753 Lewin, A., Bazin, R., and Finzi, A. (2020). High-throughput detection of antibodies targeting the
754 SARS-CoV-2 Spike in longitudinal convalescent plasma samples (*Microbiology*).
- 755 Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Nayrac, M., Beaudoin-Bussièrès, G., Benlarbi, M., Gasser, R., Brassard,
756 N., Laumaea, A., Gong, S.Y., Bourassa, C., et al. (2021). Longitudinal analysis of humoral
757 immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in convalescent individuals up to eight months post-
758 symptom onset. *Cell Rep. Med.* 100290.
- 759 Annavajhala, M.K., Mohri, H., Wang, P., Nair, M., Zucker, J.E., Sheng, Z., Gomez-Simmonds, A.,
760 Kelley, A.L., Tagliavia, M., Huang, Y., et al. (2021). Emergence and expansion of SARS-CoV-2
761 B.1.526 after identification in New York. *Nature* 597, 703–708.
- 762 Baden, L.R., El Sahly, H.M., Essink, B., Kotloff, K., Frey, S., Novak, R., Diemert, D., Spector,
763 S.A., Roupheal, N., Creech, C.B., et al. (2021). Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-
764 CoV-2 Vaccine. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 384, 403–416.
- 765 Beaudoin-Bussièrès, G., Laumaea, A., Anand, S.P., Prévost, J., Gasser, R., Goyette, G.,
766 Medjahed, H., Perreault, J., Tremblay, T., Lewin, A., et al. (2020). Decline of Humoral Responses
767 against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in Convalescent Individuals. *MBio* 11.
- 768 Beaudoin-Bussières, G., Chen, Y., Ullah, I., Prevost, J., Tolbert, W.D., Symmes, K., Ding, S.,
769 Benlarbi, M., Gong, S.Y., Tauzin, A., et al. (2021). An anti-SARS-CoV-2 non-neutralizing antibody
770 with Fc-effector function defines a new NTD epitope and delays neuroinvasion and death in K18-
771 hACE2 mice (*Microbiology*).
- 772 Björkman, C., Näslund, K., Stenlund, S., Maley, S.W., Buxton, D., and Ugglå, A. (1999). An IgG
773 Avidity ELISA to Discriminate between Recent and Chronic *Neospora Caninum* Infection. *J. Vet.*
774 *Diagn. Invest.* 11, 41–44.
- 775 Brown, K.A., Tibebu, S., Daneman, N., Schwartz, K., Whelan, M., and Buchan, S. (2021).
776 Comparative Household Secondary Attack Rates associated with B.1.1.7, B.1.351, and P.1
777 SARS-CoV-2 Variants. medRxiv 2021.06.03.21258302.
- 778 CDC (2021). Interim Clinical Considerations for Use of COVID-19 Vaccines | CDC,
779 <https://www.cdc.gov/vaccines/covid-19/clinical-considerations/covid-19-vaccines-us.html>.
- 780 Collier, D.A., De Marco, A., Ferreira, I.A.T.M., Meng, B., Datir, R.P., Walls, A.C., Kemp, S.A.,
781 Bassi, J., Pinto, D., Silacci-Fregni, C., et al. (2021). Sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 to mRNA
782 vaccine-elicited antibodies. *Nature* 1–10.
- 783 Dagpunar, J. (2021). Interim estimates of increased transmissibility, growth rate, and reproduction
784 number of the Covid-19 B.1.617.2 variant of concern in the United Kingdom. medRxiv
785 2021.06.03.21258293.

- 786 Dan, J.M., Mateus, J., Kato, Y., Hastie, K.M., Yu, E.D., Faliti, C.E., Grifoni, A., Ramirez, S.I.,
787 Haupt, S., Frazier, A., et al. (2021). Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8
788 months after infection. *Science* eabf4063.
- 789 Davies, N.G., Abbott, S., Barnard, R.C., Jarvis, C.I., Kucharski, A.J., Munday, J.D., Pearson,
790 C.A.B., Russell, T.W., Tully, D.C., Washburne, A.D., et al. (2021). Estimated transmissibility and
791 impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* 372.
- 792 Dong, E., Du, H., and Gardner, L. (2020). An interactive web-based dashboard to track COVID-
793 19 in real time. *Lancet Infect. Dis.* 20, 533–534.
- 794 ECDC (2021). Risk of spread of new SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in the EU/EEA - first
795 update, [https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/COVID-19-risk-related-to-](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/COVID-19-risk-related-to-spread-of-new-SARS-CoV-2-variants-EU-EEA-first-update.pdf)
796 [spread-of-new-SARS-CoV-2-variants-EU-EEA-first-update.pdf](https://www.ecdc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/COVID-19-risk-related-to-spread-of-new-SARS-CoV-2-variants-EU-EEA-first-update.pdf). 29.
- 797 Efrati, S., Catalogna, M., Abu Hamad, R., Hadanny, A., Bar-Chaim, A., Benveniste-Levkovitz, P.,
798 and Levtzion-Korach, O. (2021). Safety and humoral responses to BNT162b2 mRNA vaccination
799 of SARS-CoV-2 previously infected and naive populations. *Sci. Rep.* 11, 16543.
- 800 Fialová, L., Petráčková, M., and Kuchař, O. (2017). Comparison of different enzyme-linked
801 immunosorbent assay methods for avidity determination of antiphospholipid antibodies. *J. Clin.*
802 *Lab. Anal.* 31, e22121.
- 803 Fisman, D.N., and Tuite, A.R. (2021). Progressive Increase in Virulence of Novel SARS-CoV-2
804 Variants in Ontario, Canada. medRxiv 2021.07.05.21260050.
- 805 Fraley, E., LeMaster, C., Banerjee, D., Khanal, S., Selvarangan, R., and Bradley, T. (2021).
806 Cross-reactive antibody immunity against SARS-CoV-2 in children and adults. *Cell. Mol. Immunol.*
807 18, 1826–1828.
- 808 Gaebler, C., Wang, Z., Lorenzi, J.C.C., Muecksch, F., Finkin, S., Tokuyama, M., Cho, A.,
809 Jankovic, M., Schaefer-Babajew, D., Oliveira, T.Y., et al. (2021). Evolution of antibody immunity
810 to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*.
- 811 Gilbert, P.B., Montefiori, D.C., McDermott, A., Fong, Y., Benkeser, D., Deng, W., Zhou, H.,
812 Houchens, C.R., Martins, K., Jayashankar, L., et al. (2021). Immune Correlates Analysis of the
813 mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy Trial. medRxiv 2021.08.09.21261290.
- 814 Goel, R.R., Painter, M.M., Apostolidis, S.A., Mathew, D., Meng, W., Rosenfeld, A.M., Lundgreen,
815 K.A., Reynaldi, A., Khoury, D.S., Pattekar, A., et al. (2021a). mRNA vaccines induce durable
816 immune memory to SARS-CoV-2 and variants of concern. *Science* eabm0829.
- 817 Goel, R.R., Apostolidis, S.A., Painter, M.M., Mathew, D., Pattekar, A., Kuthuru, O., Gouma, S.,
818 Hicks, P., Meng, W., Rosenfeld, A.M., et al. (2021b). Distinct antibody and memory B cell
819 responses in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and recovered individuals following mRNA vaccination. *Sci.*
820 *Immunol.* 6.
- 821 Goldberg, Y., Mandel, M., Bar-On, Y.M., Bodenheimer, O., Freedman, L., Haas, E.J., Milo, R.,
822 Alroy-Preis, S., Ash, N., and Huppert, A. (2021). Waning immunity of the BNT162b2 vaccine: A
823 nationwide study from Israel. medRxiv 2021.08.24.21262423.


- 824 Gong, S.Y., Chatterjee, D., Richard, J., Prévost, J., Tauzin, A., Gasser, R., Bo, Y., Vézina, D.,
825 Goyette, G., Gendron-Lepage, G., et al. (2021). Contribution of single mutations to selected
826 SARS-CoV-2 emerging variants spike antigenicity. *Virology* 563, 134–145.
- 827 Hicks, J., Klumpp-Thomas, C., Kalish, H., Shunmugavel, A., Mehalko, J., Denson, J.-P., Snead,
828 K.R., Drew, M., Corbett, K.S., Graham, B.S., et al. (2021). Serologic Cross-Reactivity of SARS-
829 CoV-2 with Endemic and Seasonal Betacoronaviruses. *J. Clin. Immunol.* 41, 906–913.
- 830 Hoffmann, M., Müller, M.A., Drexler, J.F., Glende, J., Erdt, M., Gützkow, T., Losemann, C., Binger,
831 T., Deng, H., Schwegmann-Weßels, C., et al. (2013). Differential sensitivity of bat cells to infection
832 by enveloped RNA viruses: coronaviruses, paramyxoviruses, filoviruses, and influenza viruses.
833 *PLoS One* 8, e72942.
- 834 Hoffmann, M., Kleine-Weber, H., Schroeder, S., Krüger, N., Herrler, T., Erichsen, S., Schiergens,
835 T.S., Herrler, G., Wu, N.-H., Nitsche, A., et al. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2
836 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell* 181, 271-280.e8.
- 837 Isabel, S., Graña-Miraglia, L., Gutierrez, J.M., Bundalovic-Torma, C., Groves, H.E., Isabel, M.R.,
838 Eshaghi, A., Patel, S.N., Gubbay, J.B., Poutanen, T., et al. (2020). Evolutionary and structural
839 analyses of SARS-CoV-2 D614G spike protein mutation now documented worldwide. *Sci. Rep.*
840 10, 14031.
- 841 Jackson, L.A., Anderson, E.J., Rouphael, N.G., Roberts, P.C., Makhene, M., Coler, R.N.,
842 McCullough, M.P., Chappell, J.D., Denison, M.R., Stevens, L.J., et al. (2020). An mRNA Vaccine
843 against SARS-CoV-2 — Preliminary Report. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 383, 1920–1931.
- 844 JCVI (2021). Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) advice on third primary
845 dose vaccination, [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/third-primary-covid-19-vaccine-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/third-primary-covid-19-vaccine-dose-for-people-who-are-immunosuppressed-jcvi-advice/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-jcvi-advice-on-third-primary-dose-vaccination)
846 [dose-for-people-who-are-immunosuppressed-jcvi-advice/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/third-primary-covid-19-vaccine-dose-for-people-who-are-immunosuppressed-jcvi-advice/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-jcvi-advice-on-third-primary-dose-vaccination)
847 [immunisation-jcvi-advice-on-third-primary-dose-vaccination](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/third-primary-covid-19-vaccine-dose-for-people-who-are-immunosuppressed-jcvi-advice/joint-committee-on-vaccination-and-immunisation-jcvi-advice-on-third-primary-dose-vaccination).
- 848 Jennewein, M.F., MacCamy, A.J., Akins, N.R., Feng, J., Homad, L.J., Hurlburt, N.K., Seydoux,
849 E., Wan, Y.-H., Stuart, A.B., Edara, V.V., et al. (2021). Isolation and characterization of cross-
850 neutralizing coronavirus antibodies from COVID-19+ subjects. *Cell Rep.* 36, 109353.
- 851 Kim, W., Zhou, J.Q., Sturtz, A.J., Horvath, S.C., Schmitz, A.J., Lei, T., Kalaidina, E., Thapa, M.,
852 Soussi, W.B.A., Haile, A., et al. (2021). Germinal centre-driven maturation of B cell response to
853 SARS-CoV-2 vaccination.
- 854 Li, W., Chen, Y., Prévost, J., Ullah, I., Lu, M., Gong, S.Y., Tauzin, A., Gasser, R., Vézina, D.,
855 Anand, S.P., et al. (2021). Structural Basis and Mode of Action for Two Broadly Neutralizing
856 Antibodies Against SARS-CoV-2 Emerging Variants of Concern. *BioRxiv Prepr. Serv. Biol.*
857 2021.08.02.454546.
- 858 Lozano-Ojalvo, D., Camara, C., Lopez-Granados, E., Nozal, P., Del Pino-Molina, L., Bravo-
859 Gallego, L.Y., Paz-Artal, E., Pion, M., Correa-Rocha, R., Ortiz, A., et al. (2021). Differential effects
860 of the second SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine dose on T cell immunity in naive and COVID-19
861 recovered individuals. *Cell Rep.* 109570.
- 862 Meulen, J. ter, Brink, E.N. van den, Poon, L.L.M., Marissen, W.E., Leung, C.S.W., Cox, F.,
863 Cheung, C.Y., Bakker, A.Q., Bogaards, J.A., Deventer, E. van, et al. (2006). Human Monoclonal

- 864 Antibody Combination against SARS Coronavirus: Synergy and Coverage of Escape Mutants.
865 PLOS Med. 3, e237.
- 866 Moore, J.P., and Klasse, P.J. (2020). COVID-19 Vaccines: “Warp Speed” Needs Mind Melds, Not
867 Warped Minds. J. Virol. 94.
- 868 Muruato, A.E., Fontes-Garfias, C.R., Ren, P., Garcia-Blanco, M.A., Menachery, V.D., Xie, X., and
869 Shi, P.-Y. (2020). A high-throughput neutralizing antibody assay for COVID-19 diagnosis and
870 vaccine evaluation. Nat. Commun. 11, 4059.
- 871 Ng, K.W., Faulkner, N., Cornish, G.H., Rosa, A., Harvey, R., Hussain, S., Ulferts, R., Earl, C.,
872 Wrobel, A.G., Benton, D.J., et al. (2020). Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-
873 CoV-2 in humans. Science 370, 1339–1343.
- 874 Painter, M.M., Mathew, D., Goel, R.R., Apostolidis, S.A., Pattekar, A., Kuthuru, O., Baxter, A.E.,
875 Herati, R.S., Oldridge, D.A., Gouma, S., et al. (2021). Rapid induction of antigen-specific CD4+ T
876 cells is associated with coordinated humoral and cellular immune responses to SARS-CoV-2
877 mRNA vaccination. Immunity S1074761321003083.
- 878 Park, J.-E., Li, K., Barlan, A., Fehr, A.R., Perlman, S., McCray, P.B., and Gallagher, T. (2016).
879 Proteolytic processing of Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus spikes expands virus
880 tropism. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 113, 12262–12267.
- 881 Parry, H., Bruton, R., Stephens, C., Brown, K., Amirthalingam, G., Otter, A., Hallis, B., Zuo, J.,
882 and Moss, P. (2021). Differential immunogenicity of BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1 vaccines after
883 extended-interval homologous dual vaccination in older people. Immun. Ageing A 18, 34.
- 884 Payne, R.P., Longet, S., Austin, J.A., Skelly, D.T., Dejnirattisai, W., Adele, S., Meardon, N.,
885 Faustini, S., Al-Taei, S., Moore, S.C., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity of standard and extended
886 dosing intervals of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. Cell 0.
- 887 Pearson, C.A.B., Russell, T.W., Davies, N.G., Kucharski, A.J., CMMID COVID-19 working group,
888 Edmunds, W.J., and Eggo, R.M. (2021). Estimates of severity and transmissibility of novel SARS-
889 CoV-2 variant 501Y.V2 in South Africa, [https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/sa-novel-](https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/sa-novel-variant.html)
890 [variant.html](https://cmmid.github.io/topics/covid19/sa-novel-variant.html).
- 891 Pilishvili, T. (2021). Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna
892 COVID-19 Vaccines Among Health Care Personnel — 33 U.S. Sites, January–March 2021.
893 MMWR Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep. 70.
- 894 Planas, D., Veyer, D., Baidaliuk, A., Staropoli, I., Guivel-Benhassine, F., Rajah, M.M., Planchais,
895 C., Porrot, F., Robillard, N., Puech, J., et al. (2021a). Reduced sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 variant
896 Delta to antibody neutralization. Nature 596, 276–280.
- 897 Planas, D., Bruel, T., Grzelak, L., Guivel-Benhassine, F., Staropoli, I., Porrot, F., Planchais, C.,
898 Buchrieser, J., Rajah, M.M., Bishop, E., et al. (2021b). Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2
899 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants to neutralizing antibodies. Nat. Med. 27, 917–924.
- 900 Polack, F.P., Thomas, S.J., Kitchin, N., Absalon, J., Gurtman, A., Lockhart, S., Perez, J.L., Pérez
901 Marc, G., Moreira, E.D., Zerbini, C., et al. (2020). Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA
902 Covid-19 Vaccine. N. Engl. J. Med. 383, 2603–2615.

- 903 Prévost, J., and Finzi, A. (2021). The great escape? SARS-CoV-2 variants evading neutralizing
904 responses. *Cell Host Microbe* 29, 322–324.
- 905 Prévost, J., Gasser, R., Beaudoin-Bussièrès, G., Richard, J., Duerr, R., Laumaea, A., Anand,
906 S.P., Goyette, G., Benlarbi, M., Ding, S., et al. (2020). Cross-Sectional Evaluation of Humoral
907 Responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike. *Cell Rep. Med.* 1, 100126.
- 908 Prévost, J., Richard, J., Gasser, R., Ding, S., Fage, C., Anand, S.P., Adam, D., Vergara, N.G.,
909 Tausin, A., Benlarbi, M., et al. (2021). Impact of temperature on the affinity of SARS-CoV-2 Spike
910 glycoprotein for host ACE2. *J. Biol. Chem.* 101151.
- 911 Puranik, A., Lenehan, P.J., Silvert, E., Niesen, M.J.M., Corchado-Garcia, J., O’Horo, J.C., Virk,
912 A., Swift, M.D., Halamka, J., Badley, A.D., et al. (2021). Comparison of two highly-effective mRNA
913 vaccines for COVID-19 during periods of Alpha and Delta variant prevalence.
- 914 R R: a language and environment for statistical computing. [https://www.gbif.org/fr/tool/81287/r-a-](https://www.gbif.org/fr/tool/81287/r-a-language-and-environment-for-statistical-computing)
915 [language-and-environment-for-statistical-computing](https://www.gbif.org/fr/tool/81287/r-a-language-and-environment-for-statistical-computing).
- 916 R studio RStudio | Open source & professional software for data science teams.
917 <https://rstudio.com/>.
- 918 Rabaan, A.A., Al-Ahmed, S.H., Haque, S., Sah, R., Tiwari, R., Malik, Y.S., Dhama, K., Yattoo,
919 M.I., Bonilla-Aldana, D.K., and Rodriguez-Morales, A.J. (2020). SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV, and
920 MERS-COV: A comparative overview. *Infez. Med.* 28, 174–184.
- 921 Rambaut, A., Loman, N., Pybus, O., Barclay, W., Barrett, J., Carabelli, A., Connor, T., Peacock,
922 T., Robertson, D.L., and Volz, E. (2020). Preliminary genomic characterisation of an emergent
923 SARS-CoV-2 lineage in the UK defined by a novel set of spike mutations - SARS-CoV-2
924 coronavirus / nCoV-2019 *Genomic Epidemiology*.
- 925 Rudnick, S.I., and Adams, G.P. (2009). Affinity and avidity in antibody-based tumor targeting.
926 *Cancer Biother. Radiopharm.* 24, 155–161.
- 927 Sabino, E.C., Buss, L.F., Carvalho, M.P.S., Prete, C.A., Crispim, M.A.E., Fraiji, N.A., Pereira,
928 R.H.M., Parag, K.V., Peixoto, P. da S., Kraemer, M.U.G., et al. (2021). Resurgence of COVID-19
929 in Manaus, Brazil, despite high seroprevalence. *The Lancet* 397, 452–455.
- 930 Sahin, U., Muik, A., Derhovanessian, E., Vogler, I., Kranz, L.M., Vormehr, M., Baum, A., Pascal,
931 K., Quandt, J., Maurus, D., et al. (2020). COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b1 elicits human antibody
932 and T H 1 T cell responses. *Nature* 586, 594–599.
- 933 Sarkar, J.P., Saha, I., Seal, A., Maity, D., and Maulik, U. (2021). Topological Analysis for
934 Sequence Variability: Case Study on more than 2K SARS-CoV-2 sequences of COVID-19
935 infected 54 countries in comparison with SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV. *Infect. Genet. Evol.* 88,
936 104708.
- 937 Skowronski, D., and De Serres, G. (2021). Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19
938 Vaccine. *N. Engl. J. Med.* NEJMc2036242.
- 939 Skowronski, D.M., Setayeshgar, S., Febriani, Y., Ouakki, M., Zou, M., Talbot, D., Prystajecy, N.,
940 Tyson, J.R., Gilca, R., Brousseau, N., et al. (2021). Two-dose SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness

- 941 with mixed schedules and extended dosing intervals: test-negative design studies from British
942 Columbia and Quebec, Canada (Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)).
- 943 Stamatatos, L., Czartoski, J., Wan, Y.-H., Homad, L.J., Rubin, V., Glantz, H., Neradilek, M.,
944 Seydoux, E., Jennewein, M.F., MacCamy, A.J., et al. (2021). mRNA vaccination boosts cross-
945 variant neutralizing antibodies elicited by SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Science* eabg9175.
- 946 Tang, J.W., Toovey, O.T.R., Harvey, K.N., and Hui, D.S.C. (2021). Introduction of the South
947 African SARS-CoV-2 variant 501Y.V2 into the UK. *J. Infect.* 82, e8–e10.
- 948 Tartof, S.Y., Slezak, J.M., Fischer, H., Hong, V., Ackerson, B.K., Ranasinghe, O.N., Frankland,
949 T.B., Ogun, O.A., Zamparo, J.M., Gray, S., et al. (2021). Six-Month Effectiveness of BNT162B2
950 mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine in a Large US Integrated Health System: A Retrospective Cohort Study
951 (Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network).
- 952 Tauzin, A., Nayrac, M., Benlarbi, M., Gong, S.Y., Gasser, R., Beaudoin-Bussi eres, G., Brassard,
953 N., Laumaea, A., V ezina, D., Pr evost, J., et al. (2021). A single dose of the SARS-CoV-2 vaccine
954 BNT162b2 elicits Fc-mediated antibody effector functions and T cell responses. *Cell Host Microbe*
955 0.
- 956 Tegally, H., Wilkinson, E., Giovanetti, M., Iranzadeh, A., Fonseca, V., Giandhari, J., Doolabh, D.,
957 Pillay, S., San, E.J., Msomi, N., et al. (2020). Emergence and rapid spread of a new severe acute
958 respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) lineage with multiple spike mutations
959 in South Africa. *MedRxiv* 2020.12.21.20248640.
- 960 Ullah, I., Pr evost, J., Ladinsky, M.S., Stone, H., Lu, M., Anand, S.P., Beaudoin-Bussi eres, G.,
961 Symmes, K., Benlarbi, M., Ding, S., et al. (2021). Live imaging of SARS-CoV-2 infection in mice
962 reveals that neutralizing antibodies require Fc function for optimal efficacy. *Immunity* S1074-
963 7613(21)00347-2.
- 964 Urbanowicz, R.A., Tsoleridis, T., Jackson, H.J., Cusin, L., Duncan, J.D., Chappell, J.G., Tarr,
965 A.W., Nightingale, J., Norrish, A.R., Ikram, A., et al. (2021). Two doses of the SARS-CoV-2
966 BNT162b2 vaccine enhances antibody responses to variants in individuals with prior SARS-CoV-
967 2 infection. *Sci. Transl. Med.* eabj0847.
- 968 Volz, E., Mishra, S., Chand, M., Barrett, J.C., Johnson, R., Geidelberg, L., Hinsley, W.R., Laydon,
969 D.J., Dabrera, G., O’Toole,  ., et al. (2021). Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 Lineage B.1.1.7 in
970 England: Insights from linking epidemiological and genetic data. *MedRxiv* 2020.12.30.20249034.
- 971 Wall, E.C., Wu, M., Harvey, R., Kelly, G., Warchal, S., Sawyer, C., Daniels, R., Hobson, P.,
972 Hatipoglu, E., Ngai, Y., et al. (2021). Neutralising antibody activity against SARS-CoV-2 VOCs
973 B.1.617.2 and B.1.351 by BNT162b2 vaccination. *The Lancet* 397, 2331–2333.
- 974 Walls, A.C., Park, Y.-J., Tortorici, M.A., Wall, A., McGuire, A.T., and Velesler, D. (2020). Structure,
975 Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. *Cell* 181, 281-292.e6.
- 976 Wang, P., Nair, M.S., Liu, L., Iketani, S., Luo, Y., Guo, Y., Wang, M., Yu, J., Zhang, B., Kwong,
977 P.D., et al. (2021a). Antibody Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 Variants B.1.351 and B.1.1.7.

- 978 Wang, Q., Lei, Y., Lu, X., Wang, G., Du, Q., Guo, X., Xing, Y., Zhang, G., and Wang, D. (2019).
979 Urea-mediated dissociation alleviate the false-positive *Treponema pallidum*-specific antibodies
980 detected by ELISA. *PLOS ONE* 14, e0212893.
- 981 Wang, Z., Muecksch, F., Schaefer-Babajew, D., Finkin, S., Viant, C., Gaebler, C., Hoffmann, H.-
982 H., Barnes, C.O., Cipolla, M., Ramos, V., et al. (2021b). Naturally enhanced neutralizing breadth
983 against SARS-CoV-2 one year after infection. *Nature* 595, 426–431.
- 984 WHO (2021). Interim recommendations for use of the Pfizer–BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine,
985 BNT162b2, under Emergency Use Listing, [https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccines-SAGE_recommendation-BNT162b2-2021.1)
986 [nCoV-vaccines-SAGE_recommendation-BNT162b2-2021.1](https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-2019-nCoV-vaccines-SAGE_recommendation-BNT162b2-2021.1).
- 987 World Health Organization WHO Coronavirus (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int>.
- 988



- Naïve (2 doses, long interval)
- Previously infected (2 doses, long interval)
- Previously infected (1 dose)







Figure 1

● Naïve (2 doses, long interval) ● Previously infected (2 doses, long interval) ● Previously infected (1 dose)





Figure 2

● Naïve (2 doses, long interval)

● Previously infected (2 doses, long interval)

● Previously infected (1 dose)

A



B




Figure 3

● Naïve (2 doses, long interval)
 ● Previously infected (2 doses, long interval)
 ● Previously infected (1 dose)





Figure 4













Figure 5

A**V0****V1****V2****V3****V4****Naïve****Parameters****r values****B****Previously infected****Figure 6**

● Naïve (2 doses, long interval) ● Previously infected (2 doses, long interval) ● Previously infected (1 dose)




Figure S1 : Elicitation of Spike-specific antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously-infected individuals, Related to Figures 1 and 6.

(A-D) Cell-based ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve and PI donors collected at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 with HOS cells expressing full-length SARS-CoV-2 S. Anti-S Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated (A) anti-human IgM+IgG+IgA (B) anti-human IgM, (C) anti-human IgG, or (D) anti-human IgA. RLU values obtained with parental HOS (negative control) were subtracted and further normalized to the signal obtained with the CR3022 mAb present in each plate. Naïve and PI donors with a long interval between the two doses are represented by red and black points respectively and PI donors who received just one dose by blue points. (Left panels) Each curve represents the normalized RLUs obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by black triangles. (Right panels) Plasma samples were grouped in different time points (V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4). Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; **** $P < 0.0001$; ns, non-significant).

- Naïve (2 doses, long interval)
- Previously infected (2 doses, long interval)
- Previously infected (1 dose)
- Naïve (2 doses, short interval)




Figure S2 : Recognition of SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants and SARS-CoV-1 Spike by plasma from naïve and PI donors at each time point, Related to Figures 2, 5 and 6.

293T cells were transfected with the indicated *Betacoronavirus* Spike and stained with the CV3-25 Ab or with plasma collected at V0 (A), V1 (B), V2 (C), V3 (D) and V4 (E) and analyzed by flow cytometry. Plasma recognitions are normalized with CV3-25 binding. Naïve and PI donors with a long interval between the two doses are represented by red and black points respectively, PI donors who received just one dose by blue points and naïve donors with a short interval between the two doses by yellow points. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; **** $P < 0.0001$; ns, non-significant).

- Naïve (2 doses, long interval)
- Previously infected (1 dose)
- Previously infected (2 doses, long interval)
- Naïve (2 doses, short interval)





Figure S3 : Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Spike variants and SARS-CoV-1 Spike by plasma from naïve and PI donors at each time point, Related to Figures 3, 5 and 6.

Neutralizing activity was measured by incubating pseudoviruses bearing SARS-CoV-2 S variant or SARS-CoV-1 S glycoproteins, with serial dilutions of plasma collected at V0 (A), V1 (B), V2 (C), V3 (D) and V4 (E) for 1 h at 37°C before infecting 293T-ACE2 cells. Neutralization half maximal inhibitory serum dilution (ID₅₀) values were determined using a normalized non-linear regression using GraphPad Prism software. Naïve and PI donors with a long interval between the two doses are represented by red and black points respectively, PI donors who received just one dose by blue points and naïve donors with a short interval between the two doses by yellow points. Undetectable measures are represented as white symbols, and limits of detection are plotted. Error bars indicate means ± SEM. (* P < 0.05; ** P < 0.01; *** P < 0.001; **** P < 0.0001; ns, non-significant).

A**B**

— - urea — + urea



**C**

Figure S4 : Comparison of the detection of RBD specific antibodies between ELISA and stringent ELISA in SARS-CoV-2 naïve and previously infected individuals, Related to Figure 4.

(A-C) Indirect ELISA was performed by incubating plasma samples from naïve (A) PI vaccinated with two (B) or one dose (C) donors collected at V0, V1, V2, V3 and V4 with recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RBD protein. Anti-RBD Ab binding was detected using HRP-conjugated anti-human IgG. Relative light unit (RLU) values obtained were normalized to the signal obtained with the anti-RBD CR3022 mAb present in each plate. For ELISA (black curves), all the wash steps were made with washing buffer and for stringent ELISA (green curves), the wash steps were made with 8M of urea. Each curve represents the normalized RLUs obtained with the plasma of one donor at every time point. Mean of each group is represented by a bold line. The time of vaccine dose injections is indicated by black triangles. Error bars indicate means \pm SEM. (* $P < 0.05$; ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; **** $P < 0.0001$; ns, non-significant).