

1

2 **Comparative study of immunogenicity and safety of Gam-COVID-Vac and Sinopharm**

3 **BBIBP-CorV vaccines in Belarus**

4 Igor Stoma, Katsiaryna Korsak, Evgenii Voropaev, Olga Osipkina, Aleksey Kovalev

5 Gomel state medical university, Gomel, Republic of Belarus

6 Corresponding author: Igor Stoma, igor.stoma@gmail.com

7 **Abstract:**

8 **Introduction:** Lack of comparative studies on efficiency of a broad range of COVID19 vaccines
9 leads to lower levels of adoption and subsequent lower total immunity in several regions,
10 including Republic of Belarus. This clinical study captures and transparently demonstrates
11 varying immunogenic responses to Sputnik V and Sinopharm vaccines.

12 **Aim of this study was:** to compare the immunogenicity and reactogenicity of Sputnik V (Gam-
13 COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), PRC vaccines in vaccinated individuals.

14 **Materials and Methods:** A total of 60 adults participated the study. The immune response after
15 vaccination was assessed using enzyme immunoassay. IgG levels measured in all participants at
16 three time points: before the vaccination, 42 days after the first vaccine dose, and 6 months after
17 the first vaccine dose. The results of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody test is quantified according to
18 the WHO First International Standard (NIBSC code:20/136) and expressed in international units
19 (BAU/ml).

20 **Results:** The study participants were divided into two groups, where 30 people (50%) were
21 vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), and 30 people were vaccinated with Sinopharm
22 (BBIBP-CorV), with no gender differences in the groups. The IgG levels at 42 days after the first
23 vaccine dose were: Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac)_(42 days): Me=650.4 (642.2-669.4); Sinopharm
24 (BBIBP-CorV)_(42 days): Me=376.5 (290.9-526.4); p<0,001). The IgG levels at 6 months after the

25 first vaccine dose were: Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac)_(6 months) Me=608.7 (574.6-647.1);
26 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)_(6 months): Me=106.3 (78.21-332.4); p<0,001). Reactions after
27 vaccination appeared in 27 vaccinated individuals (45%).

28 **Conclusion:** The study showed that Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine was more
29 immunogenic than Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine. IgG levels in vaccinated individuals who
30 previously recovered from SARS-CoV-2 infection ("hybrid immunity") were higher than in
31 SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals. Reactions after vaccines administration were mild to moderate.

32 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, Vaccines, Hybrid immunity, Humoral immune response, Enzyme
33 immunoassay, BAU/ml.

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48 **Comparative study of immunogenicity and safety of Gam-COVID-Vac and Sinopharm**
49 **BBIBP-CorV vaccines in Belarus**

50 **Introduction**

51 The pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2 has been ongoing for two years. Due to the lack
52 of etiologic therapy for COVID-19 [1], increased infectivity [2] and the acquisition of vaccine-
53 resistant mutations of SARS-CoV-2 [3], vaccination is the only effective means of controlling
54 the epidemic. It has the potential to curb the spread of the virus [4], as well as to reduce the
55 consequences of infection and the burden on health care facilities [5]. Effective pandemic control
56 requires a high vaccination rate [6].

57 To date, 33 vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 have been approved for mass administration
58 worldwide [7]. They differ in their manufacturing technology, their mechanism of action and
59 efficacy.

60 In the Republic of Belarus, currently two vaccines are available to the population:
61 Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), manufactured in the Russian Federation and Sinopharm (BBIBP-
62 CorV), manufactured in China. As of 01.02.22, 45.0% of population were vaccinated with two
63 doses, 57.4% received one dose of vaccine and 2.9% were revaccinated [8]. There is a lack of
64 studies that compare the properties of vaccines (immunological efficacy, postvaccination
65 reaction rates) Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), PRC between
66 each other in the international database of medical publications. The lack of comparative
67 information about available vaccines is one of the reasons why the required vaccination coverage
68 has not yet been achieved in the Republic of Belarus

69 **Aim of the study:** To compare the immunogenicity and reactogenicity of Sputnik V
70 (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), PRC vaccines among vaccinated
71 individuals.

72 **Materials and methods:**

73 This prospective clinical study was carried out at Gomel State Medical University,
74 Gomel, Belarus from October 2020 to December 2021. Evaluation of the immune response to
75 vaccination was performed by enzyme immunoassay using the Sunrise Tecan microplate
76 photometer (Austria). Blood sampling was performed 3 times: immediately before the first dose
77 of vaccine, on day 42 and 6 months after the first dose of vaccine. All study participants were
78 informed about the study design and upcoming procedures, all participants obtained informed
79 written consent to participate in the study. The study received an approval from the institutional
80 Ethics committee of Gomel state medical university. Vaccination was performed in a strict
81 adherence to the vaccines instruction (product medical information) and in accordance with
82 principles of GDP (good distribution practice), with 2 doses of vaccines administered to all of
83 the participants.

84 A reagent kit manufactured by Vector-Best (Russian Federation) and designed for
85 enzyme immunoassay for quantitative detection of SARS-CoV-2 class G immunoglobulins,
86 SARS-CoV-2-IgG quantitative ELISA-BEST, was used for immunoassay. According to the
87 manufacturer's information letter, this kit is suitable for the quantitative detection of specific IgG
88 in SARS-CoV-2 infected and re-vaccinated patients as well as for the evaluation of post-
89 vaccination immune response during immunization with vaccines based on different
90 technologies (vector, mRNA, inactivated whole-virion). The "SARS-CoV-2-IgG quantitative
91 ELISA-BEST" reagent kit design uses recombinant full-length trimerized S glycoprotein (Spike)
92 of the SARS-CoV-2 virus derived from a eukaryotic expression system. The protein molecule+
93 consists of two subunits, S1 containing the RBD domain and S2. The reagent kit "SARS-CoV-
94 2-IgG quantitative ELISA-BEST" detects the pool of immunoglobulin class G synthesized to all
95 antigenic determinants of protein S including the RBD-domain.

96 The quantification of the SARS-CoV-2 antibody assay is based on the WHO First
97 International Standard (NIBSC code:20/136) and expressed in international units (BAU/ml).

98 According to the manufacturer's instructions, the diagnostic sensitivity for the detection
99 of IgG to SARS-CoV-2 is 100% (range 95.7%-100%, 95% confidence interval). The diagnostic
100 specificity is 100% (range 98.5%-100%, 95% confidence interval). The information letter
101 accompanying the reagent kit "SARS-CoV-2-IgG Quantitative ELISA-BEST", No. RZN
102 2021/14458 reports that virus neutralizing activity with a neutralization titer of 1/160 or higher is
103 observed in all samples with a specific IgG concentration of 150 BAU/ml or higher (ELISA titer
104 $\geq 1/600$) (95% CI: 83.16 - 100%) and only 50% of samples with a specific IgG concentration of
105 80-149 BAU/ml (ELISA titer $\geq 1/400 - 1/800$) (95% CI: 32.43 - 67.57%), a specific IgG level of
106 less than 10 BAU/ml should be considered as a negative result of the quantitative assay.

107 On every visit participants filled out a questionnaire including data on the course of
108 chronic diseases, history of COVID-19, and adverse reactions (if any). In case of any adverse
109 reactions due to vaccination the principal investigator was informed immediately.

110 Statistical processing of the results was performed using the R statistical programming
111 environment (graphs and statistical criterion calculations were obtained using the basic R
112 package and the ggpubr package). Normality of the distribution was assessed using the Shapiro-
113 Wilk test. Quantitative comparisons of linked samples (change in IgG levels over time in groups
114 with different vaccines (Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV),
115 PRC) were performed using the Friedman test, followed by pairwise comparison of groups by
116 the Wilcoxon test with Bonferroni multiple comparison adjustment. Mann-Whitney test was
117 used for unrelated samples (comparison of the dynamics of IgG levels in the group in which
118 participants were vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF with the group vaccinated
119 with Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), China). A qualitative comparison of the groups (achievement of
120 one of the IgG values: up to 150 BAU/ml, 150-500 BAU/ml, >500 BAU/ml after administration
121 of Sputnik V vaccine (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine, China;
122 incidence of major postvaccination reactions (temperature, injection site soreness) among
123 participants vaccinated with Sputnik V vaccine (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF and Sinopharm vaccine

124 (BBIBP-CorV), China) was estimated using the Pearson χ^2 test; Fisher's Exact Test was used in
125 cases where expected values in the cells of the contingency table were less than 5. The
126 significance level was set at 0.05.

127 **Results**

128 There were in total 60 participants in this study. Males accounted for 30% (18
129 participants) and females accounted for 70% of the participants (42 participants). Study
130 participants were divided into two groups, where 30 people (50%) were vaccinated with Sputnik
131 V (Gam-COVID-Vac), RF (11 men (36.67%), 19 women (63.33%)), 30 people were vaccinated
132 with Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine, PRC (7 men (23.33%), 23 women (76.67%)).
133 According to the questionnaire, 43 people (71.67%) reported having no chronic diseases. The
134 chronic diseases indicated can be grouped as follows: 1) cardiovascular diseases were 35.29% (6
135 individuals), 2) gastrointestinal diseases were 35.29% (6 individuals), 3) musculoskeletal
136 diseases were 17.65% (3 individuals), 4) respiratory diseases were 11.76% (2 individuals), 5)
137 endocrine diseases were 5.88% (1 individual), 6) female reproductive system diseases were
138 5.88% (1 individual). Participants in the study reported more than one chronic disease. When
139 comparing the two groups of participants on the basis of chronic diseases, no significant
140 difference was found ($p=1.0$). The characteristics of the study participants are presented in Table
141 1.

142 Table 1: Characteristics of study participants.

Feature	N (abs.)	%
Total number of participants, people, of which:	60	
vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac),Russia	30	50
Vaccinated with Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), China	30	50


Median age, years	46 (39; 57,75)	
Age groups:≤30		
31-39	3	5,0
40-49	15	25,0
50-59	21	35,0
60-69	11	18,33
≥70	7	11,67
	3	5,0
Gender:		
men	18	30
women	42	70
Chronic diseases:		
yes	17	28,33
no	43	71,67
COVID-19 in the anamnesis:		
yes	29	48,33
no	31	51,67

143

144 The main surrogate marker for a vaccine efficacy is its immunogenicity. In this study,

145 IgG levels to SARS-CoV-2 S-protein were tested in all participants at three stages: before

146 vaccination, 42 days after the first dose of vaccine and 6 months after the first dose of vaccine.
147 The unit of measure for IgG levels is BAU/ml. (Note: BAU-binding antibody units). The study
148 data are shown in Figure 1, Figure 2 and Figure 3.




149

150

151 *Fig. 1 Dynamics of Ig G production in response to Vaccine Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-*
152 *Vac). ("before vaccination" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) before vaccination; "42 days" - Ig G value*
153 *(BAU/ml) 42 days after the first dose; "6 months" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) 6 months after the*
154 *first vaccine dose).*


155 As shown in Figure 1, quantitative IgG levels at the three measurement points have
156 significant differences (Friedman chi-squared = 47.267, df = 2, p-value < 0,001). IgG levels
157 42 days after the first vaccine dose were significantly higher compared to the "Before
158 vaccination" point (p<0,001), 6 months after the first dose of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac)
159 vaccine the IgG level has a significant decrease (p < 0,001), however, compared to the "before
160 vaccination" point, the IgG level remains at a higher level (p < 0,001).



161

162 *Fig. 2 Dynamics of Ig G appearance in response to Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine*
163 *("before vaccination" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) before vaccination; "42 days" - Ig G value*
164 *(BAU/ml) 42 days after the first dose; "6 months" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) 6 months after the*
165 *first vaccine dose).*

166 As shown in Figure 2, the quantitative IgG values at the three study stages are
167 significantly different (Friedman chi-squared = 44.891, df = 2, p-value < 0,001). Levels of
168 IgG at 42 days after the first dose of vaccine were significantly higher than prior to
169 vaccination (p < 0,001). At 6 months after the first dose, there was a significant decrease in
170 IgG values (p < 0,001), but they remained at a higher level compared to the "before
171 vaccination" point (p < 0,001).



172


173

174 *Fig.3 Comparison of the dynamics of Ig G levels in response to the administration of*
175 *Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine ("Before vaccination" -*
176 *Ig G value (BAU/ml) before vaccination; "42 days" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) 42 days after the*
177 *first dose; "6 months" - Ig G value (BAU/ml) 6 months after the first vaccine dose).*

178 At the pre-vaccination point there is no significant difference between the Sputnik V
179 (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccines ($p=0.12$). At 42 days after the
180 administration of both vaccines, the antibody levels increase, but the quantitative IgG value
181 for the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine is significantly higher ($p < 0,001$). This trend
182 was also observed 6 months after the first dose of both vaccines ($p < 0,001$).

183 According to a questionnaire survey answers of study participants, 51.67% of
184 participants (31 people) did not have COVID-19 before vaccination. Accordingly, 48.33% of
185 participants (29 people) had had the infection prior to vaccination. When comparing the
186 groups characteristics on the basis of prior infection with SARS-CoV-2, no significant
187 difference was found ($p=0.071$).


188 As the factor of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection may influence the outcome of the
189 study, it was also included in the statistical analysis.



190

191 *Fig.4 Comparison of the groups (vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and*
 192 *Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)) by IgG levels (proportion reaching <150 BAU/ml, 150-500*
 193 *BAU/ml, >500 BAU/ml) at study sites: "42 days" - 42 days after the first dose, "6 months" - 6*
 194 *months after the first vaccine dose.*

195 Figure 4 shows that in the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine group, the largest
 196 group of individuals at the 42-day point had IgG levels above 500 BAU/ml, whereas most
 197 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)-vaccinated patients had levels ≤ 500 BAU/ml (X-squared=19.644;
 198 df=2; $p < 0,001$). At the 6-month point, this trend continued: in the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-
 199 Vac) vaccine group most individuals had IgG levels above 500 BAU/ml, while most patients
 200 vaccinated with Sinopharm vaccine had gG level below the 150 BAU/ml(X-squared=20.747;
 201 df = 2; $p < 0,001$). The groups were also compared taking into account the serological status
 202 of the study participants.



203


204 *Fig.5 Comparison of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)*
205 *groups based on serological status before vaccination ("SN"-seronegative individuals, "SP"-*
206 *seropositive participants; "Before vaccination" pre-vaccination IgG level, "42 days"-IgG*
207 *level 42 days after the first dose of one of the vaccines, "6 months later"-IgG level 6 months*
208 *after administration of one of the vaccines).*

209 Figure 5 shows differences in IgG levels to the SARS-CoV-2 protein between those
210 vaccinated with the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccines
211 among both those who had not had COVID-19 and those who had had the infection before
212 vaccination. The highest antibody levels were observed 42 days after vaccination in both the
213 seronegative (p=0.006) and seropositive groups (p < 0,001), while 6 months after vaccination
214 the IgG value declined among those who had not previously been ill (p=0.003) and those who
215 had had COVID-19 before vaccination (p < 0,001).

216 There are a number of publications suggesting that those with "hybrid immunity" are
217 most protected against COVID-19. Figure 5 also shows this trend. However, the "hybrid
218 immunity" generated by the Sputnik V vaccine has greater strength and duration (p < 0,001).

219 The reactogenicity of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)
220 vaccines is worth considering separately, as this is a frequent topic of discussion. The

221 incidence of post-vaccine reactions in this study was 45% (27 individuals). All of the
222 observed reactions were mild to moderate in severity. The most frequent ones were: injection
223 site soreness (16.67% of 10 people) and redness around the site of injection (5% - 3 people),
224 fever (6.67% of 4 people), and a combination of these reactions (Fig. 8). Participants also
225 reported weakness (1.67% - 1 person), headache (1.67% - 1 person), and swelling of the
226 injection site (1.67% - 1 person).



227
228 *Figure 6 The main post-vaccination reactions (and their combination) noted in the*
229 *study participants: soreness and redness at the injection site, increased body temperature.*

230 Post-vaccination reactions were observed in both vaccinated groups ($p=0.119$).
231 However, significant statistical differences were found only for the increase in body
232 temperature: in the group vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) this reaction was
233 more frequent ($p=0.006$).

234 **Discussion**

235 Having evaluated both vaccines currently available to the population of Belarus, it can
236 be concluded that the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine is more immunogenic, but the

237 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine is less reactogenic. For a better understanding of the
238 properties of the above mentioned vaccines, a comparative evaluation should be carried out.

239 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine is an inactivated vaccine, which is the most
240 traditional type of vaccine. The virus is grown in Vero cells, then purified and inactivated
241 with β -propiolactone - this deprives the virus of its ability to reproduce, but retains its
242 antigenic structure. The immune response of T cells is usually weak. Inactivated viruses enter
243 host cells via endocytosis and stimulate helper T cells via the MHC II pathway, resulting in an
244 activation of the humoral immune response. Inactivated vaccines do not normally stimulate
245 cytotoxic T cells through the MHC-I pathway to any significant extent, so a cell-mediated
246 immune response is not formed [9]. Inactivated vaccines require several doses and/or addition
247 of adjuvant to achieve sufficient efficacy [10]. The adverse reactions described in the
248 instructions are, in most cases, mild to moderate in severity, which resolve within a few days
249 after vaccination. The most frequent reactions ($\geq 1/10$): headache, soreness at the injection
250 site. Less frequent, but quite common ($\geq 1/100$ to $< 1/10$): fever, muscle and joint pain, fatigue,
251 cough, shortness of breath, nausea, diarrhoea, skin itching. The immunogenicity of the
252 completed course of vaccination, as declared by the manufacturer, is 79.34%. Advantages
253 include: 1) safety; 2) stability during transport and storage; 3) low cost. Disadvantages
254 include: 1) low immunogenicity; 2) short-lived immune response [11].

255 Vaccine Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine is based on non-replicating viral
256 vectors (adenoviruses 5 and 26) encoding the S-protein gene. Adenoviral vectors (Ad-vectors)
257 have several features that make them ideal candidates: a high immunogenic profile and the
258 ability, using a smaller amount of antigen, to induce both cellular and humoral immune
259 response; Ad-vectors do not integrate into the host genome [12]. To create a vector, the viral
260 E1 and/or E3 genes that enable replication are deleted and replaced with the transgene of
261 interest (derived from the Wuhan-Hu-1 SARS-CoV-2 sequence) cloned together with a tissue
262 plasminogen activator [13]. The efficacy of vector vaccines can be significantly affected by

263 previous immunity. Vectors of a rare serotype (human adenoviruses Ad26, Ad5) are used for
264 this purpose [12]. Advantages include: 1) high immunogenicity (without adding adjuvant); 2)
265 stability (vectors used have a protein envelope that protects the genetic material inside it,
266 hence the vaccine can be stored at +2 - +8 °C for at least 6 months; 3) possibility of large-scale
267 production (Ad vectors can be grown in bioreactors of 20 l volume, yielding vaccine doses
268 sufficient for 15,000 patients). Disadvantages include: 1) reactogenicity; 2) potential
269 neutralization of vaccine vector by acquired immunity antibodies; 3) cost [14, 15]. The main
270 adverse reactions that occur during the first days after administration of the Sputnik V (Gam-
271 COVID-Vac) vaccine are mainly mild to moderate in severity, lasting about 3 days. The most
272 frequent symptoms are: flu-like syndrome (chills, fever, arthralgia, myalgia, headache),
273 soreness, hyperemia and swelling at the injection site. Less common are dyspepsia, nausea,
274 nasal congestion, rhinorrhoea, sore and stuffy throat, enlargement of regional lymph nodes,
275 and possible allergic reactions. The immunological efficacy of two doses of the vaccine, as
276 declared by the manufacturer, is more than 91% (16).

277 Therefore, there is still a lack of international publications comparing the
278 immunological efficacy and reactogenicity of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm
279 (BBIBP-CorV) vaccines with each other. A retrospective observational study conducted in
280 Mongolia found the immunogenicity of two doses of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine
281 to be significantly higher than the immunogenicity of two doses of Sinopharm vaccine. No
282 reactogenicity study was conducted in this study (17). A retrospective observational study
283 conducted in Hungary investigated the efficacy of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac), Sinopharm
284 (BBIBP-CorV) et al. vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 infection (confirmed by PCR test) and
285 death from COVID-19 among vaccinated individuals. The results of this study indicate that
286 the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine was 85.7% effective against SARS-CoV-2
287 infection and 95.4-100% effective against COVID-19 deaths (depending on age cohort), and

288 the Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine was 68.7% effective against SARS-CoV-2 infection
289 and 67.3-100% effective against COVID-19 deaths (depending on age cohort) [18].

290 Only few international publications reflect the results of a study of the reactogenicity
291 of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccines. A study based on
292 a survey of vaccinees conducted in Iran found that reactions in response to Sputnik V (Gam-
293 COVID-Vac) vaccine were longer (up to 3 days) than reactions in response to Sinopharm
294 vaccine (a few hours). The frequency of post-vaccination reactions also varied, with at least
295 one reaction occurring in 93.2% of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine users and 87.3% of
296 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine users. The most frequent reactions were pain at the
297 injection site, headache and malaise. Also in the study there were cases of thrombosis and
298 conditions related to clotting disorders: 7 cases after administration of Sputnik V (Gam-
299 COVID-Vac) vaccine and 3 cases after administration of Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine.
300 However, a subsequent association between vaccination and conditions related to clotting
301 disorders has not been found for both vaccines, and this issue requires further investigation
302 [19]. Another study, based on a survey of vaccinees vaccinated with Sputnik V (Gam-
303 COVID-Vac), Sinopharm et al. in Iran, aimed to investigate cutaneous reactions in response
304 to the administration of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) and Sinopharm vaccines. Skin
305 manifestations in the vaccinated subjects were transient. The most common reactions were
306 pain at the injection site (79.9% of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine users, 60.6% of
307 Sinopharm vaccine users), tightening of the injection site (13.4% of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-
308 Vac) vaccine users, 10.3% of Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine users), reddening of the skin
309 at the injection site (12.8% of Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine users, 6.9% of
310 Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine users) [20].

311 Thus, the approaches to the study conducted at Gomel State Medical University do not
312 contradict international studies and the study is conducted in a similar way, which in our

313 opinion allows a comparative assessment of postvaccination reactions and immunogenicity of
314 Sputnik V and Sinopharm vaccines.

315 The study has a number of limitations: sample size (60 people), age of participants
316 (the study represents individuals whose age ranges from 29 to 73 years).

317 **Conclusions**

318 According to the results of the study, the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine
319 compared to Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV), has higher immunogenicity rates at both points: after
320 42 days (for Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine: Me=627.5 (461.7-650.8); for Sinopharm
321 (BBIBP-CorV) vaccine: Me=286.0 (120.3-387.9); $p < 0,001$) and 6 months (for Sputnik
322 V(Gam-COVID-Vac) vaccine: Me=549.4 (94.36-626.8); for Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV)
323 vaccine: Me=46.74 (22.23-116.4); $p < 0,001$) after first dose administration. This trend was
324 seen among both those previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 and those without a history of
325 COVID-19.

326 The study confirmed that antibodies developed as a result of prior infection with
327 SARS-CoV-2 combine with post-vaccination antibodies to form what is known as "hybrid
328 immunity". It creates higher levels of antibodies (for Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-Vac) (42 days)
329 vaccine: Me=650.4 (642.2-669.4); for Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) (42 days) vaccine:
330 Me=376.5 (290.9-526.4); $p < 0,001$), which persist for a longer time (for Sputnik V (Gam-
331 COVID-Vac) (6 mo) Me=608.7 (574.6-647.1); for Sinopharm (BBIBP-CorV) (6 months)
332 vaccine Me=106.3 (78.21-332.4); $p < 0,001$).

333 The main reactions after vaccination were fever, redness and soreness at the injection
334 site. The reactogenicity of both vaccines was relatively similar ($p = 0,119$), a fever after
335 vaccination was more common among those vaccinated with the Sputnik V (Gam-COVID-
336 Vac) vaccine (10 individuals or 33,33% vs. 3.33% of vaccinated with Sinopharm BBIBP-
337 CorV, $p = 0.006$).

338

339 Authors report no relevant conflict of interest regarding this study.

340

341 **Acknowledgments:** Authors would like to thank Alexey Zyatkov, Alexander
342 Shaforost, Nadezhda Golubykh, Elena Lipskaya, Dmitry Redko, and Vera Shandyba for data
343 collection and technical assistance.

344

345

346 **List of references:**

- 347 1. Wong RSY. COVID-19 vaccines and herd immunity: Perspectives, challenges and
348 prospects. *The Malaysian Journal of Pathology*. 2021;43(2): 203 – 217 PMID: 34448786
- 349 2. Meo SA, Meo AS, Al-Jassir FF, Klonoff DC. Omicron SARS-CoV-2 new variant: global
350 prevalence and biological and clinical characteristics. *European Review for Medical*
351 *Pharmacological Sciences*. 2021;25(24):8012-8018. doi:
352 10.26355/eurrev_202112_27652.
- 353 3. Argote P, Barham E, Zukerman Daly S, Gerez JE, Marshall J, Pocasangre O. The shot,
354 the message, and the messenger: COVID-19 vaccine acceptance in Latin America. *npj*
355 *Vaccines*. 2021;6:118. doi: 10.1038/s41541-021-00380-x
- 356 4. Strizovaa Z, Smetanovaa J, Bartunkovaa J, Milota T. Principles and Challenges in anti-
357 COVID-19 Vaccine Development. *International Archives of Allergy and Immunology*.
358 2021;1:1–11. doi: 10.1159/000514225
- 359 5. Khan M, Adil SF, Alkathlan HZ, Tahir MN, Saif S, Khan M, Khan ST. COVID-19: A
360 Global Challenge with Old History, Epidemiology and Progress So Far. *Molecules*.
361 2020;26(1):39. doi: 10.3390/molecules 26010039
- 362 6. Jackson SE, Paul E, Brown J, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Negative vaccine attitudes and
363 intentions to vaccinate against Covid-19 in relation to smoking status: a population

- 364 survey of UK adults. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2021;23(9):1623-1628.
365 doi: [10.1093/ntr/ntab039](https://doi.org/10.1093/ntr/ntab039)
- 366 7. Basta NE, Moodie EMM on behalf of the VIPER (Vaccines, Infectious disease
367 Prevention, and Epidemiology Research) Group COVID-19 Vaccine Development and
368 Approvals Tracker Team. COVID-19 Vaccine Development and Approvals Tracker.
369 Funding provided by the McGill University Interdisciplinary Initiative in Infection and
370 Immunity (MI4) (2020). <https://covid19.trackvaccines.org/>
- 371 8. Our World In Data, University of Oxford, UK
372 <https://ourworldindata.org/coronavirus/country/belarus>
- 373 9. Nascimento Júnior JAC, Santos AM, Cavalcante RCM, Quintans-Júnior LJ, Walker CIB,
374 Borges LP et al. Mapping the technological landscape of SARS, MERS, and SARS-CoV-
375 2 vaccines. *Drug Development and Industrial Pharmacy*. 2021;47(4):673–84.
- 376 10. Shahzamani K, Mahmoudian F, Ahangarzadeh S, Ranjbar MM, Beikmohammadi L,
377 Bahrami S, Mohammadi E, Esfandyari S, Alibakhshi A, Javanmard SH. Vaccine design
378 and delivery approaches for COVID-19. *International Immunopharmacology*.
379 2021;100:108086. doi: [10.1016/j.intimp.2021.108086](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intimp.2021.108086)
- 380 11. Loo KY, Letchumanan V, Ser HL, Teoh SL, Law JWF, Tan LTH, Ab Mutalib NS, Chan
381 KG, Lee LH. COVID-19: Insights into Potential Vaccines. *Microorganisms*.
382 2021;9(3):605. doi: [10.3390/microorganisms9030605](https://doi.org/10.3390/microorganisms9030605)
- 383 12. Kordyukova LV, Shanko AV. COVID19: Myths and Reality. *Biochemistry (Moscow)*.
384 2021;86(7):800-817.
- 385 13. Han X, Xu P, Ye Q. Analysis of COVID-19 vaccines: Types, thoughts, and application.
386 *Journal of Clinical Laboratory Analysis*. 2021;35(9):e23937. doi: [10.1002/jcla.23937](https://doi.org/10.1002/jcla.23937).
- 387 14. Mao Q, Xu M, He Q, Li C, Meng S, Wang Y, Cui B, Liang Z, Wang J. COVID-19
388 vaccines: progress and understanding on quality control and evaluation. *Signal
389 Transduction and Targeted Therapy*. 2021;6:199. doi: [10.1038/s41392-021-00621-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41392-021-00621-4)

- 390 **15.** Kisby T, Yilmazer A, Kostarelos K Reasons for success and lessons learnt from
391 nanoscale vaccines against COVID-19. *Nature Nanotechnology*. 2021;16(8):843-850.
392 [https://doi: 10.1038/s41565-021-00946-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41565-021-00946-9)
- 393 **16.** Logunov DY, Dolzhikova IV, Shcheblyakov DV, Tukhvatulin AI, Zubkova OV,
394 Dzharullaeva AS et al. Safety and efficacy of an rAd26 and rAd5 vector-based
395 heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccine: an interim analysis of a randomised
396 controlled phase 3 trial in Russia. *The Lancet*. 2021.;397(10275):671–81. doi:
397 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00234-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00234-8)
- 398 **17.** Dashdorj NJ, Wirz OF, Röltgen K, Haraguchi E, Buzzanco AS, Sibai M, et al. Direct
399 comparison of antibody responses to four SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in Mongolia. *Cell Host*
400 *& Microbe*. 2021;29(12):1738-1743.e4. doi: [10.1016/j.chom.2021.11.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chom.2021.11.004)
- 401 **18.** Vokó Z, Kiss Z, Surján G, Surján O, Barcza Z, Pályi B, et al. Nationwide effectiveness
402 of five SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in Hungary—the HUN-VE study. *Clinical Microbiology*
403 *and Infection*. 2021;S1198-743X(21)00639-X. doi: [10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.011)
- 404 **19.** Houshmand B, Keyhan SO, Fallahi HR, Ramezanzade S, Sadeghi E, Yousefi P.
405 Vaccine-associated complications: a comparative multicenter evaluation among dental
406 practitioners and dental students—which candidate vaccine is more safe in SARS COV
407 II, Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V), ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AstraZeneca), BBV152
408 (Covaxin), or BBIBP-CorV(Sinopharm)? *Maxillofacial Plastic and Reconstructive*
409 *Surgery*. 2022;44(1):3. doi: [10.1186/s40902-021-00330-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s40902-021-00330-6)
- 410 **20.** Pourani MR, Shahidi Dadras M, Salari M, Diab R, Namazi N, Abdollahimajd F.
411 Cutaneous adverse events related to COVID-19 vaccines: A cross-sectional
412 questionnaire-based study of 867 patients. *Dermatologic Therapy*. 2022;35(2):e15223.
413 <https://doi.org/10.1111/dth.15223>