

1 **Estimating serum cross-neutralizing responses to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages**
2 **elicited by pre-Omicron or Omicron breakthrough infection with exposure interval**
3 **compensation modeling**

4

5 **Authors:**

6 Sho Miyamoto^{a,1}, Yudai Kuroda^{b,1}, Takayuki Kanno^a, Akira Ueno^a, Nozomi Shiwa-Sudo^a, Naoko Iwata-
7 Yoshikawa^a, Yusuke Sakai^a, Noriyo Nagata^a, Takeshi Arashiro^{a,c}, Akira Ainai^a, Saya Moriyama^d, Noriko
8 Kishida^e, Shinji Watanabe^e, Kiyoko Nojima^f, Yohei Seki^f, Takuo Mizukami^f, Hideki Hasegawa^e, Hideki
9 Ebihara^g, Shuetsu Fukushi^g, Yoshimasa Takahashi^d, Ken Maeda^b, Tadaki Suzuki^{a,2}

10

11 **Affiliations:**

12 ^aDepartment of Pathology, National Institute of Infectious Diseases; Tokyo, 162-8640, Japan

13 ^bDepartment of Veterinary Science, National Institute of Infectious Diseases; Tokyo 162-8640, Japan

14 ^cCenter for Surveillance, Immunization, and Epidemiologic Research, National Institute of Infectious
15 Diseases, 162-8640, Tokyo, Japan

16 ^dResearch Center for Drug and Vaccine Development, National Institute of Infectious Diseases; Tokyo
17 162-8640, Japan

18 ^eCenter for Influenza and Respiratory Virus Research, National Institute of Infectious Diseases; Tokyo
19 208-0011, Japan

20 ^fDepartment of Safety Research on Blood and Biological Products, National Institute of Infectious
21 Diseases; 208-0011, Japan

22 ^gDepartment of Virology I, National Institute of Infectious Diseases; Tokyo 162-8640, Japan

23 ¹These authors contributed equally

24

25 ²**Corresponding Author:**

26 tksuzuki@niid.go.jp (TS)

27

28 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, SMi, YK, KM, TS; Methodology, SMi, TA, AU, TK, KM, TS;
29 Investigation, SMi, YK, TK, AU, NS, NI, YSa, NN, TA, AA, SMo, NK, SW, KN, YSe, TM, HH, HE, SF,
30 YT, KM, TS; Data curation, SMi, YK, TK, TA, SMo, SF, SW, TM, TS; Formal analysis and Visualization,
31 SMi, TS; Funding acquisition, SMi, TS; Project administration and supervision, KM, TS; Writing original
32 draft, SMi, TS; Writing – review & editing, SMi, YK, AU, KM, TS. All authors agreed to submit the
33 manuscript, read and approved the final draft, and take full responsibility of its content including the
34 accuracy of the data and statistical analysis.

35

36 **Competing Interest Statement:** The authors declare no competing interests.

37

38 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; Omicron sub-lineages; COVID-19 vaccine; Breakthrough infection;
39 Vaccination-infection interval; Cross-neutralizing antibody.

40

41 **Abstract**

42 Understanding the differences in serum cross-neutralizing responses against SARS-CoV-2 variants,
43 including Omicron sub-lineages BA.5, BA.2.75, and BQ.1.1, elicited by exposure to distinct antigens is
44 essential for developing COVID-19 booster vaccines with enhanced cross-protection against antigenically
45 distinct variants. However, fairly comparing the impact of breakthrough infection on serum neutralizing
46 responses to several variants with distinct epidemic timing is challenging because responses after
47 breakthrough infection are affected by the exposure interval between vaccination and infection. We
48 assessed serum cross-neutralizing responses to SARS-CoV-2 variants, including Omicron sub-lineages, in
49 individuals with breakthrough infections before or during the Omicron BA.1 epidemic. To understand the
50 differences in serum cross-neutralizing responses after pre-Omicron or Omicron breakthrough infection,
51 we used Bayesian hierarchical modeling to correct the cross-neutralizing responses for the exposure
52 interval between vaccination and breakthrough infection. The exposure interval required to generate
53 saturated cross-neutralizing potency against each variant differed by variant, with variants more
54 antigenically distant from the ancestral strain requiring a longer interval. Additionally, Omicron
55 breakthrough infection was estimated to have higher impact than booster vaccination and pre-Omicron
56 breakthrough infection on inducing serum neutralizing responses to the ancestral strain and Omicron sub-
57 lineages. However, the breadth of cross-neutralizing responses to Omicron sub-lineages, including BQ.1.1,
58 after Omicron or pre-Omicron breakthrough infection with the ideal exposure interval were estimated to
59 be comparable. Our results highlight the importance of optimizing the interval between vaccine doses for
60 maximizing the breadth of cross-neutralizing activity elicited by booster vaccines with or without Omicron
61 antigen.

62

63 **Significance Statement**

64 SARS-CoV-2 infections after vaccination with COVID-19 mRNA vaccines with the ancestral spike
65 antigen induce high serum neutralizing responses against Omicron sub-lineages, which are antigenically
66 distant from the ancestral antigen. In individuals with breakthrough infections, the exposure interval from
67 vaccination to infection is critical for the induction of serum cross-neutralizing activity. We used statistical
68 modeling to estimate the serum neutralizing response to Omicron sub-lineages corrected for the influence
69 of different exposure intervals between vaccination and breakthrough infection in individuals with pre-
70 Omicron and Omicron breakthrough infections. This enabled us to assess fairly the effects of exposure to
71 distinct antigens on inducing serum cross-neutralizing responses with the ideal exposure interval, and
72 revealed the clinical significance of optimizing the dose interval in COVID-19 booster vaccination.

73

74 **Introduction**

75 At the end of 2021, the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Omicron
76 (B.1.1.529) variant emerged and rapidly spread worldwide. Since then, the Omicron variant has evolved
77 into multiple sub-lineages, with BA.1, BA.2, and BA.5, emerging sequentially as the globally dominant
78 variant. In August 2022, BA.5 was the most common variant circulating worldwide. In India, the
79 proportion of BA.5 infections increased in May 2022, but the proportion of BA.2.75 (a variant of the BA.2
80 sub-lineage) has increased since June 2022, suggesting that the transmissibility of BA.2.75 may be higher
81 than that of BA.5 (1). Therefore, BA.2.75 has recently been recognized as a variant of concern (VOC)
82 lineage under monitoring. Moreover, in December 2022, BQ.1.1 (a variant of the BA.5 sub-lineage) has
83 been becoming more dominant among Omicron sub-lineages, especially in Europe and the United States
84 (<https://cov-spectrum.org>). Compared to the SARS-CoV-2 ancestral strain, the BA.1 virus has more than

85 30 amino acid mutations in the spike protein, including insertions and deletions. The BA.2 spike protein
86 differs from the BA.1 spike protein at 27 amino acid positions, whereas the BA.5 spike protein differs
87 from the BA.2 spike protein by four amino acids, including a L452R mutation. BA.2.75 differs the from
88 BA.2 spike protein at nine amino acid positions, including K147E, W152R, F157L, I210V, and G257S,
89 which are located in the N-terminal domain, and G339H, G446S, N460K, and R493Q, which are located
90 in the receptor-binding domain (RBD). BQ.1.1 differs from BA.5 spike protein at R346T, K444T, and
91 N460K.

92 Because of the numerous mutations that have accumulated in the spike protein of Omicron variants,
93 Omicron variants are antigenically distinct from the ancestral strain and have the capacity to evade
94 immunity introduced by a primary series of the first-generation COVID-19 vaccine, including COVID-19
95 mRNA vaccine containing ancestral spike antigen alone. Among Omicron sub-lineages, BQ.1.1 shows the
96 greatest immune evasion against serum neutralization (2-4). In addition, it has been shown that immunity
97 provided by booster vaccination with first-generation vaccines or post-vaccination breakthrough infection
98 can partially protect against Omicron variant infection. However, the surge in SARS-CoV-2 infections has
99 not stopped, even in areas with high booster vaccine uptake, such as Japan. This situation suggests that
100 first-generation COVID-19 vaccines have limited effectiveness at controlling the COVID-19 pandemic,
101 and highlights the need for implementation of the second-generation booster vaccines containing Omicron
102 antigen with improved effectiveness against Omicron variants. Second-generation booster vaccines should
103 induce broad-spectrum protective immunity against all SARS-CoV-2 variants, including Omicron sub-
104 lineages. However, there are many unanswered questions regarding how to induce high-quality immunity
105 that suppresses SARS-CoV-2 variants with distinct antigenicity. A better understanding of the immune
106 response to SARS-CoV-2 variant infection could facilitate the development of better vaccine designs.

107 Specifically, understanding the immune response generated by breakthrough infection or reinfection,
108 which is infection in the presence of pre-existing SARS-CoV-2 immunity due to vaccination or prior
109 infection, respectively, might help to design better booster vaccine antigens (5).

110 Recently, BA.1 and BA.2 breakthrough infections in individuals vaccinated with COVID-19 mRNA
111 vaccines were found to increase broad serum neutralizing activity against Omicron BA.1, BA.2, and prior
112 VOCs at levels comparable to those of the ancestral strain (6-9). In individuals vaccinated with COVID-
113 19 mRNA vaccines, BA.1 breakthrough infection increases memory B cells primarily for conserved
114 epitopes that are broadly shared among variants and generates robust serum cross-neutralizing activity (9).
115 Notably, convalescent serum samples from individuals with breakthrough infections have higher variable
116 neutralizing activity against Omicron sub-lineages than serum samples of booster vaccination recipients
117 (6-8, 10-15). Furthermore, the exposure interval between vaccination and infection influences the
118 induction of serum cross-neutralizing antibodies against BA.1, with a longer exposure interval
119 contributing to greater induction of serum cross-neutralizing antibodies (12, 16, 17). Unlike booster
120 vaccination, in which the dosing interval between vaccinations is controlled, the exposure interval between
121 vaccination and breakthrough infection is not controlled, resulting in individuals with breakthrough
122 infections having a variable serum neutralizing response to SARS-CoV-2 variants. Therefore, it is difficult
123 to compare the impact of breakthrough infections during different epidemic periods on the serum
124 neutralizing response against the SARS-CoV-2 variants. When the ability to induce serum neutralizing
125 responses through breakthrough infection with Omicron variants and prior VOCs is compared, individuals
126 with breakthrough infections with prior VOCs may have had a shorter exposure interval between
127 vaccination and infection than those with Omicron breakthrough infections, resulting in a lower ability to
128 induce serum cross-neutralizing responses.

129 In this study, cross-neutralizing activity against SARS-CoV-2 variants, including the Omicron sub-
130 lineages BA.1, BA.2, BA.5, BA.2.75, and BQ.1.1, was assessed using serum samples from individuals
131 with breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients before or during the Omicron epidemic.
132 Furthermore, Bayesian modeling was used to correct for the influence of different exposure intervals to
133 enable estimation of the saturated serum cross-neutralizing responses against SARS-CoV-2 variants
134 induced after breakthrough infection with the ideal exposure interval between vaccination and
135 breakthrough infection.

136

137 **Results**

138 *Antigenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages in serum samples from individuals with breakthrough*
139 *infections and booster vaccine recipients*

140 We collected serum samples from individuals with breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infections during
141 the Omicron BA.1 wave and individuals who had received a booster dose of the first-generation mRNA
142 COVID-19 vaccine containing the ancestral spike antigen alone ([SI Appendix, Table S1, and Fig. S1](#);
143 [Material and Methods](#)). Individuals with a history of a COVID-19 diagnosis and positive anti-
144 nucleoprotein (N) antibodies after the second vaccination were defined as having breakthrough infections,
145 whereas individuals who had received three doses of vaccine and did not have a COVID-19 diagnosis or
146 positive anti-N antibodies were defined as booster vaccine recipients in this cohort ([Fig. 1A](#)). Similarly,
147 we used serum samples from individuals who had breakthrough infections during the pre-Omicron wave,
148 as reported previously ([SI Appendix Fig. S1](#)) (12, 16). Age, exposure interval between the first and second
149 doses of vaccine, and time since the last vaccination were comparable between the three exposure groups
150 ([SI Appendix Table S1](#)). Anti-spike (S) antibody titers were highest in individuals with Omicron
151 breakthrough infections, and lowest in individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections ([Fig. 1A](#)).

152 Neutralization titers (NTs) were determined using live virus-based assays (Fig. 1B). Serum
153 samples from individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients had
154 uniformly lower NTs against Omicron sub-lineages BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75, and BA.5, than those against
155 the SARS-CoV-2 ancestral strain (Fig. 1B and 1C). Conversely, serum samples from individuals with
156 Omicron breakthrough infections had high NTs to BA.1, BA.2, and BA.2.75, within 3-fold of the ancestral
157 strain, but 7.4-fold lower NTs to BA.5 (Fig. 1B and 1C). The BQ.1.1 variant had the highest immuno-
158 evasion ability among individuals in the three exposure groups, resulting in a more than 20-fold decrease
159 in the NT relative to that against the ancestral strain (Fig. 1C).

160 To obtain an overall picture of the antigenicity of Omicron sub-lineages in serum samples from
161 each exposure group, we calculated the positions of antigens and serum samples on antigenic maps based
162 on the difference in NTs (Fig. 1D). Antigenic distances from the ancestral strain to BA.5 and BQ.1.1
163 evaluated by using all serum samples were further than the distances from the ancestral strain to BA.1,
164 BA.2 and BA.2.75 (Fig. S2). The antigenic distances of BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75, BA.5, and BQ.1.1 from the
165 ancestral strain in the pre-Omicron breakthrough infection and booster vaccine recipient groups were
166 longer than those in the Omicron breakthrough infection group. In addition, the distance between BA.2.75
167 and the ancestral strain in the serum samples of the Omicron breakthrough infection and booster vaccine
168 recipient groups was closer than that in the pre-Omicron breakthrough infection group, indicating that
169 BA.2.75 probably exhibited different antigenicity among the three exposure groups. Notably, in serum
170 samples from individuals in the three exposure groups, the antigenic distance between BQ.1.1 and the
171 ancestral strain ranged from 4.5 to 6.0, indicating that BQ.1.1 is the Omicron sub-lineage that is the most
172 antigenically distinct from the ancestral strain. Taken together with Figure 1C, the serum samples of the
173 Omicron breakthrough infection group showed broader breadth of cross-neutralizing potency than those

174 of the pre-Omicron breakthrough infection group.

175

176 *Estimating the serum neutralization responses against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages corrected for*
177 *the influence of different exposure intervals from the second vaccination to the third exposure*

178 A longer time between the second vaccination and third exposure, within a range of
179 approximately 120 days, is necessary to induce broader cross-neutralizing potency in serum samples from
180 individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infection, probably because memory B cell affinity maturation
181 occurs during this period (12, 18, 19). The optimal interval between the second vaccination and booster
182 dose has not yet been determined (WHO, [https://www.who.int/news/item/17-05-2022-interim-statement-](https://www.who.int/news/item/17-05-2022-interim-statement-on-the-use-of-additional-booster-doses-of-emergency-use-listed-mrna-vaccines-against-covid-19)
183 [on-the-use-of-additional-booster-doses-of-emergency-use-listed-mrna-vaccines-against-covid-19](https://www.who.int/news/item/17-05-2022-interim-statement-on-the-use-of-additional-booster-doses-of-emergency-use-listed-mrna-vaccines-against-covid-19)).

184 Generally, an interval of 4 to 6 months after the second vaccination could be considered. In Japan, a
185 vaccination interval of at least 3 months is recommended ([https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/covid-](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/covid-19/booster.html)
186 [19/booster.html](https://www.mhlw.go.jp/stf/covid-19/booster.html)). This vaccination strategy and the periods of pre-Omicron and Omicron waves resulted
187 in distinct exposure intervals among the three exposure groups (Fig. 2A; SI Appendix, Fig. S1, and Table
188 S1). To complement the missing intervals in each exposure history group, we used a Bayesian hierarchical
189 model to estimate the serum neutralizing responses against SARS-CoV-2 variants induced with different
190 antigen exposures and intervals, and estimated the saturated neutralizing responses against SARS-CoV-2
191 variants with the ideal exposure interval in each exposure history group (Figs. 2 and 3). The overall trend
192 for booster vaccine recipients and individuals with breakthrough infections showed that the interval to
193 saturate the neutralizing response was different for each variant, and that saturating the neutralizing
194 responses against Omicron sub-lineages required a longer exposure interval than those against the
195 ancestral strain (Fig. 2A). To evaluate differences in the exposure interval required to saturate the

196 neutralizing response for each SARS-CoV-2 variant, the probability densities of the estimated number of
197 days to 90% saturated NTs were calculated (Fig. 2B). The medians of the densities of the ancestral strain,
198 and BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75, BA.5, and BQ.1.1 variants were 34, 74, 71, 106, 95, and 128 days after the
199 third exposure, respectively. This finding suggests that the exposure interval for inducing saturated cross-
200 neutralizing potency against Omicron sub-lineages is longer than that against the ancestral strain, with
201 variants that are more antigenically distant from the ancestral strain requiring a longer period. Additionally,
202 the vaccination-infection intervals in most of the individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections
203 were shorter than the median of the estimated number of days to 90% saturated NTs to Omicron sub-
204 lineages, and these individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections experienced infection without
205 an exposure interval sufficient to acquire cross-neutralizing antibodies. Thus, it is essential to estimate
206 saturated cross-neutralizing potency with the ideal exposure interval to accurately assess the differences
207 in cross-neutralization responses due to varying exposure antigens in breakthrough infections, to avoid
208 bias due to the exposure interval.

209 Next, we estimated the saturated neutralizing response to each SARS-CoV-2 variant in each
210 exposure group (Figs. 3A and 3B). In the Omicron breakthrough infection group, the estimated saturated
211 NTs against the ancestral strain, and BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75, BA.5, and BQ.1.1 variants were clearly higher
212 than those in the booster vaccination group (SI Appendix Figs. S3A, and S3B). Similarly, in the Omicron
213 breakthrough infection group, the saturated NTs against the ancestral strain, and BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75,
214 and BQ.1.1 variants, were higher than those in the pre-Omicron breakthrough infection group (SI
215 Appendix Figs. S3A, and S3B). In contrast, the saturated NTs against the ancestral strain, and BA.1, BA.2,
216 BA.2.75, and BQ.1.1 variants did not differ significantly between the pre-Omicron breakthrough infection
217 group and the booster vaccination group, but the saturated NT against BA.5 was higher in the pre-Omicron

218 breakthrough infection group than that in the booster vaccination group. Notably, even with the ideal
219 interval, the BQ.1.1 variant exhibited the highest immuno-evasion capabilities in all the exposure groups,
220 with a 15.7–26.8-fold decrease in the saturated NTs relative to those against the ancestral strain (Fig. 3B
221 and 3C). This finding suggests that vaccination and prior infection are less likely to induce protective NTs
222 to BQ.1.1 than to other variants.

223 Finally, we calculated the fold decrease in the saturated NT relative to the median of the ancestral
224 strain to evaluate the breadth of cross-neutralization potency with the ideal interval (Fig. 3B and 3C).
225 Contrary to the measured NTs (Fig. 1C), no clear differences were observed between individuals with pre-
226 Omicron and Omicron breakthrough infections (Fig. 3C; SI Appendix Figs. S3C and S3D). Notably,
227 compared to the booster vaccination group, the Omicron and pre-Omicron breakthrough infection groups
228 showed relatively mild reduction in the saturated NTs against the Omicron sub-lineages, excluding BQ.1.1.
229 These findings suggest that, given an adequate exposure interval, both Omicron and pre-Omicron
230 breakthrough infections induce a broader breadth of serum cross-neutralizing activity than booster
231 vaccination with the ancestral strain antigen.

232

233 **Discussion**

234 In this study, we showed that the ideal exposure interval between vaccination and exposure to achieve
235 saturated neutralizing responses differed by variant in individuals with breakthrough infections, and that
236 more antigenically distant variants from the ancestral strain required a longer exposure interval to reach
237 to a saturated neutralizing response. In addition, we also showed that serum samples from individuals with
238 Omicron breakthrough infections had higher saturated neutralizing responses against the ancestral strain
239 and Omicron sub-lineages than those of individuals with booster vaccination or pre-Omicron breakthrough

240 infection.

241 An exposure interval of more than 128 days was required to induce broad cross-neutralizing activity
242 against the BQ.1.1 variant, which were antigenically distant from the ancestral strain. As stated above,
243 WHO recommends at least 4 months (approximately 120 days) after the second vaccination before booster
244 vaccination, which is comparable to the exposure interval needed to induce broad cross-neutralizing
245 responses. In contrast, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends at least 2
246 months (approximately 60 days) between the second and third doses
247 (<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/stay-up-to-date.html>). Although a shorter
248 vaccination interval during periods of transient surges in COVID-19 cases may benefit to the level of herd
249 immunity, it may be insufficient to induce high levels of cross-neutralizing antibodies covering
250 antigenically distinct variants. Previous studies have shown that in vaccine recipients, higher NTs were
251 induced with a dose interval of 16 weeks (median, 111 days) than with a dose interval of 4 weeks (median,
252 29 days) between the first and second doses (20), and the NT and vaccination dose interval were positively
253 correlated within approximately 100 days (21). Notably, when the vaccination dose interval between the
254 second and third dose of vaccine was between 206 and 372 days, there was no difference in the neutralizing
255 responses between the shorter and longer interval (22), suggesting that the effect of vaccination dose
256 interval on inducing neutralizing responses was saturated within this period. These increases and saturation
257 of the serum neutralization response dynamics are consistent with our model. The vaccination dose interval
258 that affects the induction of cross-neutralizing responses can be considered equivalent to the vaccination-
259 infection interval in breakthrough infections in terms of the time taken for the antibody affinity maturation
260 derived from memory B cells in germinal centers after mRNA vaccination (19, 23, 24). Memory B cells
261 that recognize Omicron and other variants proliferate after the second vaccination (18, 22), and the third

262 exposure by vaccination or breakthrough infection induces recall and proliferation of memory B cells
263 which recognize the Omicron spike protein (22, 25). As evaluating the effect of a shorter interval between
264 the second and third vaccine doses would be ethically challenging, our model using individuals with
265 breakthrough infection as a surrogate, provides valuable information about the optimal dose interval
266 between the second and third doses of vaccine. Additionally, our model also suggests that to induce higher
267 levels of cross-neutralizing responses, an additional booster vaccination should be considered in
268 individuals with breakthrough infections with a vaccination-infection interval shorter than four months
269 (120 days).

270 In serum samples of individuals with Omicron breakthrough infections, the saturated neutralizing
271 responses to Omicron sub-lineages were higher than those in serum samples of individuals with pre-
272 Omicron breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients vaccinated at the ideal intervals. Several
273 studies have also found higher cross-neutralizing antibody titers to Omicron sub-lineages in individuals
274 with BA.1 breakthrough infection than in booster vaccine recipients and individuals with Delta
275 breakthrough infection (7-9). Furthermore, BA.1 booster mRNA vaccination of mice and macaques
276 inoculated with the ancestral strain mRNA vaccines also induces higher NTs than a booster dose of the
277 ancestral strain mRNA vaccine (26, 27). Similar findings have also been reported in human studies of
278 Omicron BA.1 and ancestral bivalent vaccine recipients (28), suggesting that booster vaccination with the
279 Omicron antigen induces higher levels of cross-neutralizing antibodies. However, the serum neutralizing
280 breadth in individuals with Omicron BA.1 breakthrough infections was estimated to be similar to those of
281 individuals with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections, regardless of the antigenicity of the infecting
282 variant, and broader than those of booster vaccine recipients. These results suggest that breakthrough
283 infections might contribute to the induction of broader cross-neutralizing responses, referred to as hybrid

284 immunity (5). Compared with three doses of vaccine, breakthrough infection with Delta or Omicron BA.1
285 variants induces higher levels of memory B cells recognizing ancestral spike RBDs (7, 9, 29), and viral
286 load and duration of viral antigen exposure may contribute to enhanced stimulation of memory B cells.
287 Although the frequency of somatic hypermutations in anti-RBD⁺ memory B cells of individuals with
288 breakthrough infections is comparable to that of booster vaccine recipients (7, 29), antibodies isolated
289 from memory B cells in individuals with breakthrough infections show higher cross-neutralizing activity
290 and affinity (29). Together, these reports and our results suggest that breakthrough infection may contribute
291 to increased cross-neutralizing activity and affinity of memory B cells, regardless of the length of the
292 exposure interval.

293

294 *Limitations of study*

295 This study has several limitations. First, the number of samples evaluated was relatively small. Second,
296 the possibility that reduced neutralizing activity at the time of breakthrough infection results in efficient
297 viral replication in the upper respiratory tract may contribute to a better antibody response (16), was not
298 evaluated because of the lack of respiratory specimens. Third, our study does not support the idea that
299 breakthrough infection can act as a substitute for booster vaccination because natural infection can cause
300 long-term complications and is particularly dangerous for vulnerable individuals. Fourth, this study did
301 not include any individuals with a second booster dose of vaccine or breakthrough infection after the first
302 booster dose of vaccine. Finally, our investigation did not evaluate the actual risk of reinfection by SARS-
303 CoV-2 in individuals with a history of breakthrough infection, although there is evidence that NTs are
304 correlated with protection against ancestral strains and different variants (30-32).

305

306 *Conclusion*

307 In conclusion, estimating serum cross-neutralizing responses in individuals with breakthrough infection
308 using Bayesian modeling to compensate for the effect of varying exposure intervals, revealed the ideal
309 dose interval and fairly compared the impact of breakthrough infection on breadth of cross-neutralizing
310 responses by variants with distinct antigenicity and epidemic timing. Our results highlight that optimizing
311 the dose interval is critical for maximizing the breadth of cross-neutralizing activity elicited by booster
312 vaccines, with or without Omicron antigens. Understanding how breakthrough infection increases the
313 neutralization breadth would significantly contribute to the development of next-generation COVID-19
314 booster vaccines covering emerging variants of SARS-CoV-2.

315

316 **Materials and Methods**

317 *Participants and sampling*

318 The characteristics of the participants are listed in SI Appendix Table S3 and summarized in SI Appendix
319 Table S1. Serum samples collected 7 to 30 days after the last vaccination were used in the study. The serum
320 samples of booster vaccine recipients and patients with Omicron breakthrough infections were obtained
321 from residual samples of a national seroprevalence survey conducted in Japan from February to March
322 2022 (peak of the Omicron-dominant period) (SI Appendix Fig. S1) (33). In Japan, the BNT162b2,
323 mRNA-1273, and AZD1222 vaccines have been approved for use since February 2021. Participants
324 received the primary series (doses 1 and 2) at the intervals recommended by the manufacturers. The rollout
325 of the mRNA booster (third) dose was initiated in December 2021, and individuals became eligible 6 to 7
326 months after the second dose, depending on local availability. Booster vaccinee sera were collected from

327 individuals who had received three doses of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine, had no history of SARS-CoV-2
328 infection, and had no detectable anti-nucleoprotein (N) antibody.

329 Sera from individuals diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 infection and positive for anti-N antibodies during the
330 Omicron-dominant period following two doses of BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 mRNA vaccine were used
331 as Omicron-breakthrough infection sera. Based on the date of infection, the majority of the cases of
332 breakthrough infection were probably caused by the Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 lineages, with BA.1,
333 accounting for more than 90% of the cases (SI Appendix Fig. S1). The Omicron-breakthrough infection
334 sera (n= 30) in this study were collected 7 to 30 days after diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection. An equal
335 number of booster vaccine recipients were selected using optimal pair matching based on propensity scores
336 calculated according to age and days since the last exposure (SI Appendix Fig. S1).

337 Serum samples from patients with pre-Omicron breakthrough infections were obtained as described
338 previously (12, 16). Briefly, pre-Omicron breakthrough infection was defined according to a positive
339 SARS-CoV-2 RNA or antigen test result on a respiratory specimen collected ≥ 14 days after the second
340 vaccine dose. Demographic information, vaccination status, and respiratory samples for determining the
341 infecting variant were collected as part of the public health activity led by the Japan National Institute of
342 Infectious Diseases (NIID) under the Infectious Diseases Control Law, and the data were published on the
343 NIID website in order to meet statutory reporting requirements. Serum samples obtained from individuals
344 with breakthrough infections were collected concurrently for clinical testing provided by the NIID (with
345 patient consent), and neutralization assays were performed using residual samples as a research activity
346 with ethics approval from the Medical Research Ethics Committee of NIID and informed consent.

347 To examine neutralization, the serum samples were heat-inactivated at 56°C for 30 min before use. The
348 median dose interval between the first and second vaccine doses for individuals with breakthrough
349 infections and booster vaccine recipients was 21 days ([SI Appendix Table S1](#)).

350

351 *Ethical statement approval*

352 All samples, protocols, and procedures were approved by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of NIID
353 (approval numbers 1178, 1275, 1312, and 1510).

354

355 *SARS-CoV-2 virus*

356 We used the SARS-CoV-2 ancestral strain WK-521 (lineage A, GISAID ID: EPI_ISL_408667), Omicron
357 BA.1 variant TY38-873 (lineage BA.1, GISAID: EPI_ISL_7418017), Omicron BA.2 variant TY40-158
358 (lineage BA.2.3, EPI_ISL_9595813), Omicron BA.5 variant TY41-702 (lineage BA.5, GISAID:
359 EPI_ISL_13241867), Omicron BA.2.75 variant TY41-716 (lineage BA.2.75, GISAID:
360 EPI_ISL_13969765), and Omicron BQ.1.1 variant TY41-796 (lineage BQ.1.1, GISAID:
361 EPI_ISL_15579783) in this study. These variants were isolated using VeroE6/TMPRSS2 cells at NIID
362 with ethics approval provided by the Medical Research Ethics Committee of NIID (#1178). More
363 specifically, viruses belonging to the Omicron lineage were isolated at NIID using VeroE6/TMPRSS2 cells
364 on respiratory specimens collected from individuals screened at airport quarantine stations in Japan and
365 transferred to NIID for whole-genome sequencing.

366

367 *Cells*

368 VeroE6/TMPRSS2 cells (JCRB1819, Japanese Collection of Research Bioresources Cell Bank) were

369 maintained in low-glucose Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM) containing 10% heat-
370 inactivated fetal bovine serum (FBS), 1 mg/mL geneticin, and 100 U/mL penicillin/streptomycin at 37°C
371 supplied with 5% CO₂.

372

373 *Electrochemiluminescence immunoassay (ECLIA)*

374 Antibody titers for the ancestral spike (S) RBD and nucleoprotein (N) were measured using Elecsys Anti-
375 SARS-CoV-2 S and Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 kits according to the manufacturers' instructions.

376

377 *Live virus neutralization assay*

378 Live virus neutralization assays were performed as described previously (12, 19). Briefly, serum samples
379 were serially diluted (in two-fold dilutions starting from 1:5) in high-glucose DMEM supplemented with
380 2% FBS and 100 U/mL penicillin/streptomycin and mixed with 100 median tissue culture infectious dose
381 (TCID₅₀) SARS-CoV-2 viruses, followed by incubation at 37°C for 1 hour. The virus-serum mixtures were
382 placed on VeroE6/TMPRSS2 cells seeded in 96-well plates and cultured at 37°C with 5% CO₂ for 5 days.
383 The cells were then fixed with 20% formalin and stained with crystal violet solution. NTs were defined as
384 the geometric mean of the reciprocal of the highest sample dilution that protected at least 50% of the cells
385 from a cytopathic effect, using two to four replicate series. Because of the limited volume of serum
386 samples from individuals with breakthrough infections, this assay was performed only once. All
387 experiments using authentic viruses were performed in a biosafety level 3 laboratory at NIID.

388

389 *Antigenic cartography*

390 Antigenic maps based on NTs against SARS-CoV-2 pseudoviruses were created using the *Racmacs R*

391 function with 2,000 optimizations, with the minimum column basis parameter set to “80” (34, 35). Each
392 grid square (1 antigenic unit) corresponded to a two-fold dilution in the neutralization assay. The median
393 the antigenic distances from the ancestral strain and 95% confidence intervals of were calculated according
394 to the Pythagorean theorem using the coordinates of the antigenic maps in the optimization steps.

395

396 *Statistical analysis of measured antibody titers*

397 Data analysis and visualization were performed using GraphPad Prism 9.3.1 (San Diego, CA, USA) and
398 R 4.1.2 (<https://www.r-project.org/>). Measurements below the detection limit were recorded as half the
399 detection limit. One-way analysis of variance with Dunnett’s test or Tukey’s test were used to compare the
400 antibody titers. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

401

402 *Estimating saturated cross-neutralizing titers against SARS-CoV-2 variants.*

403 For each exposure group, we estimated the NT and time of vaccination using a Bayesian hierarchical
404 model. The log₁₀ NT after breakthrough infection or booster vaccination was described using a three-
405 parameter logistic model for each exposure interval between the second vaccination and the third exposure
406 (vaccination or breakthrough infection). We inferred population means (μ_v) separately for NTs against the
407 ancestral strain, and BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.75, BA.5, and BQ.1.1 variants. We used a hierarchical structure to
408 describe the distribution of μ_{hv} for each exposure group. Arrays in the model index over one or more
409 indices: H=3 exposure history h ; N=108 participants n ; V=6 target viruses v . The model was as follows:

410

$$411 \quad \text{NT}_{nvt} \sim \text{Normal} (\mu_{hv} / (1 + \alpha_v \exp(-\beta_v t_n)), \sigma_{\text{NT}_v}),$$

$$412 \quad \mu_{hv} \sim \text{Normal} (\mu_v, \sigma_{\mu_v}) [0, 5]$$

413 $\mu_v \sim \text{Normal}(2.5, 1) [0, 5]$

414 $\alpha_v \sim \text{Normal}(2.5, 1) [0, 5]$

415 $\beta_v \sim \text{Student_t}(4, 0.05, 0.1) [0, 1]$

416 $\sigma_{\mu_v} \sim \text{Student_t}(4, 0, 0.5) [0, \infty]$

417

418 The values in square brackets denote the truncation bounds of the distributions. The explanatory variable
419 was time, t_n , and the outcome variable was NT_{nv} , which represented the NTs against the target virus v in
420 participant n at time t . A non-informative prior was set for the standard distribution σ_{NT_v} . The parameters
421 α_v and β_v controlled the intercept and the steepness of the logistic function, respectively. The mean
422 parameter for NTs against target virus v according to the exposure history h , μ_{hv} , was generated from a
423 normal distribution with hyperparameters of the mean, μ_v , and standard deviation, σ_{μ_v} . For the
424 distribution generating β_v and σ_{μ_v} , we used a Student's t distribution with four degrees of freedom, instead
425 of a normal distribution, to reduce the effects of outlier values of β_v and σ_{μ_v} .

426 The exposure interval of days to 90% saturated NTs against each virus (tSNT90_v) was calculated according
427 to the parameters α_v and β_v as follows:

428

$$429 \quad \text{tSNT90}_v = \log_{10}(9\alpha_v) / \beta_v$$

430

431 Parameter estimation was performed using a Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) approach implemented
432 in rstan 2.26.1 (<https://mc-stan.org>). Four independent MCMC chains were run with 5,000 steps in the
433 warm-up and sampling iterations, with subsampling every five iterations. We confirmed that all estimated
434 parameters showed <1.01 R-hat convergence diagnostic values and >500 effective sampling size values,

435 indicating that the MCMC runs were convergent. The fitted model closely replicated the observed NT
436 increases in each exposure group (Figs. 2A and 3A). The above analyses were performed using R 4.1.2
437 (<https://www.r-project.org/>). Information on the estimated means of saturated NTs against SARS-CoV-2
438 variants is summarized in SI Appendix Table S2.

439

440 *Data and code availability*

441 Raw data and the code used to estimate the increase in NTs during the interval from the second
442 vaccination to the third exposure are provided in SI Appendix Table S3 and the GitHub repository
443 (<https://github.com/ShoMiyamo/VaxInfectionInterval>).

444

445 **Acknowledgments**

446 We thank Akiko Sataka, Asato Kojima, Izumi Kobayashi, Yuki Iwamoto, Yuko Sato, Milagros Virhuez
447 Mendoza, Noriko Nakajima, Kenta Takahashi, and Emi Taeda at NIID for their technical support; Jumpei
448 Ito at the University of Tokyo for technical advice on Bayesian modeling; and the healthcare facilities,
449 local health centers, and public health institutes for their contribution in providing us with patient
450 information and samples on pre-Omicron breakthrough cases as listed previously (12). We also thank the
451 Miyagi, Tokyo, Aichi, Osaka, and Fukuoka prefecture governments for their support in implementing the
452 study; staff members at the Survey Research Center and Mitsubishi Research Institute for their
453 administrative and technical assistance; and GISAID for the platform to share and compare our data with
454 data submitted globally. This work was supported by a Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science
455 Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (JSPS KAKENHI) grant 21K20768 (to SMi), by Ministry of Health
456 Labour and Welfare (MHLW) grants 20HA2001 (to TS), and 21HA2005 (to TS), and by Japan Agency

457 for Medical Research and Development (AMED) grants JP21fk0108104 (to TS), JP22fk0108637 (to TS),

458 and JP22fk0108141(to TS).

459

460


461 **References**

- 462 1. A. Saito *et al.*, Virological characteristics of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2.75 variant. *Cell*
463 *Host Microbe* **30**, 1540-1555.e1515 (2022).
- 464 2. S. Crotty, Hybrid immunity. *Science* **372**, 1392-1393 (2021).
- 465 3. A. Muik *et al.*, Omicron BA.2 breakthrough infection enhances cross-neutralization of BA.2.12.1
466 and BA.4/BA.5. *Science Immunology* **7**, eade2283 (2022).
- 467 4. Z. Wang *et al.*, Memory B cell responses to Omicron subvariants after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA
468 breakthrough infection in humans. *Journal of Experimental Medicine* **219** (2022).
- 469 5. Y.-J. Park *et al.*, Imprinted antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sublineages.
470 *Science* **378**, 619-627 (2022).
- 471 6. J. Quandt *et al.*, Omicron BA.1 breakthrough infection drives cross-variant neutralization and
472 memory B cell formation against conserved epitopes. *Science Immunology* **7**, eabq2427 (2022).
- 473 7. Y. Cao *et al.*, BA.2.12.1, BA.4 and BA.5 escape antibodies elicited by Omicron infection. *Nature*
474 10.1038/s41586-022-04980-y (2022).
- 475 8. N. P. Hachmann *et al.*, Neutralization Escape by SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Subvariants BA.2.12.1,
476 BA.4, and BA.5. *New England Journal of Medicine* 10.1056/NEJMc2206576 (2022).
- 477 9. S. Miyamoto *et al.*, Vaccination-infection interval determines cross-neutralization potency to
478 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron after breakthrough infection by other variants. *Med* **3**, 249-261.e244
479 (2022).
- 480 10. P. Qu *et al.*, Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.4/5 and BA.2.12.1 Subvariants. *New*
481 *England Journal of Medicine* **386**, 2526-2528 (2022).
- 482 11. J. Quandt *et al.*, Omicron BA.1 breakthrough infection drives cross-variant neutralization and
483 memory B cell formation against conserved epitopes. *Science Immunology* **0**, eabq2427 (2022).
- 484 12. A. Tuekprakhon *et al.*, Antibody escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.4 and BA.5 from vaccine
485 and BA.1 serum. *Cell* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.06.005> (2022).
- 486 13. S. Miyamoto *et al.*, Non-Omicron breakthrough infection with higher viral load and longer
487 vaccination-infection interval improves SARS-CoV-2 BA.4/5 neutralization. *iScience*
488 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.105969>, 105969 (2023).
- 489 14. P. Tober-Lau *et al.*, Cross-Variant Neutralizing Serum Activity after SARS-CoV-2 Breakthrough
490 Infections. *Emerging Infectious Disease journal* **28** (2022).
- 491 15. R. Kotaki *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-neutralizing memory B cells are elicited by two doses of
492 BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. *Science Immunology* **7**, eabn8590 (2022).
- 493 16. S. Moriyama *et al.*, Temporal maturation of neutralizing antibodies in COVID-19 convalescent

- 494 individuals improves potency and breadth to circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Immunity* **54**,
495 1841-1852.e1844 (2021).
- 496 17. D. Chatterjee *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Spike recognition by plasma from individuals
497 receiving BNT162b2 mRNA vaccination with a 16-week interval between doses. *Cell Reports* **38**,
498 110429 (2022).
- 499 18. V. G. Hall *et al.*, Delayed-interval BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccination enhances humoral
500 immunity and induces robust T cell responses. *Nature Immunology* **23**, 380-385 (2022).
- 501 19. R. R. Goel *et al.*, Efficient recall of Omicron-reactive B cell memory after a third dose of SARS-
502 CoV-2 mRNA vaccine. *Cell* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.04.009> (2022).
- 503 20. K. Lederer *et al.*, Germinal center responses to SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines in healthy and
504 immunocompromised individuals. *Cell* **185**, 1008-1024.e1015 (2022).
- 505 21. J. S. Turner *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines induce persistent human germinal centre
506 responses. *Nature* **596**, 109-113 (2021).
- 507 22. F. Muecksch *et al.*, Increased memory B cell potency and breadth after a SARS-CoV-2 mRNA
508 boost. *Nature* **607**, 128-134 (2022).
- 509 23. M. Gagne *et al.*, mRNA-1273 or mRNA-Omicron boost in vaccinated macaques elicits similar B
510 cell expansion, neutralizing responses, and protection from Omicron. *Cell* **185**, 1556-1571.e1518
511 (2022).
- 512 24. B. Ying *et al.*, Protective activity of mRNA vaccines against ancestral and variant SARS-CoV-2
513 strains. *Science Translational Medicine* **14**, eabm3302 (2022).
- 514 25. S. Chalkias *et al.*, A Bivalent Omicron-Containing Booster Vaccine against Covid-19. *New*
515 *England Journal of Medicine* **387**, 1279-1291 (2022).
- 516 26. C. I. Kaku *et al.*, Recall of preexisting cross-reactive B cell memory after Omicron BA.1
517 breakthrough infection. *Sci Immunol* **7**, eabq3511 (2022).
- 518 27. D. Cromer *et al.*, Neutralising antibody titres as predictors of protection against SARS-CoV-2
519 variants and the impact of boosting: a meta-analysis. *The Lancet Microbe* **3**, e52-e61 (2022).
- 520 28. S. Feng *et al.*, Correlates of protection against symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2
521 infection. *Nature Medicine* **27**, 2032-2040 (2021).
- 522 29. P. B. Gilbert *et al.*, Immune correlates analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy
523 clinical trial. *Science* **375**, 43-50 (2022).
- 524 30. T. Arashiro *et al.*, National seroepidemiological study of COVID-19 after the initial rollout of
525 vaccines: Before and at the peak of the Omicron-dominant period in Japan. *Influenza and Other*
526 *Respiratory Viruses* **17**, e13094 (2023).

- 527 31. D. J. Smith *et al.*, Mapping the Antigenic and Genetic Evolution of Influenza Virus. *Science* **305**,
528 371-376 (2004).
529 32. S. Wilks (2021) Racmacs: R Antigenic Cartography Macros. (<https://github.com/acorg/Racmacs>).
530
531

532 **Figures**



533

534 **Fig 1. Antigenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages in serum samples from individuals with**


535 **breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients. (A) Anti-spike (S) and anti-nucleoprotein (N)**

536 **antibody titers in serum samples of individuals with pre-Omicron or Omicron breakthrough infections,**


537 **and booster vaccine recipients (boosted). The titers were compared using the one-way analysis of variance**

538 **with the Tukey test. (B) The neutralization titers (NTs) against variants of SARS-CoV-2 live viruses. Data**

539 from the same serum sample are connected with lines, and the mean \pm 95% confidential interval of each
540 serum titer is presented. The titers between the ancestral and variants were compared using one-way
541 ANOVA with Dunnett's test. (C) The fold decrease of the NTs against Omicron sub-lineages relative to
542 the NT against ancestral strain. The geometric mean \pm 95% confidential interval of each serum sample is
543 shown. (D) Antigenic cartography of each serum source for individuals with pre-Omicron/Omicron
544 breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients. The variants are shown as circles and serum
545 samples are indicated as squares. Each square corresponds to a serum sample from one individual. Colors
546 represent the serum source. Each grid square (1 antigenic unit) corresponds to a two-fold dilution in the
547 serum sample used in the neutralization assay. Antigenic distance is interpretable in any direction. The
548 median (95% confidence interval) of the distance from the ancestral strain on the map is shown using gray
549 dotted lines. Statistical significance: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$.



551 **Fig 2. Estimated cross-neutralizing potency against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages of serum**
552 **samples during the vaccination to third exposure interval in individuals with pre-Omicron/Omicron**
553 **breakthrough infections or booster vaccination. (A) Estimated increase in the neutralization titers (NTs)**
554 **in serum samples of individuals with breakthrough infections or booster vaccination (boosted) during the**
555 **interval from the second vaccination to the third exposure (breakthrough infection or booster vaccination).**
556 **The measured NTs (circle) and the dynamics estimated by the Bayesian model (posterior median, line;**
557 **95% credible interval, light gray ribbon; 50% credible interval, dark gray ribbon) are shown. (B) Estimated**
558 **exposure interval to 90% saturated NT against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variants during the period from the**
559 **second vaccination to the third exposure. The probability density (upper panel, area), the cumulative**
560 **probability (lower panel, line), and the median time in days (lower panel, dotted line) are shown.**



561

562 **Fig 3. Estimates and comparisons of saturated cross-neutralizing potency of serum samples against**

563 **SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages in individuals with pre-Omicron/Omicron breakthrough**

564 **infections or booster vaccination. (A)** Estimated increases in the neutralization titers (NTs) in serum

565 samples from each participant with pre-Omicron/Omicron breakthrough infection or booster vaccination

566 from the second vaccination to the third exposure (infection or vaccination). The measured NTs (circle)

567 and the dynamics estimated by the Bayesian model (posterior median, line; 95% credible interval, ribbon)

568 are shown. (B) Estimated saturated NTs against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variants for each exposure group.

569 The posterior median (line), 50% credible interval (box), and 95% credible interval (whisker) are shown.

570 (C) The fold decrease of the NTs relative to the posterior median of NT against the ancestral strain. The

571 median (line), 50% credible interval (box), and 95% credible interval (whisker) are shown. The medians

572 are indicated above the column.

Supplementary Figures




Fig S1. Epigenomic dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 lineages in Japan. (A) The proportion of each variant relative to all sample sequences collected (line) with the 95% confidential interval (ribbon) (upper left), and the vaccination coverage of the population in Japan (lower left) are shown. Among individuals with pre-Omicron and Omicron breakthrough infections, the dates of infection are shown at the top. (B) The proportion of SARS-CoV-2 lineages according to the date of each breakthrough infection. Based on the GISAID database (<https://platform.epicov.org>), CoV-Spectrum (<https://cov-spectrum.org>) provided the percentage, the 95% confidence interval, and the number of sequences. Digital Agency, Japan (<https://info.vrs.digital.go.jp/dashboard>) provided the data on the proportion vaccinated.




Fig S2. Antigenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sub-lineages in heterogeneous serum samples from individuals with breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients. Antigenic cartography of serum sources for individuals with pre-Omicron/Omicron breakthrough infections and booster vaccine recipients. The variants are shown as circles and serum samples are indicated as squares, diamonds, and triangles. Each square, diamond, and triangle corresponds to a serum sample from one individual. Each grid square (1 antigenic unit) corresponds to a two-fold dilution in the serum sample used in the neutralization assay. Antigenic distance is interpretable in any direction. The median (95% confidence interval) of the distance from the ancestral strain on the map is shown using gray dotted lines.




Fig S3. Estimates of the probability that the neutralizing titer and the fold decrease differs according to the exposure history. (A, B) Probability densities of estimated maximum neutralization titers (NTs) against SARS-CoV-2 ancestral strain and Omicron sublineages for each exposure history. (B) Probability density of NT differences between two exposure histories. The indicated probabilities are displayed and highlighted in red if the probability is >90.0%. (C, D) Probability densities of a fold decrease in the NTs relative to the posterior median of NT against the ancestral strain. (D) Probability density of fold decrease differences between two exposure histories. The calculated probabilities are displayed and highlighted in red if the probability is >90.0%.

Supplementary Tables

Table S1. Characteristics of study participants

	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	Omicron breakthrough	Booster vaccination
Sample	Serum	Serum	Serum
N	48	30	30
Age (y)	36 (26, 50)	48 (38, 54)	44 (37, 52)
Male sex	14 (29%)	8 (27%)	4 (13%)
Vaccine (2 doses)			
BNT162b2	47 (98%)	19 (63%)	30 (100%)
mRNA-1273	0 (0%)	11 (37%)	0 (0%)
Not listed	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Dose 1 to dose 2 interval (days)	21 (21, 21)	21 (21, 28)	21 (21, 21)
Dose 2 to infection (days)	44 (30, 62)	166 (134, 177)	NA
Dose 2 to dose 3 interval (days)	NA	NA	237 (223, 254)
Last exposure to collection (days)	14 (11, 15)	20 (14, 24)	19 (15, 25)
Period of infection	May. 14 - Aug. 20, 2021	Jan. 15 - Feb. 27, 2022	NA

Median (interquartile range); n (%)

Table S2. Means of the maximum neutralization titers against SARS-CoV-2 variants

Target virus	Exposure-history	Posterior mean	Posterior 2.5%	Posterior 97.5%	R-hat	Effective sample size
Ancestral	Total	2.65	2.21	3.14	1.00	2092
Ancestral	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	2.56	2.26	3.14	1.00	1165
Ancestral	Omicron breakthrough	2.82	2.61	3.06	1.00	1039
Ancestral	Booster vaccination	2.59	2.41	2.77	1.00	1736
BA.1	Total	2.13	1.55	2.82	1.00	3267
BA.1	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	2.06	1.62	2.79	1.00	3320
BA.1	Omicron breakthrough	2.45	2.26	2.74	1.00	2468
BA.1	Booster vaccination	1.77	1.61	1.94	1.00	3368
BA.2	Total	2.21	1.56	3.12	1.00	1954
BA.2	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	2.13	1.58	3.30	1.00	1465
BA.2	Omicron breakthrough	2.54	2.28	3.25	1.00	1291
BA.2	Booster vaccination	1.89	1.70	2.15	1.00	1882
BA.2.75	Total	2.34	1.67	3.07	1.00	3758
BA.2.75	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	2.18	1.59	2.95	1.00	3413
BA.2.75	Omicron breakthrough	2.78	2.55	3.21	1.00	3165
BA.2.75	Booster vaccination	2.00	1.84	2.18	1.00	3527
BA.5	Total	1.89	1.34	2.65	1.00	2978
BA.5	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	1.94	1.41	2.79	1.00	3036
BA.5	Omicron breakthrough	2.05	1.83	2.46	1.00	2475
BA.5	Booster vaccination	1.51	1.35	1.70	1.00	3282
BQ.1.1	Total	1.44	0.95	2.17	1.00	3140
BQ.1.1	Pre-Omicron breakthrough	1.33	0.87	1.92	1.00	2655
BQ.1.1	Omicron breakthrough	1.63	1.41	2.08	1.00	1207
BQ.1.1	Booster vaccination	1.16	1.02	1.35	1.00	1204