

1 **Full title**

2 **Immunogenicity and Safety of a SARS-CoV-2 Inactivated Vaccine in Healthy**
3 **Adults Aged 18-59 years: Report of the Randomized, Double-blind, and**
4 **Placebo-controlled Phase 2 Clinical Trial**

5 **Running title**

6 Phase 2 Clinical Trial of SARS-CoV-2 Inactivated Vaccine

7 **Author List:**

8 **YanJun Zhang***, Ph.D., zhangyjtt@126.com, Department of Microbiology, Zhejiang
9 Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Hangzhou, China.

10 **Gang Zeng***, Ph.D., zengg@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.

11 **Hongxing Pan***, M.Sc., panhongxing@126.com, Jiangsu Provincial Center for
12 Disease Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.

13 **Changgui Li***, Ph.D., changguili@aliyun.com, National Institutes for Food and Drug
14 Control, Beijing.

15 **Biao Kan***, Ph.D., kanbiao@icdc.cn, National Institute for Communicable Disease
16 Control and Prevention, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention,
17 Changping, Beijing, China.

18 **Yaling Hu***, M.Sc., huyi@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.

19 **Haiyan Mao**, M.Sc., hymao@cdc.zj.cn, Department of Microbiology, Zhejiang
20 Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention, Hangzhou, China.

- 21 **Qianqian Xin**, Ph.D., xinqq@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.
- 22 **Kai Chu**, M.Sc., chukai19812007@163.com, Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease
- 23 Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.
- 24 **Weixiao Han**, M.Sc., hanwx@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.
- 25 **Zhen Chen**, M.Sc., robbieagassi@hotmail.com, National Institutes for Food and
- 26 Drug Control, Beijing.
- 27 **Rong Tang**, B.A., tangrongtr@126.com, Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease
- 28 Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.
- 29 **Weidong Yin**, MBA, yinwd@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.
- 30 **Xin Chen**, B.A., kjhszxchenxin@163.com, Suining County Center for Disease
- 31 Control and Prevention, Suining, Jiangsu Province, China.
- 32 **Xuejie Gong**, B.A., gongxj@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.
- 33 **Chuan Qin**, Ph.D., qinchuan@pumc.edu.cn, Key Laboratory of Human Disease
- 34 Comparative Medicine, Chinese Ministry of Health, Beijing Key Laboratory for
- 35 Animal Models of Emerging and Remerging Infectious Diseases, Institute of
- 36 Laboratory Animal Science, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences and Comparative
- 37 Medicine Center, Peking Union Medical College, Beijing, China.
- 38 **Yuansheng Hu**, M.P.H., huys@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing, China.
- 39 **Xiaoyong Liu**, B.A., 317840532@qq.com, Suining County Center for Disease
- 40 Control and Prevention, Suining, Jiangsu Province, China.
- 41 **Guoliang Cui**, B.A., cuiql@sinovac.com, Sinovac Life Sciences Co., Ltd., Beijing,

- 42 China.
- 43 **Congbing Jiang**, B.A., snjkws@126.com, Suining County Center for Disease
- 44 Control and Prevention, Suining, Jiangsu Province, China.
- 45 **Hengming Zhang**, M.Sc., zhanghm@sinovac.com, Sinovac Biotech Ltd., Beijing,
- 46 China.
- 47 **Jingxin Li**, Ph.D., jingxin42102209@126.com, Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease
- 48 Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.
- 49 **Minnan Yang**, Ph.D., 28453073@qq.com, CAS Key Laboratory of Infection and
- 50 Immunity, National Laboratory of Macromolecules, Institute of Biophysics, Chinese
- 51 Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.
- 52 **Xiaojuan Lian**, MBA, lianxj@sinovac.com, Sinovac Life Sciences Co., Ltd., Beijing,
- 53 China.
- 54 **Yan Song**, B.A., songyanww@126.com, Suining County Center for Disease Control
- 55 and Prevention, Suining, Jiangsu Province, China.
- 56 **Jinxing Lu**, Ph.D., lujinxing@icdc.cn, National Institute for Communicable Disease
- 57 Control and Prevention, Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention,
- 58 Changping, Beijing, China.
- 59 **Xiangxi Wang**, Ph.D., xiangxi@ibp.ac.cn, CAS Key Laboratory of Infection and
- 60 Immunity, National Laboratory of Macromolecules, Institute of Biophysics, Chinese
- 61 Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China.
- 62 **Miao Xu**, Ph.D., xumiaobj@126.com, National Institutes for Food and Drug

63 Control, Beijing.

64 **Qiang Gao**[¶], M.Sc., gaoq@sinovac.com, Sinovac Life Sciences Co., Ltd., Beijing,
65 China.

66 **Fengcai Zhu**[¶], M.D., jszfc@vip.sina.com, Jiangsu Provincial Center for Disease
67 Control and Prevention, Nanjing, China.

68

69 **Footnote**

70 *The first six authors, YZ, GZ, HP, CL, BK, and YH, contribute equally to the
71 manuscript and are listed as the first authors.

72 [¶]The last five authors, JL, XW, MX, QG, and FZ, contribute equally to the
73 correspondence and are listed as the corresponding authors.

74 **Clinical Trial number:** NCT04352608

75 **Funding Project:**

76 National Key Research and Development Program (2020YFC0849600)

77 Beijing Science and Technology Program (Z201100005420023)

78 ABSTRACT

79 BACKGROUND

80 The top priority for the control of COVID-19 pandemic currently is the development
81 of a vaccine. A phase 2 trial conducted to further evaluate the immunogenicity and
82 safety of a SARS-CoV-2 inactivated vaccine (CoronaVac).

83 METHODS

84 We conducted a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial to evaluate the
85 optimal dose, immunogenicity and safety of the CoronaVac. A total of 600 healthy
86 adults aged 18-59 years were randomly assigned to receive 2 injections of the trial
87 vaccine at a dose of 3 µg/0.5 mL or 6 µg /0.5mL, or placebo on Day 0,14 schedule or
88 Day 0,28 schedule. For safety evaluation, solicited and unsolicited adverse events
89 were collected after each vaccination within 7 days and 28 days, respectively. Blood
90 samples were taken for antibody assay.

91 RESULTS

92 CoronaVac was well tolerated, and no dose-related safety concerns were observed.
93 Most of the adverse reactions fell in the solicited category and were mild in severity.
94 Pain at injection site was the most frequently reported symptoms. No Grade 3 adverse
95 reaction or vaccine related SAEs were reported. CoronaVac showed good
96 immunogenicity with the lower 3 µg dose eliciting 92.4% seroconversion under Day
97 0,14 schedule and 97.4% under Day 0,28 schedule. 28 days after two-dose
98 vaccination, the Nab levels of individual schedules range from 23.8 to 65.4 among
99 different dosage and vaccination schedules.

100 CONCLUSIONS

101 Favorable safety and immunogenicity of CoronaVac was demonstrated on both
102 schedules and both dosages, which support the conduction of phase 3 trial with
103 optimum schedule/dosage per different scenarios.

104 **Keywords:** COVID-19; SARS-CoV-2; Inactivated vaccine; Clinical Trial.

105 BACKGROUND

106 In January 2020, outbreaks of coronavirus disease in 2019 (COVID-19) caused by
 107 severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) escalated rapidly,
 108 and since then COVID-19 cases have been reported in over 200 countries and
 109 territories. The pandemic continues to spread unabated affecting the health and
 110 changing the lifestyles of people globally.¹ To reduce the disease burden and stop the
 111 community-wide transmission of COVID-19 across the globe, specific therapeutic
 112 agents or vaccines are urgently needed. Till now, more than 120 vaccine candidates
 113 have been reported to be under development and at least 23 have progressed to the
 114 clinical evaluation stage.²

115 The inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine with aluminum hydroxide developed by
 116 Sinovac Life Sciences Co., Ltd., also known as CoronaVac, has been shown to be safe
 117 and could induce SARS-CoV-2 specific neutralizing antibodies in mice, rats, and
 118 nonhuman primates.³ On the basis of the results obtained from our phase 1 trial, no
 119 safety concerns have been identified. Notably, immunization of CoronaVac induced
 120 immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 in adults. Here, we report the results of the
 121 phase 2 trial.

122 METHODS

123 TRIAL DESIGN AND OVERSIGHT

124 This double-blind, randomized and placebo-controlled phase 2 clinical trial based on a
 125 seamless design was registered at clinicaltrials.gov (NCT04352608) and was
 126 conducted in Suining County, Jiangsu Province, China. Detailed information about
 127 the trial has been provided in our previous phase 1 study. The trial protocol and the

128 informed-consent form were approved by the ethics committee of the Jiangsu
129 Provincial Center for Disease Control and Prevention (JSCDC). This clinical trial was
130 conducted in accordance with the Chinese regulatory requirements and the standards
131 of good clinical practice.

132 Before enrollment, written informed consent was obtained from each participant. The
133 main exclusion criteria included high-risk epidemiological history, positive IgG, IgM
134 or nucleic acid test of pharyngeal or anal swab, axillary temperature $>37.0^{\circ}\text{C}$, allergy
135 to a vaccine component, and other unsuitable conditions.

136 A total of 600 healthy adults aged 18-59 years were randomly assigned into 3 groups
137 in a ratio of 2:2:1 to receive 2 injections of the trial vaccine at a dose of $3\text{ }\mu\text{g}/0.5\text{ mL}$
138 or $6\text{ }\mu\text{g}/0.5\text{ mL}$, or placebo on a Day 0,14 schedule or a Day 0,28 schedule, according
139 to a random list generated by an independent statistician..

140 **VACCINE**

141 The vaccine candidate was an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 whole virion vaccine with
142 aluminium hydroxide as adjuvant (CoronaVac) developed by Sinovac Life Sciences
143 Co., Ltd. SARS-CoV-2 virus was propagated in Vero cells and harvested. The
144 harvested virus was inactivated using β -propiolactone and further purified. The bulk
145 vaccine material obtained from this step was then adsorbed onto aluminium hydroxide
146 and formulated with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) and sodium chloride as
147 inactivated final product. The dosage of $3\text{ }\mu\text{g}/0.5\text{ mL}$ and $6\text{ }\mu\text{g}/0.5\text{ mL}$ were adopted in
148 this study. Whereas the placebo contained aluminum hydroxide diluents with no
149 antigen. Both were administered intramuscularly on the schedule of Day 0,14 or Day
150 0,28.

151 SAFETY ASSESSMENT

152 For safety evaluation of CoronaVac, the participants who received at least one dose of
153 vaccination was included. All vaccinated subjects were observed for immediate
154 adverse events (AEs) on-site for at least 30 minutes after each administration. Diary
155 cards were issued to the participants to record the solicited AEs (e.g. pain, induration,
156 swelling, redness, rash, pruritus) occurring on day 0~7 and unsolicited AEs (e.g. fever,
157 acute allergic reaction, skin and mucosa abnormality, diarrhea, anorexia, vomiting,
158 nausea, muscle pain, headache, cough, fatigue) occurring on day 0~28. Data on
159 serious adverse events (SAEs) were collected throughout the trial. All AEs were
160 assessed for severity, and the relationship to vaccination was decided by investigators
161 before unblinding.

162 IMMUNOGENICITY

163 To assess immune response, blood samples were collected from each participant
164 different time points (0/28/42th day for Day 0,14 schedule, and 0/56th day for Day 0,28
165 schedule). The ability of the antibodies present in the blood sample to bind the
166 receptor binding domain (RBD) of SARS-CoV-2 was assessed by enzyme-linked
167 immunosorbent assay (ELISA). A dilution of 1:160 was considered as a positive
168 cutoff value. We also measured neutralizing antibody titer (Nab) using a modified
169 cytopathogenic effect assay. A titer of 1:8 or higher indicated seropositivity.
170 Seroconversion was defined as a change from seronegative (<1:8) to seropositive (\geq
171 1:8) or a 4-fold increase from baseline titers if seropositive.

172 The neutralizing antibody assay was performed by Chinese National Institutes for
173 Food and Drug Control, and the ELISA was performed by Sinovac Biotech.

174 **NEGATIVE STAIN**

175 Virus particles of vaccine used for phase 1 and 2 were diluted to a concentration of
176 0.04 mg/mL, deposited on a glow-discharged carbon-coated copper grid (Electron
177 Microscopy Sciences) and after 1 min, washed twice with buffer (20 mM Tris, 200
178 mM NaCl, pH 8.0), and stained with 1% phosphotungstic acid (pH 7.0) for 1 min.
179 Then the grid was imaged at room temperature using FEI Tecnai Spirit electron
180 microscope (Thermo Fisher Scientific) operated at an acceleration voltage of 120 kV.

181

182 **STATISITICAL ANALYSIS**

183 Safety evaluation was performed on participants who received at least 1 dose of the
184 vaccine or placebo by comparing the overall incidence rate of solicited and
185 unsolicited AEs among relevant groups. Immunogenicity assessment was performed
186 on the per-protocol set (PPS). The seroconversion rate was defined as a change from
187 seronegative to seropositive or a 4-fold increase from baseline titers if seropositive.
188 The titer distributions were described with reverse cumulative distribution curves and
189 were tested with the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test over the groups.

190 The Pearson Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was adopted for the analysis of
191 binary outcomes. Clopper-Pearson method was used to compute the 95% confidence
192 intervals (CIs) of the binary outcome. ANOVA method was utilized to compare the
193 GMTs among groups. Hypothesis testing was two-sided with an alpha value of 0.05.
194 Analyses were conducted by SAS 9.4 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

195 **RESULTS**

196 STUDY POPULATION

197 From 29 April to 5 May 2020, 600 subjects were enrolled and randomly assigned to
 198 receive first of the CoronaVac or placebo dose. All subjects were included into the
 199 safety assessment. During this trial, 297 subjects put on Day 0,14 schedule and 294
 200 subjects following Day 0,28 schedule were included in the per-protocol cohort for
 201 immunogenicity analysis. These subjects received the 2 injections, attended all visits
 202 and gave planned blood sample. Information about study enrollment, randomization,
 203 and vaccination is shown in Fig. S1.

204 Baseline demographic characteristics at enrollment were similar among these groups
 205 in terms of sex, mean age, height, and weight (Table 1).

206

207

208 **Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Study Participants.***

Characteristics	3 µg Group	6 µg Group	Placebo	<i>P</i>
Day 0,14 schedule				
N	120	120	60	
Age (years)	42.0±10.2	42.4±9.0	43.6±7.6	0.5543
Gender (male/female)	54/66	48/72	25/35	0.7305
Height (m)	1.7±0.1	1.6±0.1	1.6±0.1	0.3864
Body weight (kg)	67.8±11.7	68.7±11.5	68.4±10.9	0.8258
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.9±3.6	25.5±3.2	25.5±3.0	0.2930
Day 0,28 schedule				
N	120	120	60	

Age (years)	41.5±9.6	40.6±9.9	44.3±8.4	0.0472
Gender (male/female)	63/57	63/57	30/30	0.9417
Height (m)	1.7±0.1	1.7±0.1	1.7±0.1	0.9433
Body weight (kg)	70.0±11.8	70.0±12.2	72.1±12.2	0.4704
BMI (kg/m ²) §	25.2±3.1	25.2±3.3	26.1±3.1	0.1741

* Plus-minus values are means ±SD.


§ BMI=body mass index.

ADVERSE REACTIONS

For subjects in Day 0,14 schedule, the incidence rates of adverse reactions in 6 µg, 3 µg and placebo group were 35.0%, 33.3% and 21.7%, respectively; while the corresponding incidence rates were 19.2%, 19.2% and 18.3% in Day 0,28 schedule, respectively. Within each schedule, there was no significant difference in the occurrence of adverse reactions among all vaccine and placebo groups (Fig. 1). Most of the adverse reactions were solicited adverse reactions and mild in severity. After each injection, pain at the injection site was the most frequently reported local symptoms, which reported in 61 subjects (20.3%) on Day 0,14 schedule and 31 subjects (10.3%) on Day 0, 28 schedule. (Additional detailed results related to adverse reactions are available in Table S1).

We did not observe any Grade 3 adverse reaction. Most reported adverse reactions resolved within 72 hours after vaccine administration. During the follow-up period, 3 SAEs were reported from 3 subjects and neither was vaccine related.

A. Day 0,14 Schedule



B. Day 0,28 Schedule




Figure legends

Figure 1. Incidence rates of adverse reactions among different groups in phase 2.

(A) The incidence rates of adverse reactions among different groups with a Day 0,14 schedule. (B)

The incidence rates of adverse reactions among different groups with a Day 0,28 schedule.

IMMUNOGENICITY

At baseline, all the 600 subjects were seronegative (with Nab titers of <1:8); but the seroconversion rates increased over 90% during the later stages of the trial. Within

236 each dosage, there was no significant difference in the seroconversion rates between
 237 Day 0,14 and Day 0,28 schedule. For the antibody response against the receptor
 238 binding domain, similar results were observed (Table S2). No changes in
 239 seropositivity frequencies and GMTs from baseline were found for the placebo group.

240 For subjects on Day 0,14 schedule, the GMT increased to 34.5 (95% CI, 28.5 to 41.8)
 241 and 27.6 (95% CI, 22.7 to 33.5) in 6 µg and 3 µg group, respectively, and remained
 242 stable after 28 days from the second injection (Fig. 2A). The neutralizing antibody
 243 titers for subjects on Day 0, 28 schedule increased significantly 28 days after the
 244 second injection, when compared to those of subjects on Day 0,14 schedule within
 245 each dosage group. Almost similar trends like those observed for the neutralizing
 246 antibody were observed during the evaluation of the IgG antibody level (Fig. 2B). In
 247 addition, the neutralizing antibody titers significantly decreased with increasing age
 248 (Fig. 2C and 2D); younger subjects tended to have a higher level of neutralizing
 249 antibody titers .








Figure legends

Figure 2. Antibody Response in the Per-Protocol Cohort.

(A) The neutralizing antibody titer in all participants 14 and 28 days after second dose in Day 0,14 schedule and 28 days after second dose in Day 0,28 schedule. (B) The RBD specific IgG antibody titer in all participants 14 and 28 days after second dose in Day 0,14 schedule and 28 days after second dose in Day 0,28 schedule. (C) The neutralizing antibody titer among different age-groups at different time points from all participants that received 3 μ g vaccine. (D) The neutralizing antibody titer among different age-group at different time points from all participants that received 6 μ g vaccine.

263



264

Figure legends

Figure 3. The proportion of Spikes in CoronaVac used for phase 1 and 2 vaccine evaluation.

(A) Protein composition analysis of CoronaVac samples from phase I and II by a NuPAGE 4-12% Bis-Tris gel, followed by whole-gel protein staining using Coomassie Blue gel staining reagent (45% methanol, 10% glacial acetic acid, 0.25% Coomassie Blue R-250). The viral protein bands of vaccine strain used for phase I and II were quantified by densitometry using ImageJ software with values depicted in the gel. The proportions of spikes to the total proteins in each gel lane in CoronaVac samples used for phase 1 and 2 were calculated separately. (B) Representative negative staining images of the CoronaVac samples used in phase 1 and 2 trials. Three images were randomly selected for each phase. Grouped scatter plot showing the numbers of Spikes on two-dimensional projections of randomly selected 50 virions of CoronaVac samples used for phase I (left) and phase II (right), respectively.

277 DISCUSSION

278 This trial demonstrated that the 2 doses of different dosage of CoronaVac were well
 279 tolerated and immunogenic in healthy adults aged 18-59 years. The incidence rates of
 280 adverse reactions in the 6 µg and 3 µg group were comparable, indicating that there
 281 was no dose-related aggravating concern on safety. Furthermore, no SAEs related to
 282 vaccine occurred, and most adverse reactions reported were generally assessed to be
 283 mild. The safety profile of CoronaVac is comparable to that observed in our phase 1
 284 clinical trial [see the coordinated submission], and to other inactivated vaccine
 285 formulations manufactured by Sinovac.^{4,5} Compared with other COVID-19 vaccine
 286 candidates, the incidence rate of fever was relatively low in our clinical trial, which
 287 further indicates that CoronaVac was well tolerated.⁶⁻¹⁰

288 It's worth noting that the immune responses elicited in phase 2 were much better than
 289 those recorded in phase 1, with seroconversion rates over 90%. Our preclinical
 290 investigations had revealed that cell culture technology closely correlated with viral
 291 propagation and affected viral morphology, protein composition and prefusion
 292 conformation of spikes.³ In both preclinical study and phase 1 trials, a 50-liter culture
 293 of Vero cells grown in the Cell Factory system was used, while an optimized process
 294 for growing cells using a highly automated bioreactor, where cell culture parameters
 295 like dissolved oxygen, pH, and CO₂/O₂ gas levels, were controlled precisely, was
 296 developed for producing the CoronaVac for phase 2 trial. To deduce the reasons
 297 underlying the enhanced protective immune responses observed in phase 2 trial, we
 298 examined the molecular differences between the CoronaVac used in phase 1 and 2
 299 trials. Protein composition analysis of the purified inactivated SARS-CoV-2 virions
 300 indicated that the bioreactor-produced CoronaVac possessed higher redundancy of

301 intact spike protein (~180 kDa) when compared to the Cell Factory-yielded
 302 CoronaVac (Fig. 3A). Quantitative analysis showed that the intact spike protein
 303 accounted for ~7% and ~ 3.7 of total protein mass used in phase 1 and 2 trials,
 304 respectively. Electron microscopic examination of the samples further verified that the
 305 average number of spikes per virion of the viral sample used in phase 2 trial was
 306 almost double to those used in phase 1 trial (Fig. 3B). These observations indicated
 307 that CoronaVac used in phase 2 trial contained more *bona fide* immunogens, which
 308 explains its better protective immune responses, highlighting the importance of
 309 developing an optimum manufacturing process and the integration of
 310 multiple-disciplinary techniques, such as genomics and structural biology to support a
 311 new era of precision vaccinology.

312 After two-dose vaccination, immune responses induced by Day 0,28 schedule was
 313 above the value of Day 0,14 schedule regardless of the dosage of the vaccine, which
 314 was consistent with our anticipation. By using Day 0,14 schedule, antibody response
 315 could be induced within a relatively short time period, and this schedule could be
 316 introduced to an emergency use and is of vital importance to handle COVID-19
 317 pandemic situation. Regarding the Day 0,28 schedule, robust antibody response is
 318 generated and longer persistence could be expected, which supports the need for a
 319 routine use under the low incidence rate of COVID-19.

320 Nabs play an important role in virus clearance and have been considered as a key
 321 immune correlate for protection or treatment against viral diseases. Twenty-eight days
 322 after the two-dose vaccination, the Nab levels of individual schedules range from 23.8
 323 to 65.4 in phase 2, which was lower than those of convalescent patients tested by the
 324 same method in the same laboratory, of which the Nab average level was 163.7.¹¹ We

325 assume the antibody level could provide satisfying protection against COVID-19
 326 disease based on three reasons. Firstly, most of the surrogate endpoints based on
 327 neutralizing antibodies ranges from 8-24, such as EV71 and Varicella vaccines.^{12,13}
 328 Secondly, experience from our preclinical study indicated that the neutralizing
 329 antibody titers of 1:24 elicited in macaques models conferred complete protection
 330 against SARS-CoV-2. Thirdly, several studies revealed that antibody responses
 331 generated from natural infection may decreased significantly, such as SARS-Cov-2,
 332 SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV,¹⁴⁻¹⁶ however, recrudescence of these patients has been
 333 rarely reported, which indicated that the immunological memory might play an
 334 important role of prevention of re-infections.

335 Moreover, one prospective goal of our preclinical study and clinical trials was to
 336 establish a vaccine-induced surrogate of protection. Compared with vaccine inducing
 337 high level antibody, those inducing lower antibody level are more likely to produce
 338 evidence on surrogate of protection. Under above assumptions, the dosage of 3 µg
 339 with Day 0,14 or Day 0,28 schedule is adopted in our phase 3 trial.

340 When comparing antibody levels between age-groups, it should be noted that the
 341 neutralizing antibody titers significantly decreased with increasing age. These results
 342 are consistent with epidemiological trends observed in COVID-19 patients; those with
 343 moderate or severe symptoms tend to be elderly.¹⁷ These results suggest that escalated
 344 dosage or extra dose of CoronaVac might be needed in elderly.

345 Several limitations of this trial should be noted. Firstly, we only assessed the humoral
 346 immunity in phase 2 trial, and more evaluation focus on response of Th1 and Th2 is
 347 ongoing. Secondly, we only reported immune response data on healthy adults, and do

not include data on more susceptible populations, such as elderly or with comorbidity;
and also the immune persistence is not available yet, which need to be further studied.
Thirdly, we didn't compare the neutralizing antibody titers induced by CoronaVac and
convalescent COVID-19 patients in parallel, however, we conducted this detection of
convalescent serum specimens with same procedure performed in this phase 2 trial.
In conclusion, favorable safety and immunogenicity of CoronaVac was demonstrated
on both schedules and both dosages in this phase 2 clinical trial, which support the
conduction of phase 3 trial with optimum schedule/dosage per different scenarios.
Currently, our first priority is to evaluate the protective efficacy of the 3 µg dosage
under Day 0,14 schedule. Moreover, Day 0,28 schedule with 3 µg vaccine will also be
adopted in our future phase 3 clinical trials.

REFERENCES

1. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, et al. Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding. *Lancet* 2020;395:565-74.
2. World Health Organization. Draft landscape of COVID-19 candidate vaccines. July 14, 2020 (<https://www.who.int/who-documents-detail/draft-landscape-of-covid-19-andidate-vaccines>).
3. Gao Q, Bao L, Mao H, et al. Development of an inactivated vaccine candidate for SARS-CoV-2. *Science* 2020;369:77-81.
4. Liu XE, Chen HY, Liao Z, et al. Comparison of immunogenicity between inactivated and live attenuated hepatitis A vaccines among young adults: a 3-year follow-up study. *J Infect Dis* 2015;212:1232-6.

- 371 5. Zhu F, Xu W, Xia J, et al. Efficacy, safety, and immunogenicity of an enterovirus 71 vaccine
372 in China. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:818-28.
- 373 6. Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, et al. An mRNA vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 -
374 Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med* 2020.
- 375 7. Zhu F-C, Li Y-H, Guan X-H, et al. Safety, tolerability, and immunogenicity of a recombinant
376 adenovirus type-5 vectored COVID-19 vaccine: a dose-escalation, open-label,
377 non-randomised, first-in-human trial. *Lancet* 2020;395:1845-54.
- 378 8. Zhu F-C, Guan X-H, Li Y-H, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of a recombinant adenovirus
379 type-5-vectored COVID-19 vaccine in healthy adults aged 18 years or older: a randomized,
380 double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial. *Lancet* 2020.
- 381 9. Folegatti PM, Ewer KJ, Aley PK, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the ChAdOx1
382 nCoV-19 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary report of a phase 1/2, single-blind,
383 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2020.
- 384 10. Mulligan MJ, Lyke KE, Kitchin N, et al. Phase 1/2 study to describe the safety and
385 immunogenicity of a COVID-19 RNA vaccine candidate (BNT162b1) in adults 18 to 55
386 years of age: interim report. July 1, 2020 ([https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.06.30.20142570v1)
387 2020.06.30.20142570v1). preprint.
- 388 11. Wang X, Guo X, Xin Q, et al. Neutralizing antibodies responses to SARS-CoV-2 in
389 COVID-19 inpatients and convalescent patients. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020.
- 390 12. Hao B, Chen Z, Zeng G, et al. Efficacy, safety and immunogenicity of live attenuated
391 varicella vaccine in healthy children in China: double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled
392 clinical trial. *Clin Microbiol Infect* 2019;25:1026-31.
- 393 13. Jin PF, Li JX, Zhou Y, Zhu FC. Immunological surrogate endpoints to evaluate vaccine
394 efficacy. *Chin J Prev Med* 2015;49:1110-4.

- 395 14. Seow J, Graham C, Merrick B, et al. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody
396 response in SARS-CoV-2 infection. July 11, 2020 ([https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429)
397 [2020.07.09.20148429](https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429)). preprint.
- 398 15. Choe PG, Perera R, Park WB, et al. MERS-CoV antibody responses 1 year after symptom
399 onset, South Korea, 2015. *Emerg Infect Dis* 2017;23:1079-84.
- 400 16. Cao W-C, Liu W, Zhang P-H, Zhang F, Richardus JH. Disappearance of antibodies to
401 SARS-associated coronavirus after recovery. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:1162-3.
- 402 17. Wu Z, McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and important lessons from the Coronavirus disease
403 2019 (COVID-19) outbreak in China: summary of a report of 72314 cases from the Chinese
404 Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA* 2020.