SARS-CoV-2 vaccine breakthrough infections with the alpha variant are asymptomatic or mildly symptomatic among health care workers.

Francesca Rovida[1,2], Irene Cassaniti[1], Stefania Paolucci[1], Elena Percivalle[1], Antonella Sarasini[1], Antonio Piralla[1], Federica Giardina[1], Jose Camilla Sammartino[1], Alessandro Ferrari[1], Federica Bergami[1], Alba Muzzi[3], Viola Novelli[3], Alessandro Meloni[3,4], Sara Cutti[3], Anna Maria Grugnetti[5], Giuseppina Grugnetti[5], Claudia Rona[3], Marinella Daglio[3], Carlo Marena[3], Antonio Triarico[6], Daniele Lilleri[1]*, Fausto Baldanti[1,2]

[1]Molecular Virology Unit, Microbiology and Virology Department, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy;

[2] Department of Clinical, Surgical, Diagnostic and Pediatric Sciences, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy;

[3]Medical Direction, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy;

[4] Department of Public Health, Experimental and Forensic Medicine, Section of Hygiene, University of Pavia, Pavia, Italy;

[5]Health Professions Direction, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy;

[6]Direzione Sanitaria, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy;

*Correspondence to: Daniele Lilleri; d.lilleri@smatteo.pv.it

World count:

Abstract: 163

Text: 3955

Abstract

Vaccine breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection has been monitored in 3720 healthcare workers receiving 2 doses of BNT162b2. SARS-CoV-2 infection is detected in 33 subjects, with a 100-day cumulative incidence of 0.93%. Vaccine protection against acquisition of SARS-CoV-2 infection is 83% (95%CI: 58-93%) in the overall population and 93% (95%CI: 69-99%) in SARS-CoV-2-experienced subjects, when compared with a non-vaccinated control group from the same Institution, in which SARS-CoV-2 infection occurs in 20/346 subjects (100-day cumulative incidence: 5.78%). The infection is symptomatic in 16 (48%) vaccinated subjects *vs* 17 (85%) controls (p=0.001). All analyzed patients, in whom the amount of viral RNA was sufficient for genome sequencing, results infected by the alpha variant. Antibody and T-cell responses are not reduced in subjects with breakthrough infection. Evidence of virus transmission, determined by contact tracing, is observed in two (6.1%) cases. This real-world data support the protective effect of BNT162b2 vaccine. A triple antigenic exposure, such as two-dose vaccine schedule in experienced subjects, may confer a higher protection.

Introduction

Since the identification of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) as etiological agent of Coronavirus Disease 19 (COVID-19), several efforts have been made in order to prevent infection and disease. Moreover, recently, highly effective vaccines have been introduced [1-4].

The licensed vaccines showed high efficacy in protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection in clinical trials, ranging from 70 to 95% [1-4]. However, post-authorization real-life studies are an important complement to evaluate the vaccine effectiveness in different populations and in the face of non-controlled real world challenges.

Initial nationwide data collection are confirming the effectiveness of the licensed vaccines, showing an effect size consistent with that reported in clinical trials [5-8].

However, clinical, virological and immunological characteristics of breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infections after vaccination have been poorly investigated, due to lack of prospective systematical testing in vaccinated cohorts. Some studies conducted on healthcare workers reported a lower rate of symptomatic vs asymptomatic infections in vaccinated with respect to unvaccinated individuals [9-13], while data on the actual presence of infectious virus in SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive samples recovered from vaccinated individuals are missing. Whether infected vaccinated subjects can transmit the infection, and to which extent, is a major concern for public health policy. Finally, whether post vaccine infections are associated with a deficient immune response to vaccination has not been investigated yet.

Healthcare workers have a high risk of exposure to SARS-CoV-2, therefore representing a challenging cohort for the evaluation of vaccine effectiveness and breakthrough infections. In Italy, the vaccination campaign started on December 27th, 2020, prioritizing healthcare workers and fragile and elderly individuals [14].

Aim of the present study is to investigate prospectively the risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated healthcare workers in a single Italian Center (Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo,

66 Pavia). Data are compared with the group of healthcare workers of the same Institution that did
67 not receive the vaccination during the study period.

68 The characteristics of breakthrough infections, the underlying immune response and the risk of
69 virus transmission to other individuals are investigated.

70 Results show that BNT162b2 vaccine is effective in reducing the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection
71 in healthcare workers, while breakthrough infections are poorly symptomatic and are infrequently
72 transmitted.

73

74 **Results**

75 **Incidence and clinical characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated and non-vaccinated**
76 **healthcare workers.**

77 During the period January 18-March 31 2021, 3720 healthcare workers received the second dose
78 of BNT162b2 vaccine. Overall, before vaccination 507 subjects resulted SARS-CoV-2-experienced
79 and 2761 SARS-CoV-2-naïve, while SARS-CoV-2 serostatus was unknown for 426 subjects and
80 dubious for 26 subjects (Fig 1). After complete vaccination schedule, SARS-CoV2 infection was
81 detected in 33 subjects (median time: 47, range 7-90, days after vaccination): 2 subjects among
82 the 507 SARS-CoV-2-experienced, 24 among the 2761 SARS-CoV-2 naïve individuals, and 7 among
83 the 452 individuals with unknown or dubious serostatus (Fig 1).

84 Of the 33 infected subjects, 23 (70%) were nursing or health care assistants, 8 (24%) were
85 physicians, 1 (3%) was a healthcare technician and 1 (3%) was a researcher. The infection was
86 symptomatic in 16 (48%) and asymptomatic in 17 (52%) subjects (Table 1). The most common
87 symptoms reported were rhinitis in 9 (27%), cough in 3 (9%) and arthralgia in 3 (9%) infected
88 subjects; more details on symptoms are described in Table 1. No subjects required hospitalization.
89 Virus isolation from nasal swab was attempted in 21 subjects (13 symptomatic and 8
90 asymptomatic subjects). Infectious virus was recovered in 7/13 (54%) symptomatic and 4/8 (50%)
91 asymptomatic subjects. Lineage characterization was available in 23 subjects in whom the amount
92 of viral RNA was sufficient for genome sequencing. All analyzed patients were infected by the

93 B.1.1.7 variant, also recently renamed as alpha variant. Evidence of virus transmission to family
94 members or close contacts of the 33 infected subjects was observed in 2 (6.1%, 95% CI: 1.1-19.6%)
95 cases, both of whom had a symptomatic infection.

96 The incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection after vaccination was compared to that observed in the
97 control group, including 346 healthcare workers of the same Institution that did not receive the
98 vaccination during the study period (January-May 2021). The control group included 69 SARS-CoV-
99 2 experienced and 134 SARS-CoV-2 naïve, while SARS-CoV-2 serostatus was unknown for 143
100 subjects (Fig 1). During January-May 2021, SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in 20 non-
101 vaccinated subjects: 1 subject among the 69 SARS-CoV-2-experienced, 8 among the 134 SARS-CoV-
102 2 naïve individuals, and 11 among the 143 subjects with unknown serostatus (Fig 1). Of the 20
103 infected subjects, 12 (60%) were nursing or health care assistants, 4 (20%) were administrative
104 workers, 2 (10%) were physicians, 1 (5%) was a healthcare technician and 1 (5%) was a
105 maintenance worker. The infection was symptomatic in 17 (85%) and asymptomatic in 3 (15%)
106 subjects, with a significantly higher occurrence of symptoms than in vaccinated subjects ($p=0.010$,
107 Table 1). The most common symptoms reported were fever in 13 (65%), anosmia in 12 (60%),
108 ageusia in 10 (50%) and asthenia in 8 (40%) infected subjects (Table 1), which were significantly
109 more frequent than in vaccinated subjects ($p\leq0.004$). Dyspnea, which occurred in 4 (8%) non-
110 vaccinated controls, was also significantly higher in this group ($p=0.017$). Two subjects with
111 pneumonia required hospitalization and one was transferred to Intensive Care Unit due to
112 worsening of symptoms.

113 The 100-day cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in the overall population of vaccinated
114 healthcare workers was 0.93% *vs* 5.78% ($p<0.001$) in the non-vaccinated control group (Fig 2a),
115 with an hazard ratio (HR) of 0.17 (95%CI: 0.07-0.42%) and a protective effect in prevention of
116 infection of 83% (95% CI: 58-93%). Excluding the 452 subjects with unknown or dubious
117 serostatus, and considering separately experienced and naïve subjects (Fig 2b), the 100-day
118 cumulative incidence was 0.42% in SARS-CoV-2-experienced and 0.90% in SARS-CoV-2 naïve
119 subjects ($p=0.272$). Among non-vaccinated controls (Fig 2c), after exclusion of the 143 subjects
120 with unknown serostatus the 100-day cumulative incidence was 1.45% in SARS-CoV-2-experienced

121 and 5.97% in SARS-CoV-2 naïve subjects (p=0.139). The HR for developing SARS-CoV-2 infection in
122 vaccinated *vs* non-vaccinated naïve subjects was 0.15 (95%CI: 0.03-0.76), with a protective effect
123 of 86% (95% CI: 24-98%). The HR for developing secondary SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated *vs*
124 non-vaccinated naïve subjects was 0.29 (95%CI: 0.01-8.74), with a protective effect of 71% (95%
125 CI: >0-99%). However, the number of non-vaccinated experienced subjects was too low (n=69) to
126 detect a potentially significant effect in this latter comparison. The HR for developing SARS-CoV-2
127 infection after vaccination in experienced subjects vs non-vaccinated naïve subjects was 0.07 (95%
128 CI: 0.01-0-31), with a protective effects of 93% (95% CI: 69-99%).

129

130 **Protective effect of immunity elicited by natural SARS-CoV-2 infection against secondary**
131 **infections.**

132 To compare the protective effect of the immunity elicited by vaccination or natural infection, we
133 analyzed the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in SARS-CoV-2-experienced or naïve healthcare
134 workers from the same Institution during the second pandemic wave, before the implementation
135 of the vaccination campaign. In the period April 29-June 30 2020, 3810 healthcare workers were
136 tested for previous SARS-CoV-2 infection according to serostatus determination: 336 subjects
137 resulted SARS-CoV-2 experienced and 3474 SARS-CoV-2 naïve. During the second pandemic wave,
138 SARS-CoV-2 infection was detected in 9 SARS-CoV-2-experienced and 225 SARS-CoV-2 naïve
139 subjects. The 3-months cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection (Fig 2d) was 2.68% in
140 experienced vs 6.48% in naïve subjects (p=0.006), with a hazard ratio of 0.41 (95%CI: 0.26-0.61).
141 The protective effect of the immunity elicited by natural infection was 59% (95% CI: 39-74%) Data
142 on symptoms were available for 112 subjects: 1/4 (25%) naïve and 85/108 (79%) experienced
143 subjects developed upper respiratory symptoms and no patient required hospitalization.

144

145 **Immune response in vaccinated subjects with or without breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection.**

146 The antibody and T-cell response was determined in a subset of infected subjects within 48h after
147 diagnosis of infection and in a control subset of non-infected subjects who were SARS-CoV-2 naïve

148 before vaccination. Anti-S1/S2 IgG antibodies were detected in all but one of 27 infected subjects
149 at levels not significantly different from that observed in 143 non-infected controls (Fig 3a).
150 Neutralizing serum titer was determined in 24 infected subjects and compared to that observed in
151 128 controls (Fig 3b). Median serum neutralizing titer was 1:320 (range 1:10-≥1:640), slightly lower
152 (two-fold) than that observed in controls (median titer: ≥1:640; range: 1:20-≥1:640; p=0.045).
153 Finally, the T-cell response to peptide pool of the Spike protein was not significantly different
154 between 24 infected subjects and 132 controls (Fig 3c). Antibody and T-cell response was not
155 different between symptomatic and asymptomatic subjects (data not shown).

156

157 **Discussion**

158 Results of this study suggest the protective effectiveness of BNT162b2 vaccine in prevention of
159 SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers. By comparing the incidence of vaccine breakthrough
160 infections with the incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in healthcare workers that did not receive
161 the vaccination during the study period, an 83% protection from infection was calculated. All
162 vaccine breakthrough infections were asymptomatic or symptomatic mainly with few and mild
163 symptoms as rhinitis. The frequency of symptomatic infections was lower in vaccinated than non-
164 vaccinated subjects (48% vs 85%). Live infectious virus was detected only in half of the cases of
165 breakthrough infections and virus transmission to other individuals was documented in 6.1% of
166 the cases. Finally, breakthrough infections were not associated with failure in developing antibody
167 or T-cell response after vaccination.

168 The 83% effectiveness in prevention of infection of BNT162b2 vaccine observed in our study is
169 slightly lower than the 95% efficacy reported in the phase 2/3 clinical trial [1] but is consistent with
170 those reported in a retrospective analysis conducted in Israel [9] and in the SIREN study conducted
171 in England [10], both involving healthcare workers. The active surveillance and screening
172 performed in our as well as in the other above-mentioned studies may have led to the
173 identification of a number of subclinical infections that were not ascertained in the clinical trial.
174 Nevertheless, vaccine effectiveness observed by this real-world analysis in healthcare workers
175 remains high, and results are consistent among different countries.

176 Protection from secondary infections after primary SARS-CoV-2 infection appears effective and
177 sustained for at least 10 months [15]. The protection from subsequent SARS-CoV-2 infection
178 provided by the vaccine appears even higher than that induced by natural infection (83% *vs* 59%,
179 as observed in the retrospective analysis of our study). We analysed separately the incidence of
180 breakthrough infections in individuals who were either SARS-CoV-2 naïve or experienced before
181 vaccination. Although we observed a lower incidence of breakthrough infections in experienced
182 than naïve subjects (0.42% *vs* 0.90%) and a higher protective effectiveness (94% *vs* 83%), the
183 population size was too low to verify whether SARS-CoV-2-experienced achieve a significantly
184 higher protection from infection after vaccination than naïve subjects. In addition, we cannot
185 exclude that previously infected individuals may have had different behaviors or underlying risk
186 profiles. Nevertheless, immunogenicity studies showed that vaccination is able to boost the pre-
187 existing immunity in experienced subjects, who develop higher antibody and T-cell levels than
188 naïve subjects [16-18]. In addition, we observed that vaccination of experienced individuals
189 elicited neutralizing antibody at levels that overcome the partial antibody escape of the B.1.351
190 variant [18]. It is tempting to speculate that three antigenic exposures, as in the case of SARS-CoV-
191 2-experienced subjects receiving two vaccine doses, may confer a higher and broader protection.

192 Breakthrough infections were asymptomatic or symptomatic with few symptoms. To assess
193 whether the detection of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in naso-pharyngeal samples of vaccinated subjects with
194 breakthrough infection was associated with the presence of live infectious virus, we attempted
195 virus isolation on cell cultures in 21 of the 33 subjects, recovering infectious virus only in half of
196 the cases. We could not compare the rates of infectious virus recovery in vaccinated *vs*
197 unvaccinated SARS-CoV-2 RNA positive subjects, since we did not perform virus isolation in the
198 control group. However, the low rate of detection of infectious virus is in line with a recent report
199 showing decreased viral load in infected vaccinated subjects [19], and suggests a lower
200 contagiousness, along with the lower severity, of the vaccine breakthrough infections. Thus, SARS-
201 CoV-2 RNA detected in fully vaccinated is likely to be often a sign of an abortive infection limited
202 and blocked on mucosal surfaces by the elicited immunity.

203 Most importantly, we documented a lack of transmission of the virus in the great majority of
204 cases, since only 2/33 subjects transmitted the infection to a family member. Transmission was
205 ascertained by contact tracing and analysis of naso-pharyngeal swabs of coworkers and family
206 members. Although we cannot exclude that the actual rate of transmission could have been
207 underestimated, this data suggests a low contagiousness of SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated
208 subjects and the effectiveness of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in blocking the infection spreading at the
209 population level. However, this observation should be confirmed in controlled studies.

210 In order to verify the hypothesis that a poor individual response to the vaccine is the cause of
211 breakthrough infections, we compared the antibody and T-cell responses of the infected
212 individuals with a control group of vaccinated uninfected subjects. Since the immune response
213 was evaluated in the peri-infection period (within 48h after diagnosis), it is unlikely that the levels
214 of antibody and T cells observed are the consequence of a boost due to the infection. No
215 difference was observed for anti-Spike IgG and T-cells, while a slight reduction in the neutralizing
216 serum titers was detected in the infected subjects. However, it was not possible to define a cutoff
217 level of neutralizing titer able to identify poor responders that are at higher risk for vaccine
218 breakthrough infections. We could exclude also that a viral variant associated to potential vaccine
219 escape was causing the infection, since in all cases in which the RNA amount was sufficient for
220 sequencing, the B.1.1.7 variant (alpha), which was accounting for the great majority of viral strains
221 circulating in Italy during the study period, was detected. Before the end of the study, in Italy the
222 first cases of delta variant have been reported, accounting for 0.02% [20]. No cases of delta variant
223 were identified in vaccine breakthrough infections of our study.

224 The strength of this study resides in the prospective systematical collection of virological data
225 (viral RNA detection and infectious virus recovery), clinical symptoms, immune response and virus
226 transmission to other individuals, providing an insight on the characteristics of vaccine
227 breakthrough infection and initial observational evidence for their low contagiousness. The
228 limitation resides in the small sample size of the control group for the evaluation of vaccine
229 effectiveness, and the lack of a control for the analysis of the contagiousness of breakthrough
230 infections. Nevertheless, the observed vaccine effectiveness was similar to that observed in other

real-world analysis on healthcare workers. Notwithstanding the non-random nature of the control group, we can assume that both vaccinated and control subjects were exposed to the same risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection, since all of them were healthcare workers of the same Institution. The decision to defer vaccination was taken by the individual subjects.

In conclusion, our analysis support the effectiveness of the BNT162b2 vaccine in preventing SARS-CoV-2 infection, and suggest that breakthrough infections are poorly symptomatic and likely associated with a low contagiousness. Nevertheless, the duration of the vaccine protection should be evaluated in the next future.

Methods

Study subjects and design

The occurrence of SARS-CoV-2 infection was monitored prospectively in 3720 healthcare workers of Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia receiving 2 doses of the BNT162b2 vaccine. Subjects completed vaccination schedule between January 18 and March 31, 2021 and data were collected until May 10, 2021.

Data on SARS-CoV-2 infection in 346 healthcare workers of the same Institution that did not receive the vaccination during the study period were used as control (data were collected in the period January 1-May 10, 2021).

Data on incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection during the second pandemic wave in 3810 healthcare workers from the same institution who had serological definition of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection were used to compare protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection induced by the vaccine or by natural infection (data were collected in the period September 1st-November 30, 2020). Subjects analysed are a subgroup of a cohort of healthcare workers partially described in [21].

Naso-pharyngeal swabs were collected and tested for SARS-CoV-2 RNA positivity in subjects with symptoms suggestive for SARS-CoV-2 infection or in case of contact with infected subjects as previously reported [22]. In vaccinated subjects who resulted SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive, blood

257 samples for immune response analyses were collected 24-48h after nasopharyngeal swab
258 sampling. The transmission of the infection from SARS-CoV-2 RNA-positive vaccinated subjects
259 was investigated by contact-tracing and monitoring for SARS-CoV-2 RNA detection in nasal swabs
260 in coworkers and family members of the infected subjects. Data on symptoms were collected
261 during an interview by a physician and inserted into a specific database. Study procedures were
262 approved by Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo and Comitato Etico Area Pavia and all the
263 subjects gave their written informed consent.

264 **Virus isolation**

265 Virus isolation was performed by inoculation of 200µl nasopharyngeal swab suspension medium,
266 after decontamination with an antibiotics pool for 30 min at room temperature, on Vero E6 cells
267 cultured in 24well plate, and detection of cytopathic effect after one-week culture.

268 **Sequencing**

269 Lineage characterization was available in 23 subjects in whom the amount of viral RNA was
270 sufficient for genome sequencing. In detail, total RNAs were extracted from nasopharyngeal swabs
271 by using QIAamp Viral RNA Mini Kit (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany), followed by purification with
272 Agencourt RNA Clean XP beads (Beckman Coulter, Inc., Brea, CA). Both the concentration and the
273 quality of all RNA samples were measured and checked with the Nanodrop. Virus genomes were
274 generated by using a multiplex approach, using version 1 of the CleanPlex SARS-CoV-2 Research
275 and Surveillance Panel (Paragon Genomics, Hayward, USA), according to the manufacturer's
276 protocol starting with 50 ng of total RNA. Briefly, the multiplex PCR was performed with two
277 pooled primer mixtures and the cDNA reverse transcribed with random primers was used as a
278 template. After ten rounds of amplification, the two PCR products were pooled and purified. Then
279 the digestion reaction was performed to remove non-specific PCR products, followed by second
280 PCR reaction for barcoding with 24 rounds of amplification. Libraries were checked using High
281 Sensitivity Labchip and quantified with Qubit Fluorometric Quantitation system (Life Technologies,
282 Carlsbad, CA, USA). Equimolar quantity of libraries was pooled, and the obtained run library mix
283 was loaded at 1.5 pM into Illimuna MiSeq platform (Illumina, San Diego, CA, USA,) for sequencing
284 [23]. NGS data were also analysed with an in-house pipeline and lineages were assigned from

285 alignment file using the Phylogenetic Assignment of Named Global Outbreak LINeages tool
286 PANGOLIN v1.07 (https://github.com/hCoV-2019/pangolin).

287 **SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody and T-cell determination.**

288 To detect subjects with SARS-CoV-2 infection after the first pandemic wave, serological analysis
289 was performed in the period April 29-June 30 2020 using chemiluminescent assay (Liason SARS-
290 CoV-2 S1/S2 IgG, Diasorin, Saluggia, Italy) for the quantitative measurement of SARS-CoV-2 anti-S1
291 and anti-S2 IgG antibody. Results higher than 15 AU/mL were considered positive and defined
292 SARS-CoV-2 experienced subjects, whereas results below 12 AU/mL were considered negative and
293 defined SARS-CoV-2 naïve subjects. Subjects with borderline results ranging from 12 and 15
294 AU/mL were not included in the analysis. A further serological screening was conducted after the
295 second pandemic wave in the period December 15 2020-February 3 2021. Since this second
296 screening overlapped with the initiation of the vaccination campaign, the
297 electrochemiluminescent assay Elecsys Anti-SARS-CoV-2 N (Roche Diagnostics Rotkreuz,
298 Switzerland), which provides quantitative measures of mainly IgG (but also IgA and IgM) specific
299 for SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid protein (not present in the vaccine) was used. Results were given as
300 units (U)/ml and are considered positive when ≥0.8 U/ml. Subjects with positive serological results
301 after either or both screenings were considered SARS-CoV-2 experienced before vaccination.

302 Antibody and T-cell response to Spike protein was determined in vaccinated subjects after
303 detection of SARS-CoV-2 infection and in a control group of SARS-CoV-2-naïve subjects 21 days
304 after complete vaccination [18]. Anti-Spike IgG antibody was determined using Liason SARS-CoV-2
305 S1/S2 IgG (Diasorin). Neutralizing antibody serum titre was determined as following described
306 [24]. Fifty µl of serum, from 1:10 to 1:640 in a serial fourfold dilution, were added in two wells of a
307 flat bottom tissue culture microtiter plate (COSTAR, Corning Incorporated, NY 14831, USA). Then,
308 the same volume of 100 TCID50 of SARS-CoV-2 strain was added and plates were incubated at
309 33°C in 5% CO_2. All the dilutions were made in E-MEM with addition of 1% penicillin, streptomycin
310 and glutammin and 5 γ/mL of trypsin. After 1 h incubation at 33°C 5% CO_2, Vero E6 cells were
311 added to each well. After 72 h of incubation at 33°C 5% CO_2, plates were stained with Gram's
312 crystal violet solution (Merck KGaA, 64271 Damstadt, Germany) plus 5% formaldehyde 40% m/v

313 (Carlo ErbaSpA, Arese [MI], Italy) for 30 min. Microtiter plates were then washed under running
314 water. Wells were scored to evaluate the degree of cytopathic effect (CPE) compared to the virus
315 control. Blue staining of wells indicated the presence of neutralizing antibodies. Neutralizing titer
316 was the maximum dilution with the reduction of 90% of CPE. Results higher or equal to 1:10 serum
317 titer were considered positive.

318 Spike specific T-cell response was determined with an IFNγ ELISpot assay after peripheral blood
319 mononuclear cells (PBMC) stimulation with a peptide pool (15mers overlapping by 10 aminoacids)
320 spanning the entire Spike protein [25]. In more details, PBMC were isolated from heparin-treated
321 blood by standard density gradient centrifugation. The number of IFNγ-producing spot forming
322 cells (SFC) was determined by ELISpot. Briefly, PBMC ($2x10^5$/100µl culture medium per well) were
323 stimulated in duplicate for 24 h in 96-well plates (coated with anti-IFN-γ monoclonal capture
324 antibody) with peptide pools (15 mers, overlapping by 10 aminoacids, Pepscan, Lelystad The
325 Netherlands) representative of the S at the final concentration of 0.25 µg/ml.
326 Phytoheamagglutinin (PHA; 5 µg/mL) was used as positive control, and medium alone as negative
327 control. After washing, plates were incubated for 90 minutes at 37°C with biotinylated IFN-γ
328 detection antibody. Then, streptavidin-alkaline phosphatase conjugate was added, and plates
329 were incubated at 37°C in a 5% CO_2 atmosphere for 1 hour. Finally, and 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-
330 indolyl phosphate/nitro blue tetrazolium (BCIP/NBT) was added for 20 minutes at room
331 temperature. Wells were then washed several times under running water and air-dried overnight.
332 Spots were counted using an automated AID ELISPOT reader system (AutoImmun Diagnostika
333 GmbH, Strasburg, Germany). The mean number of spots from duplicate cultures were adjusted to
334 1 x 10^6 PBMC. The net spots per million PBMC was calculated by subtracting the number of spots
335 in response to negative control from the number of spots in response to the S or N antigen.
336 Responses ≥10 net spots/million PBMC were considered positive based on background results
337 obtained with negative control (mean SFC+2SD).

338 **Statistical analysis**

339 The cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection was calculated with the Kaplan-Meier method
340 and log-rank test was adopted for statistical comparison. The hazard ratio (HR) and 95%
341 confidence interval (CI) for SARS-CoV-2 infection in the various groups of patients were calculated

342 with the log-rank approach. The vaccine effectiveness in prevention of SARS-CoV-2 infection was
343 calculated as 100% x (1-HR), and the relevant 95% CI were calculated as 100% x (1-95% CI_{HR}),
344 where CI_{HR} is the 95% CI of the HR. Similarly, the protective effectiveness of immunity elicited by
345 SARS-CoV-2 infection against secondary infections was calculated as 100% x (1-HR), and the
346 relevant 95% CI were calculated as 100% x (1-95% CI_{HR}). The frequency of symptoms in vaccinated
347 and control subjects were compared with the Fisher's exact test. The antibody and T-cell levels in
348 vaccinated subjects with or without breakthrough infections were compared with the Mann-
349 Whitney U-test.

350 **Data availability**

351 The anonymized data relevant to SARS-CoV-2 infection during the study period in vaccinated and
352 control subjects, along with serologic results indicating their previous exposure to SARS-CoV-2
353 infection, are available in the Dryad database under DOI 10.5061/dryad.n2z34tmxk
354 [https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.n2z34tmxk]. Raw data associated to Figures 2a-c are present in the
355 dataset. The 23 SARS-CoV-2 sequences obtained in this study are openly available on GISAID portal
356 and European Nucleotide Archive under the accession numbers EPI_ISL_3836237-
357 EPI_ISL_3836259.

358

359 **References**

360 1. Polack FP, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J*
361 *Med.* **383**, 2603-2615 (2020).
362 2. Baden LR, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.*
363 **382**, 1851-1852 (2021).
364 3. Sadoff J, et al. Safety and Efficacy of Single-Dose Ad26.COV2.S Vaccine against Covid-19. *N*
365 *Engl J Med.* Apr 21. Online ahead of print. (2021).
366 4. Voysey M, et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against
367 SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa,
368 and the UK. Lancet. **397**, 99-111 (2021).
369 5. Dagan N, et al. BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 vaccine in a nationwide mass vaccination setting.
370 *N Engl J Med.***384**, 1412-1423 (2021).
371 6. Vasileiou E, et al. Interim findings from first-dose mass COVID-19 vaccination roll-out and
372 COVID-19 hospital admissions in Scotland: a national prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. **397**,
373 1646-1657 (2021).
374 7. Haas EJ, et al. Impact and effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2
375 infections and COVID-19 cases, hospitalisations, and deaths following a nationwide
376 vaccination campaign in Israel: an observational study using national surveillance data.
377 *Lancet*. **397**, 1819-1829 (2021).
378 8. Lopez Bernal J, et al. Effectiveness of the Pfizer-BioNTech and Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccines
379 on covid-19 related symptoms, hospital admissions, and mortality in older adults in
380 England: test negative case-control study. *BMJ*.;**373**, n1088 (2021).
381 9. Angel Y, et al. Association Between Vaccination With BNT162b2 and Incidence of
382 Symptomatic and Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 Infections Among Health Care Workers.
383 *JAMA*. May 6. Online ahead of print (2021).
384 10. Hall VJ, et al. COVID-19 vaccine coverage in health-care workers in England and
385 effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against infection (SIREN): a prospective,
386 multicentre, cohort study. *Lancet*. **397**, 1725-1735 (2021).
387 11. Amit S, et al. Early rate reductions of SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 in BNT162b2
388 vaccine recipients. *Lancet*. **397**, 875-877 (2021).
389 12. Thompson MG, et al. Interim Estimates of Vaccine Effectiveness of BNT162b2 and mRNA-
390 1273 COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among Health Care Personnel,

391 First Responders, and Other Essential and Frontline Workers - Eight U.S. Locations,
392 December 2020-March 2021. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. **70**(13), 495-500 (2021).

393 13. Pritchard E, et al. Impact of vaccination on new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the United
394 Kingdom. *Nat Med*. Jun 9. Online ahead of print (2021). doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01410-w.
395 14. Legge 30 Dicembre 2020 n. 178 Piano Strategico Nazionale dei Vaccini per la prevenzione
396 delle infezioni da SARS-CoV-2.
397 15. O Murchu E, et al. Quantifying the risk of SARS-CoV-2 reinfection over time. *Rev Med Virol*.
398 May 27:e2260. Online ahead of print (2021).
399 16. Manisty C, et al. Antibody response to first BNT162b2 dose in previously SARS-CoV-2-
400 infected individuals. *Lancet*. **397**, 1057-1058 (2021).
401 17. Prendecki M, et al., SARS-CoV-2 Effect of previous SARS-CoV-2 infection on humoral and T-
402 cell responses to single-dose BNT162b2 vaccine. *Lancet*. **397**, 1178-1181 (2021).
403 18. Cassaniti I, et al. SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine BNT162b2 elicited a robust humoral and
404 cellular response against SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Research Square* April 9 doi:
405 10.21203/rs.3.rs-396284/v1 (2021).
406 19. Levine-Tiefenbrun M, et al. Initial report of decreased SARS-CoV-2 viral load after
407 inoculation with the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Nat Med*. **27**, 790-792 (2021).
408 20. Istituto Superiore di Sanità. Prevalenza e distribuzione delle varianti del varianti del virus
409 SARS-CoV-2 di interesse per la sanità pubblica in Italia. May 19th, 2021. Rome: ISS; 2021.

410 21. Rovida F, et al. Incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in health care workers from Northern
411 Italy based on antibody status: immune protection from secondary infection- A
412 retrospective observational case-controlled study. *Int J Infect Dis*. **109**, 199-202 (2021).
413 22. Giardina F, et al. No evidence of SARS-CoV-2 circulation in the framework of influenza
414 surveillance between October 2019 and February 2020 in Lombardy, Italy. *Travel Med*
415 *Infect Dis*. **40**:102002 (2021).
416 23. Alteri C, et al. Genomic epidemiology of SARS-CoV-2 reveals multiple lineages and early
417 spread of SARS-CoV-2 infections in Lombardy, Italy. *Nat Commun*. **12**:434 (2021).
418 24. Percivalle E, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 specific neutralising antibodies in blood
419 donors from the Lodi Red Zone in Lombardy, Italy, as at 06 April 2020. *Euro Surveill*.
420 **25**:2001031 (2020).

421 25. Cassaniti I, et al. SARS-CoV-2 specific T-cell immunity in COVID-19 convalescent patients
422 and unexposed controls measured by ex vivo ELISpot assay. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. S1198-
423 743X(21)00145-2. Online ahead of print (2021).
424

425 **Acknowledgments**

426 This work was supported by Fondazione Cariplo [grant CoVIM, no. 2020-1374] and Ministero della
427 Salute, Ricerca Finalizzata [grants no. COVID-2020-12371760 and COVID-2020-12371817]. AP and
428 FB have received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation
429 programme under grant agreement No 101003650.

430 **Author contribution**

431 FR and DL analyzed and interpreted the data and drafted the manuscript; AM, VN, AM, AMG, GG,
432 collected and managed the data; CR, MD performed patients' follow-up; FeB and IC, performed
433 experiments on T-cell response; JCS, AF, AS performed experiments on antibody response; EP
434 performed virus isolation; SP, AP, FG sequenced viral genomes; CM, AT supervised participants
435 enrollment; FaB supervised the study and revised the manuscript. All the authors critically
436 reviewed the manuscripts.

437 **Competing interests**

438 The authors have no competing interest to declare.

439 **Table 1. Symptoms of SARS CoV in vaccinated and non-vaccinated subjects**

Symptoms	Vaccinated subjects (n=33)	Non-vaccinated controls (n=20)	p-value
any	16 (48%)	17 (85%)	0.010
fever (>37.5°C)	2 (6%)	13 (65%)	<0.001
headache	2 (6%)	2 (10%)	0.627
asthenia	2 (6%)	8 (40%)	0.004
arthralgia	3 (9%)	5 (25%)	0.137
pharyngodynia	1 (3%)	2 (10%)	0.549
rhinitis	9 (27%)	2 (12%)	0.175
cough	3 (9%)	3 (15%)	0.661
pneumonia	0 (0%)	2 (10%)	0.138
dyspnea	0 (0%)	4 (20%)	0.017
anosmia	2 (6%)	12 (60%)	<0.001
ageusia	1 (3%)	10 (50%)	<0.001
nausea	1 (3%)	2 (10%)	0.549
diarrhea	1 (3%)	2 (10%)	0.549

440 Fisher's Exact test (two-sided) was used for statistical analysis.

441



Figure 1.

Figure 1. Study profile. Data from 4066 healthcare workers of San Matteo hospital, Pavia, Italy were analysed: 3720 subjects received complete schedule of BNT162b2 vaccine, while 346 subjects who did not receive vaccination during the study period were used as controls. According to serological or virological data subjects were considered SARS-CoV-2 experienced or naïve before initiation of the study, while SARS-CoV-2 serostatus was unknown or dubious for some individuals. SARS-CoV-2 infection was diagnosed during the study in 33 vaccinated subjects and 20 controls.



Figure 2

Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated and non-vaccinated healthcare workers of San Matteo hospital. a, Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in vaccinated subjects and non-vaccinated controls. **b,** Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in SARS-CoV-2-naïve and experienced vaccinated subjects. **c,** Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in SARS-CoV-2-naïve and experienced non-vaccinated control subjects. **d,** Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection in SARS-CoV-2-naïve and experienced subjects before vaccine implementation during the second pandemic wave (period: September 1st-November 30th 2020).



Figure 3

Figure 3. Antibody and T-cell responses in vaccinated healthcare workers with or without SARS-CoV-2 breakthrough infections. a, Anti-spike IgG level (AU: arbitrary units); **b**, serum neutralizing titer; **c**, IFNγ-producing spot forming cells (SFC)/10^6 peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC). Immune response was determined within 48h after diagnosis in infected subjects, and 21 days after complete vaccination schedule in non-infected subjects. Median values with interquartile ranges are shown. Mann-Whitney U-test (two-sided) was used for statistical analysis.