

Efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in thoracic cancer patients: a prospective study supporting a third dose in patients with minimal serologic response after two vaccine doses

Valérie Gounant, MD, MSc.^{1,2*}, Valentine Marie Ferré, PharmD, MSc.^{3*}, Ghassen Soussi, MD^{1,2}, Charlotte Charpentier, PharmD, PhD³, Héloïse Flament, Pharm D, PhD⁴, Nadhira Fidouh, PharmD³, Gilles Collin, Msc.³, Céline Namour, Msc.^{1,2}, Sandra Assoun,^{1,2} MD, MSc, Alexandra Bizot,^{1,2} MD, MSc., Zohra Brouk, PhD^{1,2}, Eric Vicaut, MD, PhD⁵, Luis Teixeira, MD, PhD⁶, Diane Descamps, MD, PhD³, and Gérard Zalcman, MD, PhD^{1,2,7¶}

1- Université de Paris, North-Paris Cancer University Institute, Thoracic Oncology Department, Bichat-Claude Bernard Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP.Nord), 46 rue Henri Huchard, Paris, France

2- INSERM Centre d'Investigation Clinique 1425, Bichat-Claude Bernard Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP.Nord), 46 rue Henri Huchard, Paris, France

3- Université de Paris, Virology Department, INSERM UMR1137 "Infection, Antimicrobials, Modelling, Evolution", Bichat-Claude Bernard Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP.Nord), 46 rue Henri Huchard, Paris, France

4- Université de Paris, Hematology and Immunology Department, INSERM-U1149, Research Center on Inflammation (CRI) Bichat-Claude Bernard Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP.Nord), 46 rue Henri Huchard, Paris, France

5- Université de Paris, Biostatistics and Clinical Research Department, Lariboisière Hospital (AP-HP.Nord), 2 rue Amboise Paré, 75018 Paris, France

6- Université de Paris, North-Paris Cancer University Institute, Breast Diseases Centre, INSERM U976, HIPI, "Pathophysiology of Breast Cancer Team", Saint-Louis Hospital, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP.Nord), 1 avenue Claude Vellefaux, 75010 Paris, France

7- INSERM U830 "Cancer, Heterogeneity Plasticity", Curie Institute Research Centre, 26 rue d'Ulm, 75231 Paris cedex 05, France

* both authors equally contributed

¶ To whom correspondence must be addressed:

Prof. **G. Zalcman**
Service d' Oncologie Thoracique
Hôpital Bichat-Claude Bernard
46 rue Henri Huchard
FR-75018 Paris
gerard.zalcman@aphp.fr

Key-words: lung cancer, chemotherapy, immune checkpoint inhibitors, COVID-19, Sars-CoV2 vaccination, mRNA vaccine, antibody response

Authors contribution:

conceptualization: GZ, VG, DD, LT; *supervision:* GZ, VG; *data curation:* GZ, CM, ZB, GS, VG, VMF; *Formal analysis:* GZ, GS, VG, EV, VMF; *Funding acquisition:* GZ, LT, HF, DD, EV; *Investigation:* GZ, VG, GS, SA, AB, CM, ZB; *Biological analyses:* VMF, CC, HF, NF, GC, DD; *Statistical analyses:* GS, EV; *original draft:* GZ; *review & editing:* GZ, VG, GS, VMF, HF, DD, EV, EV; *final MS approbation:* all authors.

Conflict of interest statement:

Valentine Marie Ferré, Ghassen Soussi, Charlotte Charpentier, Héloïse Flament, Nadhira Fidouh, Gilles Collin, Céline Namour, Sandra Assoun, Alexandra Bizot, Zohra Brouk, Eric Vicaut, Luis Teixeira have nothing to disclose.

Gérard Zalcman received research grants from Roche-France, BMS, Takeda outside of the submitted work, perceived fees from BMS, Astra-Zeneca, Pfizer, Borhinger-Ingelheim outside the submitted work and reimbursement for international meetings assistance from Abbvie, MSD, Astra-Zeneca, BMS, Roche-France;

Valérie Gounant reports personal fees from MSD, Chugai, Novartis, and Boehringer; personal fees and non-financial support from Astra Zeneca, BMS, Takeda, and Pfizer; grants, personal fees, and non-financial support from Roche, all outside the submitted work;

Diane Descamps reports fees from Viiv-healthcare, Gilead-Sciences, Janssen-Cilag outside the submitted work;

Abstract

Hypothesis

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) resulted in a 30% mortality rate in thoracic cancer patients. Given that cancer patients were excluded from serum anti-severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV2) vaccine registration trials, it is still unknown whether they would develop a protective anti-spike antibody response following vaccination. This prospective vaccine monitoring study primarily aimed to assess humoral responses to SARS-CoV2 vaccine in thoracic cancer patients.

Methods

SARS-CoV2-spike antibodies were measured using Abbot ARCHITECT SARS-CoV-2 IgG immunoassay, prior to first injection of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine, as well as at Week 4, and two-to-sixteen weeks after second vaccine dose. The factors associated with antibody response were analyzed.

Results

Overall, 306 patients, with a median age of 67.0 years (IQR=58-74), were vaccinated. Of these, 283 patients received two vaccine doses at 28-day intervals. After 4.7-month median follow-up, seven patients (2.3%) contracted proven symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection, with rapid favorable evolution. Of 269 serological results available beyond Day 14 post-second vaccine dose, 17 (6.3%) were still negative (<50 AU/mL) (arbitrary units/mL), while 34 (11%) were <300 AU/mL (12.5th percentile). In multivariate analysis, only age and chronic corticosteroid treatment were significantly associated with a lack of immunization. Thirty patients received a third vaccine dose, with only three patients showing persistent negative serology thereafter, whereas the others demonstrated clear seroconversion.

Conclusion

SARS-CoV2 vaccines were shown to be efficient in thoracic cancer patients, most of them being immunized after two doses. A third shot given to 1% of patients with persistent low antibody titers resulted in a 88% immunization rate.

Introduction

Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) is associated with a dramatic 30% mortality rate in thoracic cancer patients^{1,2, 3}. The Chinese series reported mortality rates of 29-39%,⁴⁻⁶ compared with 0.7-8.0% case fatality rates in their general population⁷⁻¹¹. Lung cancer patients should therefore be given priority for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) vaccination. Nonetheless, active cancer condition and immunosuppressive therapy constituted non-inclusion criteria for SARS-CoV-2 vaccine registration trials, and scarcely anything is known about the vaccine effectiveness in cancer populations. Moreover, the antibody response after influenza vaccination was previously shown to be lower in cancer patients versus healthy controls, especially concerning people aged ≥ 65 years¹². Notably, two doses of influenza vaccine were required in cancer patients to attain the same serum protection rate than in healthy controls, with on-going chemotherapy or corticosteroids resulting in lower protection¹³. Similarly, a meta-analysis on influenza vaccine effectiveness in cancer patients exhibited significantly reduced seroconversion (\geq four-fold rise) in comparison with vaccinated immunocompetent controls (0.31; 95%CI:0.22-0.43)¹⁴. Vaccination timing remains unclear too. Upon chemotherapy, the mid-point between two cycles was empirically selected for the vaccine shot. Moreover, as immunotherapy has become an essential component of lung cancer treatment, only little is known concerning undesirable effects, although no short-term reactogenicity following influenza vaccination occurred in patients under immune checkpoints inhibitors (ICIs)¹⁵. Both mRNA vaccine registration trials reported 94% effectiveness against severe COVID19 in healthy volunteers, ≥ 14 days post-second booster (Day 21 for Pfizer BNT162b2¹⁶ or Day 28 for Moderna mRNA-1273^{17, 18}). Concerning adenovirus-based vaccines (one shot of Janssen

Ad26.COV2.S¹⁹ or two doses of Astra-Zeneca ChAdOx1nCov-19 vaccines^{20, 21}), slightly lower rates were reported. Similar protection rates against severe COVID19 were confirmed in real-life by population-based Israeli and Scottish studies for Pfizer BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1nCov-19^{22, 23}. Yet, these data cannot be extrapolated to cancer patients undergoing anti-cancer treatment. Duration of anti-SARS-CoV-2-spike (anti-S) detection was at least 8 months in healthy volunteers²⁴. It is unclear whether such duration is applicable to cancer patients receiving immunosuppressing drugs. Early January 2021, vaccination was made available in France. To increase first vaccine dose availability, French Health authorities recommended a 28-day interval for both mRNA vaccines, with a 42-day interval for healthy people, this delayed second dosing being debatable^{25, 26}. Due to uncertainties concerning vaccination of cancer patients, the observational COVIDVAC-OH study (clinical.trials.gov NCT04776005) was launched, sponsored by Paris University Hospitals. This study sought to investigate SARS-CoV-2 vaccination's (mainly mRNA-based vaccines) effectiveness in over 1100 consecutive patients with solid cancers or hematological malignancies, at North-Paris University Cancer center. This report concerns 306 thoracic cancer patients.

METHODS

Trial design, objectives, and participants

We conducted a prospective study involving thoracic cancer patients followed-up in Bichat Hospital, from January 26 to July 28, 2021. Patients diagnosed with thoracic cancer and deemed eligible (no known COVID-19 infection within <last three months; life expectancy >3 months; lack of known allergy to previous vaccines) were

identified from medical records. They were contacted and offered to be vaccinated. If they accepted and in the absence of contra-indications, they were attended vaccination sessions in the outpatient clinic, according to priority sequencing, as follows: first elderly patients aged ≥ 75 years and those receiving chemotherapy; patients receiving immune checkpoint inhibitors (ICI); patients with pneumonectomy or chronic radiation pneumonitis; patients on oral tyrosine kinase targeted therapy (TKIs); patients without systemic therapy. They were given a written information leaflet on COVID19 mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine, and on serological and hematological blood tests to be performed at first dose (Day 0), at second dose (Day 28), and at least 2 weeks post-booster dose (Day 42). All patients could oppose blood samplings and still undergo vaccine injections. Recommendations to keep facial masks and social distancing were given. All patients were registered into National Health Insurance computed COVID-19 vaccine database, with national identification number, complete identity, main underlying conditions, and vaccine batch number. Following blood sampling and vaccine injection, patients were followed-up for 15 minutes under medical surveillance²⁷. This study was approved by the Comité d'Evaluation de l'Ethique des projets de Recherche Biomedicale (CEERB, IRB00006477) of University Hospitals Paris-North Val-de-Seine, Paris 7 University, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP) upon the approval number N°CER-2021-72. In the case of COVID-19-suggestive symptoms, patients were instructed to promptly inform the medical team and perform nasopharyngeal SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR swab testing. At second vaccination visit, they were questioned about undesirable events post-first vaccination and symptoms evoking COVID-19. Some patients (n=16) were vaccinated by their general practitioner or in a government-certified vaccination center. No blood sampling was available for these patients at

Days 0 and 28. If they agreed, they underwent blood sampling in the post-booster period and were included in our study.

To set up the technical conditions for SARS-CoV-2 anti-nucleocapsid (N) index and anti-Spike antibody determination, 18 control subjects from Hôpital Bichat staff, without previous COVID-19 symptoms or PCR-proved SARS-CoV-2 infection, provided their written consent for blood sampling. This occurred on Day 28 post-first vaccine, while 13 subjects underwent additional blood sampling at least 2 weeks post-second vaccine.

Study endpoints

The primary endpoint was to assess humoral immunity against SARS-CoV-2-spike in thoracic cancer patients following COVID-19 mRNA BNT162b2 vaccine injection and booster dose. Some patients vaccinated outside our center received Moderna mRNA-1273 (n=1) or Astra-Zeneca ChAdOx1 nCov-19 (n=3) vaccines, being included herein.

Secondary endpoints were vaccination safety, clinical efficacy based on RT-PCR-documented COVID-19 infection during the study, and hospitalization or death from COVID-19. Phone safety consultations were scheduled every 3 weeks. Cell immunity to SARS-CoV-2-spike protein was evaluated using T-cell enzyme linked immunospot (ELISPOT), with lymphocyte subset counts, scheduled at Day 28 and from Day 42 post-first injection in 122 arbitrarily-designated patients.

Laboratory analyses

SARS-CoV-2 anti-N and anti-S antibody titers were determined using Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgG Quant II (Abbott, Maidenhead, UK) and

expressed as index (cut-off: 0.49) and arbitrary units (cut-off: 50 AU/mL), respectively. Pseudo-neutralization assay was performed using iFlash-2019-nCoV Nab assay (YHLO, Shenzhen, China), which assesses antibody neutralizing capacity by competition with angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2)-receptor for binding to anti-spike RBD (cut-off: 10AU/mL). This assay correlated with SARS-CoV-2 *in vitro* cell micro-neutralization (paper submitted for publication).

ELISpot assay methods are in online supplement.

Statistical analysis

All samples were de-identified and assigned an ID number, with the sampling date. Sample processing and data analyses were performed, with all study personal blinded to information concerning patients and samples. De-identified data were exported from Microsoft Excel Version 2013 for Windows (Microsoft Corporation, 2013) to IBM® SPSS® Statistics for Windows, Version 25.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, N.Y., USA) for statistical analysis. Between-group comparisons were performed using Pearson's chi-squared or Fisher's exact tests for discrete variables, and Student's-T or Mann-Whitney U tests for continuous variables. Odds ratios (OR) and respective 95% confidence intervals (95%CI) were calculated using binary logistic regression. Hypothesis testing was two-tailed, with p values<0.05 considered statistically significant. All assumptions required for logistic regression modeling were verified. Multivariable analysis was conducted using binary logistic regression using the Enter method, including variables exhibiting a significance threshold p<0.20 yielded by the univariable analysis..

Funding source

The academic authors retained editorial control. The *Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris* funded the study, without participating to study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or report writing.

RESULTS

Participant characteristics

From January 20 to June 1, 2021, overall 325 thoracic cancer patients followed-up in thoracic oncology/surgery departments were proposed anti-SARS-CoV-2 vaccination with Pfizer BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. Initially, only 36 (**11%**) declined the proposal. Of these, **17** eventually accepted to be vaccinated; nine of whom were vaccinated outside of our center but participated to serological testing. Overall, 306 patients received their 28-day-spaced doses or underwent blood samplings between January 26 and May 17, 2021. Patient disposition is illustrated in **suppl. Figure 1**. Clinical follow-up was extended until July 28, 2021.

Patient clinical and demographic characteristics are provided in **Table 1**. Overall, 181 patients (59.2%) were male and 285 (93.1%) exhibited lung cancer with 260 (84.9%) non-small cell lung carcinomas (NSCLCs) and 22 (7.2%) small-cell lung carcinomas (SCLCs), while 13 (4.4%) suffered from pleural malignant mesothelioma. Median age was 67 years IQR(58-74), with 41.2 % older than 70. Most patients (57.2%) displayed late-stage disease, with 117 (38%) cancer-diagnosed within <last 12 months. Last treatment received within three months prior-first vaccine was chemotherapy (n=74; 24.2 %), given alone (51; 16.7%), with concurrent thoracic radiotherapy (n=2), or combined with ICI (21, 6.9%), while 49 patients (16%) received ICI alone, and 13.7% were treated with daily TKIs or maintenance bevacizumab. The

last 141 patients (30.7%) had not received systemic treatment within last three months. Overall, **37** (12.1%) patients displayed chronic radiation pneumonitis following radio-chemotherapy of Stage III lung cancer. A thoracic surgery history was recorded in 89 (29%) patients, six of whom (1.95%) underwent pneumonectomy and 79 (25.8%) lobectomy or sublobar resection. There were 20 (6.5%) patients under oral corticosteroids for at least 3 weeks, for immune-mediated ICI toxicity, pain, brain metastasis, or severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. Overall, 59.5% patients were in complete or partial response at vaccination time, while 29.1% were only recently cancer-diagnosed or displayed progressive disease.

Total lymphocyte counts were available for 122 (39.9%) patients on Day 28, with a median T-lymphocyte (CD3+) count at 1129/mm³ IQR(742-1434), and median CD4+ T-cell count at 596/mm³ IQR(345-853).

Humoral immune response

Median follow-up was 141 days IQR(134-183). Overall, 283 (92.5%) patients underwent serological testing at Day 28 post-first injection and received a second vaccine on that booster day. At Day 28, 248 samples from patients free of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection or with anti-N negative IgG at D0 or D28 (n=265) were available. Median anti-S IgG titer was 149.7 AU/mL IQR(21.9 - 436.1).

In patients without symptomatic or asymptomatic COVID-19 (thus excluding twenty-two patients, 17 with prior COVID-19 history, 3 with PCR-proved COVID-19 post-1st dose, and 2 with anti-N IgG detected at D0) history, a striking increase in antibody titers occurred between Day 0 (137 patients with available serology) and Day 28 (248 patients with available serology) post-first vaccine (**Figure 1A**).

Not all antibodies detected are able to efficiently neutralize the virus by impairing its binding to the ACE2 receptor expressed by respiratory cells. Neutralizing antibodies constitute a variable part of the anti-spike antibodies. The neutralization activity was measured using a pseudo-neutralization assay, assessing neutralizing antibody capacity via competition with ACE2-receptor for binding to anti-spike RBD. **Suppl. Figure 2** depicts the correlation between anti-S IgG log₁₀ titers and anti-spike RBD pseudo-neutralization log₁₀ titers. A strong correlation was observed from anti-S IgG titer of 300 AU/mL (Spearman's test, rho= 0.92, p<0.0001), supporting the neutralizing effect of serum anti-S IgG levels exceeding such cut-off.

At Day 28, 91 patients (32.3%) displayed no anti-S IgG (<50 AU/mL), while 165 patients (58.5%) exhibited only low titers (≤300 AU/mL).

By comparison, the median value of 18 healthy controls was 913 AU/mL IQR(438,3 - 1859.3), antibody titer distribution of healthy controls significantly differing from that of patients treated using chemotherapy (p <0.0001, Mann-Whitney), immunotherapy (p <0.0001, Mann-Whitney), targeted therapy or bevacizumab (p=0.043, Mann-Whitney), or those without systemic therapy <last three months (p <0.0001, Mann-Whitney) (**Figure 1B**). No significant differences in serum anti-spike antibody titers were seen between chemotherapy- and immunotherapy-treated patients (p=0.11).

The second booster dose was not administered to 24 patients due to cancer-related general condition alteration (n=2), mild symptomatic PCR-proven COVID-19 infection post-first vaccine (n=3), history of symptomatic COVID-19 before vaccination supported by anti-N IgG detection (**n=17**), and totally asymptomatic COVID-19as reflected again by anti-N IgG detection (n=2).

Serological data were available for 269 (88%) patients at Day 42, two-to-nine weeks

post-second vaccine (median time interval: 52 days IQR(45-69). Of the 306 patients, 37 could not undergo late serological control due to altered general condition (n=4), cancer-related death (n=9), patients refusal (n=5), whereas 19 patients exhibited COVID-19 at any time, with late serological control deemed unnecessary by referent physicians.

Among patients free of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection or with anti-N negative IgG at D0 and D28 (n=265), 248 samples were available at D42 (≥ 14 days post-second dose) with median serum anti-S IgG titer at 4725 AU/mL IQR(1066 - 13698), 300 AU/mL corresponding to 12.5th percentile.

Two-to-nine weeks post-second vaccine, an overall increase in serum anti-S IgG titers was noted (**Figure 1C**) with a mean 1.4-to-2-fold increase in the log₁₀ anti-spike IgG concentrations. However, 17 patients (6.3%) still exhibited negative serological testing, while 34 (11%) displayed IgG concentrations ≤ 300 AU/mL, with 65 patients (24.1%) exhibiting antibody titers below the first quartile value of 1066 UA/mL.

The median serum anti-S IgG concentration in 13 healthy controls, within a median 57-day interval post-second vaccine, was 10594 AU/mL IQR(8350-14836). The titer distribution significantly differed from that observed in patients treated using chemotherapy (p=0.0003, Mann-Whitney), immunotherapy (p=0.013, Mann-Whitney), oral targeted therapy or bevacizumab (p=0.02, Mann-Whitney), or those without systemic therapy <last three months (p=0.001, Mann-Whitney) (**Fig. 1C**).

Considering the 231 patients with available data at both points, the anti-S IgG titers significantly rose between Day 28 (first dose) and Day 42 (second dose), irrespective of systemic treatments received (**Figure 2**), with higher titers observed in previously COVID-19-infected patients (n=31) (**suppl. Figure 3**). In patients for whom serology was available at Day 28 post-first (sole) vaccine, an increase by 2 logs in anti-S IgG

antibodies was recorded, these antibodies remaining high in 14 patients on later samplings.

During the 6-month follow-up from late January to July 2021, seven patients (2.3%) experienced mildly symptomatic PCR-proven COVID-19 symptoms. In four, these symptoms respectively occurred at Days 4, 6, 12, and 20 post-first vaccine, and in the remaining three, respectively, at Days 33, 35, and 42 post-second vaccine. Only one thymic carcinoma patient (serum anti-S IgG titers at 300.4 AU/mL two days before positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing) was hospitalized, due to his frail condition, yet without requiring oxygen supply. He was discharged a week later.

Safety

No anaphylaxis reaction occurred among the 306 patients, with 587 vaccine doses administered. Safety data were available for 278 patients (90.1%), without significant safety concerns. One-third of patients (n=98) did not report symptoms post-first injection. Reported undesirable effects were transitory pain, injection-site swelling, or Grade 1 injection-site erythema, lasting <24 hours. More frequent undesirable effects of mild intensity were reported post-second vaccination in two-thirds of patients (n=201), including injection-site erythema, pain, local injection-site swelling, mild fever (<38.5°C), all lasting <36 hours. Flu-like symptoms, chills, and fatigue lasting <48 hours were reported in 25 (8%) cases. In one patient, a spectacular Grade 2 urticarial reaction occurred, resolving under oral antihistamines <three days of booster dosing. Another patient reported a large Grade 2 local reaction manifesting within 24 hours post-second injection, as large annular erythema plaques, with pain, fatigue, and mild fever (38°C), with spontaneous resolution within eight days. No vaccine-related death occurred.

Predictors of lack of immunization

We analyzed the correlation between serological titers using different cut-points (≤ 50 AU/mL; ≤ 300 AU/mL) and the main clinical, demographic, and biological variables (**suppl. Table 1A, B, C, D**). At Day 28, age ($p < 0.0001$, **suppl. Fig. 4A**), male gender ($p = 0.05$), chemotherapy-based treatment <three last months ($p = 0.004$), immunotherapy as single-therapy <three last months ($p = 0.01$), long-term corticosteroid treatment ($p = 0.01$), and lack of disease control ($p = 0.03$), were significantly associated with negative serological testing ≤ 50 AU/mL in univariable analyses (**suppl. Table 1A**). Conversely, each 100 units/mm³ increase in Day 28 T-lymphocyte (CD3+) counts ($p = 0.008$), and Day 28 CD4+ T-cell counts ($p = 0.002$, **suppl. Fig. 4B**), were associated with higher seroconversion probability ($n = 122$). In 111 patients for whom these analyses were performed, Day 28 interferon- γ specific T-cell response to SARS-CO-2-spike measured by ELISPOT assay was significantly associated with higher seroconversion probability at Day 28 (OR=0.968; 95%CI: 0.941-0.995, $p = 0.021$).

Considering variables exhibiting a $p = 0.2$ value in univariable analyses, except for the immunological data ($n = 122$ or 111), multivariable logistic regression analyses (**suppl. Table 1A**) confirmed that age (adjusted OR=1.05; 95%CI :1.02-1.08, $p = 0.0001$), with a 5% increase in non-immunization risk at Day 28 for each year, long-term corticosteroids (adjusted OR=3.26; 95%CI:1.1-9.6, $p = 0.033$), and chemotherapy as last treatment <three last months (adjusted OR=3.0; 95%CI: 1.05-8.4, $p = 0.041$) were independently associated with antibody titers ≤ 50 AU/mL at Day 28.

Considering Day 28 cut-off at ≤ 300 AU/mL (**suppl. Table 1B**), age ($p < 0.0001$, suppl. Fig. 4C), male gender ($p = 0.019$), chemotherapy ($p = 0.007$), or immunotherapy ($p = 0.037$) as last treatment were significantly associated with anti-S IgG titers ≤ 300 AU/mL. Although T-lymphocyte and CD4+ T-cell counts failed to predict seroconversion at this cut-off, Day 28 interferon- γ specific T-cell responses to SARS-CO-2-spike (ELISPOT assay; $n = 90$), was highly predictive of anti-S IgG titers over 300 AU/mL (OR=0.956; 95% IC: 0.935-0.978, $p < 0.0001$) in 111 patients with available results.

In multivariable analyses, only age, (adjusted OR= 1.05, 95%CI:1.02-1.7, $p < 0.0001$) and chemotherapy as last treatment received (adjusted OR=3.07; 95%CI:1.36-6.94, $p = 0.048$) were independently associated with Day 28 anti-S IgG titers ≤ 300 AU/mL.

Considering Day 42 cut-off at ≤ 50 AU/mL (post-second vaccination), the variables significantly associated with negative serology risk included age ($p = 0.013$), lack of disease control ($p = 0.015$), chronic corticosteroids ($p = 0.007$), and chemotherapy as last treatment received ($p = 0.021$) (**suppl. Table 1C**). Conversely, in 74 patients with available data, each 100 units/mm³ increase in Day 42 T-cell (OR= 0.60; 95%CI:0.40-0.89, $p = 0.012$) or CD4+ T-cell counts (OR=0.15; 95%CI: 0.35-0.63, $p = 0.009$) was associated with a higher seroconversion probability. In multivariable analyses, age (adjusted OR=1.09; 95%CI:1.03-1.15, $p = 0.004$), chemotherapy as last treatment received (adjusted OR= 6.60; 95%CI:1.05-41.62, $p = 0.045$), and long-term corticosteroids (adjusted OR= 6.22; 95%CI:1.41-27.43, $p = 0.016$), were significantly associated with negative Day 42 serology (≤ 50 AU/mL).

Considering Day 42 cut-off at ≤ 300 AU/mL (**suppl. Table 1D**), age ($p = 0.028$) metastatic disease extent ($p = 0.014$), chemotherapy <three last months ($p = 0.004$)

long-term corticosteroids ($p < 0.00001$), and lack of disease control ($p = 0.010$) were associated with lower immunization probability. Conversely, cancer duration was associated with a higher Day 42 sero-conversion probability >300 AU/mL ($p = 0.01$). In 74 patients with immunological data, each 100 units/ mm^3 increase in Day 42 T-cell ($\text{OR} = 0.73$; $95\% \text{CI}: 0.59-0.90$, $p = 0.003$) or CD4+ T-cell counts ($\text{OR} = 0.53$; $95\% \text{CI}: 0.35-0.82$, $p = 0.005$) was associated with higher seroconversion probability. Only age (adjusted $\text{OR} = 1.07$; $95\% \text{CI}: 1.02-1.11$, $p = 0.002$), chemotherapy as last treatment received (adjusted $\text{OR} = 3.14$; $95\% \text{CI}: 1.08-9.13$, $p = 0.036$), and long-term corticosteroids (adjusted $\text{OR} = 6.2$, $95\% \text{CI}: 1.4-27.4$, $p = 0.016$) independently influenced the probability of low response (anti-SARS-COV-2-spike IgG titers ≤ 300 AU/mL) in multivariable analyses, diminishing the probability of a reliable protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Third vaccine dose

Serial serological tests were performed in ten patients exhibiting low antibody titers post-vaccine boosting (≤ 300 AU/mL). In seven, the antibody titers decreased over time ($n = 6$) or remained stable ($n = 1$), within a 13-52 day period, whereas the three others displayed a slight increase over 300 AU/mL, within 59 days post-second dose. Two patients still presented < 1066 AU/mL, 53 and 47 days post-booster dose, remaining $< 25^{\text{th}}$ percentile. Seven of these patients were still receiving chemotherapy-based treatment ($n = 5$) or corticosteroids ($n = 2$), with three receiving neither chemotherapy nor corticosteroids.

At Day 42, 30 patients exhibiting anti-S IgG titers ≤ 300 AU/mL were proposed a third vaccine, from Day 28 post-second shot. Of these, two experienced cancer-related condition deterioration; therefore, they underwent no serology control post-third

injection. A serology assay was available beyond Day 21 post-third injection in 26/30 remaining (results still awaited for two). At the time of analysis, none of these patients displayed symptomatic COVID-19. In 26 (86.7%) patients with serological tests available at Day 28 post-third shot (**Figure 3A**), 19 (73%) demonstrated a dramatic rise in anti-S IgG titers, exceeding 3500 AU/mL, four (15.4%) displayed a moderate increase beyond 300 AU/mL cut-point, yet <1000 AU/mL (**Figure 3B**). Therefore, 88.5% exhibited sero-conversion. In all, persistent negative anti-N IgG were found, excluding any recent SARS-CoV-2 infection. Among these, three had been receiving corticosteroids for several weeks, which were continued at third vaccination. Only three patients did not respond to third vaccination, all being older than 65 years, being either totally negative (n=2, <50/AU/mL) or exhibiting low anti-spike antibodies. Among them was patient (still <50 AU/mL post-second booster), on chronic myelomonocytic leukemia Type 2, with complete molecular response. The two other patients, respectively displaying 47 and 157 AU/mL, were treated using either chemo-immunotherapy or ICI alone. These two latter patients, also suffered from hematological conditions (hypogammaglobulinemia, monoclonal IgG peak), possibly explaining their poor immunization.

DISCUSSION

COVID-19 vaccines were made available in France in January 2021. Nothing was known on COVID-19 vaccination efficacy in patients with poor immune conditions, including metastatic lung cancer patients, especially those under systemic corticosteroids or cytotoxic chemotherapy. Though lung cancer patients were reported at high COVID-19-related mortality risk in published series, lethality systematically exceeding 30% of infected patients^{1, 3, 28}, we observed only seven mild

COVID-19 cases among our 306 vaccinated patients (2.3%). Such observation strongly supports the efficacy of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines used in 98.4% of our population. A possible limitation to such outcome is the decrease in SARS-CoV-2 virus circulation <0.79 in France by mid-May 2021, versus 1.2 or 1.3 in late January 2021. However, a dramatic rise in infections occurred early July, resulting in >20,000 new daily cases. The patient acceptance rate of systematic vaccination was in line with previous reports, with only 11% initial refusals²⁹. Reactogenicity was weak, without short-term serious adverse effects in this real-life setting. We did not observe specific safety concerns in ICI-treated patients, especially regarding immune-related side-effects, as reported by Israeli teams³⁰. Moreover, our study emphasized that sero-conversion monitoring could be useful in immuno-suppressed patients. In this population, the first vaccine efficacy was much lower than that reported in vaccine registration trials, with one-third of patients displaying negative serological testing (≤ 50 AU/mL) at Day 28, whereas three-quarters exhibited <25th percentile serological titer distribution. These data are in line with prospective studies involving a mixed population with solid cancers and hematological malignancies^{31, 32}. Although there has been no clear cut-off for antibody titers predicting protection against severe COVID-19, a 300 AU/mL cut-off was shown to well correlate with the pseudo-neutralization assay, as a readout for anti-viral efficacy. We thus selected this value as protection cut-off against SARS-CoV-2 infection in our patients³³. Let us keep in mind that the recently described delta strain, which currently represents more than 90% of sequenced viral isolates in France³⁴, was reported to be 40-80% more transmissible than the alpha strain^{35, 36}, its viral burden being 1000 fold higher than other strains³⁷. It is thus crucial to define serological correlates confirming the protection of immuno-compromised patients.

With this in mind, our study provided strong evidence for keeping the initially established intervals between two vaccine shots for cancer patients. These patients displayed a delay in their immunization process, with lower levels of protective circulating vaccination-induced antibodies versus healthy vaccinated controls. Conversely, a reassuring observation has been the booster injection's remarkable efficacy, with only 6.0% of thoracic cancer patients still displaying negative serology at Day 42, whereas only % exhibited antibody titers ≤ 300 AU/mL. The two characteristics independently associated with poor immunization, irrespective the cut-point chosen, were age and long-term corticosteroids. Concerning age, a lower immunization rate was identified in octogenarians, along with a 5% decreased probability per year to reach protective immunization. Regarding long-term corticosteroids, the lower immunization may probably be explained by either lower total T-cell and CD4+ T-lymphocyte counts or T-cell specific responses to spike protein. The adverse impact of age on the ability to induce vaccine-related protective humoral responses was already highlighted in a study involving octogenarians^{38, 39}. While clearly delaying the immunization process as previously reported^{31, 40, 41}, cytotoxic chemotherapy was associated with higher low-immunization rates at Day 42, as well.

As herein shown, a third vaccine could contribute to appropriate sero-protection in patients still poorly immunized post-two vaccines. Overall, 92% of patients were shown to benefit from a third shot, reflected by substantial increases in anti-S IgG antibodies, with only very few patients left without sufficient protection. A limitation to this observation is the group's small sample size. Such outcome must be confirmed in larger-scale studies involving solid cancer patients. Notably, a third vaccine dose is

still being debated in patients with hematological malignancies or solid organ transplantation⁴²⁻⁴⁷. This latter statement is supported by the fact that three of our patients with negative serology post-third vaccine were, indeed, suffering from underlying hematological conditions. Consequently, patients with lymphocyte function defects due to lymphoid cancers or lymphocyte-depleting treatments⁴⁴ may exhibit lower benefits from a third vaccination.

List of supplementary material:

Supplemental Figure 1: Patients disposition

Supplemental Figure 2: Correlation between anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers and -spike RBD-pseudo-neutralization titers

Supplemental Figure 3: Anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers, at Day 0, Day 28, and Day 42, (respectively n=26, n=31, and n=14) in 34 patients with previous COVID-19- history or positive anti-SARS-Cov-2-Nucleocapsid IgG serology.

Supplemental Figure 4A, 4B & 4C:

4A: Distribution of patient ages according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 50 AU/mL

4B: Distribution of patients' T-lymphocyte counts according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 50 AU/mL

4C: Distribution of patient ages according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 300 AU/mL

Supplemental Immunology methods

Supplemental Table 1A: predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 50 AU/mL cut-off) at D28

Supplemental Table 1B: predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 300 AU/mL cut-off) at D28

Supplemental Table 1C: predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 50 AU/mL cut-off) at D42

Supplemental Table 1D: predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 300 AU/mL cut-off) at D28

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Serological response to COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b2 in COVID-free patients

(A) Anti-SARS-CoV-2-spike (anti-S) IgG antibody titers at Day 0 in 137 patients without previous history of COVID-19; at Day 28 after one vaccine dose injection in 248 patients without previous history of COVID-19; beyond Day 42 in 248 patients without previous history of COVID-19; beyond Day 21 after third vaccine dose in 30 patients with available results. Large horizontal bars represent the median value, with short bars showing the first (lower) and third (upper) quartiles values. The Mann-Whiney test was applied for statistical comparison.

(B) Anti-S IgG antibody titers at Day 28 after the first vaccine dose, according to the systemic treatment received within the previous three months: chemotherapy, including chemo-immunotherapy (n=62), immunotherapy alone (n=41), oral tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) or bevacizumab single-agent therapy (n=34), or without systemic treatment (n=111). Anti-S IgG antibody titers at Day 28 in 18 healthy controls are shown. Large horizontal bars represent the median value, with short bars showing the first (lower) and third (upper) quartiles values. The Mann-Whiney test was applied for statistical comparison.

(C) Anti-S IgG antibody titers at Day 42 or beyond after the first vaccine dose, according to the systemic treatment received within the previous three months: chemotherapy, including chemo-immunotherapy (n=58), immunotherapy alone (n=41), oral TKI or bevacizumab single-agent (n=36), or without systemic treatment (n=113). Anti-SARS-CoV-2-spike IgG antibody titers at Day 42 in 13 healthy controls were available. Large horizontal bars represent the median value, with short bars showing the first (lower) and third (upper) quartiles values. The Mann-Whiney test was applied for statistical comparison.

Figure 2: Anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers at Day 28 and Day 42 according to the different systemic treatments received.

The horizontal dashed lines along the x axes indicate the limit of detection (positivity cut-off) provided by the manufacturer (\log_{10} 50 AU/mL). A nonparametric two-tailed pair-wise comparison was performed using the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank

test.

Figure 3:

Figure 3A: Evolution from Day 0 of anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers after a third vaccine dose injection in 26 patients with titers below 300 AU/mL at post-second dose sampling. The lower dashed line along the x axis indicates the limit of detection (positivity cut-off) provided by the manufacturer ($\log_{10}50$ AU/mL). The upper dashed line along the x axis indicates $\log_{10}300$ AU/mL cut-off. Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney test.

Figure 3B: Comparison of anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers at Day 42 with titers post-third vaccine dose in 26 patients, and with Day 42 titers of 222 patients who received two doses. Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney test.

Suppl. Figure 1: Patients disposition

Suppl. Figure 2: Correlation between anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers (\log_{10} Arbitrary Unit/mL), x axis, and -spike RBD-pseudo-neutralization titers (\log_{10} AU/mL), y axis. Vertical dashed lines correspond to the 50 AU/mL (cut-point for positivity according to the manufacturer) and 300 AU/mL anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody \log_{10} titers. The two assays showed an excellent correlation (Spearman's test, $\rho= 0.92$, $p<0.0001$).

Suppl. Figure 3: Anti-SARS-Cov-2-spike IgG antibody titers, at Day 0, Day 28, and Day 42, (respectively $n=26$, $n=31$, and $n=14$) in 34 patients with previous COVID-19-history or positive anti-SARS-Cov-2-Nucleocapsid IgG serology. The horizontal dashed line along the x axis indicates the limit of detection (positivity cut-off) provided by the manufacturer ($\log_{10} 50$ AU/mL). Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney test.

Suppl. Figure 4A, B & C:

Suppl. Figure 4A: Distribution of patient ages according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 50 AU/mL. Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney U test.

Suppl. Figure 4B: Distribution of patients' T-lymphocyte counts according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 50 AU/mL. Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney U test.

Suppl. Figure 4C: Distribution of patient ages according to Day 28 anti-S IgG antibody titers, above or below 300 UA/mL. Statistical comparison used Mann-Whiney U test.

REFERENCES

1. Lièvre A, Turpin A, Ray-Coquard I, et al. Risk factors for Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) severity and mortality among solid cancer patients and impact of the disease on anticancer treatment: A French nationwide cohort study (GCO-002 CACOVID-19). *Eur J Cancer* 2020; 141: 62-81.
2. Whisenant J, Trama A, Torri V, et al. TERA-VOLT: Thoracic Cancers International COVID-19 Collaboration. *Cancer Cell*. 2020; 37 742-5.
3. Garassino M, Whisenant J, Huang L, et al. COVID-19 in patients with thoracic malignancies (TERA-VOLT): first results of an international, registry-based, cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2020 21: 914-22.
4. Zhang L, Zhu F, Xie L, et al. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19-infected cancer patients: a retrospective case study in three hospitals within Wuhan, China. *Ann Oncol* 2020; 31: 894-901.
5. Dai M, Liu D, Liu M, et al. Patients with Cancer Appear More Vulnerable to SARS-CoV-2: A Multicenter Study during the COVID-19 Outbreak. *Cancer Discov* 2020; 10: 783-91.
6. Yang K, Sheng Y, Huang C, et al. Clinical characteristics, outcomes, and risk factors for mortality in patients with cancer and COVID-19 in Hubei, China: a multicentre, retrospective, cohort study. *Lancet Oncol* 2020; 21: 904-13.
7. Onder G, Rezza G and Brusaferro S. Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy. *JAMA* 2020; 323: 1775-6. .
8. Levin A, Hanage W, Owusu-Boaitey N, Cochran K, Walsh S and Meyerowitz-Katz G. Assessing the age specificity of infection fatality rates for COVID-19: systematic review, meta-analysis, and public policy implications. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2020; 35: 1123-38.
9. Meyerowitz-Katz G and Merone L. A systematic review and meta-analysis of published research data on COVID-19 infection fatality rates. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020; 101: 138-48.
10. Mi Y, Huang T, Zhang J, et al. Estimating the instant case fatality rate of COVID-19 in China. *Int J Infect Dis* 2020 97: 1-6.
11. Hawkins R, Charles E and Mehaffey J. Socio-economic status and COVID-19-related cases and fatalities. *Public Health*. 2020; 189: 29-134.
12. Rondy M, Larrauri A, Casado I, et al. 2015/16 seasonal vaccine effectiveness against hospitalisation with influenza A(H1N1)pdm09 and B among elderly people in Europe: results from the I-MOVE+ project. *Euro Surveill*. 2017; 22: 30580. .
13. Hottinger A, George A-C, Bel M, et al. A Prospective Study of the Factors Shaping Antibody Responses to the AS03-Adjuvanted Influenza A/H1N1 Vaccine in Cancer Outpatients. *The Oncologist*. 2012; 17: 436-45.
14. Beck C, McKenzie B, Hashim A, Harris R and University of Nottingham Influenza and the ImmunoCompromised (UNIIC) Study Group N-V-T, JS. Influenza vaccination for immunocompromised patients: systematic review and meta-analysis by etiology. *J Infect Dis*. 2012 206: 1250-9. .
15. Bersanelli M, Giannarelli D, De Giorgi U, et al. Influenza Vaccine Indication During therapy with Immune checkpoint inhibitors: a multicenter prospective observational study (INVIDIa-2). *J Immunother Cancer*. 2021; 9: e002619.
16. Polack F, Thomas S, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. . *New Engl J Med*. 2020; 383: 2603-15.
17. Jackson L, Anderson E, Roupheal N, et al. An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 —Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med* 2020; 383: 1920-31.

18. Baden L, El Sahly H, Essin B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *New Engl J Med*. 2020; 384: 403-16.
19. Sadoff J, Gray G, Vandebosch A, et al. Safety and Efficacy of Single-Dose Ad26.COV2.S Vaccine against Covid-19. *N Engl J Med* 2021 384: 2187-201.
20. Voysey M, Clemens S, Madhi S, et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* 2021; 397: 99-111.
21. Voysey M, Costa Clemens S, Madhi S, et al. Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials. *Lancet* 2021 397: 881-91.
22. Milman O, Yelin I, Aharony N, et al. Community-level evidence for SARS-CoV-2 vaccine protection of unvaccinated individuals. *Nat Med*. 2021; Jun. 10. DOI: [10.1038/s41591-021-01407-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01407-5).
23. Vasileiou E, Simpson C, Shi T, et al. Interim findings from first-dose mass COVID-19 vaccination roll-out and COVID-19 hospital admissions in Scotland: a national prospective cohort study. *Lancet*. 2021; 397: 1646-57.
24. Widge A, Roupheal N, Jackson L, et al. Durability of Responses after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 Vaccination. *New Engl J Med*. 2020; 384: 80-2.
25. Robertson J, Sewell H and Stewart M. Delayed second dose of the BNT162b2 vaccine: innovation or misguided conjecture? *Lancet*. 2021; 397 879-80.
26. Kadire S, Wachter R and N L. Delayed Second Dose versus Standard Regimen for Covid-19 Vaccination. *New Engl J Med*. 2021; 384: e28. .
27. Castells M and Phillips E. Maintaining Safety with SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines. *New Engl J Med*. 2021; 384: 643-9.
28. Luo J, Rizvi H, Preeshagul I, et al. COVID-19 in patients with lung cancer. *Ann Oncol*. 2020; 31: 1386-96.
29. Di Noia V, Renna D, Barberi V, et al. The first report on coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) vaccine refusal by patients with solid cancer in Italy: Early data from a single-institute survey. *Eur J Cancer*. 2021; 153 260e4.
30. Waissengrin B, Agbarya A, Safadi E, Padova H and Wolf I. Short-term safety of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in patients with cancer treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors. *Lancet Oncol*. 2021; 22: 581-3.
31. Addeo A, Shah P, Bordry N, et al. Immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccines in patients with cancer. *Cancer Cell*. 2021; 39: 1-8.
32. Palich R, Veyry M, Marot S, et al. Weak immunogenicity after a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine in treated cancer patients. *Ann Oncol*. 2021; 32: 1051-3.
33. Khoury D, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med*. 2021; 27: 1205-11.
34. Alizon S, Haim-Boukobza S, Foulongne V, et al. Rapid spread of the SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant in some French regions, June 2021. *Euro Surveill* 2021; 26: 2100573.
35. Davies N, Abbott S, Barnard R, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* 2021; 372: eabg3055.
36. Jones T, Biele G, Mühlemann B, et al. Estimating infectiousness throughout SARS-CoV-2 infection course. *Science*. 2021; 373: eabi5273.
37. Kidd M, Richter A, Best A, et al. S variant SARS CoV 2 lineage B1.1.7 is associated with significantly higher viral loads in samples tested by ThermoFisher TaqPath RT qPCR. *J Infect Dis*. 2021; 223 1666-70,.

38. Collier D, Ferreira I, Kotagiri P, et al. Age-related immune response heterogeneity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine BNT162b2. *Nature*. 2021; Jun 30. doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-03739-1. Online ahead of print.
39. Iacono D, Cerbone L, Palombi L, et al. Serological response to COVID-19 vaccination in patients with cancer older than 80 years. *J Geriatr Oncol*. 2021; S1879-4068: 00136-3.
40. Barriere J, Chamorey E, Adjtoutah Z, et al. Impaired immunogenicity of BNT162b2 anti SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in patients treated for solid tumors. *Ann Oncol*. 2021; 32: 1053-5.
41. Amir Massarweh A, Eliakim-Raz N, Stemmer A, et al. Evaluation of Seropositivity Following BNT162b2 Messenger RNA Vaccination for SARS-CoV-2 in Patients Undergoing Treatment for Cancer. *JAMA Oncol*. 2021; May 28: e212155. .
42. Gavriatopoulou M, Terpos E, Kastiris E, et al. Low neutralizing antibody responses in WM, CLL and NHL patients after the first dose of the BNT162b2 and AZD1222 vaccine. *Clin Exper Med*. 2021; 234: 1-5.
43. Boyarsky B, Werbel W, Avery R, et al. Antibody Response to 2-Dose SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccine Series in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients. *JAMA* 2021; 325: 2204-06.
44. Lim S, Campbell N, Johnson M, et al. Antibody responses after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in patients with lymphoma. *Lancet Hematol*. 2021; 8: e542-e4. .
45. Herishanu Y, Avivi I, Aharon A, et al. Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine in Patients with Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia. *Blood*. 2021; 137: 3165-73. .
46. Van Oekelen O, Gleason C, Agte S, et al. Highly variable SARS-CoV-2 spike antibody responses to two doses of COVID-19 RNA vaccination in patients with multiple myeloma. *Cancer Cell*. 2021; S1535-6108: 00336-6.
47. Kamar N, Abravanel F, Marion O, Couat C, Izopet J and Del Bello A. Three Doses of an mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in Solid-Organ Transplant Recipients. *New Engl J Med*. 2021; NEJMc2108861. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMc2108861 Online ahead of print

Fig. 1A




Fig. 1B




Fig. 1C




Fig. 2






Fig. 3A



Anti-S IgG in patients receiving 2 or 3 doses according to their anti-S IgG titer at D42



- Patients with 3 vaccine doses (n = 26)
- ♦ Patients with 2 vaccine doses (n = 222)

Table 1: Patient clinical and demographic characteristics at baseline

Patients (n=306)	
Age (years)	
median (range, years)	67 (27-92)
<70	180 (58.9%)
70-79	95 (31%)
≥80	31 (10.1%)
Gender	
Male	181 (59.2%)
Female	125 (40.8%)
Body mass index	
median, Kg/m² (Q1-Q3)	24.9 (21.8-27.9)
Histology	
Lung Non-SCC	211 (68.9%)
Lung SCC	49 (16%)
Lung NSCLC	260 (84.9%)
Lung SCLC	22 (7.2%)
Pleural mesothelioma	13 (4.2%)
Others*	11 (3.5%)
Last treatment received <3 months:	
- chemo-based regimen	74 (24.2%)
- immunotherapy alone	48 (15.7 %)
- oral TKI or bevacizumab alone	43 (14%)
- no systemic treatment	141 (46.1%)
(radiotherapy, surgery, and complete response)	
Chronic radiation pneumonitis	
yes	37 (12.1%)
no	269 (87.9%)
Previous thoracic surgery	89 (29%)
Pneumonectomy	6 (1.95%)

Lobectomy or sub-lobar resection	79 (25.8%)
Thymectomy or mediastinal tumor resection	4 (1.3%)
Duration of disease:	
Median, months (Q1-Q3)	17.3 (6.4-35.3)
≥12 months	189
<12 months	117
Chronic corticosteroid treatment	
- yes	20 (6.5%)
- no	286 (93.5%)
Disease extent	
- Metastatic	175 (57.2%)
- Local or loco-regional	131 (42.8%)
Disease status	
- Response or stable	211 (69.0%)
- Progressive	95 (31.0%)
T-lymphocyte count available at Day 28	
Median /mm³ (Q1-Q3)	122 (39.9%) 1129 (742-1434)
CD4+ count available at Day 28	
Median /mm³ (Q1-Q3)	122 (39.9%) 596 (345-853)
COVID-19 history before first vaccination	
- yes	19 (6.2%)
- no	287 (93.8%)
Type of vaccine	
Pfizer BNT 162b2	302
Moderna 1273	1
Astra-Zeneca ChAdOx1 nCOVID19	3

* five thymic carcinomas, four carcinoid tumors, one hemangio-endothelioma, and one hamartochondroma

SCC: squamous cell cancer; NSCLC: non-small-cell lung cancer; SCLC; small-cell lung cancer: RT: radiotherapy; Q: quartile; TKI: tyrosine-kinase inhibitor

Supplemental online Materials

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were isolated by density gradient centrifugation using Lymphosep™ (1.077 g/ml, Biosera, France). 6 ml of whole blood was diluted 1:1 with PBS. 15 ml of Lymphosep was pipetted into 50-ml SepMate™ centrifuge tubes (Stem Cell Technologies), and the diluted blood was layered over the Lymphosep gradient. The tubes were centrifuged for 10 min at 1200 × g with break. After centrifugation, PBMCs were collected and washed twice in PBS. For cryopreservation, PBMCs were diluted with 4°C heat-inactivated fetal calf serum (FCS, Gibco™, Thermo Fischer Scientific) containing 10% DMSO and stored at -80°C until further use.

The cryopreserved PBMC samples were thawed in a 37°C water bath with gently agitation. Thereafter, the cell suspension was resuspended in 10 ml of pre-warmed RPMI 1640 medium (Gibco™, Thermo Fischer Scientific) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated FCS and 100 UI/ml Penicillin/Streptomycin (Gibco™, Thermo Fischer Scientific). After centrifugation, cells were resuspended in complete RPMI medium and counted using a hematology analyzer XE-5000 (Sysmex, Kobe, Japan).


ELISpot assay

T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination were assessed by IFN-γ ELISpot assay using a T-SPOT.COVID kit (Oxford Immunotec, Abingdon, UK). Thawed PBMCs were resuspended at 2.5x10⁶ lymphocytes/ml in AIMV medium (Thermo Fischer Scientific). PBMCs were seeded (100 μl per well) and stimulated for 16-18 h with a pool of SARS-CoV-2 spike peptides at 37°C, 5% CO₂, 95% humidity. Subsequently, cells were washed off and released IFN-γ was detected following the manufacturer's instructions. Spot forming units (SFU) were counted manually using a DX-1 Microscope (Veho, UK). Results were reported as SFU per million lymphocytes. The unspecific background (SFU from negative control wells) was subtracted from experimental readings. We excluded the results if the positive control well (phytohemagglutinin) was negative. The lower limit to indicate a positive response was 32 spots per million lymphocytes.

Enumeration of peripheral blood lymphocytes

T-(CD3+, CD3+CD4+, CD3+CD8+), B-(CD19+), and Natural Killer (NK)-lymphocyte (CD3negCD16⁺+CD56+) absolute counts were enumerated by multiparametric flow cytometry of fresh EDTA-anticoagulated whole peripheral blood (PB). PB samples were processed using a BD FACSDuet™ preparation system integrated with a BD FACSLyric™ flow cytometer (Becton Dickinson Biosciences, San Jose, CA). Lymphocyte subpopulations were assessed using BD Multitest™ CD3/CD8/CD45/CD4, BD Multitest™ CD3/CD16+CD56/CD45/CD19 and BD Trucount™ tubes for absolute count with a single step "lyse-no-wash" procedure (BD FACS™ Lysing Solution). BD FACS Suite™ Clinical software version 1.4 was used to collect and analyze the data.


Patient & serology disposition




Suppl. Figure 1

Suppl. Fig.2


Spike RBD-pseudoneutralization and anti-S IgG SARS-CoV-2 antibodies correlation



Suppl. Fig. 3




Suppl. Fig 4A




Suppl. Fig 1B

T-lymphocytes count and frequencies of immunization at D28
(serum anti-S IgG ≥ 50 AU/mL) n=122



Suppl. Fig 4C

Age and frequencies of immunization at D28
(serum anti-S IgG ≥ 300 AU/mL)



Suppl. Table 1A – Predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 50 AU/mL cut-off) at D28

Variables	N*	Univariable analysis					Multivariable analysis		
		Status at D28		OR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	P-value
		Immunized	Non-immunized						
Age (years)									
Mean (SD)	283	64.2 (11.64)	69.1 (10.65)	1.04	1.02-1.07	<10 ⁻³	1.05	1.02-1.08	<10 ⁻³
Median (IQR)		66 (56-72)	70 (62-76)						
Gender									
Female	283	87 (74.4)	30 (25.6)	1	-	-	1	-	-
Male		105 (63.3)	61 (36.7)	1.69	1.00-2.84	0.050	1.38	0.77-2.50	0.281
BMI									
Mean (SD)	283	25.07 (4.56)	25.26 (4.57)	1.01	0.96-1.07	0.738			
Median (IQR)		24.92 (21.59-27.62)	24.84 (21.97-28.69)						
Lung cancer subtype									
NSCLC		171 (70.1)	73 (29.9)	1	-	0.183	1	-	0.690
SCLC	277	12 (54.5)	10 (45.5)	1.95	0.81-4.72	0.138	1.49	0.58-3.89	0.410
MPM		6 (54.5)	5 (45.5)	1.95	0.58-6.60	0.282	0.89	0.23-3.47	0.863
Metastatic disease									
No	282	84 (71.8)	33 (28.2)	1	-	-			
Yes		107 (64.8)	58 (35.2)	1.38	0.83-2.31	0.220			
Length of cancer evolution (days)									
Mean (SD)	283	767.38 (729.98)	741.21 (1162.52)	1.00	1.00-1.00	0.817			
Median (IQR)		527 (248-1148.25)	441.00 (100-919)						
Treatment**									
TKI or anti-VEGF maintenance therapy		32 (82.1)	7 (17.9)	1	-	<10 ⁻³	1	-	0.002
No systemic therapy	283	97 (75.8)	31 (24.2)	1.46	0.59-3.64	0.415	0.90	0.24-2.43	0.839
ICI alone		26 (55.3)	21 (44.7)	3.69	1.36-10.03	0.010	2.82	0.96-8.28	0.059
Systemic treatment involving chemotherapy		37 (53.6)	32 (46.4)	3.95	1.54-10.17	0.004	2.97	1.05-8.41	0.041
Concurrent oral corticosteroid therapy									
No	283	185 (69.8)	80 (30.2)	1	-	-	1	-	-
Yes		7 (38.9)	11 (61.1)	3.63	1.36-9.71	0.010	3.26	1.10-9.65	0.033
Disease control									
Yes	278	141 (72.3)	54 (27.7)	1	-	-	1	-	-
No		49 (59.0)	34 (41.0)	1.81	1.06-3.10	0.030	1.35	0.71-2.56	0.356
Absolute CD3+ count (100 units/mm³) at D28									
Mean (SD)	122	12.47 (5.79)	9.54 (5.03)	0.895	0.824-0.972	0.008			
Median (IQR)		12.26 (8.52-15.32)	9.48 (5.66-12.25)						
Absolute CD4 count (100 units/mm³) at D28									
Mean (SD)	122	7.24 (4.20)	4.95 (3.00)	0.797	0.691-0.919	0.002		NA	
Median (IQR)		6.92 (4.31-8.80)	4.52 (2.59-6.96)						
IFN-γ ELISPOT (s.f.u. per 10⁶ cells)									
Mean (SD)	115	25.61 (49.88)	6.10 (12.20)	0.968	0.941-0.995	0.021			
Median (IQR)		6 (0-26)	1 (0-5.5)						

* Number of patients with both available SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) IgG antibodies results at D28 and the considered data

** Last anticancer therapy received during the last 3 months, prior to first COVID-19 vaccine shot.

s.f.u.: spot forming unit

Note: Excluding outliers from the multivariable logistic regression modified the impact of treatment on the outcome.

Suppl. Table 1B – Predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 300 AU/mL cut-off) at D28

Variables	N*	Univariable analysis				Multivariable analysis			
		Status at D28		OR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	P-value
	Immunized	Non-immunized							
Age (years)									
Mean (SD)	283	62.6 (11.82)	68 (10.82)	1.04	1.02-1.07	<10 ⁻³	1.05	1.02-1.07	<10 ⁻³
Median (IQR)		64 (54-70)	69 (61-75)						
Gender									
Female	283	58 (49.6)	59 (50.4)	1	-	-	1.58	0.93-2.70	0.089
Male		59 (35.5)	107 (64.5)	1.78	1.10-2.89	0.019			
BMI									
Mean (SD)	283	25.19 (4.59)	25.09 (4.54)	0.99	0.95-1.05	0.855			
Median (IQR)		25.07 (21.85-27.18)	24.78 (21.90-28.43)						
Lung cancer subtype						0.054			0.204
NSCLC		107 (43.9)	137 (56.1)	1	-	-	1	-	-
MPM	277	3 (27.3)	8 (72.7)	2.08	1.16-10.69	0.287	1.28	0.31-5.32	0.731
SCLC		4 (18.2)	18 (81.8)	3.52	0.54-8.04	0.027	2.81	0.89-8.86	0.077
Metastatic disease									
Yes	282	68 (41.2)	97 (58.8)	1	-	-			
No		48 (41.0)	69 (59.0)	1.01	0.62-1.63	0.975			
Length of cancer evolution (days)									
Mean (SD)	283	772.66 (634.14)	749.31 (1035.04)	1.00	1.00-1.00	0.828			
Median (IQR)		599 (286-1195)	475.5 (133.75-938.5)						
Treatment**						0.047			0.187
TKI or anti-VEGF maintenance therapy		23 (59.0)	16 (41.0)	1	-	-	1	-	-
No systemic therapy	283	55 (43.0)	73 (57.0)	1.91	0.92-3.95	0.082	1.41	0.63-3.13	0.403
ICI alone		17 (36.2)	30 (63.8)	2.54	1.06-6.07	0.037	1.94	0.76-4.97	0.165
Systemic treatment involving chemotherapy		22 (31.9)	47 (68.1)	3.07	1.36-6.94	0.007	3.07	1.36-6.94	0.048
Concurrent oral corticosteroid therapy									
No	283	113 (42.6)	152 (57.4)	1	-	-	1	-	-
Yes		4 (22.2)	14 (77.8)	2.60	0.83-8.11	0.099	2.07	0.63-6.86	0.232
Disease control									
Yes	278	31 (37.3)	52 (62.7)	1	-	-			
No		86 (44.1)	109 (55.9)	1.32	0.78-2.24	0.297			
CD3+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³) at D28									
Mean (SD)	122	12.23 (6.23)	11.13 (5.43)	0.967	0.905-1.034	0.326			
Median (IQR)		11.30 (8.35-15.16)	11.11 (6.45-14.05)						
CD4+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³) at D28									
Mean (SD)	122	7.35 (4.92)	6.06 (3.40)	0.922	0.834-1.020	0.116		NA	
Median (IQR)		6.92 (4.32-8.56)	5.33 (3.18-9.43)						
IFN-γ ELISPOT (s.f.c. per 10⁶ cells)									
Mean (SD)	115	45.89 (66.62)	6.99 (12.38)	0.956	0.935-0.978	<10 ⁻³			
Median (IQR)		18 (4-72)	1 (0-8)						

* Number of patients with both available SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) IgG antibodies results at D28 and the considered data

** Last anticancer therapy received during the last 3 months, prior to first COVID-19 vaccine shot

s.f.u.: spot forming unit

Note: Excluding outliers from the multivariable logistic regression modified the impact of treatment on the outcome.

Suppl. Table 1C – Predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG antibodies at 50 AU/mL cut-off) at D42

Variables	N*	Univariable analysis				Multivariable analysis			
		Status at D42		OR	95% CI	P-value	aOR	95% CI	P-value
		Immunized	Non-immunized						
Age (years)	269			1.07	1.01-1.12	0.013	1.09	1.03-1.15	0.004
Mean (SD)		65.7 (10.96)	72.8 (12.68)						
Median (IQR)		67.5 (58-73)	73 (63.5-83.5)						
Gender	269			1	-	-	1.09	1.03-1.15	0.004
Male		148 (94.3)	9 (5.7)						
Female		104 (92.9)	8 (7.1)						
BMI	263			0.94	0.83-1.05	0.263	0.96	0.84-1.09	0.486
Mean (SD)		25.18 (4.58)	23.89 (4.61)						
Median (IQR)		24.95 (21.72-28.19)	23.19 (21.10-26.73)						
Lung cancer subtype	263			1	-	-	1.09	1.03-1.15	0.004
MPM or SCLC		29 (93.5)	2 (6.5)						
NSCLC		217 (93.5)	15 (6.5)						
Metastatic disease	268			1	-	-	1.09	1.03-1.15	0.004
No		112 (95.7)	5 (4.3)						
Yes		139 (92.1)	12 (7.9)						
Length of cancer evolution (days)	269			0.999	0.998-1.000	0.100	0.999	0.998-1.001	0.267
Mean (SD)		773.69 (931.68)	741.21 (480.19)						
Median (IQR)		520 (191-1057)	252 (61.5-619)						
Treatment**	269			1	-	-	1	-	-
No systemic therapy		107 (98.2)	2 (1.8)						
ICI alone		40 (93.0)	3 (7.0)						
TKI or anti-VEGF maintenance therapy		38 (90.5)	4 (9.5)						
Systemic treatment involving chemotherapy		67 (89.3)	8 (10.7)						
Concurrent oral corticosteroid therapy	269			1	-	-	1	-	-
No		239 (94.8)	13 (5.2)						
Yes		13 (76.5)	4 (23.5)						
Disease control	265			1	-	-	1	-	-
Yes		187 (95.9)	8 (4.1)						
No		61 (87.1)	9 (12.9)						
CD3+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³) at D42	74			0.595	0.397-0.891	0.012	2.10	0.64-6.95	0.224
Mean (SD)		10.75 (4.99)	4.34 (3.15)						
Median (IQR)		10.73 (6.85-13.83)	2.74 (2.08-8.11)						
CD4+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³) at D42	74			1	-	-	2.10	0.64-6.95	0.224
Mean (SD)		5.94 (2.96)	1.94 (0.86)						
Median (IQR)		5.61 (3.23-7.96)	1.85 (1.21-2.45)						

* number of patients with both available anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) IgG antibodies at D42 and the considered data

** Last anticancer therapy received during the last 3 months, prior to first COVID-19 vaccine shot

s.f.u.: spot forming unit

Suppl. Table 1D – Predictors of non-immunization (anti-S IgG at 300 AU/mL cut-off) at D42

Variables	N*	Univariable analysis					Multivariable analysis		
		Status at D42		OR	95% CI	p-value	aOR	95% CI	p-value
		Immunized	Non-immunized						
Age (years)									
Mean (SD)	269	65.6 (10.98)	70.2 (11.93)	1.04	1.00-1.08	0.028	1.07	1.02-1.11	0.002
Median (IQR)		68 (58-73)	70 (61.5-81.25)						
Gender									
Female	269	99 (88.4)	13 (11.6)	1	-	-			
Male		136 (86.6)	21 (13.4)	1.18	0.56-2.46	0.667			
BMI									
Mean (SD)	269	25.26 (4.65)	23.97 (3.91)	0.94	0.86-1.02	0.124	0.97	0.88-1.07	0.513
Median (IQR)		24.97 (21.72-28.44)	23.67 (21.38-26.96)						
Lung cancer subtype									
NSCLC	263	204 (87.9)	28 (12.1)	1	-	-			
MPM or SCLC		25 (80.6)	6 (19.4)	1.75	0.66-4.63	0.261			
Metastatic disease									
No	268	109 (93.2)	8 (6.8)	1	-	-	1	-	-
Yes		125 (82.8)	26 (17.2)	2.83	1.23-6.52	0.014	2.13	0.82-5.51	0.119
Length of cancer evolution (days)									
Mean (SD)	269	801.21 (950.09)	413.56 (483.37)	0.999	0.998-1.000	0.010	0.999	0.998-1.000	0.081
Median (IQR)		534 (219-1088)	194 (51.5-602)						
Treatment**						0.039			0.209
No systemic therapy		117 (92.9)	9 (7.1)	1	-	-	1	-	-
TKI or anti-VEGF maintenance therapy	269	32 (86.5)	5 (13.5)	2.03	0.64-6.49	0.232	2.12	0.55-8.20	0.276
ICI alone		38 (86.4)	6 (13.6)	2.05	0.69-6.14	0.198	2.33	0.66-8.20	0.187
Systemic treatment involving chemotherapy		48 (77.4)	14 (22.6)	3.79	1.54-9.35	0.004	3.14	1.08-9.13	0.036
Concurrent oral corticosteroid therapy									
No	269	226 (89.7)	26 (10.3)	1	-	-	1	-	-
Yes		9 (52.9)	8 (47.1)	7.73	2.74-21.76	<10 ⁻⁴	6.54	1.95-21.93	0.002
Disease control									
Yes	265	177 (90.8)	18 (9.2)	1	-	-	1	-	-
No		55 (78.6)	15 (21.4)	2.68	1.27-5.67	0.010	1.49	0.62-3.61	0.376
CD3+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³) at D42									
Mean (SD)	74	11.08 (5.04)	5.86 (3.36)	0.730	0.592-0.900	0.003	NA		
Median (IQR)		11.12 (7.24-14.41)	5.85 (2.50-7.70)						
CD4+ T-cell count (100 units/mm³)									
Mean (SD)	74	6.11 (2.97)	3.07 (2.03)	0.533	0.345-0.823	0.005			
Median (IQR)		5.73 (3.82-8.11)	3.00 (1.78-3.43)						

* number of patients with both available anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) IgG antibodies at D42 and the considered data
 ** Last anticancer therapy received during the last 3 months, prior to first COVID-19 vaccine shot

HOPITAL BICHAT

46, rue Henri Huchard
75 877 PARIS Cedex 18

CEERB PARIS NORD

IRB00006477

**Comité d'Evaluation de l'Ethique
des projets de Recherche Biomédicale**

Adresse pour toute correspondance
sec.ceerb@bch.aphp.fr

Président

- Michel LEJOYEUX
michel.lejoyeux@bch.aphp.fr

Membres

- Jean-François ALEXANDRA
jean-francois.alexandra@bch.aphp.fr
- Elie AZOULAY
elie.azoulay@sls.aphp.fr
- Frédéric BRETAGNOL
frederic.bretagnol@bjn.aphp.fr
- Yves CASTIER
yves.castier@bch.aphp.fr
- Nathalie CHARNAUX
nathalie.charnaux@jvr.aphp.fr
- Christine DOSQUET
christine.dosquet@sls.aphp.fr
- Géraldine FALGARONE
g.falgarone@avc.aphp.fr
- Antoine GUEDENEY
antoine.guedeney@bch.aphp.fr
- Jean GUGLIELMINOTTI
jean.guglielminotti@bch.aphp.fr
- Michel KALAMARIDES
michel.kalamarides@bjn.aphp.fr
- Hawa KEITA-MEYER
hawa.keita@lmr.aphp.fr
- Matthieu LEGRAND
matthieu.legrand@lrb.aphp.fr
- Dan LONGROIS
dan.longrois@bch.aphp.fr
- Dominique LUTON
dominique.luton@bch.aphp.fr
- Claire MACABIAU
claire.macabiau@noos.fr
- Laurent MANDELBROT
laurent.mandelbrot@lmr.aphp.fr
- Marie-Rose MORO
marie-rose.moro@cch.aphp.fr
- Gérard REACH
gerard.reach@avc.aphp.fr
- Alain SAUVANET
alain.sauvanet@bjn.aphp.fr
- Philippe SOYER
philippe.soyer@lrb.aphp.fr
- Anne THONI
aumonerie.avicenne@avc.aphp.fr

Pr Luis TEIXEIRA
Sénopôle Saint Louis
Equipe 6 "physiopathologie des cancers du sein"
INSERM U976
Université de Paris
Hôpital Saint Louis

Pr Gérard ZALCMAN
Service d'oncologie thoracique,
CIC1425, Hôpital Bichat

Dr. Sandra ASSOUN, PHc,
Service d'oncologie thoracique,
CIC1425, Hôpital Bichat

Pr. Diane DESCAMPS,
Service de Virologie,
Hôpital Bichat

Date February 11, 2020

Subject : N° CER-2021-72

Dear Colleague,

The "Comité d'Evaluation de l'Ethique des projets de Recherche Biomédicale (CEERB) Paris Nord" (Institutional Review Board -IRB 00006477- of HUPNVS, Paris 7 University, AP-HP), has reviewed and approved the research project entitled « *Multicenter, observational study of anti-Sars-Cov2 vaccine efficacy in patients with malignant pathologies treated in the AP-HP GHU. North* » (Pr Luis TEIXEIRA, Pr Gérard ZALCMAN, Dr. Sandra ASSOUN, Pr Diane DESCAMPS, principal investigators) in 2021. This approval covers the entire period during which the project will be developed until its completion.

Yours sincerely,

Pr. Michel LEJOYEUX
Chair of the Institutional Review Board (IRB)

