medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike IgG antibody responses after second dose of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 and correlates of protection in the UK general population

Jia Wei[*1,2], Koen B. Pouwels[*,3,4], Nicole Stoesser[1,3,5,6], Philippa C. Matthews[1,6], Ian Diamond[7], Ruth Studley[7], Emma Rourke[7], Duncan Cook[7], John I Bell[8], John N Newton[9], Jeremy Farrar[10], Alison Howarth[1,6], Brian D. Marsden[1,11], Sarah Hoosdally[1], E Yvonne Jones[1], David I Stuart[1], Derrick W. Crook[1,3,5,6], Tim E. A. Peto[1,3,5,6], A. Sarah Walker[#1,2,3,12], David W. Eyre[#2,3,5,6] and the COVID-19 Infection Survey team

* contribution considered equal

contribution considered equal

See Acknowledgements for the Coronavirus Infection Survey team

[1] Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[2] Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[3] The National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance at the University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[4] Health Economics Research Centre, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[5] The National Institute for Health Research Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[6] Department of Infectious Diseases and Microbiology, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK

[7] Office for National Statistics, Newport, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[8] Office of the Regius Professor of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[9] Health Improvement Directorate, Public Health England, London, UK

[10] Wellcome Trust, London, UK

[11] Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[12] MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL, UCL, London, UK

Corresponding author:

Dr David Eyre,

david.eyre@bdi.ox.ac.uk

+44 (0)1865 221081

Microbiology Department, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford, OX3 9DU

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

We investigated anti-spike IgG antibody responses and correlates of protection following second doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in the UK general population. In 222,493 individuals, we found significant boosting of anti-spike IgG by second doses of both vaccines in all ages and using different dosing intervals, including the 3-week interval for BNT162b2. After second vaccination, BNT162b2 generated higher peak levels than ChAdOX1. Antibody levels declined faster at older ages and in males with BNT162b2, but declines were similar across ages and sexes with ChAdOX1. Prior infection significantly increased antibody half-life with both vaccines. Anti-spike IgG levels were associated with protection from infection after vaccination and, to an even greater degree, after prior infection. At least 67% protection against infection was estimated to last for 2-3 months after two ChAdOx1 doses and 6-15 months after two BNT162b2 doses in those without prior infection, and 1-2 years for those unvaccinated after natural infection. A third booster dose may be needed, prioritised to ChAdOx1 recipients and those more clinically vulnerable.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Introduction

The Pfizer-BioNTech BNT162b2 and Oxford-AstraZeneca ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (hereafter ChAdOx1) SARS-CoV-2 vaccines have been widely used in the United Kingdom and worldwide[1,2]. In the UK, vaccines were initially prioritised to older adults, frontline healthcare and social-care workers, and clinically vulnerable individuals, and then offered to other adults in decreasing age order[3]. To 4th October 2021, 85% and 78% of the population (aged ≥12y) have received one and two doses, respectively[4].

With wide-spread Alpha variant transmission, in January 2021 the UK government extended the dosing interval from 3-4 to 12 weeks for all vaccines to maximize first dose coverage, based on preliminary data showing high short-term efficacy from single BNT162b2 (90%) and ChAdOx1 (70%) doses[5]. This approach raises several questions. Although the ChOxAd1 trial found higher vaccine efficacy with dosing intervals ≥6 weeks[6], BNT162b2 trials did not compare different dosing intervals. Subsequent UK studies showed extended BNT162b2 dosing intervals generated a higher antibody response than the 3-week interval[7–9]. However, these studies were based on relatively small sample sizes (N<600) or specific population groups such as healthcare workers, potentially reducing generalisability, and antibody levels were only measured at specific times after second doses. With the rapid emergence of the Delta variant, and greater protection after second than first vaccine doses[10–12], from mid-2021 dosing intervals were reduced to 8 weeks[13] to achieve greater protection faster. However, large population-based investigations of how these different dosing intervals, or other factors, affect longer-term antibody changes after the second dose are limited, but essential to assess the duration of protection and the need for booster doses.

Following the ChAdOx1 vaccine, anti-spike IgG and pseudovirus neutralisation titres are associated with protection against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection[14]. Similarly for the mRNA-1273 vaccine, anti-spike antibody and neutralisation titres were inversely associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection, with 68.5% of vaccine efficacy up to 126 days post-second dose mediated by day 29 neutralisation titres[15]. However, how these measurements relate to antibody levels and durations of protection in populations over time, and following BNT162b vaccination, is not fully understood.

We used data from the UK's national COVID-19 Infection Survey (ISRCTN21086382), a large representative sample of households with longitudinal follow-up, to investigate real-world longer-term anti-trimeric spike IgG antibody responses following second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 vaccinations, and quantified the impact of dosing interval, age, and prior infection status on antibody peak levels and declines. We estimated the association between anti-spike IgG levels and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection, and combined these findings with estimated antibody trajectories to predict the duration of protection following second vaccination and natural infection.

Results

From 8th December 2020 to 4th October 2021, 222,493 participants received two ChAdOx1 or two BNT162b2 vaccinations and had at least one antibody measurement from 91 days before the first vaccination onwards. The median (interquartile range, IQR) age was 57 (43-68) years, 120,866 (54.3%) were female, and 209,898 (94.3%) reported white ethnicity. 7,071 (3.2%) reported working in patient-facing healthcare, and 62,814 (28.2%) having a long-term health condition. 121,322 (54.5%) and 79,693 (35.8%) participants without evidence of prior infection (see Methods) received two doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2, as did 12,066 (5.4%) and 9,412 (4.2%) with evidence of prior infection, respectively. These four cohorts contributed 723,844 anti-spike IgG measurements **(Figure S1)**. The median (IQR) [range] dosing interval was 76 (68-78) [17-237] and 76 (66-78) [17-225] days for those receiving ChAdOx1 without or with prior infection, respectively, and 71 (58-77) [17-289] and 65 (56-76) [17-238] days respectively for BNT162b2 **(Table S1).**

Anti-spike IgG response following first and second dose

In participants receiving two vaccinations without prior infection, generalised additive models (GAM) showed generally similar antibody trajectories for both vaccines, but with higher antibody levels achieved with BNT162b2 vs. ChAdOx1 **(Figure 1** for 60-year-olds**, Table S2a**; predicted trajectories for other age groups in **Figure S2)**. Anti-spike IgG levels increased after the first dose, peaked ~21 days later, then gradually declined until the second dose, after which they reached even higher peak levels ~21 days later, then gradually declined again. Post-first dose, peak levels were lower in older participants, but age differences were attenuated after the second dose **(Figure 2** for 10-week interval**, Table S2b;** predicted trajectories for other dosing intervals in **Figure S3)**. In these minimally adjusted analyses, there was no evidence of differences in antibody levels and declines after the second dose across 8-week to 12-week dosing intervals for both ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 vaccines. However, the antibody trajectories were different for the 3-week BNT162b2 dosing interval, where antibody levels gradually increased from the start of the first dose until around 42 days after the second dose, after which antibody levels were generally similar to those with 8–12-week dosing intervals, although slightly lower in 80-year-olds (**Figure S2)**.

In participants with evidence of prior infection, antibody levels started from levels above 42 ng/ml (the positivity threshold, see Methods) and gradually increased for both vaccines. There was no evidence of differences in antibody levels and declines after the second dose for dosing intervals

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

from 8 to 12 weeks **(Figure 1, Figure S4).** Antibody levels rose to lower levels in older vs. younger participants after the first dose, but the difference was attenuated after the second dose **(Figure 2, Figure S5)**. In those with prior infection, there was less boosting seen from the second dose given higher levels after one dose, compared to those not previously infected, but there was a second dose boosting effect for 80-year-olds **(Figure 3)**. For ChAdOx1, participants without prior infection had lower antibody levels post-second dose than those with prior infection post-first dose; but for BNT162b2, two vaccinations without prior infection led to higher antibody levels than previously infected participants having only one dose, especially for 80-year-olds **(Figure 3**; predicted trajectories for other dosing intervals in **Figure S6).**

Determinants of anti-spike IgG peak levels and half-life after the second dose

ChAdOx1

Of the 133,388 participants (with or without prior infection) who received two ChAdOx1 doses, 100,639 participants contributed 191,137 antibody measurements ≥21 days after the second dose (maximum 119 days), median (IQR) [range] 2 (2-3) [1-5] measurements per participant. Assuming antibody levels declined exponentially, using Bayesian linear mixed models we estimated a mean peak anti-spike IgG level of 307 ng/ml (95% credible interval, CrI 304-309), and mean half-life of 85 days (84-86) **(Figure S7)**, versus 203 ng/ml (190-210) and 184 days (163-210) respectively following natural infection[16]. There was no evidence of non-linearity in antibody declines on a log scale, and specifically no evidence that rates of antibody decline flattened over the follow-up period (up to 119 days post second vaccination). In a multivariable model, all factors considered (age, sex, ethnicity, reporting a long-term health condition, healthcare work, deprivation, dosing interval and prior infection status) were independently associated with anti-spike IgG peak levels 21 days post-second dose, but most effects were small **(Figure 4, Table S3)**. The largest effects were associated with prior infection, peak 235 ng/ml higher (226-244) and ethnicity, peak 57 ng/ml (49-65) higher in those reporting non-white ethnicity. Peak levels were slightly lower in males, those reporting a long-term health condition, those not working in healthcare, with shorter dosing intervals, younger age, and greater deprivation. For half-life, only prior infection had a substantive effect, extending the half-life by 46 days (95%CrI 39-52). There were very small reductions in half-life at older ages, with non-white ethnicity, and having a long-term health condition. There was no evidence of associations between half-life and sex, being a healthcare worker, and dosing interval in participants who received ChAdOx1.

BNT162b2

In 89,105 participants (with or without prior infection) who received two BNT162b2 doses, 55,053 participants contributed 120,728 antibody measurements ≥21 days after the second dose (≥42 days

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

for those with 3-week dosing interval, see Methods, **Figure 1**), median (IQR) [range] 3 (2-3) [1-6] per participant (maximum 149 days). The estimated mean peak level was 776 ng/ml (95%CrI 769-779), and the mean half-life was 101 days (100-102) **(Figure S7).** There was again no evidence of non-linearity in antibody declines on the log scale. Factors had greater effects on peak levels for BNT162b2 than ChAdOx1, and more had substantive effects on half-life. Specifically, age, sex, reporting a long-term health condition, and being a healthcare worker were independently associated with both peak level and half-life; and ethnicity, deprivation, dosing interval, and prior infection status with half-life **(Figure 4, Table S3)**. Peak levels were lower and half-life shorter at older ages (4 ng/ml lower per 10-years older, 95%CrI 1-6; 8 days shorter per 10-year older, 95%CrI 7-9), in males (31 ng/ml lower, 95%CrI 24-38; 12 days shorter, 95%CrI 10-14), and those reporting long-term health conditions (24 ng/ml lower, 95%CrI 16-32; 8 days shorter, 95%CrI 6-10). Within dosing intervals between 8 and 12 weeks, a longer dosing interval was associated with a longer half-life (3 days longer per 1-week longer, 95%CrI 2-4), but had no effect on peak levels. Compared with an 8-week extended schedule, a 3-week dosing interval was associated with a shorter half-life (10 days shorter, 95%CrI 4-16). Prior infection was associated with a longer half-life (87 days longer, 95%CrI 72-106). Although there was no evidence of an effect of prior infection on peak levels, this likely reflected under-estimation due to the assay quantification limit of 800 ng/ml. There was no evidence that area-level deprivation was associated with peak level, and the effect on half-life was small with BNT162b2.

Comparing the effects of factors between the two vaccines, and with our previous findings on natural infection[16] **(Figure 5)**, effects of some factors were relatively consistent between ChAdOx1, BNT162b2 and/or natural infection, albeit with differing effect sizes (e.g age, sex, on half-life; sex, ethnicity on peak; prior infection on peak and half-life), whilst for others effects were in opposite directions (e.g age on peak, ethnicity on half-life). Other than prior infection, factors had a greater effect for BNT162b2 than ChAdOx1, particularly on half-life.

Correlates of protection

To enable interpretation of anti-spike IgG levels over time, we investigated whether recent antibody levels are correlates of protection from infection following prior infection or vaccination in the general population. We used data from 17th May 2021 to 4th October 2021, i.e. while the Delta variant accounted for nearly all cases[17], and fitted logistic generalised additive models for detected new infections, investigating the effect of the most recent antibody measurement obtained 21-59 days earlier on PCR test results at each study visit. Three groups were investigated, unvaccinated participants with or without evidence of prior infection (6833 participants; 12,560 visits), participants vaccinated with ChAdOx1 ≥21 days previously (83,924 participants; 221,380 visits), and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

participants vaccinated with BNT162b2 ≥21 days previously (49,820 participants; 124,822 visits). Participants tested PCR-positive at 202 (1.6%), 1327 (0.6%), and 591 (0.5%) visits, respectively. Vaccinated participants with evidence of prior infection were excluded, as there were insufficient data to model these groups separately, and associations may differ. Adjustment was made for confounders, including age, geography, and calendar time (see Methods).

Compared with unvaccinated individuals with a most recent anti-spike IgG measurement of 2 ng/ml, protection against infection increased steeply as antibody levels rose in unvaccinated participants, consistent with protection from prior infection, with 50% protection at 36 ng/ml (below the 42 ng/ml positivity threshold) and 67% protection at 59 ng/ml. Higher antibody levels were needed to achieve the same level of protection post vaccination, with no evidence of differences in protection between ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 at any given antibody level (**Figure 6a**). For example, considering antibody levels where two thirds (67%) of individuals were protected against infection, participants vaccinated with ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 required estimated levels of 191 ng/ml and 169 ng/ml, respectively. However, as described above, antibody levels rose to higher levels following BNT162b2 than ChAdOx1, explaining higher vaccine effectiveness after BNT162b vs. ChAdOx1[18], with natural infection resulting in the lowest antibody levels but the greatest protection at a given antibody level (**Figure 6 d,e,f**). Protection against infection with moderate to high viral loads (Ct values <30) (**Figure 6b**) and symptomatic infection (**Figure 6c**) was similar. Findings were also similar when considering the maximum prior antibody measurement (which had a worse model fit), in part because of the limited time for antibody waning to occur between maximum and most recent antibody measurements (**Figure S8**).

Duration of antibody response and association with protection

Models of correlates of protection allowed post-vaccination antibody levels corresponding to 67% protection from Delta variant infection to be estimated (data were insufficient to estimate lower percentages of protection for BNT162b). The estimated mean time from second vaccination to antibody measurements reaching levels associated with 67% protection was 50-80 days for ChAdOx1 vaccinated participants without prior infection, with limited variation across age, sex, dosing interval, or long-term health conditions (**Figure 7a**). For BNT162b2, the estimated mean durations varied substantially across these factors, from 250-460 days at younger ages to 160-230 days at older ages, and were longer in females, those with longer dosing intervals, and without long-term health conditions (**Figure 7b**). For unvaccinated participants infected previously, using a model of antibody declines after natural infection[16], the duration from diagnosis to the level associated with 67% protection was estimated to be 1-2 years (**Figure 7c**). Older people had a longer duration of protection after natural infection, but these results were conditional on seroconverting, and older

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

individuals had a lower seroconversion rate (**Figure 7d**). Although data were insufficient to estimate antibody levels correlated with protection for vaccinated participants with prior infection, given their half-lives were longer, conservatively assuming threshold levels were similar to those vaccinated without prior infection, the duration of protection could last for >1 year. Times for antibody levels to fall to the threshold for positivity, i.e. 42 ng/ml, were longer, but followed the same patterns (**Figure S9**).

We estimated the proportion of participants with 67% protection at 90, 180, 270, and 360 days from second dose or natural infection based on individual-level predictions, conditional on seroconverting. At 180 days, 10% of ChAdOx1 participants without prior infection remained above the level associated with 67% protection, with little variation across different factors. For BNT162b2, the proportion varied between 60%-90% for those without prior infection and was higher in younger ages, females, and those without long-term health conditions. Over 90% of unvaccinated participants with natural infection were above the level required for 67% protection at 180 days post diagnosis (**Figure 8**).

Emerging viral variants may need higher antibody levels for the same level of neutralising activity[19]; in a sensitivity analysis assuming 2- to 4-fold increases above the threshold associated with 67% protection against the Delta variant, protection from vaccination was short-lived. For example, in a 40-year-old female without any long-term health conditions, if 3-fold higher antibody levels were required, BNT162b2 would provide around 100 days of protection, while ChAdOx1 did not reach the required antibody level (**Figure S10**).

Vaccine non-responders

We previously used latent class mixed models to identify 5.8% and 5.1% of a smaller population of participants receiving one ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose, respectively, as non-responders[20]. Because latent class models would not fit with larger numbers, we used a heuristic rule based on these previous observations to define non-response as all antibody measurements <28 ng/ml (similar levels to the previous non-response class) and having at least one antibody measurement 21 days after the first or second dose. To examine robustness, we also restricted to those having at least two antibody measurements, and after both doses (rather than each separately). Across different assumptions **(Table S4)**, we found that 5.8-7.7% and 3.5-6.0% of participants were classed as non-responders to the first ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose, respectively, similar to previously. However, only 0.4-1.0% and 0.1-0.5% participants were non-responders to the second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose, respectively, and 0.3-0.5% and 0.1-0.2% were non-responders to both first and second doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Discussion

In this study, based on a large random sample of the UK population, we found significant boosting of anti-spike IgG induced by the second dose of both ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 vaccines in all age groups and using different dosing intervals, including the three-week dosing interval for BNT162b2. Consistent with our previous findings[20], those receiving ChAdOx1 had lower peak anti-spike IgG responses than BNT162b2. Antibody levels also fell faster after ChAdOx1 vs. BNT162b2, particularly in younger individuals. After the second vaccination, older age, male sex, and long-term health conditions were all associated with substantially faster antibody declines in participants who received BNT162b2 but had no or smaller effects on declines with ChAdOx1. Based on our estimates of anti-spike antibody levels as correlates of protection, antibody levels associated with 67% protection against infection last for 2-3 months following a second dose of ChAdOx1 and 6-15 months after BNT162b2 in those without prior infection, and could last for 1-2 years in those unvaccinated, but seroconverting following natural infection. Similar to our previous findings[20], around 6-8% and 4-6% of participants were non/low-responders who did not substantially increase their antibody levels after the first ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose. However, non-response to a second dose was much smaller, <1%, suggesting that second doses can significantly boost an initial suboptimal response in most individuals, with nearly everyone seroconverting after the second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose.

Antibody trajectories after vaccination differed substantially by prior infection status. Prior infection was associated with a higher peak level and a longer half-life for ChAdOX1, but only half-life for BNT162b2. The lack of difference in peak level for BNT162b2 may reflect the assay upper limit of quantification of 800 ng/ml. Previous studies reported that a single dose of BNT162b2 or Sputnik V, an adenovirus-based vaccine, elicited post-vaccination antibody levels that were similar to, or higher than, those without prior infection who received two doses[21–24]. We found slightly lower IgG levels after a single BNT162b2 dose in previously infected participants vs. those with two BNT162b2 doses without prior infection, particularly at older ages. This suggests that a second BNT162b2 dose may still be helpful for previously infected individuals where supplies are sufficient, especially for older age groups. However, for ChAdOx1, the post-second dose IgG levels in those without prior infection were lower than in those previously infected with one ChAdOx1 dose.

In an adjusted model, longer dosing intervals between 8 and 12 weeks resulted in higher peak antibody levels for ChAdOx1 (9 ng/ml per week), but no longer half-lives, whereas increased BNT162b dosing intervals were associated with longer half-lives (3 days per week longer), but not

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

higher peak levels. Consistent with this, the 3-week dosing interval for BNT162b resulted in a 10-day shorter half-life compared to an 8-week interval. Other studies have reported higher antibody levels at 2-3 weeks[7], 4 weeks[8] and 14-34 days[9] post-second BNT162b dose with extended vs 3-week dosing intervals. Differences are plausibly related to these studies only measuring antibody levels at specific time points after second vaccination, which may not be optimal for comparison given we found that antibody levels were still increasing from 3-6 weeks post-second dose with the 3-week interval (**Figure 1**).

Older individuals had lower antibody levels after a first dose; whilst age differences attenuated post-second dose, older individuals still had lower post-second dose IgG peak levels and a shorter half-life for BNT162b2. Age-related differences were smaller for ChAdOx1. We found that females had a higher peak IgG level for both vaccines and a longer half-life for BNT162b2, similarly to natural infection[16], and consistent widely reported enhanced immune responses in females[25–29]. Healthcare workers had higher IgG peak levels for both vaccines, potentially reflecting a "healthy worker" effect[30], ongoing occupational exposure, or undetected prior infection. We also found that those reporting non-white ethnicity had higher IgG peak levels with ChAdOx1 and a longer half-life with BNT162b2. A few previous studies also reported higher antibody levels with non-white ethnicity after natural infection[16,31,32], so this could be due to genetic or societal differences, or differential rates of undetected prior infection. Long-term health conditions were associated with lower peak levels and shorter half-lives for both vaccines.

Multiple differences in associations with the two vaccines were seen, e.g. factors associated with peak levels did not affect half-life for ChAdOx1, while for BNT162b2 factors were more consistently associated with both a lower peak level and a shorter half-life, and the effect size was larger. Differences in vaccine response are expected given the differing design and mechanism of action of BNT162b2, an mRNA vaccine, and ChAdOx1, an adenovirus vector-based vaccine[33,34]. Alternative booster vaccines may reduce vaccine-specific differences[35].

We estimated mean half-lives of anti-spike IgG after second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 doses at 83 days and 101 days in those without prior infection, and 129 days and 188 days in those vaccinated and previously infected. Correlating antibody measurements over time to protection from infection is important to inform the timing of boosters and other control measures, but existing studies combining correlates of protection and longitudinal data from the same assay are limited. Data from ChAdOx1 and mRNA-1273 vaccine trials showed higher levels of binding and neutralizing antibodies were correlated with a lower risk of infection and a higher vaccine efficacy[14,15]. We also found higher anti-spike IgG levels were associated with increased protection from infection, but that the level of

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

protection associated with a given antibody level depended on the mechanism generating the antibodies, with natural infection resulting in lower measured antibody levels, but greater protection at a given antibody level, compared to vaccination. We did not see evidence of vaccine-specific differences, with the greater protection from BNT162b vs. ChAdOx1 explained by higher antibody levels rather than increased protection at a given antibody level. Using 67% protection against infection as an example threshold, protection was relatively short-lived in those not previously infected and receiving ChAdOx1; mean levels fell below this threshold at 50-90 days post second dose, but protection was more prolonged following two doses of BNT162b, 180-450 days. In those without prior infection, 6 months after the second dose, only 10% of those with ChAdOx1 would maintain 67% protection, while 60-90% those with BNT162b2 would still be above the threshold, indicating that a booster dose may be prioritised to those who had two doses of ChAdOx1, and would need to be individualised to optimise protection after two BNT162b2 doses. Estimated durations of protection were much longer following natural infection, which were estimated to be 1-2 years for those unvaccinated. The protection in those vaccinated with prior infection could be even longer given they have a longer half-life; however, we were not able to quantify the antibody level associated with 67% protection due to limited data. Our estimates of correlates of protection were based on Delta variant infections, and so account for the increased antibody levels needed for neutralisation of current variants[36,37]. However, if further increases in antibody levels required for protection were to occur with any future variants, we estimate this could substantially reduce the proportion of the population protected from infection. Nevertheless, protection against severe infection is likely to last considerably longer and be potentially more robust to future variants[38]. Further long-term follow up data are essential for ongoing monitoring.

Given the scale of the study, we did not measure other immune responses, such as memory-based responses, T cell or innate immune responses which are also involved in protection against infection;[34] they may explain the greater protection afforded by natural infection than vaccination at the same antibody level. Other study limitations include insufficient data to model two mRNA-1273 Moderna vaccine doses. We measured anti-spike IgG antibody using a single assay, with the upper limit of quantification reached by a reasonable number of measurements (n=5202, 4.3%) in the few weeks following second BNT162b2 vaccination, potentially leading to under-estimating peak levels and over-estimating half-lives in those with the highest responses, e.g. younger age groups. As antibody responses were calibrated to a monoclonal antibody they can be compared with other studies. Neutralising antibodies were not measured, but neutralisation titres were strongly correlated with anti-spike IgG titres **(Figure S11)**.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

In summary, the second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose significantly boosts anti-spike IgG levels, and dosing interval has a limited impact on antibody response. This supports reductions in the dosing interval to 8 weeks to increase protection against the widespread Delta variant. Older individuals, males, and those with long-term health conditions have faster antibody declines with BNT162b2. Protection based on the threshold level associated with 67% protection can last for 2-3 months for ChAdOx1 and >6 months for BNT162b2 in those without prior infection, and can be 1-2 years for those unvaccinated seroconverting after natural infection. Those vaccinated with prior infection could be protected for >1 year. These results may inform vaccination strategies; a third boosting dose should be prioritised to ChAdOx1 recipients, groups with faster antibody declines, and more clinically vulnerable individuals.

Methods

Population and setting

The UK's Office for National Statistics (ONS) COVID-19 Infection Survey (CIS) (ISRCTN21086382) randomly selects private households on a continuous basis from address lists and previous surveys to provide a representative sample across its four countries (England, Wales, Northern Ireland, Scotland). After obtaining verbal agreement to participate, a study worker visited each household to take written informed consent from individuals ≥2 years. At the first visit, participants were asked for consent for optional follow-up visits every week for the next month, then monthly for 12 months or to April 2022. This consent was obtained from parents/carers for those 2-15 years, while those 10-15 years also provided written assent. Children aged <2 years were not eligible for the study. For the current analysis, we only included participants aged ≥16 years who were eligible for vaccination for the majority of the study period.

Individuals were surveyed on their socio-demographic characteristics, behaviours, and vaccination status. Combined nose and throat swabs were taken from all consenting household members for SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing. For a random 10-20% of households, individuals ≥16 years were invited to provide blood samples monthly for serological testing. Household members of participants who tested positive were also invited to provide blood monthly for follow-up visits. Details on the sampling design are provided elsewhere[39]. From April 2021, additional participants were invited to provide blood samples monthly to assess vaccine responses, based on a combination of random selection and prioritisation of those in the study for the longest period (independent of test results). The study protocol is available at https://www.ndm.ox.ac.uk/covid-19/covid-19-infection-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

survey/protocol-and-information-sheets. The study received ethical approval from the South Central Berkshire B Research Ethics Committee (20/SC/0195).

Vaccination data

Vaccination information was obtained from participants at visits by self-report, including vaccination type, number of doses, and vaccination dates. Participants from England were also linked to the National Immunisation Management Service (NIMS), which contains all individuals' vaccination data in the English National Health Service COVID-19 vaccination programme. There was good agreement between self-reported and administrative vaccination data (98% on type and 95% on date[18]). We used vaccination data from NIMS where available for participants from England, and otherwise data from the survey.

Participants aged ≥16 years who received two doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 from 8th December 2020 onwards with antibody measurements from 91 days before the first vaccination date up until 4th October 2021 were included in the main analysis. Only 4,219 participants received two doses of mRNA-1273 thus were not included **(Figure S1).**

Laboratory testing

SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels were measured on venous or capillary blood samples using an ELISA detecting anti-trimeric spike IgG developed by the University of Oxford[39,40.] Normalised results are reported in ng/ml of mAb45 monoclonal antibody equivalents. Before 26 February 2021, the assay used fluorescence detection as previously described, with a positivity threshold of 8 million units validated on banks of known SARS-CoV-2 positive and negative samples[40]. After this, it used a commercialised CE-marked version of the assay, the Thermo Fisher OmniPATH 384 Combi SARS-CoV-2 IgG ELISA (Thermo Fisher Scientific), with the same antigen and colorimetric detection. mAb45 is the manufacturer-provided monoclonal antibody calibrant for this quantitative assay. To allow conversion of fluorometrically determined values in arbitrary units, we compared 3,840 samples which were run in parallel on both systems. A piece-wise linear regression was used to generate the following conversion formula:

log10(mAb45 units) = 0.221738 + 1.751889e-07*fluorescence_units +

5.416675e-07*(fluorescence_units>9190310)*(fluorescence_units-9190310)

We used ≥42 ng/ml as the threshold for determining IgG positivity (corresponding to the 8 million units with fluorescence detection). Given the lower and upper limits of the assay, measurements <2 ng/ml (2,922 observations, 0.4%) and >800 ng/ml (15,951 observations, 2.1%) were truncated at 2 and 800 ng/ml, respectively.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Combined nose and throat swabs were tested by PCR assays using the Thermo Fisher TaqPath SARS-CoV-2 assay at high-throughput national 'Lighthouse' laboratories in Glasgow and Milton Keynes (up until 8 February 2021). PCR outputs were analysed using UgenTec FastFinder 3.300.5, with an assay-specific algorithm and decision mechanism that allows conversion of amplification assay raw data into test results with minimal manual intervention. Positive samples are defined as having at least a single N-gene and/or ORF1ab detected (although S-gene cycle threshold (Ct) values are determined, S-gene detection alone is not considered sufficient to call a sample positive[39]) and PCR traces exhibiting an appropriate morphology.

Statistical analysis

Analysis of antibody levels included participants aged ≥16 years who received two doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 vaccines with or without prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. Age was truncated at 85 years in all analyses to reduce the influence of outliers. Prior infection was defined as having a PCR-positive swab test recorded in the survey or the English national testing programme (national testing data were not available for Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland), or a prior positive anti-spike IgG result (≥42 ng/ml) any time before the first vaccination. The dosing interval was calculated from the first and second vaccination dates. For the main analysis, we excluded a small number of participants who were considered as non-responders after the first or second dose, which was defined as all antibody measurements being <28 ng/ml and having at least one antibody measurement 21 days after the first or second dose (N=5,098 excluded for ChAdOx1, N=1,649 excluded for BNT162b2) **(Figure S1)**. We also excluded participants with recorded dosing interval <49 days or >91 days for ChAdOX1 (N=4,748 excluded), and 29-48 days or >91 days for BNT162b2 (N=6,374 excluded). 17-28 days were classified as a 3-week interval for BNT162b2.

We used linear generalized additive models (GAMs) to model anti-spike IgG antibody measurements after the first and second dose. We built separate models by vaccine type and prior infection status given the hypothesis that antibody response would vary by these two factors. Each model was adjusted for age and dosing interval using a tensor product of B-splines to allow for non-linearity and interaction among age, dosing interval, and time since vaccination, setting the date of the second vaccination as t=0. The smoothing penalty was selected using fast restricted maximum likelihood as implemented in the mcgv R package. The 95% CIs were calculated using the following formula: prediction ± 1.96 × standard error of prediction. We only included antibody measurements from 14 days before the first dose (setting the most recent measurement prior to 14 days before the first dose as 14 days) for those with no evidence of prior infection, and excluded measurements taken after the 95th percentile of the observed t>0 time points to avoid the outlier influence.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

We used Bayesian linear mixed interval-censored models to estimate changes in antibody levels after the second ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 dose. We included measurements from 21 days post-second dose reflecting the peak level (except for 3-week BNT162b2, see below). Measurements taken after the 95th percentile of the observed time points from 21 days post-second dose were excluded to avoid outlier influence. We assumed an exponential fall in antibody levels over time, i.e., a linear decline on a log2 scale. To examine non-linearity in antibody declines, especially the assumption that the rate of antibody decline would flatten, we additionally fitted a model using 4-knot splines for time (knots placed at 10th, 40th, 60th, and 90th of observed time points) and compared the model fit with the log-linear model using the leave-one-out cross-validation information criterion (LOOIC). We found that the spline model had a higher LOOIC (indicating a worse model fit) than the log-linear model for ChAdOx1 (351776 vs 339560), but a slightly lower LOOIC (indicating a better model fit) for BNT162b2 (221151 vs 225384). However, for both vaccines, the estimated trajectories were similar and there was no evidence of flattening (**Figure S12**), so we used the log-linear model for the rest of the analysis.

Population-level fixed effects, and individual-level random effects for intercept and slope were included in both models. Correlation between random effects was included in the BNT162b2 model but not the ChAdOx1 model based on preliminary analysis on a smaller random sample (N=20,000) where this correlation parameter was estimated as 0.03 (95% CrI -0.06-0.13). The outcome was right-censored at 800 ng/ml reflecting truncation of IgG values at the upper limit of quantification. We built a multivariable model to examine the association between peak levels and antibody half-lives with continuous age (16-85 years), sex, ethnicity, report having a long-term health condition, report working in patient-facing healthcare, deprivation percentile, continuous dosing interval (7-13 weeks), and prior infection status for both vaccines. For BNT162b2, we additionally examined the impact of a 3-week dosing interval (17-28 days) by creating a binary variable and excluding antibody measurements ≤42 days post-second dose for the 3-week group (identified from the GAM as they peaked at around 42 days post-second dose).

For each Bayesian linear mixed interval-censored model, weakly informative priors were used **(Table S5).** Four chains were run per model with 4,000 iterations and a warm-up period of 2,000 iterations to ensure convergence, which was confirmed visually and by ensuring the Gelman-Rubin statistic was <1.05 **(Table S6).** 95% credible intervals were calculated using highest posterior density intervals.

For the analysis of correlates of protection, we used data from study visits from 17th May 2021 to 4th October 2021. We grouped positive tests into episodes because PCR-positive results might be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

observed at multiple visits after infection. Following previous work, we defined the start of a new episode or 'positive case' as the date of (1) the first PCR-positive test in the study (not preceded by any study PCR-positive test); (2) a PCR-positive test after four or more consecutive negative visits; or (3) a PCR-positive test at least 120 days after the start of a previous episode with one or more negative tests immediately preceding this[12]. Analyses were based on visits, dropping any visits where participants were not at risk due to a recent new positive PCR test, with new PCR-positive episodes as the outcome. We used separate logistic generalised additive models for three outcomes: any positive PCR episode, a positive PCR episode with a moderate to high viral load (Ct value <30), a positive PCR episode with self-reported symptoms. Two exposure specifications were investigated. Firstly, considering the effect of the most recent antibody measurement obtained 21-59 days prior to the current visit, excluding more recent measurements to avoid changes in antibody levels arising from recent infection that might only be detected at the routine study visit despite occurring before this. Alternatively, we considered the maximum antibody measurement obtained ≥21 days prior to the visit. The relationship between antibody levels and the outcome was modelled using thin plate splines. We adjusted for the following confounders in all models: geographic area (12 regions in England, or Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland) and age in years, rural-urban home address, sex, ethnicity (white vs. non-white), household size, multigenerational household, deprivation, presence of long-term health conditions, working in a care-home, having a patient-facing role in health or social care, direct or indirect contact with a hospital or care-home, smoking status, and visit frequency. Calendar time and age were included using a tensor spline which was allowed to vary by region/country[12].

Three groups were investigated, unvaccinated participants with or without evidence of prior infection (to assess the impact of prior infection), participants vaccinated with ChAdOx1, and participants vaccinated with BNT162b2. Vaccinated participants with evidence of prior infection were excluded, as there were insufficient data to model these groups separately and the relationship between antibody levels and protection may differ in these groups. Visits occurring in the 21 days prior to vaccination were excluded, as we have previously reported infection rates change in the run-up to vaccination[18]. Visits in vaccinated participants were included from ≥21 days after first vaccination.

All analyses were performed in R 3.6 using the following packages: tidyverse (version 1.3.0), mgcv (version 1.8-31), brms (version 2.14.0), rstanarm (version 2.21.1), splines (version 3.6.1), ggeffects (version 0.14.3), arsenal (version 3.4.0), cowplot (version 1.1.0), bayesplot (version 1.7.2).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

References

1. Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. Regulatory approval of Pfizer/BioNTech vaccine for COVID-19 - GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/regulatory-approval-of-pfizer-biontech-vaccine-for-covid-19 (2020).

2. Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency. Oxford University/AstraZeneca COVID-19 vaccine approved - GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/oxford-universityastrazeneca-covid-19-vaccine-approved (2020).

3. Department of Health and Social Care. *UK COVID-19 vaccines delivery plan Contents*. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-covid-19-vaccines-delivery-plan (2021).

4. Vaccinations in the UK | Coronavirus in the UK. https://coronavirus.data.gov.uk/details/vaccinations (2021).

5. Prioritising the first COVID-19 vaccine dose: JCVI statement - GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/prioritising-the-first-covid-19-vaccine-dose-jcvi-statement.

6. Voysey, M. *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. *The Lancet* **397**, 99–111 (2021).

7. Parry, H. *et al.* Extended interval BNT162b2 vaccination enhances peak antibody generation in older people. *medRxiv* 2021.05.15.21257017 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.05.15.21257017.

8. Payne, R. P. *et al.* Sustained T Cell Immunity, Protection and Boosting Using Extended Dosing Intervals of BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccine. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2021) doi:10.2139/SSRN.3891065.

9. Amirthalingam, G. *et al.* Higher serological responses and increased vaccine effectiveness demonstrate the value of extended vaccine schedules in combatting COVID-19 in England. *medRxiv* 2021.07.26.21261140 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.07.26.21261140.

10. Sheikh, A., McMenamin, J., Taylor, B. & Robertson, C. SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness. *The Lancet* **397**, 2461–2462 (2021).

11. Bernal, J. L. *et al.* Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines against the B.1.617.2 (Delta) Variant. *https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2108891* (2021) doi:10.1056/NEJMOA2108891.

12. Pouwels, K. B. *et al.* Effect of Delta variant on viral burden and vaccine effectiveness against new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the UK. *Nature Medicine 2021* 1–9 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01548-7.

13. Most vulnerable offered second dose of COVID-19 vaccine earlier to help protect against variants - GOV.UK. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/most-vulnerable-offered-second-dose-of-covid-19-vaccine-earlier-to-help-protect-against-variants (2021).

14. Feng, S. *et al.* Correlates of protection against symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Medicine 2021* 1–9 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01540-1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

15. Gilbert, P. B. *et al.* Immune Correlates Analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 Vaccine Efficacy Trial. *medRxiv* 2021.08.09.21261290 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.08.09.21261290.

16. Wei, J. *et al.* Anti-spike antibody response to natural SARS-CoV-2 infection in the general population. *Nature Communications 2021 12:1* **12**, 1–12 (2021).

17. *SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in England*. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1025827/Technical_Briefing_25.pdf (2021).

18. Pritchard, E. *et al.* Impact of vaccination on new SARS-CoV-2 infections in the United Kingdom. *Nature Medicine* 1–9 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01410-w.

19. Noori, M. *et al.* Potency of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 vaccine-induced neutralizing antibodies against severe acute respiratory syndrome-CoV-2 variants of concern: A systematic review of in vitro studies. *Reviews in Medical Virology* e2277 (2021) doi:10.1002/RMV.2277.

20. Wei, J. *et al.* Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 vaccines in 45,965 adults from the general population of the United Kingdom. *Nature Microbiology 2021* 1–10 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41564-021-00947-3.

21. Krammer, F. *et al.* Antibody Responses in Seropositive Persons after a Single Dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccine. *The New England journal of medicine* (2021) doi:10.1056/NEJMc2101667.

22. Ebinger, J. E. *et al.* Antibody responses to the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine in individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Nature medicine* 1–4 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01325-6.

23. Vicenti, I. *et al.* The second dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine does not boost SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody response in previously infected subjects. *Infection* **1**, 1 (2021).

24. Claro, F., Silva, D., Rodriguez, M., Rangel, R. & Waard, J. H. de. IgG Antibody response to the Sputnik V vaccine: previous SARS-CoV-2 seropositive individuals might need just one vaccine dose. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* (2021) doi:10.1016/J.IJID.2021.07.070.

25. Terpos, E. *et al.* Age-dependent and gender-dependent antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 in health workers and octogenarians after vaccination with the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. *American Journal of Hematology* **96**, E257–E259 (2021).

26. Amodio, E. *et al.* Antibodies Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a Large Cohort of Vaccinated Subjects and Seropositive Patients. *Vaccines 2021, Vol. 9, Page 714* **9**, 714 (2021).

27. Ward, H. *et al.* Vaccine uptake and SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence among 207,337 adults during May 2021 in England: REACT-2 study. *medRxiv* 2021.07.14.21260497 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.07.14.21260497.

28. Takahashi, T. *et al.* Sex differences in immune responses that underlie COVID-19 disease outcomes. *Nature* **588**, 315–320 (2020).

29. Bunders, M. J. & Altfeld, M. Implications of Sex Differences in Immunity for SARS-CoV-2 Pathogenesis and Design of Therapeutic Interventions. *Immunity* vol. 53 487–495 (2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

30. Li, C.-Y. & Sung, E.-C. *A review of the healthy worker effect in occupational epidemiology*. *Occup. Mod* vol. 49 https://academic.oup.com/occmed/article/49/4/225/1387118 (1999).

31. Lumley, S. F. *et al.* The duration, dynamics and determinants of SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses in individual healthcare workers. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* (2021) doi:10.1093/cid/ciab004.

32. Shields, A. M. *et al.* Serological responses to SARS-CoV-2 following non-hospitalised infection: clinical and ethnodemographic features associated with the magnitude of the antibody response. *BMJ Open Respiratory Research* **8**, e000872 (2021).

33. Tregoning, J. S., Flight, K. E., Higham, S. L., Wang, Z. & Pierce, B. F. Progress of the COVID-19 vaccine effort: viruses, vaccines and variants versus efficacy, effectiveness and escape. *Nature Reviews Immunology 2021* 1–11 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41577-021-00592-1.

34. Sadarangani, M., Marchant, A. & Kollmann, T. R. Immunological mechanisms of vaccine-induced protection against COVID-19 in humans. *Nature Reviews Immunology 2021 21:8* **21**, 475–484 (2021).

35. Liu, X. *et al.* Safety and immunogenicity of heterologous versus homologous prime-boost schedules with an adenoviral vectored and mRNA COVID-19 vaccine (Com-COV): a single-blind, randomised, non-inferiority trial. *The Lancet* **398**, 856–869 (2021).

36. Jalkanen, P. *et al.* COVID-19 mRNA vaccine induced antibody responses against three SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Nature Communications 2021 12:1* **12**, 1–11 (2021).

37. Planas, D. *et al.* Reduced sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 variant Delta to antibody neutralization. *Nature 2021* 1–5 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03777-9.

38. Khoury, D. S. *et al.* Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature Medicine* 1–7 (2021) doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01377-8.

39. Pouwels, K. B. *et al.* Community prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in England from April to November, 2020: results from the ONS Coronavirus Infection Survey. *The Lancet Public Health* **6**, e30–e38 (2021).

40. Ainsworth, M. *et al.* Performance characteristics of five immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2: a head-to-head benchmark comparison. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* **20**, 1390–1400 (2020).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the support of all COVID-19 Infection Survey participants.

This study is funded by the Department of Health and Social Care with in-kind support from the Welsh Government, the Department of Health on behalf of the Northern Ireland Government and the Scottish Government. JW is supported by University of Oxford and the China Scholarship Council. ASW, TEAP, NS, DE, KBP are supported by the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance at the University of Oxford in partnership with the UK Health Security Agency (UK HSA) (NIHR200915). ASW and TEAP are also supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre. KBP is also supported by the Huo Family Foundation. ASW is also supported by core support from the Medical Research Council UK to the MRC Clinical Trials Unit [MC_UU_12023/22] and is an NIHR Senior Investigator. PCM is funded by Wellcome (intermediate fellowship, grant ref 110110/Z/15/Z) and holds an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellowship award. DWE is supported by a Robertson Fellowship and an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellowship. NS is an Oxford Martin Fellow and holds an NIHR Oxford BRC Senior Fellowship. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, NIHR, Department of Health, or UKHSA.

COVID-19 Infection Survey team group authorship

Office for National Statistics: Sir Ian Diamond, Emma Rourke, Ruth Studley, Tina Thomas, Duncan Cook.

Office for National Statistics COVID Infection Survey Analysis and Operations teams, in particular Daniel Ayoubkhani, Russell Black, Antonio Felton, Megan Crees, Joel Jones, Lina Lloyd, Esther Sutherland.

University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Medicine: Ann Sarah Walker, Derrick Crook, Philippa C Matthews, Tim Peto, Emma Pritchard, Nicole Stoesser, Karina-Doris Vihta, Jia Wei, Alison Howarth, George Doherty, James Kavanagh, Kevin K Chau, Stephanie B Hatch, Daniel Ebner, Lucas Martins Ferreira, Thomas Christott, Brian D Marsden, Wanwisa Dejnirattisai, Juthathip Mongkolsapaya, Sarah Cameron, Phoebe Tamblin-Hopper, Magda Wolna, Rachael Brown, Sarah Hoosdally, Richard Cornall, David I Stuart, Gavin Screaton.

University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health: Koen Pouwels.

University of Oxford, Big Data Institute: David W Eyre, Katrina Lythgoe, David Bonsall, Tanya Golubchik, Helen Fryer.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

University of Oxford, Radcliffe Department of Medicine: John Bell.

Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust: Stuart Cox, Kevin Paddon, Tim James.

University of Manchester: Thomas House.

Public Health England: John Newton, Julie Robotham, Paul Birrell.

IQVIA: Helena Jordan, Tim Sheppard, Graham Athey, Dan Moody, Leigh Curry, Pamela Brereton.

National Biocentre: Ian Jarvis, Anna Godsmark, George Morris, Bobby Mallick, Phil Eeles.

Glasgow Lighthouse Laboratory: Jodie Hay, Harper VanSteenhouse.

Department of Health and Social Care: Jessica Lee.

Welsh Government: Sean White, Tim Evans, Lisa Bloemberg.

Scottish Government: Katie Allison, Anouska Pandya, Sophie Davis.

Public Health Scotland: David I Conway, Margaret MacLeod, Chris Cunningham.

Author Contributions

The study was designed and planned by ASW, JF, JB, JN, ID and KBP, and is being conducted by ASW, RS, DC, ER, AH, BM, TEAP, PCM, NS, SH, EYJ, DIS, DWC and DWE. This specific analysis was designed by JW, DWE, ASW, and KBP. JW and KBP contributed to the statistical analysis of the survey data. JW, DWE, KBP and ASW drafted the manuscript and all authors contributed to interpretation of the data and results and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Competing Interests statement

DWE declares lecture fees from Gilead, outside the submitted work. No other author has a conflict of interest to declare.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Data availability

Data are still being collected for the COVID-19 Infection Survey. De-identified study data are available for access by accredited researchers in the ONS Secure Research Service (SRS) for accredited research purposes under part 5, chapter 5 of the Digital Economy Act 2017. For further information about accreditation, contact Research.Support@ons.gov.uk or visit the SRS website.

Code availability

A copy of the analysis code is available at https://github.com/jiaweioxford/COVID19_vaccine_antibody_responsehttps://github.com/jiaweioxford/COVID19_second_vaccine_antibody_response.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 1. Predicted anti-spike IgG levels in 60-year-olds by time from second vaccination according to dosing interval, vaccine type and prior infection status. a, Participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1 without prior infection. **b**, Participants who received two doses of BNT162b2 without prior infection. **c**, Participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1 with prior infection. **d**, Participants who received two doses of BNT162b2 with prior infection. Different *x* axis scales reflect different durations of follow-up post-vaccination in the different cohorts. Predicted levels are plotted on a log scale. Black dotted line indicates the threshold of IgG positivity (42 ng/ml). Black solid line indicates the second vaccination date. Line colour indicates response predicted for 3 weeks, 8-12 weeks dosing interval. See **Figure S2, S4** for other age groups. The 95% CIs are calculated by prediction ± 1.96 × standard error of the prediction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Predicted anti-spike IgG levels in participants with 10-week dosing interval by time from second vaccination according to age, vaccine type and prior infection status. a, Participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1 without prior infection. **b**, Participants who received two doses of BNT162b2 without prior infection. **c**, Participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1 with prior infection. **d**, Participants who received two doses of BNT162b2 with prior infection. Different *x* axis scales reflect different durations of follow-up post-vaccination in the different cohorts. Predicted levels are plotted on a log scale. Black dotted line indicates the threshold of IgG positivity (42 ng/ml). Red solid line indicates the first vaccination and black solid line indicates the second vaccination. Line colour indicates response predicted for age 20, 40, 60, and 80 years. See **Figure S3, S5** for other dosing interval groups; see **Figure 3** for comparison of vaccine type by age. The 95% CIs are calculated by prediction ± 1.96 × standard error of the prediction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Predicted anti-spike IgG levels in participants with 10-week dosing interval by time from second vaccination according to vaccine type, age and prior infection status. **a**, 20-year-old. **b**, 40-year-old. **c**, 60-year-old. **d**, 80-year-old. Predicted levels are plotted on a log scale. Black dotted line indicates the threshold of IgG positivity (42 ng/ml). Red solid line indicates the first vaccination and black solid line indicates the second vaccination. Line colour indicates response predicted for ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2, with or without prior infection. See **Figure S6** for other dosing interval groups, see Figure 2 for comparison of age by vaccine type. The 95% CIs are calculated by prediction ± 1.96 × standard error of the prediction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 4. Posterior predicted trajectories of anti-spike IgG levels from 21 days post-second dose by age (panel a, d), dosing interval (panel b, e), and prior infection status (panel c, f). Panel a,b,c show participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1. **Panel d,e,f** show participants who received two doses of BNT162b2. Plotted at reference categories: 60 years, female, white ethnicity, not reporting a long-term health condition, not a healthcare worker, deprivation percentile=60, 8-week dosing interval, and no prior infection. In **panel a**, 20-year-old group is not plotted because the vast majority of those receiving ChAdOx1 were ≥40 years.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 5. Comparison of effect of factors in participants who received two doses of ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 or had natural SARS-CoV-2 infection. **a,** Effect on anti-spike IgG peak levels. **b,** Effect on anti-spike IgG half-lives. Mean estimates with 95% credible intervals are presented. In panel b, 95% credible intervals are truncated at -100 and 150 days for visualisation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 6. Association between anti-spike IgG levels and protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection using the most recent antibody measurement obtained 21-59 days prior to the current visit. a, protection against any infection; **b,** protection against infection with a moderate to high viral load (Ct value <30); **c,** protection against infection with self-reported symptoms. Three groups are investigated, unvaccinated participants with or without evidence of prior infection, participants vaccinated with ChAdOx1 without evidence of prior infection, and participants vaccinated with BNT162b2 without evidence of prior infection. Dots represent the median predicted individual peak levels from the Bayesian linear mixed models: 798 ng/ml for BNT162b2, 281 ng/ml for ChAdOx1, and 199 ng/ml for unvaccinated participants [16]. Distribution of the most recent anti-spike IgG measurements for the three population groups are shown in panel **d, e, f**.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.

It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 7. Posterior predicted days (95% credible interval) from the second vaccination/infection to the threshold level associated with 67% protection (ChAdOx1: 191 ng/ml, BNT162b2: 169 ng/ml, unvaccinated: 59 ng/ml). a, In participants without prior infection and vaccinated with ChAdOX1. **b,** In participants without prior infection and vaccinated with BNT162b2. **c,** In unvaccinated participants who had natural infection. **d,** Predicted probability of seroconverting in unvaccinated participants who had natural infection, based on a previous model on seroconversion[16]**.** Estimates were separated by age, sex, dosing interval, long-term health condition (LTHC), and vaccine type for vaccinated people, and by age, sex, and LTHC for unvaccinated people. y-axis is truncated at 1200 days for visualisation. For ChAdOx1, 20-year-old group is not plotted because the vast majority of those receiving ChAdOx1 were ≥40 years. Panel **a,b,c** are conditional on participants having antibody response/seroconverting (see section of "Vaccine non-responders" for ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2, and discussion in a previous publication[16] for unvaccinated individuals).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.09.13.21263487; this version posted November 15, 2021. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Figure 8. Proportion of participants above the threshold level associated with 67% protection (ChAdOx1: 191 ng/ml, BNT162b2: 169 ng/ml, unvaccinated: 59 ng/ml) by time from second vaccination/infection. a, In participants without prior infection and vaccinated with ChAdOX1. **b,** In participants without prior infection and vaccinated with BNT162b2. **c,** In participants who had natural infection and unvaccinated. Estimates were separated by age, sex, and long-term health condition (LTHC). Numbers of participants in each panel were (in the order of no LTHC, LTHC. Numbers in bracket represents <40, 40-65, >65): **a**, N=72,121 [4,973, 46,160, 20,988], 28,518 [2,166, 14,315, 12,037]; **b**, N=36,662 [6,650, 14,108, 15,904], 18,391 [1,800, 6,696, 9,895]; **c**, N=2,625 [1,207, 1,243, 175], 646 [194, 322, 130]. All panels are conditional on participants having antibody response/seroconverting (see section of "Vaccine non-responders" for ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2, and discussion in a previous publication[16] for unvaccinated individuals).