medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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 .

Defective neutralizing antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 in vaccinated dialysis patients

Jessica Bassi[1,*], Olivier Giannini[2,3,*], Chiara Silacci-Fregni[1], Laura Pertusini[4], Paolo Hitz[2], Tatiana Terrot[5], Yves Franzosi[5], Francesco Muoio[1], Christian Saliba[1], Marcel Meury[6], Exequiel A. Dellota Jr.[6], Josh Dillen[6], Patrick Hernandez[6], Nadine Czudnochowski[6], Elisabetta Cameroni[1], Nicola Beria[4], Mariangela Ventresca[4], Alberto Badellino[3], Soraya Lavorato-Hadjeres[4], Elisabetta Lecchi[3,4], Tecla Bonora[4], Matteo Mattiolo[4], Guido Trinci[3,4], Daniela Garzoni[4], Giuseppe Bonforte[4], Valentina Forni-Ogna[4], Davide Giunzioni[4], Lorenzo Berwert[4], Ravindra K. Gupta[7,8], Paolo Ferrari[2,4,9], Alessandro Ceschi[2,5,10,11], Pietro Cippà[3,4,12], Davide Corti[1], Antonio Lanzavecchia[1], Luca Piccoli[1,§]

[1] Humabs Biomed SA, a subsidiary of Vir Biotechnology, 6500 Bellinzona, Switzerland
[2] Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, Università della Svizzera italiana, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland
[3] Department of Medicine, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, 6500 Bellinzona, Switzerland
[4] Division of Nephrology, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland
[5] Clinical Trial Unit, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland
[6] Vir Biotechnology, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA
[7] Cambridge Institute of Therapeutic Immunology & Infectious Disease (CITIID), Cambridge, UK.
[8] Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
[9] Clinical School, University of New South Wales, 2052 Sydney, Australia
[10] Division of Clinical Pharmacology and Toxicology, Institute of Pharmacological Science of Southern Switzerland, Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland
[11] Department of Clinical Pharmacology and Toxicology, University Hospital Zurich, 8091 Zurich, Switzerland
[12] Faculty of Medicine, University of Zurich, 8057 Zurich, Switzerland
[*] These authors contributed equally: Jessica Bassi, Olivier Giannini
[§] Corresponding author: Luca Piccoli (lpiccoli@vir.bio)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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

Patients on dialysis are at risk of severe course of SARS-CoV-2 infection. Understanding the neutralizing activity and coverage of SARS-CoV-2 variants of vaccine-elicited antibodies is required to guide prophylactic and therapeutic COVID-19 interventions in this frail population. By analyzing plasma samples from 130 hemodialysis (HD) and 13 peritoneal dialysis patients after two doses of BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273 vaccines, we found that 35% of the patients had low-level or undetectable IgG antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S). Neutralizing antibodies against the vaccine-matched SARS-CoV-2 and Delta variant were low or undetectable in 49% and 77% of patients, respectively, and were further reduced against other emerging variants. The fraction of non-responding patients was higher in SARS-CoV-2-naïve HD patients immunized with BNT162b2 (66%) than those immunized with mRNA-1273 (23%). The reduced neutralizing activity correlated with low antibody avidity, consistent with a delayed affinity maturation of SARS-CoV-2 S-specific B cells. These data indicate that dialysis patients should be considered for an additional boost and other therapeutic strategies, including early immunotherapy with monoclonal antibodies.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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

Patients with chronic kidney disease (CKD), in particular those with end-stage kidney disease (ESKD) on dialysis, are highly predisposed to infections, which are the major cause of morbidity and the second cause of mortality in this vulnerable population[1,2]. Infection by SARS-CoV-2, the causative agent of the Coronavirus disease-2019 (COVID-19), has posed a new threat for CKD patients, who were found to have a greater risk of severe COVID-19 course[3,4]. Early reports indicated a case fatality ranging from 10 to 30% in patients on hemodialysis [5-10].

The rapid development of COVID-19 vaccines has provided an important strategy to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection and, especially, severe COVID-19 course. In particular, mRNA-based vaccines developed by Pfizer/BioNTech (BNT-162b2) and Moderna (mRNA-1273) have demonstrated high safety and efficacy in healthy and at-risk individuals, including patients with chronic diseases, cancer and solid organ transplantation[11-14]. However, immunosuppressed patients, in particular those with hematological malignancies, autoimmune diseases and solid organ transplantations, were shown to mount a low antibody response to these vaccines[15-20]. Because of their immunological frailty, patients on dialysis were prioritized in international COVID-19 vaccination programs[21]. Recent studies in HD patients showed a delayed and lower serological response to vaccines and a rapid decline of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies[19,22-24]. These findings suggest an overall diminished vaccine response to SARS-CoV-2 in ESKD patients that is reminiscent of the low response observed after vaccination against Hepatitis B virus (HBV) and seasonal Influenza virus[25,26]. In addition, the rapid increase in cases of infection by SARS-CoV-2 Delta variant (B.1.617.2 lineage) since April 2021 provided a new potential challenge for dialysis patients, especially those with a suboptimal response to the vaccine[27].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

At this stage of the pandemic, it is urgent to identify populations not developing sufficient levels of neutralizing antibodies against circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants, which therefore may be at-risk of developing severe COVID-19. In this study, we provide evidence of the defective neutralizing antibody response to mRNA-vaccines in the dialysis population, which supports the strategy of prioritizing these patients for an additional boost and other therapeutic strategies.

Methods

Study participants and ethics statement

Blood samples were obtained from 143 dialysis patients and 48 healthcare workers under study protocols approved by the local Institutional Review Boards (Canton Ticino Ethics Committee, Switzerland). Dialysis patients and HCW were recruited from the four public hospitals of the Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale (EOC) in Ticino (Southern Switzerland). All subjects provided written informed consent for the use of blood and blood components (such as PBMCs, sera or plasma).

Isolation of plasma

Blood samples were collected before and 2-3 weeks after the first and the second COVID-19 vaccine dose. Plasma was isolated from blood draw performed using BD tubes containing Ficoll (BD, CPT Ficoll, Cat. No. 362780) and stored at +4°C until use.

Cell lines

Cell lines used in this study were obtained from ATCC (Vero E6 TMPRSS2) or ThermoFisher Scientific (Expi CHO cells, Expi293F™ and FreeStyle 293 cells). Vero E6 TMPRSS2 cells

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

were grown in DMEM supplemented with 10% HyClone (FBS). Expi293F cells were grown in Expi Medium.

Production of recombinant glycoproteins

The SARS-CoV-2 RBD WT construct was synthesized by GenScript into phCMV1, with a sequence encoding an N-terminal mu-phosphatase signal peptide, an 'ETGT' linker, SARS-CoV-2 S residues 328-531, a linker sequence, an Avi tag, a twin Strep tag and a 8xHis-tag. Recombinant ACE2 (UniProt Q9BYF1, residues 19-615 with a C-terminal thrombin cleavage site-TwinStrep-10xHis-GGG-tag, and N-terminal signal peptide) and RBD WT constructs were transiently transfected into Expi293F cells following manufacturer's instructions as previously describedSupernatants were clarified by centrifugation and affinity purified using a 5 mL StrepTrap column (28-9075-48, VWR). The SARS-CoV-2 stabilized Spike WT (D614G) construct was synthesized by GenScript into pCDNA with an N-terminal mu-phosphatase signal peptide, 2P stabilizing mutation[28,29], a TEV cleavage site and a C-terminal foldon, 8x His-tag, Avi tag and C-tag[30] and expressed in FreeStyle 293 cells following manufacturer's instructions. Supernatants were clarified by centrifugation and affinity purified using a 5 mL C-tag affinity matrix column.

VSV Spike mutants and pseudovirus generation

Amino acid substitutions were introduced into the D614G pCDNA_SARS-CoV-2_S plasmid as previously described[31].Plasmids encoding the SARS-CoV-2 S glycoprotein corresponding to the Wuhan prototype (D614, referred as WT) and variants Alpha (B.1.1.7), Beta (B.1.351), Gamma (P.1), Delta (B.1.617.2), Epsilon (B.1.429) and Kappa (B.1.617.1) SARS-CoV-2 S glycoprotein-encoding-plasmids used to produce SARS-CoV-2-VSV, were obtained using a multistep based on overlap extension PCR (oePCR) protocol[32].

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Replication defective VSV pseudovirus[33] expressing SARS-CoV-2 Spike proteins corresponding to the different VOC were generated as previously described[34].

Plasma pseudovirus neutralization assay

Vero E6-TMPRSS2 were grown in DMEM supplemented with 10% FBS and seeded into white bottom 96 well plates (PerkinElmer, 6005688), as previously described[35]. Conditions were tested in duplicate wells in each plate and at least six wells per plate contained untreated infected cells (defining the 0% of neutralization, "MAX RLU" value) and infected cells in the presence of S2E12 and S2X259 mAbs at 50 µg/ml each (defining the 100% of neutralization, "MIN RLU" value). Average of Relative light units (RLUs) of untreated infected wells (MAX RLU_{ave}) was subtracted by the average of MIN RLU (MIN RLU_{ave}) and used to normalize percentage of neutralization of individual RLU values of experimental data according to the following formula: $(1-(RLU_x - MIN\ RLU_{ave}) / (MAX\ RLU_{ave} - MIN\ RLU_{ave})) \times 100$. Data were analyzed and visualized with Prism (Version 9.1.0). Each neutralization experiment included a technical duplicate. The loss or gain of neutralization potency across Spike variants was calculated by dividing the variant ID_{50} by the parental ID_{50}.

Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA)

Spectraplate-384 with high protein binding treatment (custom made from Perkin Elmer) were coated overnight at 4°C with 5 µg/mL RBD or 1 µg/mL SARS-CoV-2 S protein in PBS. The day after plates were washed and blocked with Blocker Casein in PBS (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 37528) supplemented with 0.05% Tween 20 (Sigma Aldrich), 1h RT. Serial dilutions of plasma samples were then added to plates for 1h RT. Alkaline Phosphatase-conjugated goat anti-human IgG, IgM or IgA (Southern Biotech) were added to plates and incubated for 1h RT. 4-NitroPhenyl Phosphate (pNPP, Sigma-Aldrich, N2765-100TAB)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

substrate was then added and plates were read after 1 h (IgG) or 2 h (IgA and IgM) at 405 nm with a BioTek plate reader. Data were plotted and analyzed with GraphPad Prism software (version 9.1.0). For chaotropic ELISA, after incubation with plasma, plates were washed and incubated with a 1 M solution of sodium thiocyanate (NaSCN, Sigma 251410) for 1h RT. Avidity Index was calculated as the ratio (%) of the ED_{50} in presence and the ED_{50} in absence of NaSCN.

Blockade of RBD binding to human ACE2

Plasma were diluted in PBS and mixed with SARS-CoV-2 RBD mouse Fc-tagged antigen (Sino Biological, 40592-V05H, final concentration 20 ng/ml) and incubated for 30 min at 37°C. The percentage of inhibition was calculated as follows: (1−(OD sample−OD neg ctr)/(OD pos ctr−OD neg ctr)]) × 100.

Statistical analysis

The study was designed to have 80% power to detect a minimum 25% difference in total incidence of cases with poor neutralizing antibody response (i.e., low or undetectable plasma antibody titers) or in average neutralizing titers between dialysis patients and healthy controls as well as within the HD subgroups. Comparisons of means between two groups of unpaired data were made with Mann-Whitney rank test. Comparisons of means between multiple groups of unpaired data were made with Kruskal-Wallis rank test and corrected with Dunn's test. Comparisons of means between multiple groups of matched data were made with Friedman rank test and corrected with Dunn's test. Relative risks of defective neutralizing response in selected groups of patients were calculated from 2x2 contingency tables using two-sided Fisher's exact test. Statistical significance is set as $P<0.05$ and P-values are indicated with: ns = non-significant; *=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001. ED50 and ID50 titers were calculated from

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

the interpolated value from the log(agonist) and the log(inhibitor), respectively, versus response, using variable slope (four parameters) non-linear regression. Data were plotted and analyzed with GraphPad Prism software (version 9.1.0).

Results

Naïve dialysis patients produce low or undetectable levels of antibodies after two vaccine doses

At the beginning of the COVID-19 vaccination campaign in January 2021, 143 dialysis patients (130 HD, of whom 68% on hemodiafiltration, and 13 on peritoneal dialysis, PD) were enrolled in this study from four dialysis units of the Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale in Ticino, Switzerland, and received two doses of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccines (83% with BNT162b2 from Pfizer-BioNTech and 17% with mRNA-1273 from Moderna) between January and May 2021. Socio-demographic data, dialysis features, comorbidities, therapies and information about previous vaccinations and infections are summarized in **Table 1**. Of note, twenty-four (17%) dialysis patients were previously infected with SARS-CoV-2, of whom 18 (75%) had severe COVID-19 requiring hospitalization (13) or admission to an intensive care unit (5). A group of 48 healthcare workers, who received two doses of BNT162b2 vaccine between April and June 2021, were included as healthy controls (HC). Twenty-four HC were previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 reporting mild symptoms that did not require hospitalization.

Plasma samples were collected 2 to 3 weeks after the first and the second dose and the levels of plasma IgG, IgA and IgM specific for SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S) were measured by ELISA. A single vaccine dose induced detectable IgG in 34.6% of dialysis patients compared to 89.6% of HC, with high antibody levels in all HD and HC donors, who had been previously

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

infected with SARS-CoV-2, and moderate to high levels in 29.2% of HD and 79.2% of HC, who had not been exposed to the virus (**Supplementary Figure S1**). Importantly, although anti-SARS-CoV-2 S antibodies were measured in 94.4% of dialysis patients after the second vaccine dose, 35% of them had still low or undetectable levels of antibodies, compared to 100% of HC showing high levels of S-specific IgG (**Figure 1a-b**).

The larger fraction of donors with low or no antibodies (36.9%) was represented by the HD group, with naïve patients immunized with BNT162b2 showing the lowest levels of plasma IgG (50.6%) compared to those who received mRNA-1273 (9.1%) (**Figure 1a-b**). The lower IgG level in naïve HD patients was the result of a slower kinetics of antibodies induced by the vaccines as compared to naïve HC and previously infected donors (**Figure 1c**). Of note, average antibody titers of previously infected HD patients were higher than those of HC (**Figure 1a**), a finding that is consistent with more severe COVID-19 course in these patients[36-38]. Plasma samples from the 13 PD patients were collected only after the second vaccine dose and all the donors showed detectable S-specific IgG with average plasma levels that were comparable to those of HC (**Figure 1a-b**). S-specific IgG levels highly correlated with RBD-specific IgG, suggesting that, similarly to natural infection, antibodies to this domain dominated the response induced by vaccination in both patients and controls (**Figure 1d** and **Supplementary Figure S2a**). Finally, we observed that two vaccine doses induced detectable levels of S-specific IgA, which correlated with corresponding IgG levels, and no IgM in the majority of the donors (**Figure 1e-g** and **Supplementary Figure S2a-c**). Taken together, these data show that mRNA vaccines induce low levels of plasma antibodies in the majority of dialysis patients, in particular in those who are on HD and have never been exposed to SARS-CoV-2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Poor neutralization of Wuhan prototypic SARS-CoV-2 and related risk factors in naïve dialysis patients

To determine the neutralizing activity of vaccine-induced antibodies, we performed an *in vitro* neutralization assay of plasma samples using pseudotyped vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV) that express the Wuhan wild-type (WT, D614) SARS-CoV-2 S glycoprotein (**Figure 2a** and **Supplementary Figure S3a**). Compared to HC, 49% of dialysis patients had no or low neutralizing activity against the vaccine-matched SARS-CoV-2 strain (**Figure 2b**). In particular, while most of previously infected HD patients (87%) had moderate to high neutralizing antibody titers, which were similar or higher than those of HC, naïve HD patients had a heterogenous response with 57.0% of them characterized by a poor neutralizing activity, which was completely absent in the majority (60.7%) of these patients (**Figure 2a**). Of note, the fraction of non-responding patients was higher in naïve HD patients immunized with BNT162b2 (65.9%) than those immunized with mRNA-1273 (22.7%) (**Figure 2b**). Despite higher plasma S-specific IgG titers (**Figure 1a-b**), 60% of naïve PD patients had a similar poor neutralizing response compared to naïve HD patients, with 33.3% of those, who received BNT162b2 vaccine, showing no neutralizing activity (**Figure 2a-b**). The poor neutralizing activity was confirmed also by the low capability of plasma antibodies to inhibit binding of RBD to human ACE2 receptor (**Supplementary Figure S3b**). Interestingly, in previously infected dialysis patients, we observed average neutralizing and ACE2-inhibiting antibody titers that were higher than those of HC and correlated with S- and RBD-specific IgG levels (**Figure 2a** and **Supplementary Figure S3c-e**).

We next performed a sub-analysis to understand which socio-demographic and clinical data were associated to a significant risk for dialysis patients of being poor responders, here defined as having low or no neutralizing antibody titers after two mRNA-vaccine doses. Among all patients, dialysis mode (HD or PD) was not identified as risk factor, whereas

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

vaccination with BNT162b2 and no previous SARS-CoV-2 infection represented the major risk factors for having a defective neutralizing antibody response (relative risk of 2.75 and 4.50, respectively) (**Table 2**). Within the larger HD group, socio-demographic factors, including gender, age, body mass index, smoke and dialysis features could not be identified as risk factors (**Table 3**). Among comorbidities, we found that patients with heart failure history had an 1.68-increased relative risk of poor response. As expected, patients in therapy with immunosuppressive drugs had a 1.53 relative risk of poor response to the vaccine with, in particular, calcineurin inhibitors accounting for the highest relative risk (1.87). Vaccination with BNT162b2 was confirmed as a major factor with a relative risk of poor response of 2.88, which increased to 3.60 in 22 naïve HD patients who were matched to 22 naïve HD patients immunized with mRNA-1273 by age, gender, dialysis vintage and comorbidities. Among HD patients immunized with BNT162b2, those older than 80 and with heart failure history had an increased risk of poor response of 1.57 and 1.55, respectively (**Table 3**). Collectively, these findings suggest that frailer and/or immunosuppressed naïve dialysis patients are at risk of failing to produce sufficient levels of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies after vaccination with BNT162b2.

Loss of neutralization of Delta and other SARS-CoV-2 variants in dialysis patients

We next addressed the question whether vaccine-induced antibodies that neutralize wild-type SARS-CoV-2 could also neutralize current circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants, in particular the Delta variant (B.1.617.2 lineage) (**Figure 2c**). Most dialysis patients (76.9%) had plasma antibodies with low or undetectable neutralizing activity against the Delta variant, with 48.0% and 80.0% of naïve HD and PD patients with detectable levels of neutralizing antibodies against WT SARS-CoV-2 showing complete loss of neutralization against this variant (**Figure 2d** and **Supplementary Figure S4a**). Almost all the donors, including HC, had a greater than

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

2-fold reduction in the neutralizing activity against Delta variant, with naïve HD patients showing up to 17-fold (average 4.7) loss in neutralization, as compared to previously infected patients that showed a maximum 5-fold loss (average 3.0) (**Figure 2e**). Similarly, naïve PD patients showed up to 10-fold (average 5.4) loss of neutralization against Delta variant (**Figure 2e**).

The loss of neutralization against some of the other circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants was higher compared to Delta, in particular for naïve HD patients, who showed an average 7.3-, 7.6- and 6.8-fold reduction in their neutralizing activity against Beta (B.1.351), Epsilon (B.1.429) and Kappa (B.1.617.1) (**Figure 2f-g** and **Supplementary Figure S4b-f**). Previously infected HD patients and naïve PD patients also showed a drastic loss of neutralization against different variants, which was comparable to that of naïve HD patients, but higher than that of HC (**Figure 2f-g** and **Supplementary Figure S4b-f**). Complete loss of neutralization of Beta, Epsilon and Kappa variants was observed in 37-43.3% of HD and 75% of PD patients with detectable neutralizing antibodies against WT SARS-CoV-2 (**Supplementary Figure S4a**). Collectively, these findings show that the reduced neutralizing activity of vaccine-elicited antibodies against wild-type SARS-CoV-2 in dialysis patients is further affected against other circulating variants.

The reduced neutralizing activity correlates with a low antibody avidity

To explain the defective neutralizing activity of vaccine-induced antibodies observed in dialysis patients, we hypothesized that these antibodies did not gain a sufficient avidity to bind and neutralize SARS-CoV-2 after two vaccine doses. We therefore determined the avidity of plasma antibodies by measuring their binding to SARS-CoV-2 S in presence of sodium thiocyanate, a chaotropic agent that induces dissociation of the antibody from the antigen in case of low affinity. While most of the previously infected HD patients (87%) showed moderate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

to high-avidity antibodies, a high fraction of naïve HD showed low- (42%) or no (9%) avidity antibodies and most of the naïve PD patients (75%) also showed low-avidity antibodies (**Figure 3a**). As expected, antibodies of all HC that were previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 showed high avidity (index >50%), whereas naïve HC showed moderate avidity (23-50%), consistent with the different duration of affinity maturation ongoing in the two groups (**Figure 3a**). The avidity indexes correlated with SARS-CoV-2 S-specific antibody and neutralizing titers (**Figure 3b** and **Supplementary Figure S5a**). In particular, we observed larger fractions of HD patients with moderate to high avidity among patients with higher neutralizing antibody titers (**Figure 3c**). The lower avidity titers were paralleled by higher fractions of dialysis patients showing low- or non-neutralizing antibodies against the Delta and other SARS-CoV-2 variants (**Figure 3d** and **Supplementary Figure S5b-f)**. Collectively, these data support the hypothesis that vaccine-induced antibodies require high avidity to neutralize SARS-CoV-2 and different variants.

Discussion

In this phase of the COVID-19 pandemic where SARS-CoV-2 variants are rapidly spreading worldwide, we urgently need to understand the efficacy of vaccines administered so far in high-risk immunocompromised populations, in particular patients with chronic diseases[39,40]. In this study, we provide evidence that dialysis patients do not develop sufficient levels of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants after two doses of mRNA vaccines.

The analysis of plasma SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG and IgA showed an overall response to mRNA vaccine in 94.4% dialysis patients, which is comparable to data shown in other reports (70.5-96%)[19,22,41,42]. Nevertheless, we observed reduced antibody levels after both the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

first and the second dose in HD patients who were naïve to SARS-CoV-2, a finding consistent with a delayed immune response in this population[19,43,44]. These data suggest that measuring serum antibody titers to SARS-CoV-2 in dialysis patients could help clinicians to identify vaccine non-responders and guide clinical decision-making. However, currently available serological tests detect antibodies against the Spike of the Wuhan SARS-CoV-2 and do not define the level of neutralizing activity against the virus, which is considered a more relevant serological correlate of protection[45].

In this study, we found that 49% of dialysis patients had low or undetectable levels of neutralizing antibodies against the vaccine-matched SARS-CoV-2 with a significant reduction in neutralizing titers against different circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants in dialysis patients, which is consistent with an immune evasion by the virus[27,35]. Based on these data, we calculated that the fraction of dialysis patients non-responding to the vaccine further increased to 77% in the case of the Delta variant, suggesting that the great majority of dialysis patient immunized with two doses of an mRNA vaccine may not develop a protective antibody response against SARS-CoV-2 variants.

Despite the huge discrepancy between the fraction of non-responders based on antibody levels and on neutralizing titers, we observed a high correlation between these titers, which may help to define proper cut-offs in the serological tests used in clinical settings to identify non-responding patients. Furthermore, the correlation observed between neutralizing activity and antibody avidity suggests that the identification of non-responding patients may be helped by a SARS-CoV-2 avidity test, as successfully implemented for other infectious diseases[46-50].

We identified that having never been exposed to SARS-CoV-2 is the major factor that increases the risk of a defective antibody response after vaccination, especially in HD patients. Indeed, naïve individuals were shown to develop lower titers of neutralizing antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 variants compared to previously infected individuals after two mRNA vaccine

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

doses[35], indicating that vaccination may boost the neutralizing antibody response in dialysis patients after infection[51]. This effect can be explained by the higher antibody avidity that previously infected patients gained over time compared to naïve patients, who instead showed a delayed and low-avidity response. These findings are consistent with a slower affinity maturation of SARS-CoV-2 S-specific B cells, which appears to be a peculiar immunological feature of the dialysis population.

A recent report by Carr et al[52], showed that naïve HD patients vaccinated with BNT162b2 developed higher neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants compared to Astra Zeneca - Oxford University AZD1222 vaccine, suggesting that mRNA vaccines provide a higher level of protection in dialysis patients compared to adenovirus-based vaccines. However, a difference in efficacy may exist among mRNA vaccines, as we found that being immunized with BNT162b2 instead of mRNA-1273 was the second most relevant risk factor for a defective response in the dialysis population, especially in naïve HD patients. This difference can be explained by the lower mRNA amount provided by one dose of BNT162b2 compared to mRNA-1273[11,12]. Indeed, the mRNA-1273 vaccine was found to be more reactogenic[53] and to induce higher antibody titers in healthy individuals as well as in the more vulnerable elderly population[54,55].

Similarly to other studies analyzing the factors that were associated to low antibody levels after COVID-19 vaccination in dialysis patients, we also found a few risk factors of defective neutralizing antibody response to mRNA vaccines, including age, heart failure and immunosuppression[14,20,22,23,43,56-58]. However, other factors, such as gender and dialysis vintage[43], dialysis adequacy measured by Kt/V[20], comorbidities[14] and non-responsiveness to Hepatitis B vaccination[20,23] were not identified as risk factors in our study.

Our study has some limitations including a missing control group of patients matched by age, gender and comorbidities, without ESKD, while our control group was composed by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

younger individuals with few or no comorbidities. Another limitation was the low number of PD patients that did not allow to make subgroup analyses of risk factors of defective response. In addition, our patients were unbalanced in terms of type of mRNA vaccine received (BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273), although we had sufficient statistical power to make a comparison, even in a subgroup of patients matched by age, gender and comorbidity index.

In conclusion, our study demonstrates, at the functional level, that mRNA vaccines induce a defective neutralizing antibody response against SARS-CoV-2 variants in dialysis patients, in particular in naïve HD patients immunized with BNT162b2. Our findings support the need of an additional boost, preferentially with a high-dose mRNA vaccine, in this population[58-60], which, however, need to be continuously monitored with proper serological tests that measure not only the serum antibody levels, but also their neutralizing activity, either directly or indirectly through an avidity test. Finally, our data suggest that some patients may not respond efficiently even after an additional boost and, therefore, in case of SARS-CoV-2 infection, they should be considered for other therapeutic strategies, including early immunotherapy with monoclonal antibodies.

Disclosure statement

J.B., C.S.-F., F.M., C.S., M.Me., E.A.D.J., N.C., E.C., D.C. A.L., and L.Pi. are employees of Vir Biotechnology Inc. and may hold shares in Vir Biotechnology Inc. R.K.G. has received consulting fees from Johnson and Johnson and GlaxoSmithKline. The other authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all the nurses of the Ente Ospedaliero Cantonale, who helped collecting data and blood samples: Gianna Croppi, Sara Candolfi, Marie-Eve Brodeur, Chiara Tettamanti,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Giorgia Esposito, Fabio Capocasale, Elisa Capitale, Marianna Vitini, Pedrag Lazarevic, Gaetano Donato, Fabienne Poncetta, Chiara Mattei. We thank Sarita Prosperi and Barbara Guggiari-De Rosa for organizational support. A special thanks to all the dialysis patients who accepted to participate to this study. The project was partially funded by the Swiss Kidney Foundation (to O.G.). We acknowledge support from the G2P-UK National Virology consortium funded by MRC/UKRI (grant ref. MR/W005611/1, to R.K.G.).

Author contributions

O.G., P.F., A.C., P.C., D.C, A.L. and L.Pi. contributed to study concept and design. L.Pe., N.B., A.B., S.L.-H., E.L., T.B., M.Ma., G.T., D.G., G.B., V.F.-O., D.G., L.B. contributed to donors' recruitment, questionnaire and sample collection. L.Pe., T.T., Y.F., P.H. contributed to database preparation, data filling and cleaning. J.B., C.S.-F., F.M. contributed to sample processing. J.B., L.Pi. contributed to experiment design. J.B., C.S.-F., F.M. performed serological assays. M.Me., E.A.D.J., N.C., E.C. contributed to protein expression and purification. C.S., R.K.G. contributed to pseudotyped virus production. J.B., O.G., P.H., D.C., L.Pi. contributed to data analysis. J.B., O.G., P.F., A.C., P.C., D.C, A.L. and L.Pi. wrote the manuscript. O.G., L.Pi. provided overall supervision.

References

1 Zoccali, C. *et al.* The systemic nature of CKD. *Nat Rev Nephrol* **13**, 344-358, doi:10.1038/nrneph.2017.52 (2017).

2 Dalrymple, L. S. & Go, A. S. Epidemiology of acute infections among patients with chronic kidney disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* **3**, 1487-1493, doi:10.2215/CJN.01290308 (2008).

3 Henry, B. M. & Lippi, G. Chronic kidney disease is associated with severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) infection. *Int Urol Nephrol* **52**, 1193-1194, doi:10.1007/s11255-020-02451-9 (2020).

4 Cippa, P. E. *et al.* A data-driven approach to identify risk profiles and protective drugs in COVID-19. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **118**, doi:10.1073/pnas.2016877118 (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

5 Anand, S. *et al.* Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in a large nationwide sample of patients on dialysis in the USA: a cross-sectional study. *The Lancet* **396**, 1335-1344, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)32009-2 (2020).

6 Corbett, R. W. *et al.* Epidemiology of COVID-19 in an Urban Dialysis Center. *J Am Soc Nephrol* **31**, 1815-1823, doi:10.1681/ASN.2020040534 (2020).

7 Jager, K. J. *et al.* Results from the ERA-EDTA Registry indicate a high mortality due to COVID-19 in dialysis patients and kidney transplant recipients across Europe. *Kidney Int* **98**, 1540-1548, doi:10.1016/j.kint.2020.09.006 (2020).

8 Hilbrands, L. B. *et al.* COVID-19-related mortality in kidney transplant and dialysis patients: results of the ERACODA collaboration. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* **35**, 1973-1983, doi:10.1093/ndt/gfaa261 (2020).

9 The Renal Association, B., UK. UK Renal Registry (2020) COVID-19 surveillance report for renal centres in the UK: All regions and centres.

10 Robinson, B. M. *et al.* Worldwide Early Impact of COVID-19 on Dialysis Patients and Staff and Lessons Learned: A DOPPS Roundtable Discussion. *Kidney Med* **3**, 619-634, doi:10.1016/j.xkme.2021.03.006 (2021).

11 Baden, L. R. *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 403-416, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2035389 (2021).

12 Polack, F. P. *et al.* Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 2603-2615, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2034577 (2020).

13 Dagan, N. *et al.* BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a Nationwide Mass Vaccination Setting. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 1412-1423, doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2101765 (2021).

14 Butt, A. A., Omer, S. B., Yan, P., Shaikh, O. S. & Mayr, F. B. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Effectiveness in a High-Risk National Population in a Real-World Setting. *Ann Intern Med*, doi:10.7326/M21-1577 (2021).

15 Malard, F. *et al.* Weak immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in patients with hematologic malignancies. *Blood Cancer J* **11**, 142, doi:10.1038/s41408-021-00534-z (2021).

16 Louapre, C. *et al.* Anti-CD20 therapies decrease humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with multiple sclerosis or neuromyelitis optica spectrum disorders. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*, doi:10.1136/jnnp-2021-326904 (2021).

17 Boyarsky, B. J. *et al.* Antibody Response to 2-Dose SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccine Series in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients. *JAMA* **325**, 2204-2206, doi:10.1001/jama.2021.7489 (2021).

18 Ikizler, T. A., Coates, P. T., Rovin, B. H. & Ronco, P. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination in patients receiving kidney replacement therapy. *Kidney Int* **99**, 1275-1279, doi:10.1016/j.kint.2021.04.007 (2021).

19 Rincon-Arevalo, H. *et al.* Impaired humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 BNT162b2 vaccine in kidney transplant recipients and dialysis patients. *Sci Immunol* **6**, doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abj1031 (2021).

20 Danthu, C. *et al.* Humoral Response after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA Vaccination in a Cohort of Hemodialysis Patients and Kidney Transplant Recipients. *J Am Soc Nephrol*, doi:10.1681/ASN.2021040490 (2021).

21 *Public Health England, Immunization against infection disease: the Green book*. (Public Health England, 2021).

22 Grupper, A. *et al.* Humoral Response to the Pfizer BNT162b2 Vaccine in Patients Undergoing Maintenance Hemodialysis. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*, doi:10.2215/CJN.03500321 (2021).

23 Zitt, E. *et al.* The Safety and Immunogenicity of the mRNA-BNT162b2 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Hemodialysis Patients. *Front Immunol* **12**, 704773, doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.704773 (2021).

24 Alcazar-Arroyo, R. *et al.* Rapid decline of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in patients on haemodialysis: the COVID-FRIAT study. *Clin Kidney J* **14**, 1835-1844, doi:10.1093/ckj/sfab048 (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

25 Krueger, K. M., Ison, M. G. & Ghossein, C. Practical Guide to Vaccination in All Stages of CKD, Including Patients Treated by Dialysis or Kidney Transplantation. *Am J Kidney Dis* **75**, 417-425, doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2019.06.014 (2020).

26 Chaves, S. S. *et al.* Immunogenicity of hepatitis B vaccine among hemodialysis patients: effect of revaccination of non-responders and duration of protection. *Vaccine* **29**, 9618-9623, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2011.10.057 (2011).

27 Mlcochova, P. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617.2 Delta variant replication and immune evasion. *Nature*, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03944-y (2021).

28 Kirchdoerfer, R. N. *et al.* Stabilized coronavirus spikes are resistant to conformational changes induced by receptor recognition or proteolysis. *Sci Rep* **8**, 15701, doi:10.1038/s41598-018-34171-7 (2018).

29 Pallesen, J. *et al.* Immunogenicity and structures of a rationally designed prefusion MERS-CoV spike antigen. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **114**, E7348-E7357, doi:10.1073/pnas.1707304114 (2017).

30 Walls, A. C. *et al.* Structure, Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. *Cell* **181**, 281-292 e286, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.02.058 (2020).

31 Gregson, J. *et al.* Human Immunodeficiency Virus-1 Viral Load Is Elevated in Individuals With Reverse-Transcriptase Mutation M184V/I During Virological Failure of First-Line Antiretroviral Therapy and Is Associated With Compensatory Mutation L74I. *J Infect Dis* **222**, 1108-1116, doi:10.1093/infdis/jiz631 (2020).

32 Forloni, M., Liu, A. Y. & Wajapeyee, N. Creating Insertions or Deletions Using Overlap Extension Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) Mutagenesis. *Cold Spring Harb Protoc* **2018**, doi:10.1101/pdb.prot097758 (2018).

33 Takada, A. *et al.* A system for functional analysis of Ebola virus glycoprotein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **94**, 14764-14769, doi:10.1073/pnas.94.26.14764 (1997).

34 Riblett, A. M. *et al.* A Haploid Genetic Screen Identifies Heparan Sulfate Proteoglycans Supporting Rift Valley Fever Virus Infection. *J Virol* **90**, 1414-1423, doi:10.1128/JVI.02055-15 (2016).

35 McCallum, M. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 immune evasion by the B.1.427/B.1.429 variant of concern. *Science* **373**, 648-654, doi:10.1126/science.abi7994 (2021).

36 Piccoli, L. *et al.* Mapping Neutralizing and Immunodominant Sites on the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Receptor-Binding Domain by Structure-Guided High-Resolution Serology. *Cell* **183**, 1024-1042 e1021, doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.09.037 (2020).

37 Legros, V. *et al.* A longitudinal study of SARS-CoV-2-infected patients reveals a high correlation between neutralizing antibodies and COVID-19 severity. *Cell Mol Immunol* **18**, 318-327, doi:10.1038/s41423-020-00588-2 (2021).

38 Roltgen, K. *et al.* Defining the features and duration of antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with disease severity and outcome. *Sci Immunol* **5**, doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abe0240 (2020).

39 Kliger, A. S. Targeting Zero Infections in Dialysis: New Devices, Yes, but also Guidelines, Checklists, and a Culture of Safety. *J Am Soc Nephrol* **29**, 1083-1084, doi:10.1681/ASN.2018020132 (2018).

40 Windpessl, M. *et al.* COVID-19 vaccines and kidney disease. *Nat Rev Nephrol* **17**, 291-293, doi:10.1038/s41581-021-00406-6 (2021).

41 Schrezenmeier, E. *et al.* Immunogenicity of COVID-19 Tozinameran Vaccination in Patients on Chronic Dialysis. *Front Immunol* **12**, 690698, doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.690698 (2021).

42 Stumpf, J. *et al.* Humoral and cellular immunity to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in renal transplant versus dialysis patients: A prospective, multicenter observational study using mRNA-1273 or BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. *Lancet Reg Health Eur*, 100178, doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2021.100178 (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

43 Lacson, E. *et al.* Immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Dialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol*, doi:10.1681/ASN.2021040432 (2021).

44 Anderegg, M. A. *et al.* De novo vasculitis after mRNA-1273 (Moderna) vaccination. *Kidney Int* **100**, 474-476, doi:10.1016/j.kint.2021.05.016 (2021).

45 Khoury, D. S. *et al.* Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med*, doi:10.1038/s41591-021-01377-8 (2021).

46 Hazell, S. L. Clinical utility of avidity assays. *Expert Opin Med Diagn* **1**, 511-519, doi:10.1517/17530059.1.4.511 (2007).

47 Gaspar, E. B. & De Gaspari, E. Avidity assay to test functionality of anti-SARS-Cov-2 antibodies. *Vaccine* **39**, 1473-1475, doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.02.003 (2021).

48 Bauer, G. *et al.* The challenge of avidity determination in SARS-CoV-2 serology. *J Med Virol* **93**, 3092-3104, doi:10.1002/jmv.26863 (2021).

49 Teimouri, A., Mohtasebi, S., Kazemirad, E. & Keshavarz, H. Role of Toxoplasma gondii IgG Avidity Testing in Discriminating between Acute and Chronic Toxoplasmosis in Pregnancy. *J Clin Microbiol* **58**, doi:10.1128/JCM.00505-20 (2020).

50 Genco, F. *et al.* Comparison of the LIAISON(R)XL and ARCHITECT IgG, IgM, and IgG avidity assays for the diagnosis of Toxoplasma, cytomegalovirus, and rubella virus infections. *New Microbiol* **42**, 88-93 (2019).

51 Chan, L., Fuca, N., Zeldis, E., Campbell, K. N. & Shaikh, A. Antibody Response to mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Hemodialysis Patients with and without Prior COVID-19. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* **16**, 1258-1260, doi:10.2215/CJN.04080321 (2021).

52 Carr, E. J. *et al.* Neutralising antibodies after COVID-19 vaccination in UK haemodialysis patients. *The Lancet*, doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(21)01854-7 (2021).

53 Chapin-Bardales, J., Gee, J. & Myers, T. Reactogenicity Following Receipt of mRNA-Based COVID-19 Vaccines. *JAMA* **325**, 2201-2202, doi:10.1001/jama.2021.5374 (2021).

54 Puranik, A. *et al.* Comparison of two highly-effective mRNA vaccines for COVID-19 during periods of Alpha and Delta variant prevalence. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2021.08.06.21261707 (2021).

55 Abe, K. T. *et al.* Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 variants in vaccinated Ontario long-term care home residents and workers. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2021.08.06.21261721 (2021).

56 Jahn, M. *et al.* Humoral Response to SARS-CoV-2-Vaccination with BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) in Patients on Hemodialysis. *Vaccines (Basel)* **9**, doi:10.3390/vaccines9040360 (2021).

57 Clarke, C. L. *et al.* Longevity of SARS-CoV-2 immune responses in hemodialysis patients and protection against reinfection. *Kidney Int* **99**, 1470-1477, doi:10.1016/j.kint.2021.03.009 (2021).

58 Longlune, N. *et al.* High immunogenicity of a messenger RNA based vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 in chronic dialysis patients. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*, doi:10.1093/ndt/gfab193 (2021).

59 Ducloux, D., Colladant, M., Chabannes, M., Yannaraki, M. & Courivaud, C. Humoral response after 3 doses of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in patients on hemodialysis. *Kidney Int* **100**, 702-704, doi:10.1016/j.kint.2021.06.025 (2021).

60 Espi, M. *et al.* Justification, safety, and efficacy of a third dose of mRNA vaccine in maintenance hemodialysis patients: a prospective observational study. *medRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2021.07.02.21259913 (2021).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Table 1. Socio-demographic and clinical data of enrolled dialysis patients and healthy controls

	Dialysis patients	Hemodialysis (HD)	Peritoneal dialysis (PD)	Healthy controls (HC)
Enrolled donors	143	130	13	48
Age, min-max, median, IQR, years	29-97, 76, 67-83	29-97, 76, 68-83	32-82, 71, 55-78	24-67, 42, 32-49
Gender, female, n (%)	48 (34%)	43 (33%)	5 (38%)	35 (73%)
Median BMI, min-max, median, IQR, Kg/m^2	17.6-58-8, 25.9, 22.9-29.2	17.6-58.8, 26.0, 22.8-29.4	18-36.8, 25.7, 23.3-29.0	17-3, 25, 21-28
Smoker, n (%)	21 (15%)	18 (14%)	3 (23%)	13 (27%)
Dialysis treatment, n (%)				
HD, n (%)	130 (91%)	130 (100%)		
HDF, n (%)		89 (68%)		
PD, n (%)	13 (9%)		13 (100%)	
Dialysis vintage, min-max, median, IQR, months	11-268, 42, 25-80	11-268, 46, 26-87	11-70, 28, 16-44	
Dialysis access, native AVF, n (%)	96 (67%)	96 (74%)		
Comorbidities, n (%)				
Diabetes	58 (41%)	56 (43%)	2 (15%)	2 (4%)
Hypertension	121 (85%)	109 (84%)	12 (92%)	5 (10%)
Heart failure	19 (13%)	18 (14%)	1 (8%)	-
Coronary heart disease	46 (32%)	41 (32%)	5 (38%)	-
Peripheral arterial disease	29 (20%)	28 (22%)	1 (8%)	-
Pulmonary disease	42 (29%)	38 (29%)	4 (31%)	-
Chronic liver disease	12 (8%)	12 (9%)	-	-
Gastrointestinal disease	27 (19%)	24 (18%)	3 (23%)	-
Hemato-oncological disease	12 (8%)	12 (9%)	1 (8%)	-
Autoimmune disease	11 (8%)	9 (7%)	2 (15%)	1 (3%)
Kidney transplant	10 (7%)	10 (8%)	-	-
Neurodegenerative disease	4 (3%)	4(3%)	-	-
Psychiatric disease	13 (9%)	13 (10%)	-	-
Charlson comorbidity index, min-max, median, IQR	3-21, 8, 7-11	3-21, 9, 7-11	5-11. 6. 6-8	-
Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, n (%)	24 (17%)	23 (18%)	1 (8%)	24 (50%)
mild or no symptoms[1]	6 (25%)	5 (22%)	1 (100%)	24 (50%)
severe course with hospitalization	18 (75%)	18 (78%)	-	-
ICU admission	5 (28%)	5 (28%)	-	-
Diagnosis - vaccine interval, min-max, median, IQR, months	1.1-9.7, 3.5, 2.9-7.7	1.1-9.7, 3.3, 2.9-7.7	9.3	3.5-12.8, 4.8, 4.7-5.5
COVID-19 vaccine received				
Pfizer-BioNTech, n (%)	118 (83%)	107 (82%)	11 (85%)	48 (100%)
Moderna, n (%)	25 (17%)	23 (18%)	2 (15%)	-
Dose 1 - dose 2 interval, min-max, median, IQR, days	20-38, 28, 26-28	20-28, 28, 26-28	21-28, 24, 22-28	23-31, 38, 28-28
Sampling after dose 1, min-max, median, IQR, days	9-33, 15, 13-26	9-33, 15, 13-26	-	12-16, 13, 12-14
Sampling after dose 2, min-max, median, IQR days	13-27, 18, 17-19	13-27, 18, 17-19	16-25, 18, 17-21	10-21, 13, 12-14
2020 seasonal flu vaccination, n (%)	101 (70%)	94 (72%)	7 (54%)	29 (60%)
Pharmacolgical treatment				
Oral anticoagulation	27 (19%)	25 (19%)	2 (15%)	-
Antiaggregant drugs	124 (43%)	124 (95%)	-	-
ACE inhibitors/ARBs	70 (49%)	58 (45%)	12 (92%)	3 (6%)
Calcium antagonists	61 (43%)	51 (39%)	10 (77%)	-
Beta blockers	88 (62%)	79 (61%)	9 (69%)	2 (4%)
Statins	80 (56%)	71 (55%)	9 (69%)	2 (4%)
Oral antidiabetic drugs	22 (15%)	22 (17%)	-	2 (4%)
Insulin	37 (26%)	35 (27%)	2 (15%)	-
Immunosuppressive drugs[2]	24 (17%)	22 (17%)	2 (15%)	-
Oral/intravenous steroids	17 (12%)	16 (12%)	1 (8%)	-
Calcineurin inhibitors[3]	8 (6%)	8 (6%)	-	-
Vitamin D derivatives	112 (78%)	102 (78%)	10 (77%)	-

IQR, interquartile range. BMI, body mass index. HDF, hemodiafiltration. AVF, arteriovenous fistula. PCR, polymerase chain rection. ICU, intensive care unit. ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme. ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers. [1] with positive PCR and/or serology. [2] include any of steroids, cyclosporine, tacrolimus, rituximab, mycophenolate mofetil and azathioprine. [3] include cyclosporine and tacrolimus.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Table 2. Analysis of relative risk of defective neutralizing response to COVID-19 vaccination in dialysis patients

Variable	Analyzed group	Reference group	n_{an}	n_{ref}	Relative Risk	95% CI	P-value	Significant[§]
Dialysis mode	HD/HDF	PD	128	15	1.05	0.668-2.03	>0.9999	ns
Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection	No	Yes	119	24	4.50	1.78-13.1	<0.001	***
mRNA vaccine	BNT162b2	mRNA-1273	118	25	2.75	1.37-6.30	0.002	**

[§]ns = non-significant; *=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001.

Table 3. Analysis of relative risk of defective neutralizing response to COVID-19 vaccination in naïve HD patients

	Variable	Analyzed group	Reference group	Total naïve HD patients						Naïve HD patients immunized with BNT162b2					
				n_{an}	n_{ref}	Relative Risk	95% CI	P-value	Significant[§]	n_{an}	n_{ref}	Relative Risk	95% CI	P-value	Significant[§]
Socio-demographic data	**Gender**	Female	Male	36	70	1.07	0.738-1.50	0.8367	ns	30	54	1.11	0.789-1.51	0.6338	ns
	Age	>80 years	<80 years	46	60	1.00	0.702-1.39	0.8456	ns	25	59	1.57	1.18-2.08	0.0054	**
		<18.5	18.5-24.9	4	40	1.90	0.934-2.67	0.1217	ns	3	32	1.68	0.715-2.37	0.279	ns
	Body Mass Index (BMI)	25-29.9	18.5-24.9	36	40	0.95	0.606-1.48	>0.999	ns	29	32	1.05	0.687-1.58	>0.999	ns
		>30	18.5-24.9	26	40	1.25	0.811-1.87	0.3224	ns	20	32	1.26	0.833-1.87	0.3701	ns
	Smoker	Yes	No	15	91	1.36	0.864-1.84	0.2604	ns	14	70	1.25	0.811-1.65	0.361	ns
Dialysis features	**Residual diuresis**	Oligoanuria	Non-oligoan.	61	45	1.11	0.791-1.59	0.692	ns	50	34	1.02	0.747-1.44	>0.999	ns
	Dialysis vintage	>5 years	<5 years	43	63	1.20	0.852-1.67	0.3231	ns	34	50	1.06	0.755-1.44	0.8171	ns
	Dialysis mode	HDF	HD	72	34	1.42	0.969-2.23	0.0942	ns	59	25	1.13	0.815-1.71	0.6165	ns
	HD duration	>4 hours	<4 hours	70	35	1.26	0.885-1.93	0.2186	ns	55	28	1.14	0.828-1.68	0.4704	ns
	Vascular access	Graft/catheter	Native fistula	104	2	0.56	0.470-1.64	0.504	ns	82	2	0.65	0.138-1.90	0.5425	ns
	Treatment adequacy (Kt/V)	<1.2	>1.2	10	82	0.71	0.295-1.29	0.5034	ns	8	66	0.75	0.318-1.24	0.44	ns
	Anticoagulant therapy	Yes	No	102	4	1.14	0.636-3.82	>0.999	ns	81	3	0.98	0.651-3.18	>0.999	ns
Comorbidities	**Heart failure**	Yes	No	15	91	1.68	1.16-2.17	0.0119	*	14	70	1.55	1.11-1.96	0.0281	*
	Coronary heart disease	Yes	No	33	73	1.28	0.899-1.76	0.2053	ns	28	56	1.24	0.886-1.66	0.2302	ns
	Autoimmune disease	Yes	No	7	99	1.01	0.436-1.58	>0.999	ns	6	76	1.02	0.453-1.48	>0.999	ns
	Hypertension	Yes	No	88	18	0.91	0.643-1.49	0.7962	ns	69	15	0.98	0.707-1.60	>0.999	ns
	Peripheral arterial disease	Yes	No	25	81	0.99	0.631-1.40	>0.999	ns	22	63	0.96	0.630-1.33	>0.999	ns
	Diabetes mellitus	Yes	No	49	57	1.33	0.952-1.88	0.117	ns	39	45	1.29	0.942-1.79	0.167	ns
	Pulmonary disease	Yes	No	35	71	1.09	0.754-1.52	0.6801	ns	28	56	0.97	0.668-1.33	>0.999	ns
	Cerebrovascular disease	Yes	No	12	94	1.21	0.689-1.70	0.5464	ns	10	74	0.89	0.302-2.12	>0.999	ns
	Neurodegenerative disease	Yes	No	4	102	1.34	0.531-1.88	0.6312	ns	4	84	1.15	0.458-1.60	>0.999	ns
	Oncologic disease	Yes	No	11	95	1.33	0.774-1.82	0.3424	ns	8	76	1.16	0.624-1.58	0.7084	ns
	Psychiatric disorder	Yes	No	9	97	0.57	0.203-1.14	0.1719	ns	8	76	0.55	0.198-1.05	0.1176	ns
	Liver disease	Yes	No	11	95	1.33	0.774-1.82	0.3424	ns	11	73	1.13	0.661-1.54	0.7405	ns
	Gastrointestinal disease	Yes	No	22	84	0.96	0.589-1.38	>0.999	ns	18	66	1.02	0.653-1.41	>0.999	ns
	Kidney transplant	Yes	No	8	98	1.62	0.956-2.08	0.1339	ns	8	76	1.39	0.821-1.77	0.2526	ns
	Charlson comorbidity index	>8	<8	57	49	1.38	0.983-2.01	0.078	ns	44	40	1.36	0.994-1.94	0.0679	ns
Therapies	**Oral anticoagulants**	Yes	No	21	85	1.12	0.715-1.57	0.631	ns	16	68	1.06	0.668-1.45	>0.999	ns
	Antiaggregant drugs	Yes	No	69	37	1.16	0.819-1.72	0.5378	ns	58	26	1.00	0.734-1.47	>0.999	ns
	ACE inhibitors/ARBs[1]	Yes	No	50	56	1.12	0.799-1.57	0.559	ns	14	70	1.09	0.791-1.50	0.6507	ns
	Calcium antagonists	Yes	No	42	64	0.82	0.559-1.16	0.3183	ns	31	53	0.77	0.512-1.06	0.1546	ns
	Beta blockers	Yes	No	66	40	1.31	0.919-1.96	0.1609	ns	55	29	1.18	0.852-1.75	0.3471	ns
	Statins	Yes	No	58	48	1.08	0.775-1.54	0.6964	ns	46	38	0.99	0.724-1.38	>0.999	ns
	Oral antidiabetic drugs	Yes	No	17	89	1.18	0.728-1.64	0.5957	ns	14	70	1.25	0.811-1.65	0.361	ns
	Insulin	Yes	No	30	76	1.17	0.804-1.62	0.5144	ns	24	60	1.22	0.855-1.63	0.3137	ns
	Immunosuppressive drugs[2]	Yes	No	19	87	1.53	1.05-2.02	0.0405	*	18	66	1.25	0.852-1.66	0.2712	ns
	Oral/intravenous steroids	Yes	No	12	94	1.38	0.839-1.87	0.2238	ns	13	71	1.21	0.765-1.62	0.5276	ns
	Calcineurin inhibitors[3]	Yes	No	7	99	1.87	1.18-2.29	0.018	*	6	78	1.59	0.955-1.93	0.0886	ns
	Antibiotics	Yes	No	12	94	0.87	0.434-1.37	0.7595	ns	12	72	0.74	0.367-1.15	0.3252	ns
	Antiviral drugs	Yes	No	3	103	0.58	0.107-1.43	0.578	ns	3	81	0.50	0.092-1.23	0.2727	ns
	Vitamin D derivatives	Yes	No	83	23	1.39	0.903-2.41	0.163	ns	66	18	1.23	0.848-2.07	0.4033	ns
	Nonsteroidal anti-inflam. drugs	Yes	No	4	102	1.34	0.531-1.88	0.6312	ns	2	82	1.55	0.525-1.86	0.5425	ns
Vaccinations and infections	**mRNA vaccine**	BNT162b2	mRNA-1273	84	22	2.88	1.47-6.55	0.0005	***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	mRNA vaccine (matched)[4]	BNT162b2	mRNA-1273	22	22	3.60	1.79-8.23	0.0002	***	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Flu vaccination	No	Yes	19	86	1.04	0.631-1.49	>0.999	ns	17	66	0.99	0.617-1.38	>0.999	ns
	HBV vaccination	No	Yes	30	56	1.18	0.798-1.69	0.494	ns	26	43	1.16	0.812-1.62	0.4381	ns
	HBV vaccine response	Non-responder	Responder	15	40	1.40	0.812-2.22	0.2393	ns	10	32	1.69	1.04-2.54	0.0608	ns
	Non-SARS-CoV-2 infections	Yes	No	42	64	1.17	0.825-1.62	0.4261	ns	35	49	1.01	0.717-1.37	>0.999	ns
	Non-SARS-CoV-2 resp. infection	Yes	No	5	101	1.44	0.667-1.94	0.3854	ns	6	78	1.24	0.574-1.65	0.655	ns
	HBV infection	Yes	No	16	90	0.99	0.571-1.46	>0.999	ns	15	69	0.90	0.525-1.29	0.7655	ns
	HCV infection	Yes	No	5	101	1.44	0.667-1.94	0.3854	ns	4	84	1.57	0.790-1.89	0.2932	ns
	Bacteriemia/Fungemia	Yes	No	16	90	1.13	0.676-1.59	0.7854	ns	12	72	1.02	0.586-1.43	>0.999	ns

[1]ACE, angiotensin-converting enzyme. ARB, angiotensin-receptor blocker. [2]include any of steroids, cyclosporine, tacrolimus, rituximab, mycophenolate mofetil and azathioprine. [3]include cyclosporine and tacrolimus.
[4]patients were matched by age (±5 years), gender, dialysis vintage (±3 or >10 years), comorbidity index (±3) [§]ns = non-significant; *=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 | Comparison of mRNA vaccine-induced plasma antibody titers against SARS-CoV-2 between healthy controls and dialysis patients. (**a**) Plasma IgG titers (ED50) to SARS-CoV-2 S after two doses of Pfizer/BioNTech (P/B) or Moderna (M) vaccines in previously infected (square) and naïve (circle) healthy controls (HC, red), hemodialysis (HD, blue) and peritoneal dialysis (PD, orange) patients. Grey areas indicate non-specific IgG titers <50, a cut-off that was determined on non-specific binding to uncoated ELISA plates. An additional cut-off of 1'000, determined from the lowest titers in HC after two doses, was used to distinguish low (50-1'000) from high (>1'000) IgG titers. Statistical significance is set as P<0.05 and P-values are indicated with asterisks (*=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001). (**b**)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

Percentages of donors with high, low or no plasma IgG to SARS-CoV-2 S-specific after two doses (right) of mRNA-vaccine. Total number of donors within each cohort of HC and dialysis patients (DP) and within each subgroup is shown at the top of each bar. (**c**) Kinetics of plasma IgG titers to SARS-CoV-2 measured before vaccination (T0), after one (T1) or two (T2) vaccine doses. Each line connects samples from the same individual. White squares indicate HD patients who were not yet infected at T0 sampling. (**d**) Correlation analysis between plasma IgG titers to SARS-CoV-2 S and RBD in all the plasma samples collected after the second vaccine dose. (**e**) Plasma IgA titers to SARS-CoV-2 S after two vaccine doses in HC, HD and PD patients. (**f**) Correlation analysis between plasma IgG and IgA titers to SARS-CoV-2 S in all the plasma samples collected after the second vaccine dose. (**g**) Plasma IgM titers to SARS-CoV-2 S after two vaccine doses in HC, HD and PD patients.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 | Analysis of neutralizing activity of plasma antibodies against wild-type SARS-CoV-2, Delta and other variants. (**a**) Neutralizing antibody titers (ID50, 50% of inhibitory dilution) against pseudotyped VSV viruses harboring wild-type (D614) SARS-CoV-2 S determined using plasma from previously infected (square) and naïve (circle) healthy controls (HC), hemodialysis (HD) and peritoneal dialysis (PD) patients after two doses of Pfizer/BioNTech (P/B) or Moderna (M) vaccines. Grey areas indicate non-neutralizing titers (<50). A cut-off of 200, determined from the lowest neutralizing titers in HC, and a cut-off of 1'000, determined from the 25% percentile of titers in previously infected HC cohort, were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

used to distinguish low (50-200) from moderate (200-1'000) or high (>1'000) neutralizing titers. Statistical significance is set as P<0.05 and P-values are indicated with asterisks (*=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001). Shown are data from n = 2 independent experiments. (**b**) Percentages of donors with high, moderate, low or no plasma neutralizing antibodies to WT SARS-CoV-2 S after two doses of mRNA vaccine. Total number of donors within each cohort of HC and dialysis patients (DP) and within each subgroup is shown at the top of each bar. (**c**) Neutralization of WT (black) and Delta (B.1.617.2, blue) SARS-CoV-2 pseudotyped VSV by four representative plasma samples showing high, moderate, low or no neutralization to WT SARS-CoV-2. (**d-e**) Side-by-side comparison (**d**) and fold change analysis (**e**) of neutralizing titers against WT and Delta SARS-CoV-2 in 48 HC, 130 HD and 13 PD patients. Fold change is calculated as the ratio of ID50 value of WT and ID50 value of Delta variant. Shown are data from n = 2 independent experiments. (**f-g**) Side-by-side comparison (**f**) and fold change analysis (**g**) of neutralizing titers against WT and Alpha (B.1.1.7), Beta (B.1.351), Gamma (P.1), Epsilon (B.1.429) and Kappa (B.1.617.1) SARS-CoV-2 variants in 28 HC, 47 HD and 5 PD patients. Numbers in each cell of panel **g** indicate the average fold change values of WT ID50 to variant ID50 in all the cohorts analyzed including only donors with ID50 neutralizing titers against WT SARS-CoV-2 greater than 80. Shown are data from n = 2 independent experiments.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 | Role of avidity of plasma antibodies in the neutralization of wild-type SARS-CoV-2 and Delta variant. (**a**) Avidity index of plasma antibodies to WT SARS-CoV-2 S in previously infected (square) and naïve (circle) healthy controls (HC), hemodialysis (HD) and peritoneal dialysis (PD) patients after two doses of mRNA vaccine. Grey areas indicate no avidity measured of plasma antibodies with ED50 titers lower than 50. A cut-off of 23%, determined from the lowest avidity index in naïve HC, and a cut-off of 50%, determined from the lowest avidity index in previously infected HC cohort, were used to distinguish low (0-23%) from moderate (23-50%) or high (>50%) avidity. Statistical significance is set as P<0.05 and P-values are indicated with asterisks (*=0.033; **=0.002; ***<0.001). Shown are data from n = 2 independent experiments. (**b**) Correlation analysis between plasma IgG avidity index to WT SARS-CoV-2 S and neutralization of WT SARS-CoV-2 in all the plasma samples collected after the second vaccine dose. (**c**) Percentages of donors having plasma antibodies with high, moderate, low or no avidity to WT SARS-CoV-2 S after two doses of mRNA

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.05.21264054; this version posted October 7, 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 .

vaccine. Donors are shown as a total (bold) or divided by level of neutralization of WT SARS-CoV-2 (no, low, moderate, high). Total number of donors within each group is shown at the top of each bar. (**d**) Percentages of donors having plasma antibodies with high, moderate, low or no neutralization of Delta SARS-CoV-2 after two doses of mRNA vaccine. Donors are shown as a total (bold) or divided by level of avidity to WT SARS-CoV-2 S (no, low, moderate, high). Total number of donors within each group is shown at the top of each bar.