

1 **Title:** Heterologous Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) / mRNA-1273 (Moderna) vaccination induces  
2 a stronger humoral response than homologous Sputnik V in a real-world data analysis.

3  
4 **Running title:** Humoral response to the Sputnik V/Moderna vaccination.

5  
6 **Authors:** Matías J. PERESON<sup>a,b</sup>, Lucas AMAYA<sup>c</sup>, Karin NEUKAM<sup>d,e</sup>, Patricia BARE<sup>f</sup>, Natalia  
7 ECHEGOYEN<sup>c</sup>, María Noel BADANO<sup>d</sup>, Alicia LUCERO<sup>c</sup>, Antonella MARTELLI<sup>c</sup>, Gabriel H.  
8 GARCIA<sup>a</sup>, Cristina VIDELA<sup>c</sup>, Alfredo P. MARTÍNEZ<sup>c</sup>, Federico A. DI LELLO<sup>a,b,\*</sup>

9  
10 **Affiliations:**

11 <sup>a</sup>Universidad de Buenos Aires. Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica. Instituto de Investigaciones  
12 en Bacteriología y Virología Molecular (IBaViM). Buenos Aires, Argentina.

13 <sup>b</sup>Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Ciudad Autónoma de  
14 Buenos Aires, Argentina.

15 <sup>c</sup>Virology Section, Centro de Educación Médica e Investigaciones Clínicas Norberto Quirno  
16 "CEMIC". Buenos Aires, Argentina.

17 <sup>d</sup>Servicio de Enfermedades Infecciosas, UCEIMP. Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío. Seville,  
18 Spain.

19 <sup>e</sup>Instituto de Biomedicina de Sevilla/CSIC/Universidad de Sevilla. Seville, Spain.

20 <sup>f</sup>Instituto de Medicina Experimental (IMEX), Academia Nacional de Medicina, Ciudad Autónoma  
21 de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

22 **\*Corresponding Author:** Dr. Federico Alejandro Di Lello, Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica,  
23 Universidad de Buenos Aires, Junín 956, 4º piso, (1113), Ciudad de Buenos Aires, Argentina.

24 Phone: +54 11 5287 4472

25 Fax: +54 5287 4662, E-mail: [fadilello@ffyb.uba.ar](mailto:fadilello@ffyb.uba.ar)

26 **ABSTRACT**

27 **Introduction:** Growing data are demonstrating safety and immunogenicity of heterologous  
28 vaccination schemes against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2)  
29 infection. This strategy opens up the possibility of a shorter path towards the end of the pandemic.

30 **Objective:** To compare the homologous prime-boost vaccination scheme of Gam-COVID-Vac  
31 (Sputnik V, SpV) to its heterologous combination with mRNA-1273 (Moderna, Mod) vaccine.

32 **Methods:** SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike (S)-receptor binding domain (RBD) IgG concentration was  
33 assessed three to seven weeks after complete vaccination. Reactogenicity was evaluated by  
34 declared side events and medical assistance required until day 7 post-boost.

35 **Results:** Of 190 participants enrolled, 105 received homologous SpV/SpV and the remaining  
36 heterologous SpV/Mod vaccination scheme, respectively. Median (interquartile range, IQR) age  
37 was 54 (37-63) years, 132 (69.5%) were female and 46 (24.2%) individuals had a prior confirmed  
38 COVID-19. Anti-S-RBD IgG median (IQR) titers were significantly higher for SpV/Mod [2511  
39 (1476-3992) BAU/mL] than for SpV/SpV [582 (209-1609) BAU/mL,  $p < 0.001$ ] vaccination scheme.  
40 In a linear model adjusted for age, gender, time to the serological assay and time between doses,  
41 SpV/Mod [4.154 (6.585-615.554),  $p < 0.001$ ] and prior COVID [3.732 (8.641-202.010),  $p < 0.001$ ]  
42 were independently associated with higher anti-S-RBD IgG values. A higher frequency of mild-  
43 moderate adverse effects was associated with the heterologous scheme, although it was well  
44 tolerated by all individuals and no medical assistance was required.

45 **Conclusion:** The heterologous SpV/Mod combination against SARS-CoV-2 is well tolerated and  
46 significantly increases humoral immune response as compared to the homologous SpV/SpV  
47 immunization.

48

49 **Key Words:** SARS-CoV-2; Vaccine; Heterologous scheme; Gam-COVID-Vac; mRNA-1273

## 50 INTRODUCTION

51 Vaccination is the best strategy to limit the pandemic caused by the severe acute respiratory  
52 syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2). The heterologous vaccination schemes approval  
53 represents a valuable alternative to the fluctuating supply of the second doses of certain  
54 homologous schemes and reliefs concerns about the side effects of heterologous schemes in  
55 people at high risk of serious adverse effect<sup>1,2</sup>. Studies on the heterologous vaccination schemes  
56 including the adenovirus vaccine ChAdOx1 (Vaxzevria, AstraZeneca, Oxford, UK) followed by the  
57 mRNA vaccines Pfizer (BNT162b2 Comirnaty, BioNTech, Mainz, Germany) or the mRNA-1273  
58 (Moderna, Cambridge, MA, USA) have yielded encouraging results. In this sense, robust humoral  
59 and cellular immune response, safety, and enhanced neutralizing activity have been proved for  
60 these heterologous schemes<sup>3-8</sup>.

61 Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) is a Russian recombinant adenovirus-based vaccine (adenovirus  
62 26 for prime and adenovirus 5 for boost) that has been approved for emergency use in more than  
63 71 countries including Argentina<sup>9</sup>. Sputnik V has proven safety and efficacy (91.6%) in phase 2/3  
64 clinical trials and effectiveness after the first (78.6-87.6%) and two components (75.5-100%)  
65 administration in real-life studies<sup>10-13</sup>. The Gamaleya Research Centre recommended a 21-day  
66 interval between the first and the second dose, but they also stated that it is possible to increase  
67 the interval from the earlier approved 21 days to up to three months. Interval extension does not  
68 affect the vaccine-induced immune response<sup>14</sup>.

69 In Argentina, the Sputnik V second component delayed supply has led to the implementation  
70 of a heterologous vaccination scheme with the Moderna vaccine. However, there is no information  
71 about the heterologous Sputnik V/Moderna immune response.

72 Humoral immune response to vaccination represents the most used tool to evaluate vaccine  
73 performance; in addition, it has been correlated with protective effects against symptomatic  
74 SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>15</sup>. The aim of this study was to determine the immunogenicity and

75 reactogenicity of the Moderna vaccine administered as boost to individuals primed with Sputnik

76 V

## 77 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

### 78 *Study design and population*

79 In this observational cohort study, all subjects who attended to the Centro de Educación Médica  
80 e Investigaciones Clínicas “Norberto Quirno” (CEMIC), Buenos Aires, Argentina, from December  
81 2020 to August 2021 were included if i) they had received Sputnik V prime immunization, ii) they  
82 had received a boost of either Sputnik V or Moderna within 18 weeks post-prime dose, and iii)  
83 they presented to monitor their humoral immune response between 3-7 weeks after the boost  
84 dose. Individuals who received Sputnik V as the boost dose represented the homologous  
85 (SpV/SpV) group, while those who received the Moderna boost were included in the heterologous  
86 (SpV/Mod) group. The vaccination scheme depended on dose availability and the prioritization of  
87 risk populations, as established by the Argentine Ministry of Health at the time of boost.

88

### 89 *Immunogenicity*

90 Binding IgG antibodies against the spike (S) receptor-binding domain (RBD) of SARS-CoV-2  
91 (anti-S-RBD) concentration was assessed at 3-7 weeks after boost. Anti-S-RBD antibodies were  
92 quantified using the Abbott Diagnostics SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quant chemiluminescent  
93 microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) on an Architect i2000 SR and an Alinity I analyzer (Abbott  
94 Diagnostics, Abbott Park, Illinois, USA). To standardize the results to WHO binding antibody units  
95 (BAU), a correction factor for Abbott arbitrary units (AU) was applied and where  $1 \text{ BAU/mL} = 0.142$   
96  $\text{AU}$ , as previously established by Abbott with the WHO international standard NIBSC 20–136<sup>16</sup>.  
97 Following the manufacturer recommendations, samples were considered as reactive for anti-S-  
98 RBD when titers were above  $50 \text{ AU/mL}$  ( $7.2 \text{ BAU/mL}$ ). An 80% protective effect (PROT-80)  
99 against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection was assumed when anti-S-RBD titers were  $\geq 506$   
100  $\text{BAU/mL}$ <sup>15</sup>.

101

### 102 *Reactogenicity*

103 All participants were invited to complete an online questionnaire to report all possible post-  
104 boost vaccination adverse events, medication, and medical assistance required. The intensity of  
105 adverse effects was graded as mild, moderate, and severe depending on the interference with  
106 daily activities.

107

### 108 *Statistical analysis*

109 Descriptive statistics and univariate analyses were performed to compare the study groups.  
110 The outcome variable was the anti-S-RBD titer 3-7 weeks after the boost dose. Differences in  
111 anti-S-RBD levels and PROT-80 between the SpV/SpV and the SpV/Mod prime-boost schemes  
112 were evaluated. Categorical variables were expressed as number (percentage) and analyzed  
113 using the Chi-square test or the Fisher's test while the student's t-test and the Mann-Whitney *U*  
114 test were used for comparing continuous variables, which were expressed as median  
115 (interquartile range, IQR). Associations between anti-S-RBD levels and the time intervals from  
116 prime to boost ( $\Delta P-B$ ) and boost to anti-S-RBD IgG serological determination ( $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD), as  
117 well as the age, were evaluated by means of the Spearman correlation coefficient ( $\rho$ ). Those  
118 factors potentially associated with the outcome variable, such as age and sex, were evaluated in  
119 a generalized linear model. Finally, multivariate logistic regression models were developed to  
120 identify factors associated with PROT-80. Statistical analyses were carried out using the SPSS  
121 statistical software package release 23.0 (IBM SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA).

122

### 123 *Ethical aspects*

124 The study was designed and performed according to the Helsinki declaration and all blood  
125 donors gave their written informed consent (Study protocol EX-2021-06438339- -UBA-  
126 DME#SSA\_FFYB, Ethics committee of the Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica, Universidad de  
127 Buenos Aires).

128 **RESULTS**

129 *Study population*

130 From December 2020 to August 2021, 190 subjects were included in the study, 105 in the  
131 SpV/SpV group and 85 in the SpV/Mod group. Female participants were 132 (69.5%) and the  
132 median (IQR) age was 54 (37-63) years. Overall, median time intervals were 33 (24-97) days for  
133  $\Delta$ P-B and 23 (21-32) days for  $\Delta$ B-antiSRBD, respectively. Forty-six (24.2%) individuals had a  
134 confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to vaccination, with a median (IQR) time of 21 (7.3-27)  
135 weeks between infection and prime dose as available data from 44 persons. Thus, 144 (75.8%)  
136 were *naïve* to SARS-CoV-2 infection at vaccination time. Table 1 shows epidemiological and  
137 vaccination-specific characteristics according to the vaccination group.

138

139 *Immunogenicity*

140 Anti-S-RBD IgG was reactive in all 190 (100%) samples. In the overall population, median  
141 (IQR) anti-S-RBD titers were 582 (209-1609) BAU/mL in individuals who received the SpV/SpV  
142 scheme, and 2511 (1476-3992) BAU/mL in the SpV/Mod group,  $p < 0.001$ . Among women, anti-S-  
143 RBD was 1377 (347-2639) BAU/mL as compared to 1343 (503-3513) BAU/mL in men ( $p = 0.438$ ).  
144 In the bivariate correlation analyses among those who received the SpV/SpV or the SpV/Mod  
145 vaccination scheme, there was no significant association between anti-S-RBD levels and  $\Delta$ P-B  
146 [ $\rho = 0.033$  ( $p = 0.739$ ) and  $-0.154$  ( $p = 0.160$ )],  $\Delta$ B-antiSRBD [ $\rho = -0.128$  ( $p = 0.192$ ) and  $-0.003$   
147 ( $p = 0.981$ )] or age [ $\rho = -0.128$  ( $p = 0.192$ ) and  $-0.003$  ( $p = 0.981$ )], respectively. Anti-S-RBD levels  
148 according to epidemiological and vaccination-specific parameters for the homologous and  
149 heterologous schemes are shown in Table 2.

150 In participants of the SpV/Mod group who had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to  
151 vaccination, the humoral response as measured by anti-S-RBD levels was 1.7-fold higher than  
152 that observed in the non-infected ones. Likewise, within the SpV/SpV group, a confirmed previous  
153 SARS-CoV-2 infection resulted in 8-fold higher anti-S-RBD levels as compared to participants

154 without prior infection (Table 2). Anti-S-RBD (IQR) levels were 2375 (722-4057) BAU/mL in  
155 subjects with a time difference between SARS-CoV-2 infection to prime dose above the median  
156 (21 weeks) as compared to 2618 (1712-4027) BAU/mL in patients who had suffered infection less  
157 than 21 weeks prior to prime vaccination ( $p=0.372$ ). Achievement of PROT-80 were 20 (91%)  
158 versus 22 (100%),  $p=0.488$ , respectively.

159 Figure 1 shows the comparison of anti-S-RBD levels observed in SpV/SpV and SpV/Mod  
160 groups according to whether the participants had a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to  
161 vaccination or not. The SpV/Mod vaccination scheme [B:2200; 95% confidence interval (CI):568-  
162 3832;  $p=0.009$ ], as well as prior SARS-CoV-2 infection (B:1603; 95CI:1154-2051;  $p<0.001$ ), were  
163 independently associated with anti-S-RBD levels in a generalized linear model adjusted for age  
164 (B:-1082; 95%CI:-17255-15089;  $p=0.895$ ), gender (B:109076; 95%CI:-301717-519870),  $\Delta P$ -B  
165 (B:-14323; 95%CI:-42977-14331;  $p=0.325$ ) and  $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD (B:-32095; 95%CI:-71911-7720;  
166  $p=0.113$ ).

167 The PROT-80 overall rate was 73.2%, as reached by 139 participants: 57 (54.3%) of the SpV/SpV  
168 group and 82 (96.5%) of the SpV/Mod group,  $p<0.001$ . The PROT-80 rates according to age, sex,  
169 prior SARS-CoV-2 infection,  $\Delta P$ -B, and  $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD are displayed in Table 3. Multivariate  
170 analyses identified the SpV/Mod scheme and a previous infection with SARS-CoV-2 as  
171 independent predictors to reach PROT-80 (Table 3).

172

### 173 *Reactogenicity*

174 The analysis of the reactogenicity was evaluated in both groups during seven days after the  
175 boost. The homologous and heterologous immunization schemes were well tolerated, and no  
176 medical assistance or potentially life-threatening events were reported. Adverse events, including  
177 local and systemic symptoms, were more frequent in the SpV/Mod group (72.9%) than in the  
178 SpV/SpV group (55.2%),  $p=0.012$ . Overall, the most frequent systemic adverse events were  
179 myalgia (26.8%), fever (21.6%), fatigue (19.5%), and headache (16.8%). The heterologous



180 vaccine scheme induced significantly more systemic adverse effects than the homologous one  
181 (64.7% vs 36.2%,  $p < 0.001$ ). Table 4 shows the presence and intensity of systemic adverse effects  
182 by vaccination scheme. Regarding local adverse events, pain at the injection site was frequently  
183 reported (20.0%) and it was significantly more frequent for the homologous scheme than for the  
184 heterologous one (28.0% vs 11.8%,  $p = 0.011$ ). Figure 2 shows the reactogenicity by adverse effect  
185 (local and systemic) according to the vaccination scheme.

186 **DISCUSSION**

187 The present work shows that, in a real-life setting, the incorporation of heterologous prime-  
188 boost vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 could be a valuable strategy in response to deficiencies  
189 in doses supply or the presence of serious adverse effects in the prime dose. Overall, the  
190 heterologous scheme showed significantly higher titers of anti-S-RBD IgG. Moreover, both  
191 vaccination schemes were well tolerated, and no medical assistance was required.

192 All the study participants presented anti-S-RBD IgG seroconversion after the complete  
193 immunization with both boosts. These results were expected for the Sputnik V complete  
194 scheme<sup>13,17</sup> and validated the immunogenicity achieved with the Moderna boost. Importantly, a  
195 higher antibody titer was achieved with the heterologous scheme. Although a better humoral  
196 response has been already described for mRNA vaccines as compared to adenovirus-  
197 based<sup>3,4,7,8,18</sup>, there is still no data validating this assumption for the SpV/Mod combination. Our  
198 results support the use of the Moderna vaccine as an alternative to the homologous Sputnik V  
199 scheme in general. Also, this would be of special interest during a supply shortage. Further cellular  
200 studies are justified since the combination of vaccines appears to complement the characteristic  
201 immune response triggered by each vaccine platform<sup>7,19</sup>. In this way, the SpV/Mod combination  
202 could especially benefit certain risk groups through the development of a more robust and long-  
203 lasting immune response against SARS-CoV-2.

204  
205 Although the threshold to confer protection against SARS-CoV-2 after COVID-19 vaccination  
206 depends on several factors, a randomized trial on the ChAdOx1 vaccine efficacy provides robust  
207 data to deduct the antibody levels associated with protection against SARS-CoV-2. In this trial,  
208 Feng et al identified 506 BAU/ml as the cut-off level for binding anti-S-RBD antibodies to provide  
209 a vaccine efficacy of 80% against symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection<sup>15</sup>. According to this  
210 threshold, in the present study, almost 100% of the SpV/Mod group had a vaccine efficacy of 80%  
211 while only 54% of the SpV/SpV group achieved such protection. Moreover, in the multivariate

212 analysis, the vaccine efficacy of 80% was not associated with age, gender,  $\Delta P$ -B, and  $\Delta B$ -  
213 antiSRBD. All this is in accordance with previous studies on homologous regimens that, when  
214 compared, suggest that Sputnik V is moderately less effective than Moderna vaccine in preventing  
215 symptomatic COVID-19<sup>13,18,20</sup>.

216

217 In the present study, no significant gender-specific differences in anti-S-RBD IgG titers were  
218 observed. This result is in line with other studies where gender seems not to influence antibody  
219 development against Sputnik V and Moderna vaccines<sup>10,17,21,22</sup>. In contrast, other studies have  
220 reported higher antibody levels in women<sup>23-24</sup>, reflecting the need for further research in this field.  
221 Likewise, contradictory results have been published related to the age of the vaccinees. While  
222 some studies have reported higher antibody titers in young people<sup>24-26</sup>, Wheeler and colleagues  
223 did not find an antibody response-age dependency after the second dose of the Moderna  
224 vaccine<sup>22</sup>. In another study carried out in Argentina, involving a population with a mean age of 45  
225 years, Rovere et al. also failed to detect an age-response correlation for the Sputnik V scheme<sup>17</sup>.  
226 In accordance with the latter findings, we did not observed differences in the anti-S-RBD IgG titers  
227 related to participants' age.

228

229 As expected, a significant correlation was found between higher anti-S-RBD IgG titers and a  
230 confirmed prior infection with SARS-CoV-2 for both schemes. However, the impact of time  
231 between infection and prime dose did not reach statistical significance. This finding is in line with  
232 previous studies reporting an increased anti-S-RBD IgG response in subjects previously infected  
233 with SARS-CoV-2<sup>10,17,27</sup>. Importantly, in the present setting, the difference between schemes was  
234 more evident for the *naïve* individuals, reaching 8-fold higher anti-S-RBD IgG titers for the  
235 heterologous scheme with respect to the homologous one. It can thus be concluded that  
236 especially those without prior infection would benefit from a switch in the boost component.

237

238 Regarding reactogenicity, adverse events including local and systemic symptoms in  
239 participants who received SpV/Mod vaccination was slightly higher than for SpV/SpV, confirming  
240 previously reported findings<sup>13,21</sup>. Importantly, these findings are derived mainly from participants  
241 of a clinical trial and there is very little data on SpV/SpV reactogenicity under real-life conditions.  
242 The present work therefore provides important contribution to the understanding of vaccination in  
243 the clinical practice. In contrast, the higher rate of adverse events in the SpV/Mod scheme was  
244 expected since it is well established that stronger side effects are associated with mRNA  
245 platforms<sup>20,28,29</sup>. However, it is important to note that very similar severe adverse events were  
246 observed (10% SpV/Mod vs 10.5% SpV/SpV) and no major effects requiring medical assistance  
247 were reported in any of the schemes. Moreover, it should be considered that, since most serious  
248 adverse effects have been reported in a very low frequency, even when no participant required  
249 medical assistance, the small size of our sample could have influenced on this aspect<sup>30</sup>.

250  
251 This study has some limitations. First, due to the observational, real-world design of our study,  
252 the vaccination scheme distribution was not randomized and depended on the risk priorities  
253 established by the Ministry of Health. Due to the limited availability of doses, the SpV/SpV group  
254 was mostly formed by active healthcare-workers who were at highest priority for vaccination at  
255 the time and benefited from the last available Sputnik V boost doses. In contrast, the SpV/Mod  
256 scheme was mostly applied to individuals older than 60 years old who were at intermediate  
257 priority. Apart from age distribution, the limited supply of the second component of Sputnik V led  
258 to almost 4-fold differences in the median interval between prime and boost immunization, since  
259 the Moderna vaccine was also not immediately available once the shortage of Sputnik V was  
260 evident. However, there was no correlation between age or the time intervals used in this study  
261 and the anti-S-RBD levels. As a result, when the samples were stratified according to age,  $\Delta P-B$ ,  
262 and  $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD, no significant differences of the antibody titers were observed between  
263 different levels of categorization within each vaccine scheme group, while the significant

264 difference in anti-S-RBD between the two vaccine scheme groups was maintained. Therefore,  
265 both populations can be regarded as comparable and an impact of differences in age and time  
266 intervals on the analyses is very unlikely in the present setting. Second, due to the lack of  
267 availability in Argentina, a homologous Moderna vaccination control group could not be included  
268 to determine whether the elevated anti-S-RBD levels were due to an additive or a synergistic  
269 effect of the two vaccines. However, data from other studies on Mod/Mod suggest a strong  
270 immune response to anti-S-RBD<sup>22</sup>. Still, future studies are warranted to clarify this issue.

271

272 In conclusion, the heterologous immunization with SpV/Mod is not only immunogenic and well  
273 tolerated but also induces a stronger humoral response than the homologous Sputnik V scheme.  
274 Further studies such as, the neutralization plaque assay against the current and emerging  
275 variants of SARS-CoV-2, are needed to investigate the efficacy of SpV/Mod vaccinations in the  
276 local realities of each population.

277 **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

278 Matías J. Pereson, Patricia Bare, María Noel Badano and Federico A. Di Lello are members of  
279 the National Research Council (CONICET) Research Career Program. Karin Neukam is the  
280 recipient of a Miguel Servet contract by the Instituto de Salud Carlos III (grant number  
281 CP118/00033). We would like to thank to Mrs. Silvina Heisecke, from CEMIC-CONICET, for the  
282 copyediting of the manuscript

283

284 **Conflict of Interest:** the authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

285

286 **Funding:** none.

287

288 **Authorship**

289 Matías J. PERESON and Karin NEUKAM: Analysis and interpretation of data, Drafting the article.  
290 Final approval of the version to be submitted.

291 Lucas AMAYA: Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data. Final approval of the version to  
292 be submitted.

293 Patricia BARE, Natalia ECHEGOYEN, María Noel BADANO, Alicia LUCERO, Antonella  
294 MARTELLI: Acquisition of data, Final approval of the version to be submitted.

295 Gabriel H. GARCIA, Cristina VIDELA, Alfredo P. MARTÍNEZ: Analysis and interpretation of data,  
296 Revising the manuscript critically for important intellectual content, Final approval of the version  
297 to be submitted.

298 Federico A. DI LELLO: Conception and design of the study, Acquisition, Analysis, and  
299 interpretation of data, Drafting the article

300 **REFERENCES**

- 301 1. European Medicines Agency. AstraZeneca's COVID-19 vaccine: EMA finds possible link  
302 to very rare cases of unusual blood clots with low blood platelets. April 7, 2021.  
303 [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood)  
304 [possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/astrazenecas-covid-19-vaccine-ema-finds-possible-link-very-rare-cases-unusual-blood-clots-low-blood) (9 February 2022, date last  
305 accessed).
- 306 2. European Medicines Agency. COVID-19 vaccines: update on ongoing evaluation of  
307 myocarditis and pericarditis. June 11, 2021. [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-19-vaccines-update-ongoing-evaluation-myocarditis-pericarditis)  
308 [19-vaccines-update-ongoing-evaluation-myocarditis-pericarditis](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/covid-19-vaccines-update-ongoing-evaluation-myocarditis-pericarditis) (9 February 2022, date  
309 last accessed).
- 310 3. Borobia, A. M., Carcas, A. J., Pérez-Olmeda, M., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity and  
311 reactogenicity of BNT162b2 booster in ChAdOx1-S-primed participants (CombiVacS): a  
312 multicentre, open-label, randomised, controlled, phase 2 trial. *Lancet (London, England)*,  
313 398(10295), 121–130. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)01420-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01420-3)
- 314 4. Fabricius, D., Ludwig, C., Scholz, J., et al. (2021). mRNA Vaccines Enhance Neutralizing  
315 Immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Variants in Convalescent and ChAdOx1-Primed Subjects.  
316 *Vaccines*, 9 (8), 918. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines9080918>
- 317 5. Hillus, D., Schwarz, T., Tober-Lau, P., et al. (2021). Safety, reactogenicity, and  
318 immunogenicity of homologous and heterologous prime-boost immunisation with  
319 ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 and BNT162b2: a prospective cohort study. *The Lancet. Respiratory*  
320 *medicine*, 9(11), 1255–1265. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(21\)00357-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(21)00357-X)
- 321 6. Normark, J., Vikström, L., Gwon, Y. D., et al. (2021). Heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19  
322 and mRNA-1273 Vaccination. *The New England journal of medicine*, 385 (11), 1049–  
323 1051. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2110716>

- 324 7. Pozzetto, B., Legros, V., Djebali, S., et al. (2021). Immunogenicity and efficacy of  
325 heterologous ChadOx1/BNT162b2 vaccination. *Nature*, 10.1038/s41586-021-04120-y.  
326 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04120-y>
- 327 8. Schmidt, T., Klemis, V., Schub, D., et al. (2021)a. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity of  
328 heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19/mRNA vaccination. *Nature medicine*, 27(9), 1530–1535.  
329 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01464-w>
- 330 9. Ministerio de Salud de la República Argentina. Boletín oficial. Resolución 2784/2020.  
331 <https://www.boletinoficial.gob.ar/detalleAviso/primera/239160/20201224> (9 February  
332 2022, date last accessed).
- 333 10. Claro, F., Silva, D., Rodriguez, M., Rangel, H. R., & de Waard, J. H. (2021).  
334 Immunoglobulin G antibody response to the Sputnik V vaccine: previous SARS-CoV-2  
335 seropositive individuals may need just one vaccine dose. *International journal of infectious*  
336 *diseases: IJID: official publication of the International Society for Infectious Diseases*, 111,  
337 261–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2021.07.070>
- 338 11. González, S., Olszevicki, S., Salazar, M., et al. (2021). Effectiveness of the first  
339 component of Gam-COVID-Vac (Sputnik V) on reduction of SARS-CoV-2 confirmed  
340 infections, hospitalisations and mortality in patients aged 60-79: a retrospective cohort  
341 study in Argentina. *EClinicalMedicine*, 40, 101126.  
342 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eclinm.2021.101126>
- 343 12. Vokó, Z., Kiss, Z., Surján, G., et al. (2021). Nationwide effectiveness of five SARS-CoV-2  
344 vaccines in Hungary-the HUN-VE study. *Clinical microbiology and infection: the official*  
345 *publication of the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*,  
346 S1198-743X(21)00639-X. Advance online publication.  
347 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.11.011>



- 348 13. Logunov, D. Y., Dolzhikova, I. V., Shcheblyakov, D. V., et al. (2021). Safety and efficacy  
349 of an rAd26 and rAd5 vector-based heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccine: an  
350 interim analysis of a randomised controlled phase 3 trial in Russia. *Lancet (London,*  
351 *England)*, 397(10275), 671–681. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(21\)00234-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00234-8)
- 352 14. The Gamaleya Research Centre:  
353 [https://sputnikvaccine.com/newsroom/pressreleases/the-gamaleya-center-statement-on-](https://sputnikvaccine.com/newsroom/pressreleases/the-gamaleya-center-statement-on-increasing-the-interval-between-first-and-second-sputnik-v-vaccine/)  
354 [increasing-the-interval-between-first-and-second-sputnik-v-vaccine/](https://sputnikvaccine.com/newsroom/pressreleases/the-gamaleya-center-statement-on-increasing-the-interval-between-first-and-second-sputnik-v-vaccine/). (9 February 2022,  
355 date last accessed).
- 356 15. Feng, S., Phillips, D. J., White, T., et al. (2021). Correlates of protection against  
357 symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature medicine*,  
358 10.1038/s41591-021-01540-1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01540-1>
- 359 16. Galli C., Daghfal D., and Averhoff, F. (2021). Antibody testing for SARS-CoV-2 infection,  
360 quantitative determination, response to vaccines and viral variability.  
361 [https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
362 [cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
363 [4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
364 [NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
365 [c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
366 [nqvFqHkx\\_WlydBAcl4ZA\\_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q)  
367 [WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q](https://cdn.pepperapps.io/diagnostics-cms/public/60dcbcd551c1ff090981ed95?signature=eyJhbGciOiJIaXNCIjIjImMiOiJBMTI4Q0JDLUhTMjU2In0..9nFGX43vdCD-Qd2XE-NzdA.e5mqnWdULSy2PGkSwfQ10kEG1UQzLUxlzkdUvU7F1xv06WNo-c47joEI46OqfiQdEoako-TvRI4CwkLYtVIVYRR7v2jcgknBx9SFQIzw-nqvFqHkx_WlydBAcl4ZA_wEKCPydLqBtvFu7APi9pVFVDt-WE7028r1nMWpvAe5CiYb2tzNgCGIvM09-oxpfdY.vWBKI-boWE1UxgZgSc1K6Q) (9  
368 February 2022, date last accessed).
- 369 17. Rovere P., Laurelli A., Diaz A., Dabusti G. and Valdez P. (2021). Seroprevalencia de  
370 anticuerpos Anti S1 SARS-CoV-2 en trabajadores vacunados con SPUTNIK V en un  
371 hospital público de la ciudad de Buenos Aires.

- 372 [https://www.medicinabuenosaires.com/revistas/vol81-21/destacado/original\\_7593.pdf](https://www.medicinabuenosaires.com/revistas/vol81-21/destacado/original_7593.pdf) (9  
373 February 2022, date last accessed).
- 374 18. Fiolet, T., Kherabi, Y., MacDonald, C. J., et al. (2021). Comparing COVID-19 vaccines for  
375 their characteristics, efficacy and effectiveness against SARS-CoV-2 and variants of  
376 concern: A narrative review. *Clinical microbiology and infection: the official publication of*  
377 *the European Society of Clinical Microbiology and Infectious Diseases*, S1198-  
378 743X(21)00604-2. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmi.2021.10.005>
- 379 19. Schmidt, T., Klemis, V., Schub, D., Schneitler, S., Reichert, M. C., Wilkens, H., Sester, U.,  
380 Sester, M., & Mihm, J. (2021)**b**. Cellular immunity predominates over humoral immunity  
381 after homologous and heterologous mRNA and vector-based COVID-19 vaccine  
382 regimens in solid organ transplant recipients. *American journal of transplantation: official*  
383 *journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant*  
384 *Surgeons*, 10.1111/ajt.16818. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.16818>.
- 385 20. Baden, L. R., El Sahly, H. M., Essink, B., et al. (2021). Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-  
386 1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. *The New England journal of medicine*, 384(5), 403–416.  
387 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2035389>
- 388 21. Babamahmoodi, F., Saeedi, M., Alizadeh-Navaei, R., et al. (2021). Side effects and  
389 Immunogenicity following administration of the Sputnik V COVID-19 vaccine in health care  
390 workers in Iran. *Scientific reports*, 11(1), 21464. [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00963-7)  
391 [00963-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-00963-7)
- 392 22. Wheeler, S. E., Shurin, G. V., Yost, M., et al. (2021). Differential Antibody Response to  
393 mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines in Healthy Subjects. *Microbiology spectrum*, 9 (1), e0034121.  
394 <https://doi.org/10.1128/Spectrum.00341-21>
- 395 23. Grzelak, L., Velay, A., Madec, Y., et al. (2021). Sex Differences in the Evolution of  
396 Neutralizing Antibodies to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *The*  
397 *Journal of infectious diseases*, 224 (6), 983–988. <https://doi.org/10.1093/infdis/jiab127>

- 398 24. Kontou, E., Ranellou, K., Zoulas, D., et al. (2021). Antibody Response Following a Two-  
399 Dose mRNA Vaccination Regimen, in Health Care Workers of a Tertiary Hospital in  
400 Athens, Greece. *Journal of personalized medicine*, 11 (6), 576.  
401 <https://doi.org/10.3390/jpm11060576>
- 402 25. Steensels, D., Pierlet, N., Penders, J., Mesotten, D., & Heylen, L. (2021). Comparison of  
403 SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Response Following Vaccination With BNT162b2 and mRNA-  
404 1273. *JAMA*, 326(15), 1533–1535. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.15125>
- 405 26. Yang, H. S., Costa, V., Racine-Brzostek, S. E., et al. (2021). Association of Age With  
406 SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Response. *JAMA network open*, 4 (3), e214302.  
407 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2021.4302>
- 408 27. Ebinger, J. E., Fert-Bober, J., Printsev, I., et al. (2021). Antibody responses to the  
409 BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine in individuals previously infected with SARS-CoV-2. *Nature*  
410 *medicine*, 27(6), 981–984. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-021-01325-6>
- 411 28. Normark, J., Vikström, L., Gwon, Y. D., et al. (2021). Heterologous ChAdOx1 nCoV-19  
412 and mRNA-1273 Vaccination. *The New England journal of medicine*, 385(11), 1049–1051.  
413 <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMc2110716>
- 414 29. Powell, A. A., Power, L., Westrop, S., et al. (2021). Real-world data shows increased  
415 reactogenicity in adults after heterologous compared to homologous prime-boost COVID-  
416 19 vaccination, March-June 2021, England. *Euro surveillance: bulletin European sur les*  
417 *maladies transmissibles = European communicable disease bulletin*, 26(28), 2100634.  
418 <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2021.26.28.2100634>
- 419 30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2021). Selected Adverse Events Reported  
420 after COVID-19 Vaccination. [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-  
421 \[ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html\]\(https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html\)](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html) (9 February 2022, date last accessed).  
422

423 **TABLES**

424 **Table 1. Population epidemiological characteristics and vaccination-specific parameters**  
425 **by vaccination scheme (n=190).**

Characteristic	Homologous SpV/SpV (n=105)	Heterologous SpV/Mod (n=85)	p
Age* (years)	42 (33-54)	63 (56-66)	<0.001
Female gender n (%)	80 (76.2)	52 (61.2)	0.025
Prior confirmed COVID-19 n (%)	36 (34.3)	10 (11.8)	<0.001
$\Delta$ P-B (days)*	25 (21-27)	97 (89-109)	<0.001
$\Delta$ B-antiSRBD (days)*	26 (21-39)	22 (21-26)	0.001

426 SpV = Sputnik V, Mod = Moderna

427 \*Median (interquartile range)

428  $\Delta$ P-B: time from prime to boost;  $\Delta$ B-antiSRBD: time from boost to anti-S-RBD IgG serological  
429 determination

430 **Table 2. Anti-S-RBD IgG titer for homologous and heterologous vaccination schemes.**

Parameter	SpV/SpV			SpV/Mod			<i>p</i> <sub>intergroup</sub>
	n=105			n=85			
	n	Anti-S-RBD (BAU/mL)*	<i>p</i> <sub>intragroup</sub>	n	Anti-S-RBD (BAU/mL)*	<i>p</i> <sub>intragroup</sub>	
Age			0.732			0.221	
24-45 years	64	517 (232-1991)		9	3285 (2678-3854)		<0.001
46-60 years	28	629 (135-1145)		25	2830 (1764-4446)		<0.001
>60 years	13	840 (150-1617)		51	1926 (1364-3631)		0.001
Gender			0.510			0.889	
female	80	642 (212-1874)		52	2313 (1514-3982)		<0.001
male	25	511 (173-1221)		33	2830 (1326-3992)		<0.001
Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection			<0.001			0.019	
yes	36	2258 (901-2722)		10	3853 (2436-3852)		0.008
no	69	278 (121-659)		75	2257 (1391-3615)		<0.001
ΔP-B			0.903			0.750	
3-10 weeks	98	612 (189-1562)		5	2868 (1668-3389)		0.013
11-18 weeks	7	357 (242-2027)		80	2409 (1469-4022)		0.003
ΔB-antiSRBD			0.385			0.228	
2-4 weeks	55	656 (210-1897)		81	2252 (1448-3877)		<0.001
5-7 weeks	50	502 (200-1290)		4	3062 (2598-4522)		<0.001

432 *P*-values refer to the comparisons of the titers observed in different categories for each parameter  
433 within study groups ( $p_{\text{intragroup}}$ ), as well as for the comparisons of each category between the study  
434 groups ( $p_{\text{intergroup}}$ ).  
435 \*Median (interquartile range); time intervals from prime to boost ( $\Delta P$ -B) and boost to anti-S-RBD  
436 IgG determination ( $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD).

437 **Table 3. Univariate and multivariate analyses of potential predictors of the achievement**  
 438 **of 80% protection against CoVID-19 (PROT-80) (n=190).**

Parameter	PROT-80, n (%)			$p_{uv(overall)}$	Adjusted OR (95% CI)	$p_{mv}$
	SpV/SpV	SpV/Mod	Overall			
Vaccine scheme						
SpV/SpV			57 (54.3)	<0.001	Ref	<0.001
SpV/Mod	-	-	82 (96.5)		4.154 (6.585- 615.55)	
Age (years)*						
24-45	35 (54.7)	9 (100)	44 (60.3)	0.003	-0.007	0.993
46-60	15 (53.6)	25 (100)	40 (75.5)		(0.957-1.029)	
>60	7 (53.8)	48 (94.1)	55 (85.9)			
Gender						
Male	13 (52)	31 (9.9)	44 (75.9)	0.577	Ref	0.686
female	44 (55)	51 (98.1)	95 (72.0)		0.436 (0.545-4.387)	
Prior SARS-CoV-2 infection						
No	23 (33.3)	72 (96)	95 (66.0)	<0.001	Ref	<0.001
Yes	34 (94.4)	10 (100)	44 (95.7)		3.732 (8.641- 202.01)	

$\Delta P-B$ (weeks)						
11-18	3 (42.9)	77 (96.3)	81 (92.0)	<0.001	Ref	0.754
3-10	54 (55.1)	5 (100)	58 (56.9)		-0.004	
						(0.972-1.021)
$\Delta B$ -antiSRBD (weeks)						
3-4	32 (58.2)	72 (96)	104 (80.0)	0.002	Ref	0.125
5-7	25 (/50)	10 (100)	35 (58.3)		-0.036	
						(0.921-1.01)

439 SpV: Sputnik V; Mod: Moderna; uv: univariate; mv: multivariate; P: prime; B: boost. *P*-values for  
440 age, gender, prior SARS-CoV-2 infection,  $\Delta P-B$  and  $\Delta B$ -antiSRBD were 0.955, 0.486, <0.001,  
441 0.404 and 0.26 for the SpV/SpV group and 0.355, 0.333, 0.684, 0.832 and 0.684 for the SpV/Mod  
442 group, respectively.  
443 \*Entered as continuous variable in the multivariate analysis.




444 **Table 4. Presence and intensity of adverse systemic effects by vaccination scheme**

<b>Intensity of adverse event</b>	<b>Homologous SpV/SpV (n=105)</b>	<b>Heterologous SpV/Mod (n=85)</b>	<b>p</b>
No reaction	67 (63.8%)	30 (35.3%)	<0.001
Mild	13 (12.4%)	20 (23.5%)	0.043
Moderate	14 (13.3%)	27 (31.8%)	0.002
Severe	11 (10.5%)	8 (9.4%)	0.807

445 SpV = Sputnik V, Mod = Moderna

446 **FIGURES**

447 **Figure 1.** Anti-S-RBD IgG levels for homologous (SpV/SpV) and heterologous (SpV/Mod)  
448 scheme vaccinated subjects who had (A) or had not (B) a confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection prior  
449 to vaccination.



450

451 **Figure 2.** Reactogenicity: frequency of participants' reported local and systemic adverse effects for the SpV/SpV and SpV/Mod  
 452 schemes, classified by severity

