Original Research

Preceding anti-spike IgG levels predicted risk and severity of COVID-19 during the Omicron-dominant wave in Santa Fe city, Argentina

Ayelen T. Eberhardt[1], Melina Simoncini[2,3], Carlos Piña[2,3], Germán Galoppo[4,5], Virginia Parachú-Marco[6], Andrea Racca[1,7], Sofía Arce[1], Evangelina Viotto[2], Florencia Facelli[1], Florencia Valli[2], Cecilia Botto[5], Leonardo Scarpa[2], Celina Junges[1, 5], Cintia Palavecino[1], Camila Beccaria[7,8], Diego Sklar[9], Graciela Mingo[10], Alicia Genolet[10], Mónica Muñoz de Toro[4,5], Hugo Aimar[9], Verónica Marignac[2,12], Juan Carlos Bossio[11], Gustavo Armando[11], Hugo Fernández[11], Pablo M. Beldomenico[1,7*].

[1]*Laboratorio de Ecología de Enfermedades, Instituto de Ciencias Veterinarias del Litoral (ICIVET-Litoral), Universidad Nacional del Litoral - Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (UNL-CONICET), Esperanza, Argentina.*
[2]*Centro de Investigación Científica y de Transferencia Tecnológica a la Producción-Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas-Provincia de Entre Ríos-Universidad Autónoma de Entre Ríos, Diamante, Argentina.*
[3]*Facultad de Ciencia y Tecnología, Universidad Autónoma de Entre Ríos, Diamante, Entre Ríos, Argentina*
[4]*Laboratorio de Ecofisiopatología - Instituto de Salud y Ambiente del Litoral (ISAL) Universidad Nacional del Litoral-Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (UNL-CONICET), Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[5]*Facultad de Bioquímica y Ciencias Biológicas, Universidad Nacional del Litoral (FBCB-UNL), Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[6]*Laboratorio de Ecología Molecular Aplicada, Instituto de Ciencias Veterinarias del Litoral-Universidad Nacional del Litoral - Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (UNL-CONICET), Esperanza, Argentina.*
[7]*Facultad de Ciencias Veterinarias, Universidad Nacional del Litoral, Esperanza, Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[8]*Laboratorio de Biología Celular y Molecular Aplicada, Instituto de Ciencias Veterinarias Del Litoral (ICIVET-Litoral), Universidad Nacional Del Litoral (UNL), Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas (CONICET), Esperanza, Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[9]*Instituto de Matemáticas Aplicadas del Litoral (IMAL), Universidad Nacional del Litoral - Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (UNL-CONICET), Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[10]*Instituto de Estudios Sociales (INES), Universidad Nacional de Entre Ríos-Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (UNER-CONICET).*
[11]*Instituto Nacional de Enfermedades Respiratorias "Dr. Emilio Coni", Santa Fe, Argentina.*
[12]*Laboratorio de Investigación en Enfermedades Infecciosas, Dr Néstor Bianchi, Hospital San José de Diamante, Entre Ríos, Argentina.*

*Correspondence: pbeldome@fcv.unl.edu.ar

Abstract

The SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant has increased infectivity and immune escape compared with previous variants, and caused massive COVID-19 waves globally. Despite a vast majority (~90%) of the population of Santa Fe city, Argentina, had been vaccinated and/or had been infected by SARS-CoV-2 by the arrival of Omicron, the epidemic wave that followed was by far the largest one experienced in the city. A serosurvey conducted prior to the arrival of Omicron allowed to assess the acquired humoural defences preceding the wave and to evaluate associations with infection risk and severity during the wave. A very large proportion of the 1455 sampled individuals had immunological memory against COVID-19 at the arrival of Omicron (almost 90%), and about half (48.9%) had high anti-Spike IgG levels (>200 UI/ml). The

antibody titres were strongly associated with the number of vaccine shots and the vaccine platform received, and also depended markedly on prior COVID-19 diagnosis and the days elapsed since last antigen exposure (vaccine shot or natural infection). Following-up 514 participants provided real-world data linking antibody levels with protection against COVID-19 during a period of high risk of exposure to an immune-escaping highly transmissible variant. Pre-wave antibody titres were strongly associated with COVID-19 incidence and severity of symptoms during the wave. Also, receiving a vaccine shot during the follow-up period reduced the COVID-19 risk drastically (15-fold). These results highlight the importance of maintaining high defences through vaccination anticipating or during a period of high risk of exposure to immune-escaping variants.

Keywords: SARS-CoV-2, antibody titre, humoural defences, infection risk, disease severity, longitudinal study, pre-exposure

Introduction

As of June 2022, the COVID-19 pandemic continues to occur despite the acquired defences developed in a large proportion of people due to vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 and/or natural infection. Several viral variants have evolved, prevailing the ones that achieved enhanced transmissibility and immune escape compared to prior variants (Tian et al. 2022). Until November 2021, some strains had become prominent and had caused new outbreaks worldwide. These were considered variants of concern, and were named Alpha, Beta, Gamma, and Delta. A new variant, B.1.1.529, was first detected in samples collected on 11th November 2021 in Botswana and on 14th November 2021 in South Africa (Tian et al. 2022). On 26th November, the WHO defined it as the fifth variant of concern, naming it Omicron. So far, Omicron is the variant with the largest number of mutations, many of which provide increased infectivity and immune escape compared with previous variants (Hu et al. 2022; Duong et al. 2022). This resulted in massive waves of COVID-19 emerging worldwide soon after the new variant appeared (Daria & Islam, 2022).

The dynamics of COVID-19 have been heterogeneous since the beginning of the pandemic (Beldomenico 2020). While countries like United Kingdom and Germany have gone through several epidemic waves, others like Thailand and Vietnam had their first wave only after over a year had passed since SARS-CoV-2 began to circulate in those countries. In Argentina, by early December 2021 there had been two waves, the first one by mid-2020, related to the arrival and spread of the virus, and the second one in 2021 associated with the seasonality of respiratory viruses. Omicron was confirmed in Argentina on 5th December 2021, and some days later the country suffered the largest COVID-19 epidemic wave so far, with a peak infection rate several times higher than the peaks observed in the two previous waves.

In Santa Fe, a city of around 430,000 inhabitants, COVID-19 dynamics reflected what was observed elsewhere in the rest of the country (Figure 1). By mid-December 2021, 12.9% of the citizens had been diagnosed with COVID-19, 90.6% had received a first dose of an anti-SARS-

CoV-2 vaccine, 79.2% a second dose, and 10.3% a third one (data provided by the Ministry of Health of Santa Fe province). The wave that followed the arrival of Omicron began around 18th December 2022 in Santa Fe city, and the number of daily cases started to decline by mid-January 2022, returning to levels as low as before the wave by the end of February (Figure 1).

During the last two months of 2021, we conducted a survey collecting relevant information on COVID-19 and measuring anti-spike IgG antibodies in people from randomly selected households of Santa Fe city and from citizens that volunteered to participate in the study. This provided the opportunity of characterising the acquired humoural defences of the population of Santa Fe city immediately prior to the arrival of Omicron. In March 2022, after the wave was over, a subset of the study participants were asked to complete a second questionnaire indicating if they were diagnosed with COVID-19 after 15th December 2021, if they got additional vaccine shots, and other relevant information. The data collected allowed us to pursue three goals:

1) to describe the acquired humoural immunity of the population immediately prior to the arrival of Omicron
2) to assess which factors were associated with such immune status (i.e. previous infection, different vaccination schemes, time from last exposure, etc.), and
3) to evaluate if those humoural defences predicted the risk and severity of COVID-19 during the wave.



Figure 1. Temporal distribution of the confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Santa Fe city (official records of the Ministry of Health of Santa Fe province).

Materials and methods

111 ***Source of the data***

112 A random sample of 1000 households including all neighbourhoods of Santa Fe city was
113 provided by the Instituto Provincial de Estadísticas y Censos. In September and October 2021,
114 those households were visited, and the occupants were invited to participate in a COVID-19
115 study that involved answering a questionnaire and providing a blood sample to measure IgG
116 antibodies against SARS-CoV-2. A second visit was scheduled from 1st November 2021 to 23rd
117 December 2021, to fill the questionnaires and take a blood sample. In addition, during that
118 period volunteers were invited to participate by announces in the local media. We collected
119 data from 414 people from randomly selected households and 1041 volunteers.

120 The first questionnaire included queries on sex, age, having been diagnosed with COVID-19
121 (with dates and diagnosis details), COVID-19 severity and duration, vaccine shots received
122 (with type and dates), close contacts with COVID-19 cases, co-morbidities, among other
123 information.

124 Those that were sampled after 15th November 2021, were asked to complete a second
125 questionnaire in March 2022. This allowed us to follow the participants from whom there was
126 an antibody measurement within a month prior to the Omicron-dominant wave. The second
127 questionnaire inquired for the period that went from the date of the blood sample collection
128 to 28th February 2022, and included information on close contact with cases during that
129 period, COVID-19 diagnosis (with dates and diagnosis details), vaccine shots (with type and
130 dates), and disease severity and duration. When there were doubts about the responses given
131 in the questionnaires, the participants were contacted again to ask for clarification. We
132 obtained 514 valid responses to this second questionnaire.

133 Using the information obtained from the questionnaires, we established a COVID-19 case
134 when the participant indicated that she/he was given positive by the government after an
135 official PCR test, or given positive by the government due to having symptoms while
136 cohabitating with a case, or had a PCR positive test by a private laboratory, or had a positive
137 rapid antigen test while having symptoms or after having had a close contact with a case.
138 People that declared they suspected having had COVID-19 but were not tested (25 in the first
139 questionnaire and 4 in the second questionnaire) were removed from the analysis.

140 All procedures were carried out under the approval of the Ethics and Biosafety Committee of
141 the Scientific and Technological Centre of Santa Fe of the Argentine Council for Research and
142 Technology (CCT Santa Fe CONICET). All participants signed an informed consent.

143 ***Quantification of IgG***

144 Levels of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike protein IgG were quantified by COVID AR IgG immunoassay
145 developed by Instituto Leloir in Argentina (Ojeda et al. 2021), following the manufacturer's
146 instructions. This IgG immunoassay kit consists of a solid phase ELISA that utilizes the trimer of
147 native protein S and a receptor binding domain as antigens, obtained by recombinant DNA
148 techniques produced in human cells.

149 Briefly, 40 µl of fingertip capillary blood samples were diluted 1:6 in the diluent provided in the
150 SEROKIT developed by Instituto Leloir, and kept refrigerated. At the laboratory, samples were

151 re-diluted 1:3, and 200 µl of each 1:18 final dilution were transferred to 96-well plates and
152 incubated at 37°C for one hour. IgG specific for spike protein was captured on the plate, and
153 subsequently the wells were thoroughly washed 6 times to remove unbound material. Anti-
154 Human IgG, HRP-linked antibody was then used to recognize the bound IgG. A mix of HRP
155 substrate and TMB (1:1) was added to develop color. The magnitude of optical density at 450
156 nm is proportional to the quantity of IgG specific for spike protein. To estimate antibody levels,
157 sample optical densities were converted to concentrations expressed in UI/ml by using a lineal
158 model built with the optical densities (response variables) obtained in each plate from two sets
159 of known dilutions of the positive control at 50, 100, 200 and 400 UI/ml. These dilutions were
160 the independent variable, included as a polynomial term (with lineal and quadratic terms) to
161 address possible non-linearity of the dilution-OD relationship. The R^2 of that model was
162 checked to confirm that the value was >0.85, otherwise all samples were analysed again in a
163 new plate.

164 ***Statistical analysis***

165 All statistical analyses were done using the Software R version 4.2.0 (The R Foundation for
166 Statistical Computing). The analyses were conducted in three steps, to pursue three
167 complementary goals, as follows.

168 The first step aimed to characterise the acquired humoural defences in Santa Fe immediately
169 prior to the arrival of Omicron. This part consisted of descriptive statistics of the IgG levels,
170 overall and by age group.

171 The goal of the second step was to investigate the determinants of the IgG levels measured.
172 For this, the antibody levels were the response variable, which were transformed by
173 calculating the square root to approach normality. Two sets of lineal models were run, one
174 containing the polynomial term 'number of doses + (number of doses)^{2}' as variable of interest
175 (to take into account possible non-linearity of the titre-dose relationship), and the second set
176 including only the 4 vaccination schemes most frequently observed, to compare antibody
177 levels among them. In both models, the independent variables 'COVID-19' (prior diagnosis of
178 COVID-19) and 'days from last exposure' (vaccine shot or detected infection; whatever
179 happened last), were included. The vaccination schemes used for the second model were: two
180 Astra-Zeneca vaccines (viral vector vaccine; N= 411), two Sinopharm (inactivated vaccine; N=
181 334), two Sputnik V vaccines (viral vector vaccine; N= 260), the combination of Spunik V and
182 Moderna (viral vector + mRNA vaccines; N= 155), and two Pfizer/BioNTech (mRNA vaccine; N=
183 25).

184 The third step used information from the second questionnaire to conduct a longitudinal
185 analysis that enabled assessment of how the vaccines and antibody levels influenced the
186 incidence of COVID-19 during the Omicron-dominant wave in Santa Fe. In addition, we looked
187 at associations between antibody levels and COVID-19 symptoms severity and duration among
188 those that were infected during the Omicron-dominant wave. For this third step, the period in
189 which participants were followed to assess new detected infections by SARS-CoV-2 was from
190 December 18th to February 28th (72 days).

In order to establish an association between vaccination status and the incidence of COVID-19 during the Omicron-dominant wave, we built a Generalized Lineal Models (GLM) with a binomial response (COVID-19 positive or not). The model used number of vaccine doses as the independent variable of interest, included as a polynomial term.

To assess associations between antibody levels and the incidence of COVID-19 during the Omicron-dominant wave, we used a subset of data (N= 484) that excluded participants that got a vaccine shot between 7 days prior of the blood sample collection and 15th December 2021 (N= 30), as for those cases the antibody levels recorded did not reflect the humoural immunity on the arrival of Omicron. We built a GLM with a binary response that evaluated associations between antibody levels, while adjusting by a number of relevant factors, detailed below. The independent variable of interest (IgG levels) was also included in a separate model as a dichotomous factor, setting those with antibody levels >400 UI/ml (very high levels; N= 158) as 1, and the rest as 0 (N= 326).

Finally, in the subset of samples that was diagnosed with COVID-19 during the wave (N= 184) the associations between antibody levels and COVID-19 severity and duration were assessed with ordinal regression models, where the responses were 3-level ordinal variables, as follows. Disease severity was measured by asking in the second questionnaire whether they had no or very mild symptoms (e.g. light sore throat, nasal congestion; level 1), mild symptoms (e.g. one or two days of fever and/or light malaise, not requiring bed rest; level 2), or moderate symptoms (e.g. bed rest was required; level 3). The participants were also asked if hospitalization was required, as a 4th level, but none chose this option. As for the duration of COVID-19 symptoms (excluding loss of smell), the three levels were: one day or less (level 1), two to five days (level 2), and more than 5 days (level 3).

For all models used in step 3, potential confounding phenomena was controlled for by including in the models relevant independent variables, as follows. Age (in years, and assessed separately as a single term or polynomial) was included in all models. Also in all models, receiving a new vaccine during the wave period was included as a two-level independent variable, as those that got a booster shot within the follow-up period had changes in both the antibody levels and the vaccination scheme. The cases in which the vaccine shot was received late in the wave (after 15th February 2022; N= 7) were not used in the models that included the new shot variable. The number of known close contacts with COVID-19 cases was used as a proxy of exposure, and used for the GLMs assessing associations with COVID-19 incidence. Close contact was defined as being within 3 m distance or indoors for over 15 minutes with someone who was diagnosed with COVID-19, and the contact happened within the period that went from two days prior the onset of symptoms and seven days after the onset of symptoms. The contacts were set at 5 levels, 0, 1, 2, 3, and 4 or more close contacts with cases. Prior COVID-19 was included in models that assessed associations between vaccination status and COVID-19 incidence during the wave. Finally, the presence of co-morbidities (i.e. high blood pressure, diabetes, obesity, heart disease, chronic pulmonary disease, cancer) was included in the models assessing the influence of antibody levels on COVID-19 severity and duration. All these variables used for adjustment purposes were dropped from the models if they were not important for the model's goodness of fit, as indicated by AIC comparisons.

233

234 **Results**

235 ***Description of the sample***

236 We obtained answers to the first questionnaire and blood samples from 1455 people. Of
237 those, 57.3% were female and 43.7% were male. The mean age was 41 years old, being the
238 minimum 5 months old and the maximum 95 years old.

239 Almost three quarters (74.7%) of the participants had not been diagnosed with COVID-19 at
240 the time of answering the first questionnaire, but 2.4% of those (N= 25) suspected having been
241 infected. One quarter (24.8%) was diagnosed with COVID-19 once, and 0.4% (N= 6) twice.

242 Regarding the vaccination regime, 6.9% of the participants were not vaccinated at the time of
243 sampling, 5% had one dose, 83.6% had two doses, 4.5% had three doses and 0.07% had four
244 doses. The vaccination scheme most frequently applied in the sample was two Astra-Zeneca
245 vaccines, followed by two Sinopharm, two Sputnik V vaccines, and the combination of Spunik V
246 and Moderna. At the time of the sampling, Pfizer/BioNTech vaccines were being used for
247 youngsters aged 13 to 18 years old, having 25 participants of our study two doses, and 19 one
248 dose.

249 ***Characterisation of the acquired humoural defences prior to the Omicron-dominant wave***

250 Anti-spike IgG were detected in 88.7% (1290/1455) of the samples. Among those that received
251 at least one dose of an anti-COVID-19 vaccine, 7.4% (100/1354) did not have detectable IgG.
252 Among the non-vaccinated (N=99), 63.6% (63/99) did not have detectable antibodies. Of the
253 unvaccinated that had antibodies, 72% (26/36) had not been diagnosed with COVID-19 nor
254 suspected having been infected.

255 Almost half (48.9%) of the participants had antibody levels considered to be high (>200 UI/ml),
256 and more than one third (35.4%) had very high levels (>400 UI/ml). The overall mean antibody
257 level was 290 UI/ml, but it varied by age group (Table 1). Among the age group considered to
258 be of high risk (>60 years old), the vast majority was vaccinated (98.1%), but 17% was
259 vulnerable because they had no detectable IgG (6%) or had low antibody levels (11% with <40
260 UI/ml). However, most aged 60 and above had very high antibody levels (65% with >400
261 UI/ml). The high level of antibodies observed in those aged 13-20 is attributable to the good
262 performance of the vaccine received by that age group and the shorter time elapsed from the
263 last shot.

264 ***Antibody levels according to vaccine doses and schemes***

265 Those participants that were not vaccinated had a mean IgG titer of 62.5 UI/ml, while the
266 mean level was 287.9 UI/ml, 293.5 UI/ml, and 567.8 UI/ml for those that received one, two or
267 three doses, respectively. A third dose increased the antibody levels significantly, and there
268 was strong positive association with prior COVID-19 and a strong negative correlation with
269 days that elapsed from last exposure (vaccine or infection) (Figure 2, Table 2).

270

271 **Table 1**. Central tendency (mean and median) of antibody levels and proportion of vaccine coverage (at
272 least one shot) by age group, in samples taken from Santa Fe citizens in November and December 2021.

Age range	Sample size	Mean; Median (UI/ml)	% without antibodies	% vaccinated
0-12 years old	84	175; 12	43.4%	47.0%
13-20 years old	87	474; 499	9.0%	85.4%
21-40 years old	535	217; 82	12.2%	95.8%
41-60 years old	438	307; 223	9.5%	96.0%
> 60 years old	311	378; 408	5.9%	98.1%

273

274 **Table 2**: Lineal model assessing the association between antibody (IgG) levels and number of anti-
275 COVID-19 vaccine doses received, adjusting by prior COVID-19 diagnosis and days from last exposure
276 (vaccine or known infection). Significant terms are printed in bold.

Model = Antibody levels$^{0.5}$ ~ Vaccine doses + Vaccine doses^{2} + COVID-19 + Days from exposure.

Term	Coefficients	Standard error	P-value
Intercept	**15.6487**	**1.6665**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine doses	**-1.7496**	**1.5259**	**0.2518**
Vaccine doses^{2}	**1.2979**	**0.4477**	**0.0038**
COVID-19	**5.0559**	**0.5401**	**<0.0001**
Days from exposure	**-0.0388**	**0.0036**	**<0.0001**

Antibody levels: Titre of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike protein IgG.
Vaccine doses: number of vaccine shots received prior to the blood sample.
COVID-19: prior diagnosis of COVID-19.
Days from exposure: days elapsed from the last vaccine shot or detected infection .

277



278

279 **Figure 2**. Levels of antibodies (IgG) against SARS-CoV-2 by number of vaccine doses and prior COVID-19
280 diagnosis.

When comparing the four vaccination schemes most frequently applied while adjusting by prior COVID-19 infection and days elapsed from last exposure, we observed very significant differences in antibody levels (Table 3; Figure 3). The scheme with inactivated vaccines (Sinopharm) showed significantly lower antibody levels than all other schemes, both schemes of viral vectors (Astra-Zeneca and Sputnik V) performed similarly, and the schemes combining vector and mRNA (Sputnik V + Moderna) and two mRNA (Pfizer/BioNTech) showed the highest levels, not statistically different between them (Table 3).

Table 3: Lineal model assessing the association between antibody (IgG) levels and different anti-COVID-19 schemes, adjusting by prior COVID-19 diagnosis and days from last exposure (vaccine or known infection). PostHoc Tukey tests indicated the significant differences between vaccination schemes. Significant terms are printed in bold.

Model = Antibody levels$^{0.5}$ ~ Vaccine scheme + COVID-19 + Days from exposure.

Term	Coeficientes	Standard error	P-value
Intercept	**9.5656**	**0.6366**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine scheme (AZ+AZ)	**7.4257**	**0.5327**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine scheme (Spk+Spk)	**8.7071**	**0.5917**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine scheme (Spk+Mod)	**14.2388**	**0.6971**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine scheme (Pfi+Pfi)	**17.2906**	**1.4859**	**<0.0001**
COVID-19	**5.5569**	**0.4686**	**<0.0001**
Days from exposure	**-0.0315**	**0.0038**	**<0.0001**

Multiple Comparisons of Means: Tukey Contrasts

	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	P-value
AZ+AZ - Sph+Sph	**7.4258**	**0.5328**	**13.938**	**<0.001**
Spk+Spk - Sph+Sph	**8.7071**	**0.5917**	**14.715**	**<0.001**
Spk+Mod - Sph+Sph	**14.2388**	**0.6972**	**20.423**	**<0.001**
Pfi+Pfi - Sph+Sph	**17.2907**	**1.4860**	**11.636**	**<0.001**
Spk+Spk - AZ+AZ	1.2813	0.5698	2.249	0.147
Spk+Mod - AZ+AZ	**6.8130**	**0.6684**	**10.193**	**<0.001**
Pfi+Pfi - AZ+AZ	**9.8649**	**1.4598**	**6.758**	**<0.001**
Spk+Mod - Spk+Spk	**5.5317**	**0.7250**	**7.630**	**<0.001**
Pfi+Pfi - Spk+Spk	**8.5836**	**1.4962**	**5.737**	**<0.001**
Pfi+Pfi - Spk+Mod	3.0518	1.5270	1.999	0.246

Vaccine scheme: AZ+AZ= Astra Zeneca × 2; Spk+Spk= Sputnik V × 2; Spk+Mod= Sputnik V + Moderna; Pfi+Pfi= Pfizer/BioNTech × 2. Reference level: Sph+Sph = Sinopharm × 2.
Antibody levels: Titre of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike protein IgG.
COVID-19: prior diagnosis of COVID-19.
Days from exposure: days elapsed from the last vaccine shot or detected infection.



Figure 3. Levels of antibodies (IgG) against SARS-CoV-2 by vaccine scheme and prior COVID-19 diagnosis. Sph= Sinopharm; AZ= Astra Zeneca; Spk= Sputnik V; Mod= Moderna; Pfi= Pfizer/BioNTech

Vaccination status and COVID-19 incidence during the Omicron-dominant wave

Of the 514 participants followed up during the wave, 184 (35.8%) were diagnosed with COVID-19 between 18th December 2022 and 28th February 2022. The incidence in those that had had COVID-19 previously was also high (reinfection rate: 39/121 = 32.2%). The number of vaccine doses received prior to the arrival of Omicron did not appear to have an effect on the COVID-19 infection risk during the wave (Table 4). However, a deeper analysis taking into account age, prior COVID-19, receiving a vaccine dose during the wave, and close contact with cases, showed that the number of doses was significantly associated with infection risk in a non-linear way, as observed for the association with antibody levels (Table 2), indicating that a significant reduction in infection risk was observed only for those with 3 or more vaccine shots (Table 5). Contact with cases and vaccination during the wave were strong predictors of COVID-19 risk during the wave, and prior COVID-19 was also significantly associated (Table 5).

Table 4. COVID-19 attack rate during the Omicron-dominant wave in Santa Fe city, by number of vaccine doses received prior to the onset of the wave.

Number of vaccine doses:	**0**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
N=	41	9	405	58	1
Diagnosed with COVID-19=	15	6	146	17	0
Attack rate=	36.6%	66.7%	36.0%	29.3%	-

314 **Table 5**. Logistic regression assessing the association between COVID-19 diagnosis (yes/no) during the
315 Omicron-dominant wave and number of vaccine doses received before the wave, adjusting by age, prior
316 COVID-19, vaccine shot during the wave and number close contacts with cases. Significant terms are
317 printed in bold.

Model = COVID-19 (yes/no) ~ Age + Vaccine doses + Vaccine doses^2 + Prior COVID-19 + Contact + New vaccine shot

Term	Coeficientes	Standard error	P-value
Intercept	0.4628	0.0713	<0.0001
Age	-0.0009	0.0011	0.4330
Vaccine doses	**0.3299**	**0.0704**	**<0.0001**
Vaccine doses^2	**-0.1166**	**0.0229**	**<0.0001**
Prior COVID-19	**-0.1050**	**0.0417**	**0.0122**
Contact	**0.0896**	**0.0212**	**<0.0001**
New vaccine shot	**-0.5161**	**0.0386**	**<0.0001**

Age: in years.
Vaccine doses: number of vaccine doses received before the wave (0 - 4).
Prior COVID-19: diagnosis of COVID-19 before the Omicron-dominant wave.
Contact: number close contacts with cases during the Omicron wave.
New vaccine shot: vaccine shot during the Omicron wave.

318

319 ***Antibody levels and COVID-19 incidence during the Omicron-dominant wave***

320 There was a strong negative association between antibody levels preceding the Omicron-
321 dominant wave and COVID-19 incidence during the wave (Figure 4, Table 6 and Table S1). For
322 every 100 UI/ml increase in IgG levels, the risk of infection decreases 12%, adjusting by recent
323 vaccine shot and contact with cases (Table 6). Participants with antibody levels >400 UI/ml at
324 the onset of the wave had 67% less chances of being diagnosed with COVID-19 during the
325 wave (Table S1 in supplementary material). In addition, receiving a vaccine shot after the onset
326 of the wave and the number of close contacts with cases were strong predictors of COVID-19
327 risk in all models. A vaccine shot during the wave reduced 15-fold the probability of COVID-19
328 (Table 6). Every close contact with a case increased 71% the odds of being diagnosed with
329 COVID-19 during the wave (Table 6).

330

331 **Table 6**. Logistic regression assessing the association between COVID-19 diagnosis (yes/no) during the
332 Omicron-dominant wave and antibody levels, adjusting by vaccine shot during the wave and number
333 close contacts with cases. Significant terms are printed in bold.

Model = COVID-19 (yes/no) ~ Antibody levels + New vaccine shot + Contact

Term	Coefficients (*log-odds*)	Standard error	P-value
Intercept	0.3857	0.2050	0.0599
Antibody levels	**-0.0011**	**0.0004**	**0.0062**
New vaccine shot	**-2.7105**	**0.2661**	**<0.0001**
Contact	**0.5349**	**0.1419**	**0.0001**

Antibody levels: Titre of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike protein IgG.
New vaccine shot: vaccine shot during the Omicron wave.
Contact: number of close contacts with cases during the Omicron wave.



Figure 4. Predicted probability of COVID-19 during the Omicron-dominant wave depending on the levels of antibodies (IgG) against SARS-CoV-2 and the administration of a vaccine dose during the wave. For the simulation contact with cases was set at 1.

Antibody levels and COVID-19 severity and duration

The ordinal regression model showed that antibody levels were strongly associated with the severity of the symptoms (Table 7, Figure 5). For every 100 UI/ml increase in the IgG level, the odds of being more likely to have higher disease severity (mild or moderate symptoms versus none or very mild symptoms) decreases 34.8%, holding constant new vaccine shot, age and presence of co-morbidities. The model looking at the association between antibody levels and duration of the symptoms showed a negative trend, but not statistically significant, although borderline (p=0.05; Table S2 in supplementary material).

352 **Table 7**. Ordinal regression model assessing the association between severity of COVID-19 symptoms
353 and antibody levels, adjusting by vaccine shot during the wave, age and co-morbidities. Significant terms
354 are printed in bold.

Model = Severity ~ Antibody levels + New vaccine shot + Age + Co-morbidity.

Term	Coefficients	Standard error	P-value
Antibody levels	**-0.0019**	**0.0005**	**<0.0001**
New vaccine shot	**-1.0189**	**0.4580**	**0.0261**
Age	-0.0089	0.0112	0.4235
Co-morbidity	-0.7914	0.4744	0.0953

Severity: severity of COVID-19 symptoms; 3-level ordinal variable: very mild symptoms, mild symptoms or moderate symptoms.
Antibody levels: Titre of anti-SARS-CoV-2 spike protein IgG.
New vaccine shot: vaccine shot during the Omicron wave.
Age: in years.
Co-morbidity: conditions like high blood pressure, diabetes, obesity, heart disease, chronic pulmonary disease, cancer.

355



356

357 **Figure 5.** Levels of antibodies (IgG) against SARS-CoV-2 at the onset of the Omicron-dominant wave by
358 the severity of the symptoms when they became infected during the wave. None or very mild
359 symptoms, N= 59; mild disease, N= 69; disease that required bed rest, N= 59.

360

361 ## Discussion

362 The arrival of the variant Omicron was associated with the largest wave of COVID-19 cases in
363 Santa Fe city (Figure 1), despite immediately prior to the wave a vast majority of the citizens
364 (>90%) had been vaccinated and/or had been infected by SARS-CoV-2. Here we characterised
365 the acquired humoural defences in Santa Fe prior to the arrival of Omicron, estimating that a
366 high proportion of the population had immunological memory against COVID-19 (i.e. almost
367 90% of our sample had detectable antibodies). Moreover, about half of the participants had

368 high antibody levels (>200 UI/ml). Although the number of cases during the Omicron-dominant
369 wave was much higher than in the previous two waves, the mortality due to COVID-19 was
370 considerably lower. Before the Omicron-dominant wave, there had been 856 deaths over
371 55969 cases (case-fatality= 1.5%) in Santa Fe, and during the wave there were 54 deaths over
372 36166 cases (case-fatality= 0.15%) (official records of the Ministry of Health of Santa Fe
373 province). This 10-fold lower impact could be attributable to the high level of defences here
374 described, which is supported by the individual-level data presented, where the severity of
375 COVID-19 was lower the higher the preceding antibody levels. However, because there is
376 evidence that suggests that Omicron may be less pathogenic than previous variants (Ulloa et
377 al. 2022; Wolter et al. 2022) it is difficult to infer how much of the reduced severity is due to
378 immunological experience and how much attributable to virus evolution making new variants
379 less pathogenic (Bhattacharyya et al. 2022).

380 Antibodies provide protection either through direct obstruction of infection or through their
381 ability to leverage the immune system to eliminate pathogens. The neutralising antibody titres
382 generated in vaccine clinical trials are assumed to be correlated with protective effect and the
383 durability of the protection (He et al. 2021). Measuring antibody-mediated protection to
384 coronaviruses requires characterisation of immune responses prior to a known exposure or
385 period of risk. Such data is only available from few human challenge experiments, in which
386 volunteers were exposed to experimental infections with human coronaviruses (Huang et al.
387 2020). Some of those studies showed evidence that pre-exposure titres correlated negatively
388 with infection risk and severity (Bradburne et al. 1967; Callow 1985). More recent relevant
389 evidence comes from treatments with convalescent plasma. The efficacy of convalescent
390 plasma transfusion as a treatment for COVID-19 was found to depend on the antibody levels of
391 the plasma. Plasma with higher anti–SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody levels was associated with a
392 lower risk of death (Joyner et al. 2021). In this longitudinal study, we provide individual-level
393 real-world data linking antibody levels and protection against COVID-19 during a period of high
394 risk of exposure to an immune-escaping highly transmissible variant.

395 We found that the level of antibodies of the participants immediately prior to the arrival of
396 Omicron were strongly associated with the number of vaccine shots and the vaccine platform
397 received, and also depended markedly on prior COVID-19 diagnosis and the days elapsed since
398 last exposure (vaccine shot or infection). Those that received a third vaccine dose had much
399 higher antibody levels than participants that got 2 or less shots at the time of sampling, which
400 resulted from the booster effect already documented (Kanokudon et al. 2022). It is noteworthy
401 that in our study this large difference between the titres of 2 and 3 shots was maintained
402 when adjusting by days from the last shot.

403 Another factor that explained the variability in antibody levels in our sample was the
404 vaccination scheme. The vaccine schemes used in Argentina showed different performance in
405 terms of immunogenicity. Two inactivated vaccines (Sinopharm) conferred the lowest antibody
406 levels, and schemes that used mRNA platforms (Sputnik + Moderna or Pfizer/BioNTech × 2) the
407 highest titres, whereas both vector vaccines (Astra Zeneca × 2 or Sputnik V × 2) performed
408 between the other two schemes. This is in agreement with what was reported previously
409 (Banki et al. 2022; Kanokudon et al. 2022; Kudlay & Svistunov 2022).

Despite the strong association between vaccination status and antibody levels, an association of the former with COVID-19 incidence during the wave was only apparent when adjusting by age, prior COVID-19, number of close contacts and vaccination during the wave. When all those factors were held equal, only those with 3 doses were found to have lower chances of being diagnosed with COVID-19 during the wave. A recent study showed that the neutralization potency against Omicron was undetectable in sera from most vaccinees, except for individuals recently receiving a RNAm vaccine booster (3rd dose) (García-Beltran et al. 2022). The apparent lack of effect observed in those with 1 or 2 vaccine doses might result from the large variability in immunogenicity of the vaccines used and the strong correlation observed with days elapsed from the last vaccine shot (as those with 3 shots had been vaccinated more recently). It was documented that anti-spike IgG wane quickly (Bayart et al. 2021; Levin et al. 2021), and here we confirmed this in a real-world study and showed consequences of waning defences on disease risk and severity.

Prior studies have shown increased antibody evasion and greater breakthrough infection risk of Omicron, compared with previous variants (Hoffmann et al. 2021; Mannar et al. 2022; Hu et al. 2022). However, although reduced, the binding of IgG antibodies to the Omicron Spike antigen is maintained, and recent data suggests that extraneutralising antibodies contribute to disease control (Bartsch et al. 2022). This partial immune escape implicates that higher defence levels would be required to reduce the risk and severity of COVID-19 caused by the Omicron variant. Here we present evidence of this in real circumstances. Anti-spike IgG levels and variables that cause antibodies to rise (i.e. prior COVID-19 and a recent boost shot; Table 5) were strong drivers of COVID-19 risk and severity. Our results strongly suggest that to reduce the impact of highly transmissible and immune-escaping variants like Omicron, the acquired defences should be kept high. Therefore, booster vaccine shots anticipating or during a period of high exposure risk are highly recommended.

The results hereby presented offer an explanation to the epidemiological pattern observed in Santa Fe city during the Omicron-dominant wave. The arrival of the Omicron variant caused the largest COVID-19 epidemic experienced in Santa Fe city since the beginning of the pandemic, but the case-fatality observed was 10-fold lower than that of previous waves. The increased number of cases may be have been caused by the immune escape and high transmissibility of Omicron while the high immune defences existing in the population at the time of its arrival most likely contributed the low impact observed. Disease risk and severity was lowest in individuals with high antibody levels, which highlight the importance of maintaining high defences through vaccination in the presence of immune-escaping variants.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Agencia Santafesina de Ciencia, Tecnología e Innovación (Grant # DEMES-2020-0008). The Instituto Provincial de Estadísticas y Censos of Santa Fe province provided the random sample of households. Laboratorio Lemos, Instituto Leloir, Dr. Andrea Gamarnik and Dr. Marcelo Yanovsky donated part of the assays used in this work. Special thanks to all participants for accepting taking part in this study. To visit the selected households and collect the samples, we got assistance from Georgina Brusco, Marina Visconti,

452 Triana Rodriguez, Shirley Musio, Julieta Maldonado, María Laura Arce, María Belén Marinaro,
453 Lucía Slaboch, Lucía Jalit, Camila Maldonado, Florencia Bergogne Cis, Maira Gutierrez, Matías
454 Palmero, Karen Mendoza, Antonella Menegazzo, Rocía Gareis, Emiliano Grandoli, Ivana
455 Ondarcuhu, Camila Zlauvinen, Damián Doña, María Rocío Bustos, Eduardo Masat and Juliana
456 Torancio.

457

458 **References**

459 Bánki Z, Mateus J, Rössler A, et al. Heterologous ChAdOx1/BNT162b2 vaccination induces
460 stronger immune response than homologous ChAdOx1 vaccination: The pragmatic, multi-
461 center, three-arm, partially randomized HEVACC trial [published online ahead of print, 2022
462 May 23]. *EBioMedicine*. 2022;80:104073. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2022.104073.

463 Bartsch YC, Tong X, Kang J, et al. Omicron variant Spike-specific antibody binding and Fc
464 activity are preserved in recipients of mRNA or inactivated COVID-19 vaccines. *Sci Transl Med*.
465 2022;14(642):eabn9243. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abn9243.

466 Bayart JL, Morimont L, Closset M, et al. Confounding Factors Influencing the Kinetics and
467 Magnitude of Serological Response Following Administration of BNT162b2. *Microorganisms*.
468 2021;9(6):1340. Published 2021 Jun 21. doi:10.3390/microorganisms9061340.

469 Bhattacharyya RP, Hanage WP. Challenges in Inferring Intrinsic Severity of the SARS-CoV-2
470 Omicron Variant. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(7):e14. doi:10.1056/NEJMp2119682.

471 Bradburne AF, Bynoe ML, Tyrrell DA. Effects of a "new" human respiratory virus in
472 volunteers. *Br Med J*. 1967;3(5568):767-769. doi:10.1136/bmj.3.5568.767.

473 Beldomenico PM. Do superspreaders generate new superspreaders? A hypothesis to explain
474 the propagation pattern of COVID-19. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;96:461-463.
475 doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.05.025.

476 Callow KA. Effect of specific humoral immunity and some non-specific factors on resistance of
477 volunteers to respiratory coronavirus infection. *J Hyg (Lond)*. 1985;95(1):173-189.
478 doi:10.1017/s0022172400062410.

479 Daria S, Islam MR. The SARS-CoV-2 omicron wave is indicating the end of the pandemic phase
480 but the COVID-19 will continue. *J Med Virol*. 2022;94(6):2343-2345. doi:10.1002/jmv.27635.

481 Duong BV, Larpruenrudee P, Fang T, et al. Is the SARS CoV-2 Omicron Variant Deadlier and
482 More Transmissible Than Delta Variant?. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2022;19(8):4586.
483 Published 2022 Apr 11. doi:10.3390/ijerph19084586.

484 Garcia-Beltran WF, St Denis KJ, Hoelzemer A, et al. mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccine boosters
485 induce neutralizing immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. *Cell*. 2022;185(3):457-
486 466.e4. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.12.033.

487 He Q, Mao Q, Zhang J, et al. COVID-19 Vaccines: Current Understanding on Immunogenicity,
488 Safety, and Further Considerations. *Front Immunol*. 2021;12:669339. Published 2021 Apr 12.
489 doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.669339.

490 Hoffmann M, Krüger N, Schulz S, et al. The Omicron variant is highly resistant against antibody-
491 mediated neutralization: Implications for control of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Cell*.
492 2022;185(3):447-456.e11. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.12.032.

493 Hu J, Peng P, Cao X, et al. Increased immune escape of the new SARS-CoV-2 variant of concern
494 Omicron. *Cell Mol Immunol*. 2022;19(2):293-295. doi:10.1038/s41423-021-00836-z.

495 Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, et al. A systematic review of antibody mediated
496 immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and association with
497 severity. *Nat Commun*. 2020;11(1):4704. Published 2020 Sep 17. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-
498 18450-4.

499 Joyner MJ, Carter RE, Senefeld JW, et al. Convalescent Plasma Antibody Levels and the Risk of
500 Death from Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(11):1015-1027. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2031893.

501 Kanokudom S, Assawakosri S, Suntronwong N, et al. Safety and Immunogenicity of the Third
502 Booster Dose with Inactivated, Viral Vector, and mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines in Fully Immunized
503 Healthy Adults with Inactivated Vaccine. *Vaccines (Basel)*. 2022;10(1):86. Published 2022 Jan 6.
504 doi:10.3390/vaccines10010086.

505 Kudlay D, Svistunov A. COVID-19 Vaccines: An Overview of Different Platforms. *Bioengineering*
506 *(Basel)*. 2022;9(2):72. Published 2022 Feb 12. doi:10.3390/bioengineering9020072.

507 Levin EG, Lustig Y, Cohen C, et al. Waning Immune Humoral Response to BNT162b2 Covid-19
508 Vaccine over 6 Months. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(24):e84. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2114583.

509 Mannar D, Saville JW, Zhu X, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant: Antibody evasion and cryo-EM
510 structure of spike protein-ACE2 complex. *Science*. 2022;375(6582):760-764.
511 doi:10.1126/science.abn7760.

512 Ojeda DS, Gonzalez Lopez Ledesma MM, Pallarés HM, et al. Emergency response for evaluating
513 SARS-CoV-2 immune status, seroprevalence and convalescent plasma in Argentina. *PLoS*
514 *Pathog*. 2021;17(1):e1009161. Published 2021 Jan 14. doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1009161.

515 Tian D, Sun Y, Xu H, Ye Q. The emergence and epidemic characteristics of the highly mutated
516 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant. *J Med Virol*. 2022;94(6):2376-2383. doi:10.1002/jmv.27643.

517 Ulloa AC, Buchan SA, Daneman N, Brown KA. Estimates of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant
518 Severity in Ontario, Canada. *JAMA*. 2022;327(13):1286-1288. doi:10.1001/jama.2022.2274.

519 Wolter N, Jassat W, Walaza S, et al. Early assessment of the clinical severity of the SARS-CoV-2
520 omicron variant in South Africa: a data linkage study. *Lancet*. 2022;399(10323):437-446.
521 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(22)00017-4.