Evolution of long-term hybrid immunity in healthcare workers after different COVID-19 vaccination regimens: a longitudinal observational cohort study

Shona C. Moore[1]*, Barbara Kronsteiner[2,3]*, Stephanie Longet[4,5]*, Sandra Adele*[2,3], Alexandra S. Deeks[2,6], Chang Liu[5], Wanwisa Dejnirattisai[5,7], Laura Silva Reyes[8], Naomi Meardon[9], Sian Faustini[10], Saly Al-Taei[10], Tom Tipton[4,5], Luisa M Hering[1], Adrienn Angyal[11], Rebecca Brown[11], Alexander R Nicols[12], Susan L Dobson[1], Piyada Supasa[5], Aekkachai Tuekprakhon[5], Andrew Cross[13], Jessica K Tyerman[12], Hailey Hornsby[11], Irina Grouneva[11], Megan Plowright[9,11], Peijun Zhang[11], Thomas A.H. Newman[9,11], Jeremy M. Nell[14], Priyanka Abraham[2,3], Mohammad Ali[2,3], Tom Malone[2], Isabel Neale[2,3], Eloise Phillips[2], Joseph D. Wilson[2, 6,15], Adrian Shields[10,16], Emily C. Horner[17], Lucy H. Booth[17], Lizzie Stafford[5], Sagida Bibi[8], Daniel G. Wootton[1,13,18], Alexander J. Mentzer[5,6], Christopher P. Conlon[3,5], Katie Jeffery[6,19], Philippa C. Matthews[2,20,21,22], Andrew J. Pollard[5,8,23], Anthony Brown[2], Sarah L. Rowland-Jones[9,11], Juthathip Mongkolsapaya[5,24], Rebecca P. Payne[12], Christina Dold[8,23], Teresa Lambe[8,24], James E.D. Thaventhiran[17], Gavin Screaton[5,24], Eleanor Barnes[2,6,23,25], Susan Hopkins[26,27,28], Victoria Hall[26,28], Christopher JA Duncan[12,14]†, Alex Richter[10,16]†, Miles Carroll[4,5]†, , Thushan I. de Silva[9,11]†, Paul Klenerman[2,6,23,25]†^, Susanna Dunachie[2,3,6,29]†, Lance Turtle[1,13,]†^ on behalf of the PITCH Consortium+

1. NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections, Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, UK
2. Peter Medawar Building for Pathogen Research, Nuffield Dept. of Clinical Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
3. Oxford Centre For Global Health Research, Nuffield Dept. of Clinical Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
4. Pandemic Sciences Institute, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
5. Wellcome Centre for Human Genetics, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
6. Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Oxford, UK
7. Division of Emerging Infectious Disease, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand
8. Oxford Vaccine Group, Department of Paediatrics, University of Oxford, UK
9. Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Sheffield, UK
10. Institute for Immunology and Immunotherapy, College of Medical and Dental Science, University of Birmingham, UK
11. Department of Infection, Immunity and Cardiovascular Disease, University of Sheffield, UK
12. Translational and Clinical Research Institute, Immunity and Inflammation Theme, Newcastle University, UK
13. Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK
14. Department of Infection and Tropical Medicine, Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK
15. Oxford University Medical School, Medical Sciences Division, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
16. University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK
17. MRC Toxicology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

18. Institute of Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, University of Liverpool, UK
19. Radcliffe Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, UK
20. The Francis Crick Institute, London, UK
21. Division of Infection and Immunity, University College London, London, UK
22. Department of Infectious Diseases, University College London Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK
23. NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
24. Chinese Academy of Medical Science (CAMS) Oxford Institute (COI), University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
25. Translational Gastroenterology Unit, University of Oxford, UK
26. UK Health Security Agency, London, UK
27. Faculty of Medicine, Department of Infectious Disease, Imperial College London, UK
28. NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infection and Antimicrobial Resistance, University of Oxford, UK
29. Mahidol-Oxford Tropical Medicine Research Unit, Bangkok, Thailand

*These authors contributed equally
†Senior Author
^Corresponding authors:
Lance Turtle, Ronald Ross Building, Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and Immunology, University of Liverpool, 8 West Derby Street, L69 7BE.
lance.turtle@liverpool.ac.uk
Paul Klenerman, Peter Medawar Building for Pathogen Research, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3SY, UK. paul.klenerman@ndm.ox.ac.uk

Secondary Author List
Hibatullah Abuelgasim, Emily Adland, Zahra Ahmed, Hossain Delowar Akther, Ahmed Alhussni, Ali Amini, M. Azim Ansari, Rachel Anslow, Carolina V. Arancibia-Cárcamo, Ana Atti, James Austin, Angela Bailey, Martin Bayley, Alice Bridges-Webb, Helen Brown, Jeremy Chalk, Meera Chand , Anu Chawla, Senthil Chinnakannan, Elizabeth Clutterbuck, Debbie Cross, Jospeh Cutteridge, Catherine de Lara, Sophie Davies, Lucy Denly, Ben Diffey, Stavros Dimitriadis, Thomas M Drake, Timothy Donnison, Maeva Dupont, Elena Efstathiou, David Eyre, Alex Fairman, Sarah Foulkes, John Frater, Siobhan Gardiner, Javier Gilbert-Jarmillo, Philip Goulder, Jessica Gregory, Fatima Mariam Ilyas, Carl-Philipp Hackstein, Sophie Hambleton, Muzlifah Haniffa, Helen, Hanson, Jenny Haworth, Carole Hays, Jennifer Holmes, Jasmin Islam, Anni Jämsén, Chris Jones, Geraldine Jones, Mwila Kasanyinga, Sinead Kelly, Rosemary Kirk, Michael L. Knight, Allan Lawrie, Lian Lee, Lauren Lett, Katy Lillie, Nicholas Lim, Alison Lye, Chloe Matthewman, Spyridoula Marinou, Jessica McNeill, Gracie Mead, Hema Mehta, Haniffa Muzlifah, Christopher Norman, Denise O'Donnell, Ane Ogbe, Juyeon Park, Brendan A. I. Payne, Gareth Platt, Sonia Poolan, Nicholas Provine, Narayan Ramamurthy, Rachel Whitham, Nichola Robinson, Leigh Romaniuk, Patpong Rongkard, Ayoub Saei, Oliver L. Sampson, Donal Skelly, Jarmila S. Spegarova, Gareth Stephens, Emily Stephenson, Rachel Stimpson, Kris Subramaniam, Chloe Tanner, Lydia J. Taylor, Chitra Tejpal, Sarah Thomas, Neall Townsend, Simon Travis, Nicola Trewick, Stephanie Tucker, Helena Turton, Zara Valiji, Adam Watson, Lisa Watson, Esme Weeks, Jane Willson, Barbara Wilson, Robert Wilson, Steven Wood, Rachel Wright, Huiyuan Xiao, Amira A. T. Zawia

Abstract

Both infection and vaccination, alone or in combination, generate antibody and T cell responses against SARS-CoV-2. However, the maintenance of such responses – and hence protection from disease – requires careful characterisation. In a large prospective study of UK healthcare workers (Protective immunity from T cells in Healthcare workers (PITCH), within the larger SARS-CoV-2 immunity & reinfection evaluation (SIREN) study) we previously observed that prior infection impacted strongly on subsequent cellular and humoral immunity induced after long and short dosing intervals of BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech) vaccination. Here, we report longer follow up of 684 HCWs in this cohort over 6-9 months following two doses of BNT162b2 or AZD1222 (Oxford/AstraZeneca) vaccination and following a subsequent BNT162b2 booster vaccination. We make three observations: Firstly, the dynamics of humoral and cellular responses differ; binding and neutralising antibodies declined whereas T and memory B cell responses were maintained after the second vaccine dose. Secondly, vaccine boosting restored IgG levels, broadened neutralising activity against variants of concern including omicron BA.1, and further boosted T cell responses. Thirdly, prior infection maintained its impact driving larger as well as broader T cell responses compared to never-infected people – a feature maintained even after the third dose. In conclusion, broadly cross-reactive T cell responses are well maintained over time – especially in those with "hybrid" vaccine and infection-induced immunity – and may contribute to continued protection against severe disease.

INTRODUCTION

As vaccines have been deployed to tackle the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, crucial questions have emerged regarding long-term maintenance of protective immunity against disease. The appearance of viral variants leading to successive waves of infection has clearly shown the limits of vaccine protection against infection (UK Health Security Agency, 2022). Despite this, vaccine protection against severe disease has been well maintained across the recent delta (Tartof et al., 2021) and omicron BA.1 (Andrews et al., 2022) waves. To understand the underlying immune responses that determine these population-level observations, large-scale studies of individuals with high exposure to SARS-CoV-2, such as health care workers (HCWs), can provide valuable insights as has been demonstrated by the SARS-CoV-2 immunity & reinfection evaluation (SIREN) study in the UK (Hall et al., 2022; Hall et al., 2021a; Hall et al., 2021b). Protective Immunity from T Cells in Healthcare workers (PITCH), a study aligned closely with SIREN, is focused on the longitudinal analysis of antiviral T and B cell responses after infection and/or vaccination with BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech) or AZD1222 (Oxford/AstraZeneca). PITCH has already provided data indicating that the extended interval vaccine regimen for BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine deployed in the UK was associated with enhanced antibody and $CD4^+$ T cell helper responses (Payne et al., 2021). All immune responses were strongly enhanced by prior SARS-CoV-2 infection.

The long-term impacts of prior exposure, vaccine regimen and vaccine type have not been fully defined, especially at the level of T cell responses. Characterising the response to vaccines and infections in healthy people is essential to determine future vaccination policies, while identification of vulnerable non-responders can inform additional interventions such as extra booster doses of vaccine and/or monoclonal antibody therapies. Correlations with protection from infection at a population level have been observed for binding (Earle et al., 2021; Gilbert et al., 2022) and neutralising antibodies (Addetia et al.; Feng et al., 2021; Gilbert et al., 2022; Khoury et al., 2021; Moore et al., 2021). The role of other, non-neutralising antibody functions, such as antibody-dependent NK cell activity, antibody-dependent phagocytosis or complement deposition, requires further investigation (Ewer et al., 2021; Kaplonek et al., 2022a; Tomic et al., 2022). However, monitoring of SARS-CoV-2 specific T cell immunity is also essential, as T cell defence is potentially a key explanation for lower case hospitalisation and mortality for omicron variant compared with earlier variants (Nyberg et al., 2022), despite omicron's high mortality in unvaccinated populations (Mefsin et al., 2022). T cells are a cornerstone of antiviral defence, orchestrating the immune response including cytotoxic activity against virally infected cells and optimising production of antibodies from B cells (Sette and Crotty, 2021). Macaque (McMahan et al., 2021) and human (Kedzierska and Thomas, 2022; Molodtsov et al., 2022; Rydyznski Moderbacher et al., 2020) studies support this key role for T cells in protection against the severe effects of SARS-CoV-2 infection, potentially alongside functional antibody properties beyond neutralisation (Bartsch Yannic et al.; Kaplonek et al., 2022b). In some cases cross-

reactive T cells are associated with protection against infection in exposed seronegative groups (Kundu et al., 2022). There is also evidence of SARS-CoV-2 specific cell responses in highly exposed HCW without seroconversion (Ogbe et al., 2021), and expansion of pre-existing RNA-polymerase-specific T cells in seronegative SARS-CoV-2 infection (Swadling et al., 2022).

There is a body of emerging data on the waning of antibody responses, especially after the shorter dose interval regimen for BNT162b2 (Goldberg et al., 2021; Naaber et al., 2021). Waning of antibody is associated with loss of protection against infection (Hall et al., 2022; Wei et al., 2022), whereas protection against severe disease is relatively well maintained (Andrews et al., 2022; Carazo et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2022; Rosenberg et al., 2021; Tartof et al., 2021; UK Health Security Agency, 2022). T cell responses to spike protein post vaccination do not correlate strongly with binding or neutralising antibody responses (Payne et al., 2021). Importantly, whilst antibodies generated in response to vaccination neutralise omicron much less well than the ancestral strain (Dejnirattisai et al., 2022; Schmidt et al., 2021), the T cell response to SARS-CoV-2 is minimally impacted by mutations in the alpha, beta, gamma and delta variants of concern (Payne et al., 2021; Skelly et al., 2021), and 75-85% preserved against the omicron BA.1 variant (De Marco et al., 2021; Gao et al., 2022; GeurtsvanKessel Corine et al., 2022; Keeton et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022; Madelon et al., 2022; Tarke et al., 2022). Given that at this point in the pandemic, public health decisions are increasingly being made around limiting severe disease rather than preventing milder infections in the community, having robust data at scale that indicates the trajectory of the T cell responses after different vaccine regimens is of increasing value. Clearly the impact of subsequent vaccine dosing on T and B cell responses is additionally a key focus in such decision making.

We previously observed higher anti-spike binding and neutralising antibodies responses and lower spike-specific T cell magnitude but increased IL2 production one month after second dose when BNT162b2 was delivered with a longer dosing interval (median 10 weeks) compared to the licensed shorter (3-4 weeks) interval (Payne et al., 2021). This has been reported in an elderly population (Parry et al., 2022), and the antibody findings have been confirmed in the larger SIREN cohort (Otter et al., 2022). Evidence of improved vaccine effectiveness with a longer dose interval was reported in a study of two Canadian provinces (Skowronski et al., 2022).

Our objective was to explore the characteristics of adaptive and humoral immunity following two or three vaccine doses, considering the longer-term impacts of regimen variation, vaccine type (including the Oxford-AZ ChadOx1-based vaccine) and infection over time. In the present study, we observed a long-term impact of prior infection even after two doses of vaccine, which is consistent with protection documented in SIREN (Hall et al., 2022). We see no decline in T cell responses over time regardless of vaccine regimen — this contrasts with waning of both binding and neutralising antibody (NAb) titres, which remained strongest and broadest in the long

interval BNT162b2 group. The third dose of vaccine minimised differences seen between vaccine regimens after two doses and reduced the impact of prior infection on binding antibody responses. Overall, the data indicate a stable pool of T cell memory is induced and maintained across vaccine types/regimens, consistent with the sustained impact of vaccination with or without prior infection in protection against severe disease.

RESULTS

Participants vaccinated with a primary course and a booster dose of COVID vaccine
We studied 684 participants who had been vaccinated with a primary course of COVID-19 vaccine between 9th December 2020 and 23rd May 2021 (Table 1 and Figure 1). In total, 592 participants received a primary course of BNT162b2 vaccine (Pfizer), of whom 84 participants received the second dose of BNT162b2 vaccine after a short (3-5 week, median 24 days) interval, and 508 participants received the second dose of BNT162b2 vaccine after an extended (6-17 week, median 71 days) interval (Payne et al., 2021). 92 participants received a primary course of AZD1222 vaccine administered with an interval of 7-23 weeks (median 74 days). The median age of all participants was 43 (range 22-77), and 73.8% of participants were female as in our previous reports from this cohort, and the wider SIREN study, reflecting the demographic of healthcare workers in the UK.

Symptomatic infection and asymptomatic anti-nucleocapsid (N) seroconversion was common during the study period
During follow up of this cohort (May 2021 to March 2022), some participants became infected during the SARS-CoV-2 waves of delta and omicron BA.1 (Table 1). This included 33 participants with known infection (typically symptomatic) detected by a positive PCR assay. 49 participants who did not report any SARS-CoV-2 infection (no positive PCR, lateral flow test or symptoms) had evidence of asymptomatic infection between 1 and 6 months after the second vaccine, reflected by N antibody seroconversion detected in the 6 month sample. As a result, we ended up with exactly half the cohort (342 participants) remaining who met the definition of infection-naïve.

Participants with evidence of infection between the 1-month and 6-month post dose 2 sampling timepoints (infection during the study) had similar T cell responses to those with previous infection at the time of their first vaccine dose (Figure S2). Spike IgG measured by MSD was lower in those infected during the study compared with those infected before vaccination, but was higher than naïve participants. In this report, participants with previous infection were therefore analysed as one group (“hybrid immunity”) regardless of when the infection occurred.

Magnitude of T cell IFNγ ELISpot responses is greatest following BNT162b2 short dose interval at six months and is augmented by previous infection

In infection-naïve participants, at 6 months post vaccine dose 2, there was no significant difference in the T cell response by IFNγ ELISpot assay between the three primary vaccine groups, although there was a trend towards those who received BNT162b2 vaccine with a short interval (median 3 weeks) having higher T cell responses than those groups who were vaccinated with a BNT162b2 long interval (median 10 weeks), or the group vaccinated with AZD1222 (Figure 2A). This difference was significant for the BNT162b2 short and long interval groups 1 month after the second dose (Payne et al., 2021). Spike-specific T cell responses 6 months after vaccination were considerably greater in all groups than the historical median responses we observed using the same assay in this cohort pre-vaccination in 2020 (Tomic et al., 2022) six months after wave 1 infection (44 SFU/$10^{6,}$ IQR 1-107).

For anti-spike binding antibody responses, levels were higher for BNT162b2 recipients than AZD1222 recipients irrespective of the dosing interval (Figure 2B). A similar pattern was apparent for RBD antibody (Figure 2C). As we observed at 1 month post second dose, T cell and antibody responses were greater in magnitude in those who were previously infected at any point before the 6-month post second dose sample was collected (Figure 2A-C). T cell responses against M and N were, as expected, higher in those with previous infection, and correlated with N antibody levels (Figure 2D).

One month after a booster (third) vaccine, IFNγ ELISpot T cell responses are equivalent in all groups irrespective of primary vaccine regimen

Over the 6-month period following the second vaccine dose, T cell IFNγ responses were well maintained, with modest falls which did not reach statistical significance, and were typically boosted after the third dose (Figure 3A,D,G). This boost was statistically significant in previously infected individuals in the BNT162b2 long interval (Figure 3D) and the AZD1222 group (Figure 3G). By 1 month after the third vaccine dose, all three groups had equivalent T cell IFNγ responses (Figure 3J).

Infection leads to boosting of IFNγ ELISpot T cell responses following all vaccine regimens

Spike-specific T-cell responses for all three regimens were boosted following previous infection compared to infection naïve, although this was not significant for the AZD1222 group. T cell responses were still higher 1 month post dose 3 in those who had been previously infected with SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 3M). M and N responses were not affected by vaccination (Supplementary Figure S3A-C).

Humoral responses wane quickly but are boosted by third dose vaccination

After the second vaccine dose, antibody responses decreased sharply, with the median SARS-CoV-2 spike binding IgG titre (MSD) decreasing between 3 and 7-fold in all groups of vaccine recipients by 6 months (Figure 3B, E and H). Naive participants who received AZD1222 had lower spike antibody titres post second dose than those receiving BNT162b2 regimens, but these titres were then boosted

25-fold by the third (BNT162b2 mRNA) vaccine dose. One month after the third dose, spike antibody IgG binding levels in all BNT162b2 recipients increased back to similar levels as were measured one month post dose 2 (Figure 3K and N). Titres in the AZD1222 group one month post dose 3 were 8-fold higher in naïve participants and 2-fold higher in previously infected participants than they were one month post dose 2 (Figure 3H). After the third dose, there was no significant difference in the magnitude of the spike binding IgG response between vaccine regimens (Figure 3K). Overall a subtle (1.37-fold) significant increase in spike IgG remained between previously infected and naïve participants one month after the third dose (Figure 3N). The RBD binding response followed the same pattern as the total spike response (Supplementary Figure S3D-F) and N antibody titres were unchanged by vaccination (Supplementary Figure S3G-I).

Memory B cell responses were measured by IgG ELISpot in a subset of 106 participants (Figure 3C,F, I). In the BNT162b2 long interval group, 6 months after the second dose, memory B cell frequencies were similar between naïve and previously infected participants, and, importantly, these responses were preserved, with no statistically significant difference from one month post second dose in any vaccine group. Previously infected participants had higher memory B cell frequencies one month after the second vaccine dose than naïve individuals, but this difference had evened out by one month after the third dose (Fig 3L, O), (unlike the T cell IFNγ response, where there was still an advantage in those previously infected). The other groups followed similar trends though lacked sufficient numbers for statistical testing.

These data indicate that although antibody levels decline between the second and third vaccine doses, T and B cell responses are well maintained across this period. Previous infection incurred an advantage in terms of the magnitude of the response for T cells at all timepoints, including after the third vaccine dose. The third vaccine dose boosted immunity back to previous levels, or greater, with a tendency to even out any earlier differences.

The antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 broadens after the third vaccine dose including enhanced neutralisation activity against omicron BA.1

Despite the differences between the vaccine groups in binding antibody 6 months after the second dose (Figure 2B), there was no difference in neutralisation capacity of sera from these participants against the ancestral Victoria strain (Figure 4A). Neutralisation titres were lower against delta and lower still against omicron BA.1 compared with Victoria, as previously described (Dejnirattisai et al., 2022; Schmidt et al., 2021). The BNT162b2 long interval group had higher neutralising titres against delta than the short interval group, as they did 28 days after the second dose (Payne et al., 2021). Using a surrogate neutralisation assay on the MSD platform, which measures inhibition of spike-ACE2 binding, we measured neutralisation of a wider range of variants. Here, we saw more statistically significant differences with the BNT162b2 long interval group having higher antibody titres than the other groups

(Figure 4B). Although there was a trend for higher titres in the BNT162b2 short group compared to the AZD1222 group, this did not reach significance. The surrogate neutralisation assay showed a good correlation with the live virus focus reduction neutralisation assay for Victoria, delta and omicron variants (Supplementary Figure S4).

After the third dose of vaccine, neutralisation capacity against both the delta and omicron BA.1 variants increased. Our previous report in this cohort demonstrated that the neutralisation of omicron BA.1 was significantly higher 28 days after three doses of BNT162b2 compared to 28 days after 2 doses (Dejnirattisai et al., 2022). No differences were observed between vaccine groups after the third dose (Figure 4C). These differences also evened out in the ACE2 inhibition assay, though there was some saturation of the assay (Figure 4D). Therefore, although the overall level of binding antibody did not increase between 28 days after the second and 28 days after the third dose (Figure 3E), the neutralisation capacity of the antibody response broadened, and the gap between groups closed (Figure 4E). Thus, we observed a higher quality of response after the third dose, paralleling what has been seen for clinical effectiveness of a booster dose against omicron.

Polyfunctional T cell responses are detectable six months after vaccination, with enhancement in previously infected individuals

T cell responses measured by intracellular cytokine staining (ICS) were lower at 6 months post second dose in AZD1222 vaccinated participants compared to BNT162b2 recipients (Figure 5A), in line with the ELISpot findings. T cell function was similar between the two BNT162b2 groups, and there was less IL-2 and TNF made by the AZD1222 group (Figure 5A). $CD8^+$ T cells made a substantial fraction of the IFNγ, at least half on average (Figure 5B), with a trend to more in the AZD1222 group, as known for chimpanzee adenovirus vectored vaccines (Barnes et al., 2012). Very little IL-2 was made by $CD8^+$ T cells; the overwhelming majority of the IL-2 response came from $CD4^+$ T cells on a per individual basis, irrespective of vaccination regimen (Figure 5C). All groups of participants made polyfunctional T cell responses, but the AZD122 vaccinated naive participants had fewer triple IFNγ/IL-2/TNF positive cells than either BNT162b2 vaccinated group (Figure 5D).

These differences in $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cell responses between vaccine regimens were not seen in those previously infected, who uniformly had polyfunctional responses detectable.

CD4+ and CD8+ proliferation responses to SARS-CoV2 spike are higher in previously infected participants

We also assess responses using T cell proliferation, which represents an assay more biased towards central memory responses than IFNγ assays. T cell proliferation to spike was higher in previously infected compared to naïve individuals with a 4-fold and up to 8-fold increase in the median responses of $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T

cells respectively (Figure 6A, B and D), thus confirming the enduring increase in cellular memory conferred by infection combined with vaccination. The magnitude of proliferative responses to spike was comparable between $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells across all vaccine groups except the naïve BNT162b2 short interval group where $CD4^+$ responses were significantly greater than their $CD8^+$ counterpart (median 6.5%, IQR 3.2-14.9% versus median 3.1%, IQR 1.4-8.4%, p=0.0426). As expected, responses to M and N were absent in the majority of naïve individuals (Figure 6C, E) with only one sample per vaccination regimen showing slightly elevated $CD4^+$ T cell proliferation (3-11%) which was not explained by N seroconversion (Figure 6C). We did not find any significant differences between vaccination regimens in the naïve or previously infected groups.

Cross reactive T and B cell responses to the omicron variant are preserved compared to ancestral variant after second and third vaccine doses

We investigated the effect of the third vaccine dose on T cell and B cell responses to omicron BA.1, in recognition of reduced vaccine effectiveness against infection with omicron variant but a preserved effect against severe disease. Unlike neutralising antibody responses, which were much lower for omicron BA.1 6 months after the second dose (Figure 4A), and lower but with the gap narrowed after the third dose (Figure 4B), T cell and B cell ELISpot responses were much less impacted (Figure 7A-F). For T cells, the proportion of ancestral variant responses that were relatively preserved for omicron BA.1 was very high 6 months after the second dose (median 94%, IQR 75-110), and 1 month after a third dose, (median 90%, IQR 70-104), although the difference between ancestral strain and omicron was significant by Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank test. Analysis of T cell ELISpot responses comparing only the peptides impacted by mutations did reveal a drop (Figure 7C, median 53%, IQR 22 - 75), but this was not enough to have an impact on the T cell response for all of spike. For B cells, responses to omicron BA.1 were lower compared to the ancestral strain 1 month after the second dose (median 59% omicron relative to ancestral variant, IQR 56-67, p=0.0005), 6 months after the second dose (median 57% IQR 45-64, p<0.0001) and 1 month after a third dose, (median 69% IQR 58-78, p<0.0001) (Figure 7D-F). This still represents a relative preservation of B cell immunity, compared to the absolute loss of neutralising antibodies to omicron after two vaccines (Figure 4A and B).

We also measured the effect of omicron on the cytokine profile of T cells by ICS. Similar to the results using ancestral spike sequence, at 6 months post second dose, T cells made multiple cytokines in response to omicron BA.1 (Supplementary Figure S5A-C). The total proportion of the IFNγ response in $CD4^+$ cells dropped slightly (Figure S5D). As before, $CD4^+$ T cell responses in AZD1222 recipients were generally lower compared to BNT162b2 recipients, and IL-2 responses in $CD8^+$ T cells were small. In addition, the proliferative responses of $CD8^+$ T cells from previously infected individuals to omicron BA.1 spike was significantly lower compared to ancestral spike (Figure S5G, median 12.1%, IQR 5.5-25.3% versus

median 20.9%, IQR 7.4-28.1%, p=0.026) with no changes observed for $CD4^+$ T cell proliferation (Figure S5D and F). Overall, T and B cell responses to the omicron BA.1 variant were well preserved, compared with antibody responses.

DISCUSSION

Our study reports robust immunity to SARS-CoV-2 spike including to the omicron BA.1 variant for all three primary vaccine regimens - BNT162b2 with a short (3-4 week) dosing interval, BNT162b2 with a long (6-17 week) dosing interval, and AZD1222 – following boosting with BNT162b2. Over the course of the COVID-19 pandemic, vaccines have significantly reduced the link between the number of infections with SARS-CoV-2, and the numbers of hospital admissions and deaths due to COVID-19. Although there has been continual evolution of viral variants, which have evaded the antibody response to varying degrees (Harvey et al., 2021), vaccines have retained more effectiveness against severe disease than against overall infection (Andrews et al., 2022; Tartof et al., 2022; UK Health Security Agency, 2022). Emerging evidence implicates T cells as one potential mechanism for this protection, perhaps in addition to non-neutralising antibody functions (Bartsch Yannic et al.; Kaplonek et al., 2022b). The presence of both T cell and antibody responses gives the greatest protection from infection (Molodtsov et al., 2022) and from death in severe disease (Rydyznski Moderbacher et al., 2020), an observation that is also supported by studies in a macaque model (McMahan et al., 2021).

Here, in a cohort of participants which overlaps with the SIREN study - in which vaccine effectiveness has been shown (Hall et al., 2022), we have observed robust responses across different SARS-CoV-2 variants from a third dose of COVID vaccine. However, these responses have different dynamics: binding and neutralising antibodies wane over the 6 months following the second dose, whereas B and T cell ELISpot responses wane much less over that interval. At 6 months post second dose, T cells secrete multiple cytokines and proliferate, indicating a broad range of memory function is retained by these cells. In addition, T cell responses are higher 6 months after vaccination in uninfected participants than they were in unvaccinated HCW 6 months after wave 1 infection in 2020, in a previous study of this cohort, (Tomic et al., 2022).

The third vaccine dose boosted all responses; the relative magnitude of the boost of T cell response was smaller, due to this response having waned much less post second dose meaning the proportional response increase is smaller. However, the T cell response was, on average, higher post third dose than one month post second dose, whereas the binding antibody response was not. Despite this observation, the neutralising capacity of the antibody response post third dose was much greater. In combination with earlier observations (which overlap with this cohort) (Dejnirattisai et al., 2022), this suggests that overall binding antibody levels do not change with the third dose compared with the second dose, but that the quality of the antibody

response improves. Given the B cell response also declined less in the 6 months after second vaccination than did the neutralising antibody response, presumably many of these cells make antibody which binds, but does not neutralise, the virus.

Participants who have been infected with SARS-CoV-2 at any time maintained an advantage in the magnitude of their response at all time points in the study. Importantly, there was still a benefit of the third dose of vaccination detectable for this group, although this was predominantly for T cells. Along with greater immunogenicity in this previously infected group, vaccine effectiveness is also higher in the same cohort (Hall et al., 2022). We could also still detect an influence of the dose interval of BNT162b2 vaccine at 6 months after vaccination. However, after the third vaccine dose, these differences had largely evened out and were no longer significant between the groups. T cell and antibody responses to spike were lower 6 months after primary vaccination course for AZD1222 compared to either BNT162b2 dosing regimen, compatible with previous reports for antibodies (Wall et al., 2021; Ward et al., 2022) and lower vaccine effectiveness against infection (UK Health Security Agency, 2022), although vaccine effectiveness against hospitalisation is well preserved. After the AZ-primed recipients received a heterologous boost with BNT162b2, robust and similar cellular and antibody immunity including against omicron BA.1 variant was seen for all three regimens studied.

The third dose gave a broad immune response which could recognise all the variants tested. T cell responses were less impacted by viral variants that antibodies, likely due to the wider range of epitopes available to T cells compared with antibodies, where protective responses are more focussed. Our findings are in line with those of others, who have also observed that antibodies decline more rapidly than T cell responses (Zhang et al., 2022).

Our study has a number of limitations. (i) As with other HCW studies, our cohort has a female majority and is predominantly in people reporting white ethnicity. We have not observed any impact of sex or ethnicity in this study or our previous reports (Angyal et al., 2021; Payne et al., 2021). (ii) The longitudinal cohort does not include never-vaccinated participants, because all the HCWs engaged with our studies across six sites took up vaccination. However, we have been able to compare responses six months after vaccination (in 2021) with historical data using the same assay in a subset of the same cohort in 2020, six months after wave 1 (ancestral strain) infection before vaccine were available (Tomic et al., 2022) and demonstrate that vaccine-induced responses in infection-naïve HCWs are higher than infection-induced responses. (iii) We were not able to perform all assays on all participants at all timepoints, due to lack of sample availability, missed follow up visits, and/or laboratory capacity. This means that not all our data are longitudinal, though many are. To account for this, we have used unpaired testing in all our comparisons. (iv) We only performed neutralising antibody measurements on naïve participants due to the labour intensity and interpretation requiring matching with infecting variant strain

and this information was limited. (v) We defined previous infection in participants as previously testing PCR positive for SARS-CoV-2, or seroconversion to anti-N positivity during the study. However, some of the group labelled as naïve could have been exposed to SARS-CoV-2, and anti-N seroconversion is less likely in vaccinated people and differs between variants (Follmann et al., 2022; Whitaker et al., 2021). (vi) For people with vaccine breakthrough infections since the second vaccine dose, infecting sequence data was not always available. However, we know that the majority of this report covers a period in time when delta was the predominant variant, with 68% and 88% of the sampling complete for this study by 1st December 2021 and 1st January 2022 respectively.

In summary, we have observed that SARS-CoV-2 specific cellular immune responses are better maintained compared to antibodies in the 6 months following the second dose of COVID-19 vaccine. The third dose of vaccine confers a measurable benefit to these responses irrespective of the primary course, including in people who have previously been infected, who also therefore stand to benefit from a third dose. The third dose also induces better antibody recognition of SARS-CoV-2 variants, including omicron BA.1. Despite public concern about loss of immunity over time post infection and/or vaccines, we find ample evidence of strong and durable immunity and memory responses that are likely to sustain protection against severe COVID-19 long term. Further booster vaccinations are of the most importance for protecting against infections in the clinically vulnerable, with short-lived benefit but potential for critical reduction in hospitalisation rates in people with the co-factors of comorbidity and SARS-CoV-2 infection. People with immune compromise are now receiving fourth or even fifth vaccine doses in UK and other countries, and parallel studies of durability of immunity in such populations are needed. The role of further booster vaccines for HCWs requires onward longitudinal follow-up of this cohort and others, but prevention of infection in HCWs continues to be desirable to minimise infection-related absence, nosocomial transmission and risks of Long COVID. Our findings allow establishment of the dynamics of the immune response post infection and vaccination in a healthy population of working age, which can then be used as a benchmark for evaluating immunity in vulnerable groups, and provides the first glimpse of evolving “hybrid immunity” driven by ongoing viral exposure in vaccinated populations.

METHODS

Study design and sample collection

In this prospective, observational, cohort study, participants were recruited into the PITCH study from across six centres (Birmingham, Cambridge, Liverpool, Newcastle, Oxford and Sheffield). Individuals consenting to participate were recruited by word of mouth, hospital e-mail communications and from hospital-based staff screening programmes for SARS-CoV-2, including HCWs enrolled in the

national SIREN study at three sites (Liverpool, Newcastle and Sheffield). Eligible participants were adults aged 18 or over, and currently working as an HCW, including allied support and laboratory staff, or were volunteers linked to the hospital. The majority of participants were sampled for previous reports in this PITCH cohort (Angyal et al., 2021; Ogbe et al., 2021; Payne et al., 2021; Skelly et al., 2021). Participants were sampled for the current study between 4 January 2021 and 15 February 2022, with the majority of the sampling complete before the omicron BA.1 variant emerged in the UK (68% of sampling was prior to December 2021 and 88% was prior to January 2022).

Participants had received one of three vaccine regimens: “Short” - two doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech) administered with the manufacturer’s licenced dosing interval (median 24 days, IQR 21-27); “Long” - two doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech) administered with an extended dosing interval (median 71 days, IQR 66-78); and “AZ” - two doses of AZD1222 (Oxford/AstraZeneca), administered a median 74 days (IQR 65-78) apart. All participants then received a third “booster” dose of BNT162b2, a median of 207 days, (IQR 191-233) days after the second dose, regardless of primary vaccine regimen. Participants underwent phlebotomy for assessment of immune responses one (median 28 days, IQR 26-32) and six (median 185 days, IQR 173-200) months after the second dose of vaccine, and one month after the third dose of vaccine (median 31 days, IQR 28-37). Clinical information including BNT162b2 and AZD1222 vaccination dates, date of any SARS-CoV-2 infection (either prior to vaccination or during the study) defined by a positive PCR test and/or detection of antibodies to spike or nucleocapsid protein, presence or absence of symptoms, time between symptom onset and sampling, age, sex and ethnicity of participant was recorded. Key information on demographics and vaccine dose intervals is shown in Table 1. N seroconversion was defined as an N antibody level over the cut-off threshold previously defined using pre-pandemic samples (Angyal et al., 2021), and at least a 2-fold increase over the baseline value.

PITCH is a sub-study of the SIREN study, which was approved by the Berkshire Research Ethics Committee, Health Research 250 Authority (IRAS ID 284460, REC reference 20/SC/0230), with PITCH recognised as a sub-study on 2 December 2020. SIREN is registered with ISRCTN (Trial ID:252 ISRCTN11041050). Some participants were recruited under aligned study protocols. In Birmingham participants were recruited under the Determining the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in convalescent health care workers (COCO) study (IRAS ID: 282525). In Liverpool some participants were recruited under the “Human immune responses to acute virus infections” Study (16/NW/0170), approved by North West - Liverpool Central Research Ethics Committee on 8 March 2016, and amended on 14th September 2020 and 4th May 2021. In Oxford, participants were recruited under the GI Biobank Study 16/YH/0247, approved by the research ethics committee (REC) at Yorkshire & The Humber - Sheffield Research Ethics Committee on 29 July 2016, which has been amended for this purpose on 8 June 2020. In Sheffield, participants

were recruited under the Observational Biobanking study STHObs (18/YH/0441), which was amended for this study on 10 September 2020. We also included some participants from Cambridge from a study approved by the National Research Ethics Committee and Health Research Authority (East of England – Cambridge Research Ethics Committee (SCORPIO study, SARS-CoV-2 vaccination response in obesity amendment of ‘‘NIHR BioResource’’ 17/EE/0025).The study was conducted in compliance with all relevant ethical regulations for work with human participants, and according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (2008) and the International Conference on Harmonization (ICH) Good Clinical Practice (GCP) guidelines. Written informed consent was obtained for all participants enrolled in the study.

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs), plasma and serum were separated and cryopreserved. Some of the immune response data from one month after the second dose has been previously reported (Payne et al., 2021), as has some of the neutralising antibody data for HCWs receiving a short dosing interval for BNT162b2 (Dejnirattisai et al., 2022). The study size was selected because this number was feasible for the six clinical and laboratory sites to study, and consistent with our track record of significant findings at this scale.

Meso Scale Discovery (MSD) IgG binding assay

IgG responses to SARS-CoV-2, SARS-CoV-1, MERS-CoV and seasonal coronaviruses were measured using a multiplexed MSD immunoassay: The V-PLEX COVID-19 Coronavirus Panel 3 (IgG) Kit (cat. no. K15399U) from Meso Scale Discovery, Rockville, MD USA. A MULTI-SPOT® 96-well, 10 spot plate was coated with three SARS CoV-2 antigens (Spike (S), Receptor-Binding Domain (RBD), Nucleoprotein (N)), SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV spike trimers, spike proteins from seasonal human coronaviruses, HCoV-OC43, HCoV-HKU1, HCoV-229E and HCoV-NL63, and bovine serum albumin (negative control). Antigens were spotted at 200−400 µg/mL (MSD® Coronavirus Plate 3). Multiplex MSD assays were performed as per the manufacturer’s instructions. To measure IgG antibodies, 96-well plates were blocked with MSD Blocker A for 30 minutes. Following washing with washing buffer, samples diluted 1:1,000-30,000 in diluent buffer, MSD standard and undiluted internal MSD controls, were added to the wells. After 2-hour incubation and a washing step, detection antibody (MSD SULFO-TAG™ anti-human IgG antibody, 1/200) was added. Following washing, MSD GOLD™ read buffer B was added and plates were read using a MESO® SECTOR S 600 reader. The standard curve was established by fitting the signals from the standard using a 4-parameter logistic model. Concentrations of samples were determined from the electrochemiluminescence signals by back-fitting to the standard curve and multiplying by the dilution factor. Concentrations are expressed in Arbitrary Units/ml (AU/ml). Cut-offs were determined for each SARS-CoV-2 antigen (S, RBD and N) based on the mean concentrations measured in 103 pre-pandemic sera + 3 Standard Deviations. Cut-offs were: S, 1160 AU/ml; RBD, 1169 AU/ml; and N, 3874 AU/ml.

MSD ACE2 inhibition assay

The V-PLEX SARS-CoV-2 Panel 23 (ACE2) Kit, from MSD, Rockville, MD, a multiplexed MSD immunoassay, was also used to measure the ability of human sera to inhibit ACE2 binding to SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens including B (Victoria), B.1.1.7/alpha, B.1.351/beta P.1/gamma, B.1.617.2/delta or B.1.1.529; BA.1/omicron BA.1). A MULTI-SPOT 96-well, 10 spot plate was coated with SARS-CoV-2 spike antigens including these ones above-mentioned. Multiplex MSD Assays were performed as per manufacturer's instructions. To measure ACE2 inhibition, 96-well plates were blocked with MSD Blocker for 30 minutes. Plates were then washed in MSD washing buffer, and samples were diluted 1:10 – 1:100 in diluent buffer. Neutralizing activity was determined by measuring the presence of antibodies able to block the binding of ACE2 to SARS-CoV-2 spike proteins from Victoria spike, B.1.1.7/alpha, B.1.617.2/delta, B.1.351/beta, P.1/gamma and B.1.1.529; BA.1/omicron BA.1 and was expressed as percentage of ACE2 inhibition in comparison to the blanks on the same plate. Furthermore, internal controls and the WHO SARS-CoV-2 Immunoglobulin international standard (NIBSC 20/136) were added to each plate. After a 1-hour incubation, recombinant human ACE2-SULFO-TAG was added to all wells. After a further 1-hour, plates were washed and MSD GOLD Read Buffer B was added, plates were then immediately read using a MESO SECTOR S 600 Reader.

Focus Reduction Neutralisation Assay (FRNT)

The neutralisation potential of antibodies (Ab) was measured using a Focus Reduction Neutralisation Test (FRNT), where the reduction in the number of the infected foci is compared to a negative control well without antibody. Briefly, serially diluted Ab or plasma was mixed with SARS-CoV-2 strain Victoria or P.1 and incubated for 1 hr at 37C. The mixtures were then transferred to 96-well, cell culture-treated, flat-bottom microplates containing confluent Vero cell monolayers in duplicate and incubated for a further 2 hr followed by the addition of 1.5% semi-solid carboxymethyl cellulose (Sigma) overlay medium to each well to limit virus diffusion. A focus forming assay was then performed by staining Vero cells with human anti-nucleocapsid monoclonal Ab (mAb206) followed by peroxidase-conjugated goat anti-human IgG (A0170; Sigma). Finally, the foci (infected cells) approximately 100 per well in the absence of antibodies, were visualized by adding TrueBlue Peroxidase Substrate (Insight Biotechnology). Virus-infected cell foci were counted on the classic AID ELISpot reader using AID ELISpot software. The percentage of focus reduction was calculated and IC50 was determined using the probit program from the SPSS package. In order to reduce confounding arising from exposure to different SARS-CoV-2 variants, these experiments were conducted only on participants who were naive at the time of sampling 6-months post second vaccine dose, as defined by no history of positive PCR or lateral flow test for SARS-CoV-2, and no anti-N IgG seroconversion during the study.

T cell interferon-gamma (IFNγ) ELISpot Assay

The PITCH ELISpot Standard Operating Procedure has been published previously (Angyal et al., 2021). Interferon-gamma (IFNγ) ELISpot assays were set up from cryopreserved PBMCs using the Human IFNγ ELISpot Basic kit (Mabtech 3420-2A). A single protocol was agreed across the centres as previously published (Angyal et al., 2021) and available on the PITCH website (PITCH Consortium).

In brief, PBMCs were thawed and rested for 3-6 hours in R10 media: RPMI 1640 (Sigma) supplemented with 10% (v/v) Fetal Bovine Serum (Sigma), 2mM L-Glutamine (Sigma) and 1mM Penicillin/Streptomycin (Sigma) in a humidified incubator at 37°C, 5% CO_2, prior to stimulation with peptides. PBMCs were then plated in duplicate or triplicate at 200,000 cells/well in a MultiScreen-IP filter plate (Millipore, MAIPS4510) previously coated with capture antibody (clone 1-D1K) and blocked with R10. PBMCs were then stimulated with overlapping peptide pools (18-mers with 10 amino acid overlap, Mimotopes) representing the spike (S), Membrane (M) or nucleocapsid (N) SARS-CoV-2 proteins at a final concentration of 2 ug/ml for 16 to18 hours in a humidified incubator at 37°C, 5% CO_2. For selected individuals, pools representing spike protein of the Omicron (BA.1) variant were included. Pools consisting of CMV, EBV and influenza peptides at a final concentration of 2ug/ml (CEF; Proimmune) and concanavalin A or phytohemagglutinin L (PHA-L, Sigma) were used as positive controls. DMSO was used as the negative control at an equivalent concentration to the peptides. After the incubation period as well as all subsequent steps wells were washed with PBS/0.05% (v/v) Tween20 (Sigma). Wells were incubated with biotinylated detection antibody (clone 7-B6-1) followed by incubation with the ELISpot Basic kit streptavidin-ALP. Finally colour development was carried out using the 1-step NBT/BCIP substrate solution (Thermo Scientific) for 5 minutes at RT. Colour development was stopped by washing the wells with tap water. Air dried plates were scanned and analysed with either the AID Classic ELISpot reader (software version 8.0, Autoimmune Diagnostika GmbH, Germany) or the ImmunoSpot® S6 Alfa Analyser (Cellular Technology Limited LLC, Germany). Antigen-specific responses were quantified by subtracting the mean spots of the negative control wells from the test wells and the results were expressed as spot-forming units (SFU)/10^6 PBMCs. Samples with a mean spot value greater than 50 spots in the negative control wells were excluded from the analysis.

For comparison of responses to omicron BA.1 we firstly compared responses to 178 peptides spanning all of spike (S1 and S2) for the ancestral (wild type) and the omicron BA.1 variant, then secondly we compared responses to the 51 peptides representing the regions of spike with mutations in omicron BA.1, again comparing ancestral and omicron BA.1. To reduce the disproportionate impact of background noise, samples with a total response to ancestral spike of <33 SFU/10^6 PBMCs were excluded from analysis, with this cut off threshold calculated as the mean + two standard deviations of the DMSO wells across all experiments in the study. The % of the T cell response to ancestral strain that was preserved against omicron BA.1 was

calculated for each paired sample then expressed as the median and IQR for the group.

Memory B cell Fluorospot assay

Cryopreserved PBMCs were thawed and cultured for 72 hours with polyclonal stimulation containing 1 µg/ml R848 and 10 ng/ml IL-2 from the Human memory B cell stimpack (Mabtech). Using the Human IgA/IgG FluoroSpotFLEX kit (Mabtech), stimulated PBMCs were then added at $2x10^5$ cells/well to fluorospot plates coated with 10 µg/ml Sars-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein diluted in PBS. Plates were incubated for 16 hours in a humidified incubator at 37°C, 5% CO_2 and developed according to the manufacturer's instructions (Mabtech). Analysis was carried out with AID ELISpot software 8.0 (Autoimmun Diagnostika). All samples were tested in triplicates and response was measured as spike- specific spots per million PBMCs with PBS background subtracted.

Intracellular cytokine stimulation assay

In a subset of donors (n=95), selected at random from all three vaccine regimens and previous SARS-CoV-2 infection, T cell responses were characterised further using intracellular cytokine staining (ICS) after stimulation with overlapping SARS-CoV2 peptide pools. In brief, cryopreserved PBMCs were thawed, rested for 4-5 hours in R10 media and then plated at $1x10^6$ cells/well in a 96 well U-bottom plate together with co-stimulatory molecules anti-CD28 and anti-CD49d (both BD). Peptide pools (spanning ancestral (B.1) spike, omicron BA.1 spike, ancestral membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N) proteins) were added at 2 µg/ml final concentration for each peptide. DMSO (Sigma) was used as the negative control at the equivalent concentration to the peptides. As a positive control, cells were stimulated with 1x cell activation cocktail containing phorbol-12-myristate 13-acetate (PMA) at 81µM and ionomycin at 1.3µM final concentration (Biolegend). The cells were then incubated in a humidified incubator at 37°C, 5% CO_2 for 1 hour before incubating for a further 15 hours in the presence of 5µg/ml Brefeldin A (Biolegend). Flow cytometry staining was performed as described below.

Proliferation assay

T cell proliferation assessed the magnitude of memory responses to SARS-CoV2 spike, M and N protein in the $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cell pool in 73 individuals selected for the ICS assay, with 27 participants from the BNT162b2 short interval group (16 naïve and 11 previously infected), 27 participants from the BNT162b2 long interval group (15 naïve and 12 previously infected) and 19 participants from the AZD1222 group (8 naïve and 11 previously infected). CellTrace™ Violet (CTV, Invitrogen) labelling and stimulation with SARS-CoV-2 peptide pools spanning ancestral spike (divided into two pools, S1 and S2), omicron (BA.1) spike (S1 and S2), ancestral M and N protein, as well as a control peptide mix, CEF (1µg/ml per peptide) was carried out as previously described (Ogbe et al., 2021). Cells were incubated in RPMI 1640 (Sigma) supplemented with 10% human AB serum (Sigma), 2mM L-

glutamine (Sigma) and 1 mM Penicillin/Streptomycin (Sigma) in a 96 well U-bottom plate at 250,000 cells per well in single or duplicate depending on cell availability. DMSO added at the same concentration to SARS-CoV-2 peptides served as negative control and 2ug/ml PHA-L as positive control. Cells were placed in a humidified incubator at 37°C, 5% CO_2. Half a media change was performed on day 4 and cells were harvested for flow cytometry staining on day 7 as described below. Data were expressed as relative frequency of proliferating cells within single, live CD4+ T cells and CD8+ T cells respectively. Background was subtracted from stimulated samples and samples were excluded due to high background (DMSO control >2% proliferation in any T cell subset,) or less than 1000 events in the single, live CD3+ gate (10 samples in total were excluded). Responses to individual peptide pools and summed responses to total spike (S1+S2) and M+NP were reported.

Flow cytometry straining and analysis

Details for antibodies are listed in Supplementary Table 1. All washes and extracellular staining steps for PBMC were carried out in cell staining buffer (Biolegend) for ICS samples and PBS for proliferation samples. At the end of the culture period, PBMCs were washed once and subsequently stained with near-infrared fixable live/dead stain (Invitrogen) together with a cocktail of fluorochrome-conjugated primary human-specific antibodies against CD4, CD8, CD14 (all Biolegend) as well as human Fc blocking reagent (Miltenyi Biotec) for ICS and CD3, CD4 and CD8 (all Biolegend) for proliferation samples. Cells were stained at 4°C in the dark for 20 minutes, followed by one wash. Proliferation samples were then fixed with a 4% formaldehyde solution (Sigma) for 10min at 4°C, washed and stored in PBS in the fridge for up to one day. ICS samples were fixed and permeabilized in Cytofix/Cytoperm buffer (BD) for 20 min at 4°C, washed with 1x Perm buffer (BD) once followed by staining with the following primary human-specific antibodies diluted in Perm buffer: CD3, IFN-γ, TNF (all Biolegend), IL-2 (eBioscience) for 20 min at 4°C followed by one wash in 1x Perm buffer. Cells were stored in cell staining buffer in the fridge for up to one day. Samples were acquired on a MACSQuant analyser 10 and X (Miltenyi Biotec) and analysis was performed using FlowJo software version 10.8.1 (BD Biosciences). Example gating strategies are shown in Supplementary Figure 1.

Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are displayed with median and interquartile range (IQR). Unpaired comparisons across two groups were performed using the Mann-Whitney test, and across three groups using the Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's multiple comparisons test. Paired comparisons were performed using the Wilcoxon matched pairs signed rank test. Two-tailed P values are displayed. Statistical analyses were done using R version 4.0.2 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL https://www.R-project.org/) using the tidyverse packages (Wickham et al., 2019) and GraphPad Prism 9.3.1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS
We are grateful to all our healthcare worker colleagues who participated in the study. For the Birmingham participants, the study was carried out at the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)/Wellcome Trust Birmingham Clinical Research Facility. Laboratory studies were undertaken by the Clinical Immunology Service, University of Birmingham.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
Conceptualization, L.T., S.J.D., P.K., T.dS., S.H., V.H., C.J.A.D., R.P.P., A.R., M.C., G.S.; Methodology, S.J.D., P.K., L.T., S.C.M., B.K., S.L., T.dS., C.J.A.D., A.R., M.C., G.S., C.D., N.G., S.H., V.H.; Formal Analysis, B.K., S.C.M., S.J.D., L.T., T.dS., C.D., S.L., D.T.S., W.D., A.S.D., S.A., J.D.W. Investigation, B.K., R.P.P., S.L., C.L., W.D., S.A., N.M., S.F., S.A-T., S.C.M., T.T., L.M.H., A.A., R.B., A.R.N., S.L.D., E.C.H., L.H.B., P.S., A.C., A.B-W., L.S.R., A.L., J.K.T., H.H., I.G., M.P., P.Z., T.A.H.N., J.M.N., P.A., E.P., T.M., I.N., A.H., A.Sh., L.S., D.G.W., A.B.; Resources, A.B., L.T., E.B.; Data Curation, S.C.M., A.D.; Writing – Original Draft, L.T., S.J.D., P.K., Writing – Review & Editing, B.K., S.C.M., S.L., T.dS., S.L.D., S.J., D.G.W., C.P.C., K.J., P.C.M., A.J.P., J.M., E.B., A.R., M.C., G.S.; Visualization, S.C.M., S.L., B.K., S.A., J.D.W., L.T., S.J.D., Supervision, B.K., C.P.C., K.J., J.F., A.J.P., S.L.R-J., J.E.D.T., R.P.P., J.M., E.B., S.H., V.H., C.D., C.J.A.D., A.R., M.C., G.S., T.dS., L.T., P.K., S.J.D., Project Administration, A.S.D., Funding Acquisition, P.K., S.J.D., L.T., T.dS., C.J.A.D., A.R., S.H., V.H.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS
This work was funded by the UK Department of Health and Social Care as part of the PITCH (Protective Immunity from T cells to Covid-19 in Health workers) Consortium, UKRI as part of “Investigation of proven vaccine breakthrough by SARS-CoV-2 variants in established UK healthcare worker cohorts: SIREN consortium & PITCH Plus Pathway” MR/W02067X/1, with contributions from UKRI/NIHR through the UK Coronavirus Immunology Consortium (UK-CIC), the Huo Family Foundation and The National Institute for Health Research (UKRIDHSC COVID-19 Rapid Response Rolling Call, Grant Reference Number COV19-RECPLAS).

E.B. and P.K. are NIHR Senior Investigators and P.K. is funded by WT109965MA. S.J.D. is funded by an NIHR Global Research Professorship (NIHR300791). T.dS is funded by a Wellcome Trust Intermediate Clinical Fellowship (110058/Z/15/Z). RPP is funded by a Career Re-entry Fellowship (204721/Z/16/Z). C.J.A.D. is funded by a Wellcome Clinical Research Career Development Fellowship (211153/Z/18/Z). J.M. and G.S. are funded by the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences (CAMS) Innovation Fund for Medical Science (CIFMS), China (grant number: 2018-I2M-2-002), Schmidt Futures, the Red Avenue Foundation and the Oak Foundation. The Wellcome Centre for Human Genetics is supported by the Wellcome Trust (grant 090532/Z/09/Z). P.C.M. is funded by Wellcome (110110z/15/Z), the Francis Crick Institute, and the University College London Hospital NIHR Biomedical Research

Centre. J.E.D.T. is supported by the Medical Research Council (MR/W020564/1) and (MC_UU_0025/12). L.T. is supported by the Wellcome Trust (grant number 205228/Z/16/Z) and the National Institute for Health Research Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Emerging and Zoonotic Infections (NIHR200907) at University of Liverpool in partnership with UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA), in collaboration with Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine and the University of Oxford. D.G.W. is supported by an NIHR Advanced Fellowship in Liverpool. M.C., S.L., L.T., and T.T. are supported by U.S. Food and Drug Administration Medical Countermeasures Initiative contract 75F40120C00085. The Sheffield Teaching Hospitals Observational Study of Patients with Pulmonary Hypertension, Cardiovascular and other Respiratory Diseases (STH-ObS) was supported by the British Heart Foundation (PG/11/116/29288). The STH-ObS Chief Investigator Allan Laurie is supported by a British Heart Foundation Senior Basic Science Research fellowship (FS/18/52/33808). We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the UK Department of Health and Social Care via the Sheffield NIHR Clinical Research Facility award to the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals Foundation NHS Trust.

The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, the Department of Health and Social Care or Public Health England or the US Food and Drug Administration.

S.J.D. is a Scientific Advisor to the Scottish Parliament on COVID-19 for which she receives a fee. A.J.P. is Chair of UK Dept. Health and Social Care's (DHSC) Joint Committee on Vaccination & Immunisation (JCVI), but does not participate in policy decisions on COVID-19 vaccines. He was previously a member of the WHO's SAGE. The views expressed in this article do not necessarily represent the views of DHSC, JCVI, or WHO. AJP is chief investigator on clinical trials of Oxford University's COVID-19 vaccine funded by NIHR. Oxford University has entered a joint COVID-19 vaccine development partnership with AstraZeneca. G.S. sits on the GSK Vaccines Scientific Advisory Board and is a founder member of RQ Biotechnology.

REFERENCES

Addetia, A., Crawford Katharine, H.D., Dingens, A., Zhu, H., Roychoudhury, P., Huang, M.-L., Jerome Keith, R., Bloom Jesse, D., Greninger Alexander, L., and McAdam Alexander, J. Neutralizing Antibodies Correlate with Protection from SARS-CoV-2 in Humans during a Fishery Vessel Outbreak with a High Attack Rate. J Clin Microbiol *58*, e02107-02120.

Andrews, N., Stowe, J., Kirsebom, F., Toffa, S., Rickeard, T., Gallagher, E., Gower, C., Kall, M., Groves, N., O'Connell, A.-M.*, et al.* (2022). Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness against the Omicron (B.1.1.529) Variant. N Engl J Med *386*, 1532-1546.

Angyal, A., Longet, S., Moore, S.C., Payne, R.P., Harding, A., Tipton, T., Rongkard, P., Ali, M., Hering, L.M., Meardon, N.*, et al.* (2021). T-cell and antibody responses to first BNT162b2 vaccine dose in previously infected and SARS-CoV-2-naive UK health-care workers: a multicentre prospective cohort study. Lancet Microbe. 2021/11/16.

Barnes, E., Folgori, A., Capone, S., Swadling, L., Aston, S., Kurioka, A., Meyer, J., Huddart, R., Smith, K., Townsend, R.*, et al.* (2012). Novel Adenovirus-Based Vaccines Induce Broad and Sustained T Cell Responses to HCV in Man. Sci Transl Med *4*, 115ra111-115ra111.

Bartsch Yannic, C., Tong, X., Kang, J., Avendaño María, J., Serrano Eileen, F., García-Salum, T., Pardo-Roa, C., Riquelme, A., Cai, Y., Renzi, I.*, et al.* Omicron variant Spike-specific antibody binding and Fc activity are preserved in recipients of mRNA or inactivated COVID-19 vaccines. Sci Transl Med *14*, eabn9243.

Carazo, S., Skowronski, D.M., Brisson, M., Sauvageau, C., Brousseau, N., Gilca, R., Ouakki, M., Barkati, S., Fafard, J., Talbot, D.*, et al.* (2022). Protection against Omicron re-infection conferred by prior heterologous SARS-CoV-2 infection, with and without mRNA vaccination. medRxiv, 2022.2004.2029.22274455.

De Marco, L., D'Orso, S., Pirronello, M., Verdiani, A., Termine, A., Fabrizio, C., Capone, A., Sabatini, A., Guerrera, G., Placido, R.*, et al.* (2021). Preserved T cell reactivity to the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron variant indicates continued protection in vaccinated individuals. bioRxiv, 2021.2012.2030.474453.

Dejnirattisai, W., Huo, J., Zhou, D., Zahradnik, J., Supasa, P., Liu, C., Duyvesteyn, H.M.E., Ginn, H.M., Mentzer, A.J., Tuekprakhon, A.*, et al.* (2022). SARS-CoV-2 Omicron-B.1.1.529 leads to widespread escape from neutralizing antibody responses. Cell *185*, 467-484 e415. 2022/01/27.

Earle, K.A., Ambrosino, D.M., Fiore-Gartland, A., Goldblatt, D., Gilbert, P.B., Siber, G.R., Dull, P., and Plotkin, S.A. (2021). Evidence for antibody as a protective correlate for COVID-19 vaccines. Vaccine *39*, 4423-4428.

Ewer, K.J., Barrett, J.R., Belij-Rammerstorfer, S., Sharpe, H., Makinson, R., Morter, R., Flaxman, A., Wright, D., Bellamy, D., Bittaye, M.*, et al.* (2021). T cell and antibody responses induced by a single dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine in a phase 1/2 clinical trial. Nat Med *27*, 270-278. 2020/12/19.

Feng, S., Phillips, D.J., White, T., Sayal, H., Aley, P.K., Bibi, S., Dold, C., Fuskova, M., Gilbert, S.C., Hirsch, I.*, et al.* (2021). Correlates of protection against symptomatic and asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Med *27*, 2032-2040.

Follmann, D., Janes, H.E., Buhule, O.D., Zhou, H., Girard, B., Marks, K., Kotloff, K., Desjardins, M., Corey, L., Neuzil, K.M.*, et al.* (2022). Anti-nucleocapsid antibodies following

SARS-CoV-2 infection in the blinded phase of the mRNA-1273 Covid-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. medRxiv, 2022.2004.2018.22271936.

Gao, Y., Cai, C., Grifoni, A., Müller, T.R., Niessl, J., Olofsson, A., Humbert, M., Hansson, L., Österborg, A., Bergman, P.*, et al.* (2022). Ancestral SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells cross-recognize the Omicron variant. Nat Med *28*, 472-476.

GeurtsvanKessel Corine, H., Geers, D., Schmitz Katharina, S., Mykytyn Anna, Z., Lamers Mart, M., Bogers, S., Scherbeijn, S., Gommers, L., Sablerolles Roos, S.G., Nieuwkoop Nella, N.*, et al.* (2022). Divergent SARS-CoV-2 Omicron–reactive T and B cell responses in COVID-19 vaccine recipients. Science Immunology *7*, eabo2202.

Gilbert, P.B., Montefiori David, C., McDermott Adrian, B., Fong, Y., Benkeser, D., Deng, W., Zhou, H., Houchens Christopher, R., Martins, K., Jayashankar, L.*, et al.* (2022). Immune correlates analysis of the mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. Science *375*, 43-50.

Goldberg, Y., Mandel, M., Bar-On, Y.M., Bodenheimer, O., Freedman, L., Haas, E.J., Milo, R., Alroy-Preis, S., Ash, N., and Huppert, A. (2021). Waning Immunity after the BNT162b2 Vaccine in Israel. N Engl J Med *385*, e85. 2021/10/28.

Hall, V., Foulkes, S., Insalata, F., Kirwan, P., Saei, A., Atti, A., Wellington, E., Khawam, J., Munro, K., Cole, M.*, et al.* (2022). Protection against SARS-CoV-2 after Covid-19 Vaccination and Previous Infection. N Engl J Med *386*, 1207-1220.

Hall, V.J., Foulkes, S., Charlett, A., Atti, A., Monk, E.J.M., Simmons, R., Wellington, E., Cole, M.J., Saei, A., Oguti, B.*, et al.* (2021a). SARS-CoV-2 infection rates of antibody-positive compared with antibody-negative health-care workers in England: a large, multicentre, prospective cohort study (SIREN). Lancet *397*, 1459-1469. 2021/04/09.

Hall, V.J., Foulkes, S., Saei, A., Andrews, N., Oguti, B., Charlett, A., Wellington, E., Stowe, J., Gillson, N., Atti, A.*, et al.* (2021b). COVID-19 vaccine coverage in health-care workers in England and effectiveness of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine against infection (SIREN): a prospective, multicentre, cohort study. Lancet *397*, 1725-1735. 2021/04/23.

Harvey, W.T., Carabelli, A.M., Jackson, B., Gupta, R.K., Thomson, E.C., Harrison, E.M., Ludden, C., Reeve, R., Rambaut, A., Peacock, S.J.*, et al.* (2021). SARS-CoV-2 variants, spike mutations and immune escape. Nature Reviews Microbiology *19*, 409-424.

Kaplonek, P., Cizmeci, D., Fischinger, S., Collier, A.-r., Suscovich, T., Linde, C., Broge, T., Mann, C., Amanat, F., Dayal, D.*, et al.* (2022a). mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccines elicit antibodies with differences in Fc-mediated effector functions. Sci Transl Med *14*, eabm2311.

Kaplonek, P., Fischinger, S., Cizmeci, D., Bartsch, Y.C., Kang, J., Burke, J.S., Shin, S.A., Dayal, D., Martin, P., Mann, C.*, et al.* (2022b). mRNA-1273 vaccine-induced antibodies maintain Fc effector functions across SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. Immunity *55*, 355-365.e354.

Kedzierska, K., and Thomas, P.G. (2022). Count on us: T cells in SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination. Cell Reports Medicine *3*, 100562.

Keeton, R., Tincho, M.B., Ngomti, A., Baguma, R., Benede, N., Suzuki, A., Khan, K., Cele, S., Bernstein, M., Karim, F.*, et al.* (2022). T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike cross-recognize Omicron. Nature *603*, 488-492.

Khoury, D.S., Cromer, D., Reynaldi, A., Schlub, T.E., Wheatley, A.K., Juno, J.A., Subbarao, K., Kent, S.J., Triccas, J.A., and Davenport, M.P. (2021). Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Med *27*, 1205-1211.

Kundu, R., Narean, J.S., Wang, L., Fenn, J., Pillay, T., Fernandez, N.D., Conibear, E., Koycheva, A., Davies, M., Tolosa-Wright, M.*, et al.* (2022). Cross-reactive memory T cells associate with protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection in COVID-19 contacts. Nature Communications *13*, 80.

Lin, D.-Y., Gu, Y., Wheeler, B., Young, H., Holloway, S., Sunny, S.-K., Moore, Z., and Zeng, D. (2022). Effectiveness of Covid-19 Vaccines over a 9-Month Period in North Carolina. N Engl J Med *386*, 933-941.

Liu, J., Chandrashekar, A., Sellers, D., Barrett, J., Jacob-Dolan, C., Lifton, M., McMahan, K., Sciacca, M., VanWyk, H., Wu, C.*, et al.* (2022). Vaccines elicit highly conserved cellular immunity to SARS-CoV-2 Omicron. Nature *603*, 493-496.

Madelon, N., Heikkilä, N., Sabater Royo, I., Fontannaz, P., Breville, G., Lauper, K., Goldstein, R., Grifoni, A., Sette, A., Siegrist, C.-A.*, et al.* (2022). Omicron-Specific Cytotoxic T-Cell Responses After a Third Dose of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine Among Patients With Multiple Sclerosis Treated With Ocrelizumab. JAMA Neurology.

McMahan, K., Yu, J., Mercado, N.B., Loos, C., Tostanoski, L.H., Chandrashekar, A., Liu, J., Peter, L., Atyeo, C., Zhu, A.*, et al.* (2021). Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus macaques. Nature *590*, 630-634.

Mefsin, Y., Chen, D., Bond, H.S., Lin, Y., Cheung, J.K., Wong, J.Y., Ali, S.T., Lau, E.H.Y., Wu, P., Leung, G.M.*, et al.* (2022). Epidemiology of infections with SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.2 variant in Hong Kong, January-March 2022. medRxiv, 2022.2004.2007.22273595.

Molodtsov, I.A., Kegeles, E., Mitin, A.N., Mityaeva, O., Musatova, O.E., Panova, A.E., Pashenkov, M.V., Peshkova, I.O., Alsalloum, A., Asaad, W.*, et al.* (2022). SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells and antibodies in COVID-19 protection: a prospective study. Clin Infect Dis, ciac278.

Moore, P.L., Moyo-Gwete, T., Hermanus, T., Kgagudi, P., Ayres, F., Makhado, Z., Sadoff, J., Le Gars, M., van Roey, G., Crowther, C.*, et al.* (2021). Neutralizing antibodies elicited by the Ad26.COV2.S COVID-19 vaccine show reduced activity against 501Y.V2 (B.1.351), despite protection against severe disease by this variant. bioRxiv, DOI: 2021.2006.2009.447722.

Naaber, P., Tserel, L., Kangro, K., Sepp, E., Jürjenson, V., Adamson, A., Haljasmägi, L., Rumm, A.P., Maruste, R., Kärner, J.*, et al.* (2021). Dynamics of antibody response to BNT162b2 vaccine after six months: a longitudinal prospective study. The Lancet Regional Health – Europe *10*.

Nyberg, T., Ferguson, N.M., Nash, S.G., Webster, H.H., Flaxman, S., Andrews, N., Hinsley, W., Bernal, J.L., Kall, M., Bhatt, S.*, et al.* (2022). Comparative analysis of the risks of hospitalisation and death associated with SARS-CoV-2 omicron (B.1.1.529) and delta (B.1.617.2) variants in England: a cohort study. The Lancet *399*, 1303-1312.

Ogbe, A., Kronsteiner, B., Skelly, D.T., Pace, M., Brown, A., Adland, E., Adair, K., Akhter, H.D., Ali, M., Ali, S.-E.*, et al.* (2021). T cell assays differentiate clinical and subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections from cross-reactive antiviral responses. Nat Commun *12*, 2055.

Otter, A.D., D'Arcangelo, S., Whitaker, H., Hewson, J., Foulkes, S., Atti, A., Cole, M., Linley, E., Tonge, S., Hettiarachchi, N.*, et al.* (2022). Determinants of SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike antibody levels following BNT162b2 vaccination: cross-sectional analysis of 6,000 SIREN study participants. medRxiv, 2022.2004.2021.22274025.

Parry, H., Bruton, R., Stephens, C., Bentley, C., Brown, K., Amirthalingam, G., Hallis, B., Otter, A., Zuo, J., and Moss, P. (2022). Extended interval BNT162b2 vaccination enhances peak antibody generation. npj Vaccines *7*, 14.

Payne, R.P., Longet, S., Austin, J.A., Skelly, D.T., Dejnirattisai, W., Adele, S., Meardon, N., Faustini, S., Al-Taei, S., Moore, S.C.*, et al.* (2021). Immunogenicity of standard and extended dosing intervals of BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. Cell *184*, 5699-5714.e5611. 2021/10/16.

PITCH Consortium.

Rosenberg, E.S., Dorabawila, V., Easton, D., Bauer, U.E., Kumar, J., Hoen, R., Hoefer, D., Wu, M., Lutterloh, E., Conroy, M.B.*, et al.* (2021). Covid-19 Vaccine Effectiveness in New York State. N Engl J Med *386*, 116-127.

Rydyznski Moderbacher, C., Ramirez, S.I., Dan, J.M., Grifoni, A., Hastie, K.M., Weiskopf, D., Belanger, S., Abbott, R.K., Kim, C., Choi, J.*, et al.* (2020). Antigen-Specific Adaptive Immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in Acute COVID-19 and Associations with Age and Disease Severity. Cell *183*, 996-1012.e1019.

Schmidt, F., Muecksch, F., Weisblum, Y., Da Silva, J., Bednarski, E., Cho, A., Wang, Z., Gaebler, C., Caskey, M., Nussenzweig, M.C.*, et al.* (2021). Plasma Neutralization of the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron Variant. N Engl J Med *386*, 599-601.

Sette, A., and Crotty, S. (2021). Adaptive immunity to SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. Cell *184*, 861-880.

Skelly, D.T., Harding, A.C., Gilbert-Jaramillo, J., Knight, M.L., Longet, S., Brown, A., Adele, S., Adland, E., Brown, H., Chinnakannan, S.*, et al.* (2021). Two doses of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination induce robust immune responses to emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern. Nature Communications *12*, 5061.

Skowronski, D.M., Febriani, Y., Ouakki, M., Setayeshgar, S., El Adam, S., Zou, M., Talbot, D., Prystajecky, N., Tyson, J.R., Gilca, R.*, et al.* (2022). Two-dose SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness with mixed schedules and extended dosing intervals: test-negative design studies from British Columbia and Quebec, Canada. Clin Infect Dis, ciac290.

Swadling, L., Diniz, M.O., Schmidt, N.M., Amin, O.E., Chandran, A., Shaw, E., Pade, C., Gibbons, J.M., Le Bert, N., Tan, A.T.*, et al.* (2022). Pre-existing polymerase-specific T cells expand in abortive seronegative SARS-CoV-2. Nature *601*, 110-117.

Tarke, A., Coelho, C.H., Zhang, Z., Dan, J.M., Yu, E.D., Methot, N., Bloom, N.I., Goodwin, B., Phillips, E., Mallal, S.*, et al.* (2022). SARS-CoV-2 vaccination induces immunological T cell memory able to cross-recognize variants from Alpha to Omicron. Cell *185*, 847-859.e811.

Tartof, S.Y., Slezak, J.M., Fischer, H., Hong, V., Ackerson, B.K., Ranasinghe, O.N., Frankland, T.B., Ogun, O.A., Zamparo, J.M., Gray, S.*, et al.* (2021). Effectiveness of mRNA BNT162b2 COVID-19 vaccine up to 6 months in a large integrated health system in the USA: a retrospective cohort study. The Lancet *398*, 1407-1416.

Tartof, S.Y., Slezak, J.M., Puzniak, L., Hong, V., Xie, F., Ackerson, B.K., Valluri, S.R., Jodar, L., and McLaughlin, J.M. (2022). Durability of BNT162b2 vaccine against hospital and emergency department admissions due to the omicron and delta variants in a large health system in the USA: a test-negative case–control study. The Lancet Respiratory Medicine.

Tomic, A., Skelly, D.T., Ogbe, A., O'Connor, D., Pace, M., Adland, E., Alexander, F., Ali, M., Allott, K., Azim Ansari, M.*, et al.* (2022). Divergent trajectories of antiviral memory after SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nature Communications *13*, 1251.

UK Health Security Agency (2022) COVID-19 vaccine surveillance report: 12 May 2022 (week 19). https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1075115/COVID-19_vaccine_surveillance_report_12_May_2022_week_19.pdf

Wall, E.C., Wu, M., Harvey, R., Kelly, G., Warchal, S., Sawyer, C., Daniels, R., Adams, L., Hobson, P., Hatipoglu, E.*, et al.* (2021). AZD1222-induced neutralising antibody activity against SARS-CoV-2 Delta VOC. The Lancet *398*, 207-209.

Ward, H., Whitaker, M., Flower, B., Tang, S.N., Atchison, C., Darzi, A., Donnelly, C.A., Cann, A., Diggle, P.J., Ashby, D.*, et al.* (2022). Population antibody responses following COVID-19 vaccination in 212,102 individuals. Nature Communications *13*, 907.

Wei, J., Pouwels, K.B., Stoesser, N., Matthews, P.C., Diamond, I., Studley, R., Rourke, E., Cook, D., Bell, J.I., Newton, J.N.*, et al.* (2022). Antibody responses and correlates of protection in the general population after two doses of the ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2 vaccines. Nat Med *28*, 1072-1082.

Whitaker, H.J., Gower, C., Otter, A.D., Simmons, R., Kirsebom, F., Letley, L., Quinot, C., Ireland, G., Linley, E., Ribeiro, S.*, et al.* (2021). Nucleocapsid antibody positivity as a marker of past SARS-CoV-2 infection in population serosurveillance studies: impact of variant, vaccination, and choice of assay cut-off. medRxiv, 2021.2010.2025.21264964.

Wickham, H., Averick, M., Bryan, J., Chang, W., McGowan, L., François, R., Grolemund, G., Hayes, A., Henry, L., Hester, J.*, et al.* (2019). Welcome to the Tidyverse. Journal of Open Source Software *4*, 1686.

Zhang, Z., Mateus, J., Coelho, C.H., Dan, J.M., Moderbacher, C.R., Gálvez, R.I., Cortes, F.H., Grifoni, A., Tarke, A., Chang, J.*, et al.* (2022). Humoral and cellular immune memory to four COVID-19 vaccines. Cell https://doiorg/101016/jcell202205022.

	All	AZ	Pfizer Short	Pfizer Long
Total N	**684**	**92**	**84**	**508**
Dosing Intervals				
Median Days	71	74	24	71
Median Weeks	10	11	3	10
Interquartile Range (Days)	63-77	64.75-78	21-27	66-78
Maximum Days	158	158	38	120
Minimum Days	14	53	0	0
Range (Days)	14-158	53:158	0:38	0:120
Infection Status				
Naïve, N (%)	342 (50.0%)	45 (51.1%)	49 (41.7%)	248 (52.4%)
Total Previous SARS-CoV-2, N (%)	342 (50.0%)	47 (48.9%)	35 (58.3%)	266 (48.8%)
Previous infection at baseline , N[a]	269	39	30	200
PCR+ Breakthrough Infections, N[b]	33	5	4	24
Seroconverted During Study, N[c]	49	6	1	42
Age				
Maximum Age	77	77	71	71
Minimum Age	22	22	22	22
Age Range	22-77	22-77	22-71	22-71
Median Age In Years	43	43	45	43
Interquartile Range Age	33-52.3	27-56	37-55	33-51.25
Sex				
Female, N (%)	505 (73.8%)	68 (73.9%)	50 (59.5%)	387 (76.2%)
Male, N (%)	179 (26.2%)	24 (26.1%)	34 (40.5%)	121 (23.8%)
Ethnicity				
White, N (%)[d]	464 (83.8%)	71 (79.8%)	56 (84.8%)	337 (84.5%)
Asian, N (%)[d]	56 (10.1%)	12 (13.5%	5 (7.6%)	39 (9.8%)
Black, N (%)[d]	7 (1.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.5%)	6 (1.5%)
Other, N (%)[d]	27 (4.9%)	6 (6.7%)	4 (6.1%)	17 (4.3%)
Unreported, N	130	3	18	109

[a]Previous infection at baseline = previous PCR+ SARS-CoV-2 +/- anti-nucleocapsid IgG positive

[b]PCR+ Breakthrough infections include 9 re-infections who were in the "Previous infection at baseline" group

[c]Seroconverted during study = No documented PCR+, lateral flow test or suspected SARS-CoV-2 infection, but asymptomatic rise in anti-nucleocapsid IgG (MSD) above assay positivity threshold and > 2x baseline

[d]Percentage of reported ethnicities

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of participants in the study

FIGURES AND FIGURE LEGENDS



Figure 1: Study Design
Schematic representation of vaccination and phlebotomy time points.
Figure created using Biorender.



Figure 2: Comparison of T cell and IgG responses six months after the second dose of vaccine according to vaccine regime and infection status.
(2A) Comparison of IFNy ELISpot responses to spike S (ancestral strain) from cryopreserved peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) in naïve participants 6 months after 2 doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) delivered with a short dosing interval ("Short", 3-5 weeks, n=33), or a long dosing interval ("Long", 6-17 weeks, n=1*16*), or naïve participants 6 months after 2 doses of AZD1222 (AstraZeneca) vaccine ("AZ", n=29), previously infected BNT162b2 short (n=13), previously infected BNT162b2 long (n=94), and previously infected AZ (n=16) individuals. (2B) Effect of vaccine regimen and infection status on SARS-CoV-2 S-specific IgG responses in naïve short (n=38), naïve long (n=170), naïve AZ (n=39), previously infected short

(n=18), previously infected long (n=99), previously infected AZ (n=28) individuals. (2C) Effect of vaccine regime and infection status on SARS-CoV-2 RBD-specific IgG responses in naïve short (n=38), naïve long (n=169), naïve AZ (n=37), previously infected short (n=18), previously infected long (n=99), previously infected AZ (n=28) individuals. (2D) Association of membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N) protein specific T cell and SARS-CoV-2 N-specific IgG responses in participants 6 months after second dose, and 28 days after third dose, by infection status. Grey circles = naïve; red circles = previously infected. ELISpot values are expressed as spot forming units per million (SFU/10^6) PBMCs. Displayed are responses to peptide pools representing the sum of S1 and S2 units of S (ancestral strain). IgG responses were measured in serum 6 months after the second dose using multiplexed MSD immunoassays and are shown in arbitrary units (AU)/mL. Bars represent the median. Vaccine regimes and infection status were compared with Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's multiple comparisons test (2A-C) and Spearman's tests (2D), with 2-tailed p-values shown above linking lines. Where p-values are absent, comparison was not statistically significant ($p<0.05$).



Figure 3. Time course of T cell, binding IgG and B cell responses 1 and 6 months after 2 doses of BNT162b2 (short or long interval) or AZD1222 vaccine, and following a third vaccine (BNT162b2)

T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike by IFNγ ELISpot assay after (3A) BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) delivered with a short dosing interval ("Short", 3-5 weeks, n=11-44 naïve, n=10-24 previously infected), or (3D) a long interval ("Long", 6-17 weeks, n=49-189 naïve, n=31-156 previously infected) and (3G) AZD1222 (AstraZeneca) vaccine ("AZ", n=18-26 naïve, 6-26 previously infected) are shown 1 and 6 months after 2 doses and following a third dose of BNT162b2. (3J) Comparison of T cell responses 1 month after the third booster dose by primary vaccine regimen (BNT162b2 Short, Long or AZD1222). (3M) Timecourse comparison of T cell responses to spike for all vaccine regimens.

IgG responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike by MesoScale Discovery assay after (3B) BNT162b2 Short (n=24-59 naïve, n=8-24 previously infected), (3E) BNT162b2 Long (n=123-178 naïve, 78-203 previously infected) and (3H) AZ122 (n=28-54 naïve, n=16-44 previously infected) are shown 1 and 6 months after two doses and following a third dose of BNT162b2. (3K) Comparison of IgG antibody responses 1 month after the third booster dose by primary vaccine regimen. (3N) Timecourse comparison of IgG antibody response for all vaccine regimens.

B cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike by B cell Elispot assay after (3C) BNT162b2 Short (n=6-13 naïve, n=1-4 previously infected), (3F) BNT162b2 Long (n=12-47 naïve, n=22-39 previously infected) and (3I) AZ122 (n=5-8 naïve, n=7-10 previously infected) are shown 1 and 6 months after two doses and following a third dose of BNT162b2. (3L) Comparison of B cell responses 1 month after the third booster dose by primary vaccine regimen. (3O) Timecourse comparison of B cell responses to spike for all vaccine regimens.

Grey circles = naïve individuals, red circles = previously infected individuals. Bars represent the median. Comparisons are with the Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test and Dunn's multiple comparisons tests, with 2-tailed p values shown above linking lines for significant differences with $p<0.05$.



Figure 4. Neutralizing antibody titer profiles against SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern 6 months after 2 doses of BNT162b2 or AZD1222 and 1 month after a third vaccine with BNT162b2.

Neutralizing antibodies against the Victoria isolate (orange), delta (B.1.617.2, purple) and omicron BA.1 (B.1.1.529 BA.1, blue) taken from infection-naïve participants after receiving 2 doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) vaccine delivered in a short ("Short", 3-5 weeks, n=20) or long ("Long", 6-17 weeks, n=20) dosing interval, or 2 doses of AZD1222 (AstraZeneca) vaccine ("AZ", n=16) are shown in (4A) 6 months after the second dose, and (4B) for the same individuals, 1 month after a third "booster" dose with BNT162b2 for all participants. Geometric mean neutralizing titers with 95% confidence intervals are shown. Focus Reduction Neutralization Assay 50 (FRNT50) is the reciprocal dilution of the concentration of serum required to produce a 50% reduction in infectious focus forming units of virus in Vero cells (ATCC CCL-81). (4C) Comparison of the data from (4A) and (4B), plotted as means with error

bars by vaccine regimen. V2+6 months = 6 months after the second vaccine, V3+1 month = 1 month after the third “booster” BNT162b2 vaccine. The range of fold change (median) between V2+6 months and V3+1 month for the three vaccine regimens (Short – dashed line, Long – solid line, and AZ – dotted line) is shown in brackets for each variant. Data in (4A), (4B) and (4C) from the Short group (n=20) has been previously published (Dejnirattisai, Huo et al. 2022). (4D) Impact of Short or Long BNT162b2 vaccine dosing interval and AZ on the ability of sera to inhibit ACE2 binding to SARS-CoV-2 spike (Victoria isolate, delta (B.1.617.2), Omicron BA.1 (B.1.1.529 BA.1), alpha (B.1.1.7), beta (B.1.351) and gamma (P.1) 6 months after the second dose and (4E) 1 month after a third “booster” dose with BNT162b2. ACE2 inhibition was analysed using a multiplexed MSD® assay. Data are shown in percentage of inhibition. Bars represent the median with 95% confidence intervals. Naïve, Short: n=20; Naïve, Long: n=20; Naïve, AZ: n=16 for V2 + 6 months; Naïve, Short: n=19; Naïve, Long: n=20; Naïve, AZ: n=10 for V3 + 1 month. Vaccine regimens were compared with the Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test and Dunn’s multiple comparisons tests, with 2-tailed p values shown above linking lines when 2-tailed $p<0.05$, and fold changes are shown between the columns.



Figure 5. Analysis of Spike-specific T cell responses by flow cytometry
Cryopreserved PBMCs from a subset of 95 participants who received BNT162b2 (Pfizer/BioNTech) with a short or long dosing interval, or AZD1222 (AstraZeneca), 1

month after the second dose, were analysed by intracellular cytokine staining and flow cytometry. (5A) The individual cytokine expression levels of total IFNγ, IL2 or TNF are shown as a percentage of the $CD4^+$ T cell population (top panels), or $CD8^+$ T cell population (bottom panels). Populations were analysed by gating on single, live, $CD3^+$ cells (Supplementary figure 1). Short = BNT162b2 short interval; Long = BNT162b2 long interval; AZ = AZD1222. Naïve participants are shown as grey circles and previously infected are red circles. Box plots represent the median, IQR and whiskers 1.5 x the IQR. (5B) and (5C) The T cell populations responsible for IFNγ (5B) or IL2 (5C) expression were assessed as the proportion of IFNγ or IL2 expressed by $CD4^+$ T cells, calculated by dividing the cytokine production in $CD4^+$ T cells by the total cytokine production in response to spike in both $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells. (5D) Polyfunctionality was evaluated by combined expression of IFNγ, IL2 and TNF in $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells, showing the percentage of cells making all three cytokines. Naïve short: n=20, Naïve long: n=15, Naïve AZ n=14, Previously infected (Prev inf) short: n=13, Prev inf long: n=17, Prev inf AZ: n= 16. Unpaired comparisons across two groups were performed using the Mann Whitney test with 2-tailed p values shown above linking lines when 2-tailed $p<0.05$.



Figure 6. T cell proliferation to SARS-CoV2 at 6 months after the primary vaccine course of 2 doses of BNT162b2 or AZD1222

T cell proliferation to SARS-CoV2 peptide pools was assessed by flow cytometry in PBMC from 73 participants who had received either BNT162b2 with a short or long vaccine dosing interval or AZD1222 vaccine and were either naïve or were previously

infected (either at baseline or during the course of the study). (6A) Relative frequency of $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells proliferating to individual peptide pools spike S1, spike S2, membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N) protein in naïve (n=39) and previously infected (n=34) individuals. Grey colour=missing value. (6B, 6D) Summed responses to spike (S1+S2) and (6C, 6E) M+N protein in $CD4^+$ (6B, 6C) and $CD8^+$ (6D, 6E) T cells are shown across the 3 vaccine regimens separated by exposure status (naïve versus previously infected). Individual data points and median with IQR are displayed for naïve short BNT162b2: n=16, naïve long BNT162b2: n=15, naïve AZ: n=8, previously infected short BNT162b2: n=11, previously infected long BNT162b2: n=12, previously infected AZ: n=11. Comparisons between naïve and previously infected within each vaccine regimen were performed using the Mann Whitney test, and comparisons between the three vaccine regimens within the naïve and previously infected groups was performed using Kruskal Wallis and Dunn's multiple comparisons test. 2-tailed P values are shown only for statistically significant comparisons ($p<0.05$). Fold change between medians of two groups are shown in brackets next to p value. Grey circles = naïve individuals, red circles = previously infected individuals.



Figure 7: Longitudinal comparison of T cell and B cell responses against ancestral strain and omicron BA.1 variant according to vaccine regimen and infection status.

(7A-7B) Pairwise comparison of T cell responses to spike from ancestral strain and omicron BA.1 variant from cryopreserved peripheral mononuclear cells (PBMCs) by IFNγ ELISpot assay in participants (7A) 6 months post primary vaccine course (2 doses of BNT162b2 or AstraZeneca), n=215, and (7B) 1 month post third BNT162b2 vaccine dose, n=175. Displayed are responses to peptide pools representing the sum of S1 and S2 units of S from ancestral strain and omicron variant. (7C) Pairwise comparison of IFNγ ELISpot responses in a subset of participants (n=36) to only the 51 out of 178 peptides spanning spike that have mutations in omicron BA.1 compared to the ancestral strain.

(7D-7F) Pairwise comparison of B cell responses to S in ancestral strain and omicron BA.1 variant from cryopreserved PBMCs in (7D) participants 1 month post vaccine dose 2 (n=12); (7E) 6 months post second vaccine dose (n=43); (7F) 1 month post

third vaccine dose (n=80). Orange circles = responses against Victoria variant; blue circles = responses against omicron BA.1 variant. Displayed are responses to peptide pools representing S1 and S2 units of S from ancestral and omicron variants.
ELISpot values are expressed as antibody SFU/10^6 PBMCs. Horizontal lines represent median values. Comparisons between responses to ancestral and Omicron variants were made using Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test, with 2-tailed p-values of significant differences ($p<0.05$) shown above linking lines.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Supplementary Table 1. Antibodies used for intracellular cytokine staining and proliferation assay

Marker name	Fluorochrome	Clone	Species reactivity	Host species	Isotype	Manufacturer	Catalogue number	Dilution used
CD3	PerCP	UCHT1	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	300428	100
CD3	FITC	UCHT1	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	300440	50
CD4	APC	RPA-T4	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	300514	200
CD8	PE-Cy7	RPA-T8	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	301012	200
CD8	BV510	RPA-T8	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	301048	600
CD14	APC-Fire750	M5E2	human	mouse	IgG2a, κ	Biolegend	301854	200
IFN-γ	PE	4S.B3	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	502508	50
TNF	FITC	MAb11	human	mouse	IgG1, κ	Biolegend	502906	40
IL-2	PE-Cy7	MQ1-17H12	human	rat	IgG2a, κ	eBioscience	25-7029-41	100



Figure S1. Gating strategy for T cell cytokine secretion (ICS) and proliferation (S1A) For ICS assays single cells were gated using forward scatter (FSC)- area (A) and FSC- height (H) followed by a lymphocyte gate using FSC-A and side scatter (SSC)- A. Live $CD3^+$ T cells were gated based on exclusion of dead cells (LD-NiR) and monocytes (CD14 APC Fire-750) as well as positivity for CD3 PerCP. T cell subsets were identified based on staining for CD4 APC and CD8 BV510 respectively

and expression of cytokines (IFNγ, TNF, IL-2) was then identified in the $CD4^{+}CD8^{-}$ gate as well as the $CD8^{+}CD4^{-}$ gate. Representative gating is shown for the DMSO negative control and the PMA/Ionomycin positive control. In the case of PMA/Ionomycin the $CD4^{+}$ gate was extended all the way to the $CD4^{-}$ population due to downregulation of expression upon treatment (not shown in the figure).
(S1B) For proliferation assays, lymphocytes were gated FSC-A and SSC-A parameters, followed by two subsequent single cell gates on FSC-H and width (W) as well as SSC-H and W to exclude doublets. From there live T cells were gated (LD-NiR low $CD3^{+}$) and T cell subsets were identified ($CD4^{+}CD8^{-}$ and $CD8^{+}CD4^{-}$) using $CD4^{+}$ APC and $CD8^{+}$ PE-Cy7. Within the $CD4^{+}$ and the $CD8^{+}$ T cell gate proliferating cells were identified by gating on cells with reduced CTV (CellTrace™ Violet) fluorescence intensity.



Figure S2: Comparison of T cell and IgG responses in those previously infected at baseline, infected during study, or infected at any time, at six months post second vaccine.

(S2A) Comparison of IFNy ELISpot responses to S (ancestral strain) from cryopreserved PBMCs in short naïve (n=33), infected during study (n=2), previously infected at baseline (n=11) individuals; long naïve (n=116), infected during study (n=32), previously infected at baseline (n=62) individuals; AZ naïve (n=29), infected during study (n=6), previously infected at baseline (n=10) individuals. (S2B) Effect of vaccine regime and infection status on SARS-CoV-2 S-specific IgG responses in short naïve (n=38), infected during study (n=2), previously infected at baseline (n=21); long naïve (n=132), infected during study (n=36), previously infected at baseline (n=96); AZ naïve (n=27), infected during study (n=7), previously infected at baseline (n=23). Grey circles = naïve; solid red circles = previous infection at baseline; open red circles = infected during study. ELISpot values are expressed as SFU/10^6 PBMCs, with values displayed responses to peptide pools representing S1 and S2 units of S (ancestral strain). IgG responses were measured in serum six months after the second dose using multiplexed MSD immunoassays and are shown in arbitrary units (AU)/mL. Horizontal bars represent the median. Vaccine regimens and vaccine status was compared using Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's multiple comparisons test, with 2-tailed p-values shown above linking lines where significant ($p<0.05$).



fFigure S3: T cell and IgG Antibody responses to membrane protein, nucleocapsid protein and receptor binding domain.

IFNy ELISpot responses to membrane (M) and nucleocapsid (N) protein cryopreserved in PBMCs from participants receiving a primary course of BNT162b2 short dosing interval (S3A), long dosing interval (S3B) and AstraZeneca (S3C).

IgG against receptor binding domain (RBD) in participants receiving a primary course of BNT162b2 short dosing interval (S3D), long dosing interval (S3E) and AstraZeneca (S3F).

IgG against nucleocapsid (N) protein in participants receiving a primary course of BNT162b2 short dosing interval (S3G), long dosing interval (S3H) and AstraZeneca (S3I).

Grey circles = naïve individuals, red circles = previously infected individuals. Bars represent the median. Comparisons are with the Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric test and Dunn's multiple comparisons tests, with 2-tailed p values shown above linking lines for significant differences with $p<0.05$.



Figure S4: Correlation between ACE2 inhibition and neutralising antibodies. Correlation between the percentage of ACE2 inhibition and neutralisation titers against the Victoria isolate, Delta (B.1.617.2) and Omicron BA.1 (B.1.1.529 BA.1), expressed as Focus Reduction Neutralization Assay 50 (FRNT50), determined in infection-naïve participants after receiving two doses of BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) vaccine delivered in a short (“Short”, 3-5 weeks, n=20) or long (“Long”, 6-14 weeks, n=20) dosing interval, or two doses of AZD1222 (AstraZeneca) vaccine (“AZ”, n=15) 6 months after the second dose. Pairwise correlations were assessed using Spearman's rank-order correlation. Rhombus = Pfizer short, triangle= Pfizer Long, circle=AZ.



Figure S5. T cell cytokine responses and proliferation to the omicron (BA.1) variant 6 months after the primary vaccine course with BNT162b2 or AZD1222.

Cytokine responses (IFNγ, IL2 and TNF) of (S5A) $CD4^+$ and (S5B) $CD8^+$ T cells in response to SARS-CoV2 spike from the ancestral (wildtype) strain were compared to the Omicron (BA.1) variant in naïve and previously infected participants at 6 months post second dose of either BNT162b2 (short and long dosing interval) or AZD1222. (S5C) Combined data from naïve and previously infected participants for IFN-γ and IL-2 in CD4+ T cells are displayed for each vaccine regimen. Proliferative responses of (S5D, F) $CD4^+$ and (S5E, G) $CD8^+$ T cells to SARS-CoV2 spike (S1+S2) from the ancestral strain were compared to the omicron BA.1 variant in a subset of (S5D, E) naïve (n=9) and (S5F, G) previously infected (prev inf, n=27) participants from all three vaccine regimens 6 months after the second dose. Individual data points are presented, and paired values are connected with a line. Paired testing was performed using Wilcoxon signed rank test and 2-tailed p values for significant differences ($p<0.05$) are displayed. Closed circles = ancestral spike, Open circles = omicron BA.1 spike, Grey = naïve individuals, red= prev inf individuals.