

Evaluation of the safety and immunogenicity of fractional intradermal COVID-19 vaccines as a booster: A pilot study

Suvimol Niyomnaitham^{1,2}, Somruedee Chatsiricharoenkul^{1,2}, Zheng Quan Toh^{3,4}, Sansnee Senawong⁵, Chatkamol Pheerapanyawaranun¹, Supaporn Phumiamorn⁶, Paul V Licciardi^{3,4}, Kulkanya Chokephaibulkit^{1,7,*}

¹ Siriraj Institute of Clinical Research, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

² Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

³ Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

⁴ Department of Paediatrics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Victoria, Australia

⁵ Department of Immunology, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

⁶ Department of Medical Sciences, Ministry of Public Health, Thailand

⁷ Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

***Corresponding author:** Kulkanya Chokephaibulkit, MD, Professor of Paediatrics, Department of Paediatrics, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, 2 Wanglang Road, Bangkoknoi, Bangkok 10700, Thailand Tel: (+66) 2-4141899;
Fax: (+66) 2-4128243, E-mail: kulkanya.cho@mahidol.ac.th.

Abstract

Intradermal vaccination using fractional dosage of the standard vaccine dose is one strategy to improve access to COVID-19 immunization. We conducted a pilot study in healthy adults in Thailand to evaluate the safety and immunogenicity of intradermal administration of fractional dose of ChAdOx1 (1/5th of standard dosage) or BNT162b2 (1/6th of standard dosage) to individuals previously vaccinated (prime) with two-dose intramuscular CoronaVac, ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2. Following an initial immunogenicity exploratory phase for each vaccine combination group (N=10), a total of 135 participants (N=45 per group) were recruited to three groups (CoronaVac prime-intradermal BNT162b2 boost, CoronaVac prime-intradermal ChAdOx1 boost and ChAdOx1 prime-intradermal BNT162b2 boost) and their immunogenicity data compared to a previous cohort who received the same vaccine intramuscularly. Two weeks following booster vaccination, neutralizing antibodies against the delta variant were similar between intradermal and intramuscular vaccination. However, neutralizing antibodies against the omicron variant in the intradermal BNT162b2 boost groups were ~6-fold lower, while the ChAdOx1 boost group was ~5-fold higher compared to their respective vaccine regimen given intramuscularly. The intradermal booster significantly increased spike-specific T cell responses in all three groups from pre-booster levels. Local and systemic adverse reactions were milder in intradermal compared to intramuscular injections. Further studies are needed to evaluate the clinical relevance of these findings and the feasibility of administration of intradermal COVID-19 vaccines.

Keywords: COVID-19 vaccination; Intradermal; Heterologous; Booster; Thailand

1. Introduction

As of June 2022, eleven COVID-19 vaccines (4 non-replicating viral vector, 3 inactivated, 2 RNA, 2 protein subunit) have been granted Emergency Use Listing by the World Health Organization (WHO) [1]. These vaccines given as two- or one-dose schedules (Ad26.CoV.S, Johnson and Johnson) were highly effective against severe COVID-19 and deaths, and also provided some protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection prior to the omicron variant [2]. However, a booster or third vaccine dose is needed to protect against the SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant due to its ability to evade vaccine-induced immunity [3]. Neutralizing antibodies are thought to be the primary mechanism of protection, but the concentration needed to protect has not been identified [4]. Furthermore, T cell immunity is increasingly recognized as an important marker of protection against severe COVID-19, and is conserved across multiple SARS-CoV-2 variants [5].

In high-income countries, most of the eligible population have received two or three doses of COVID-19 vaccines, but only 20% in LMICs have received one dose due to inequitable distribution of COVID-19 vaccines [6]. A few strategies have been proposed to improve access to COVID-19 vaccination that includes fractional dosing, intradermal vaccination, heterologous vaccine regimens and dose stretching [7]. While heterologous regimens and dose stretching have been studied extensively, few studies have examined intradermal COVID-19 vaccination. The dermis consists of multiple antigen presenting cells that improve vaccine immunogenicity [8]. As such, intradermal vaccination typically requires a lower vaccine dose than intramuscular vaccination, hence maximizing the use of available vaccines. While the reactogenicity following intradermal vaccination is generally higher for localized reactions, systemic reactions were lower compared to intramuscular vaccination [9]. Intradermal administration may increase vaccine

uptake among those with vaccine hesitancy due to safety concerns of standard intramuscular injection. Intradermal vaccination is already in routine use for Bacillus Calmette-Guérin and Rabies vaccines.

Since early 2021, Thailand has mainly relied on the chimpanzee adenovirus-vector (ChAdOx1) vaccine (AZD1222, *AstraZeneca/Oxford*) and the whole-cell inactivated vaccines such as CoronaVac (*Sinovac, Life Sciences*) for protection against COVID-19. Subsequently, a limited amount of BNT162b2 vaccines (*Pfizer-BioNTech*) were available. One way to maximize the use of these vaccines is intradermal vaccination using lower vaccine dosage, but whether similar immunogenicity can be achieved as with standard intramuscular vaccination is unclear. Heterologous vaccine regimens were recommended by the WHO under certain circumstances related to vaccine supply and access [10]. This study aims to assess the safety and immunogenicity of intradermal administration of heterologous or homologous booster vaccination using fractional BNT162b2 ($1/6^{\text{th}}$ of standard dose) or ChAdOx1 ($1/5^{\text{th}}$ of standard dose) in individuals who have completed the standard intramuscular primary series vaccination of either ChAdOx1, CoronaVac or BNT162b2. These dosages are typical for intradermal vaccination [11].

2. Materials and Methods

Study design and participants

This single-center prospective cohort study was conducted at Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand between September 2021-February 2022. Participants were healthy adults aged 18 years or older and have received homologous two-dose primary series intramuscular vaccination of either CoronaVac (CoronaVac-prime), ChAdOx1

(ChAdOx1-prime), or BNT162b2 (BNT162b2-prime) 4-12 weeks prior to recruitment. The participants were excluded from the study if they had the following conditions: confirmed history of SARS-CoV-2 infection, had received current prophylactic treatment or investigational agents against COVID-19 within 90 days, had unstable underlying diseases that may compromise the immune responses, had a history of vaccine hypersensitivity, were pregnant, were immunocompromised or receiving immunosuppressive agent. Written informed consent was obtained prior to recruitment.

The recruitment was conducted in two phases (Figure 1). The initial phase was an exploratory phase to determine immunogenicity and safety of 0.1 mL of ChAdOx1 (1/5th of standard intramuscular dose) or 0.05 mL BNT162b2 (1/6th of standard intramuscular dose) as booster via intradermal injection for each two-dose intramuscular primary series vaccination (prime) group: CoronaVac, ChAdOx1, or BNT162b2. There was a total of six groups and the planned sample size was 10 per group. The extended phase was aimed to focus on the CoronaVac- and ChAdOx1-prime groups, the main primary series regimens in Thailand, with additional 35 participants enrolled in each group to increase the power of the analysis. However, no additional participants were enrolled for the ChAdOx1 prime- intradermal ChAdOx1 booster group due to poor immunogenicity data found in the initial phase.

Blood samples were collected for humoral (binding antibody and neutralizing antibody) and cellular (ELISpot) immune response assessment at pre- and 2 weeks post intradermal booster vaccination. The participants were observed for at least 30 minutes following the vaccination for any immediate adverse events. The participants were instructed to submit self-assessment report using an electronic diary (eDiary) in the Google Form for seven days after each dose of vaccination for any adverse events (AEs) both solicited local and systemic reactions. The

solicited local AEs include pain, erythema, and swelling/induration at the injection site, and localized axillary lymphadenopathy or swelling or tenderness ipsilateral to the injection arm. The systemic AEs include headache, fatigue, myalgia, arthralgia, diarrhea, dizziness, nausea/vomiting, rash, fever, and chills. The severity of solicited AEs was graded using a numerical scale from 1 to 4 based on the Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events – Version 5.0 guide by the United States National Cancer Institute (NCI/NIH).

The study protocol was registered at Thai Clinical Trial Registry (TCTR20210907003, TCTR20211102006), and approved by the Siriraj Institutional Review Board (COA no. Si635/2021 and Si894/2021).

Chemiluminescent microparticle assay (CMIA) for anti-SARS-CoV-2 binding antibody

The plasma samples were isolated from the blood collected in tubes with sodium citrate solution and stored at -80°C. The level of antibody (IgG) against receptor binding domain (RBD) of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein (S1 subunit) was determined by a CMIA using the SARS-CoV-2 IgG II Quant (Abbott, List No. 06S60) on the ARCHITECT I System. This assay linearly measures the level of antibody between 21.0– 40,000.0 arbitrary unit (AU)/mL, which was converted later to WHO International Standard concentration as binding antibody unit per mL (BAU/mL) following the equation provided by the manufacturer ($\text{BAU/mL} = 0.142 \times \text{AU/mL}$).

50% Plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT₅₀) against SARS-CoV-2 strains

The neutralizing antibody titers against delta and omicron (BA.1) strains were determined by 50% plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT₅₀) on post-booster samples. The method was described previously [12]. The titer of each sample was defined as the reciprocal of the highest

test serum dilution, which the virus infectivity was reduced by 50% of an average plaque counts in the virus control wells and was calculated by using a four-point linear regression method. The PRNT₅₀ titer below positive cutoff of 10 were arbitrarily assigned a value of 5.

IFN- γ ELISpot

Cellular immunity was determined by IFN- γ ELISpot (Mabtech, Nacka Strand, Sweden) to ancestral strain on a subset of participants for each group (N=20). Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were counted and stimulated with S-peptide consisting of 100 peptides from spike protein, and nucleoprotein-membrane protein-open reading frame proteins (NMO)-peptide pools consisting of 101 peptides from nucleocapsid (N), membrane (M), open reading frame (ORF) 1, non-structural protein (nsp) 3, ORF-3a, ORF-7a, and ORF8 proteins. Negative controls contained only cell culture media, while positive controls contained anti-cluster of differentiation 3 (CD3) at a dilution of 1:1000. ELISpot plates were then incubated for 20 hours at 37°C and 5% CO₂, washed and developed using a conjugated secondary antibody that bound to membrane-captured IFN- γ . The plates were read using IRIS (Mabtech) and spots were analyzed using Apex software 1.1 (Mabtech) and converted to spot-forming units (SFU) per million cells.

Statistical Analysis

The immunogenicity and reactogenicity of the intradermal booster in CoronaVac-prime and ChAdOx1-prime groups were compared with previous study of the standard intramuscular booster injection of similar regimens and timing of booster vaccination [13]. The sample size of 45 in each group included in the extended phase will provide the 90 % power to determine the

non-inferiority between intradermal and intramuscular route if the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval (CI) around the ratio of anti-RBD SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody geometric mean concentrations (GMC) two weeks after vaccine injection is at least 0.67, as recommended by WHO (<https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/WHO-TRS-1004-web-annex-9>). The AEs endpoints were presented as frequencies and the Chi-square test was used to test for statistical difference. The immunological endpoints of anti-SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG and PRNT₅₀ titer were reported as GMC and geometric mean titers (GMT) with 95% confidence interval (CI), respectively. Unpaired t-test were used to compare IgG GMCs and IFN- γ SFU between groups. Pearson's correlation coefficient to assess the correlation between Log₁₀ of anti-SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG and Log₁₀ of PRNT₅₀. All statistical analyses were performed using the GraphPad Prism 9 version 9.2.0 (283) (GraphPad Software, CA, USA), except for ANOVA analysis of the anti-SARS-CoV-2 RBD IgG among different age groups that was performed using STATA version 17 (StataCorp, LP, College Station, TX, USA).

3. Results

Baseline characteristics of study participants

The baseline characteristics of the cohort and results of the initial phase are shown in Supplementary materials (Supplementary Figure 1 and Supplementary Table 1 and 2). For the main analysis in the extended phase, a total of 45 participants in the CoronaVac prime-intradermal ChAdOx1 boost (CoronaVac-ChAdOx1), CoronaVac prime-intradermal BNT162b2 boost (CoronaVac-BNT162b2) and ChAdOx1 prime-intradermal ChAdOx1 boost (ChAdOx1-BNT162b2) groups were included, and their baseline demographic characteristics are shown in Table 1. The overall median age (interquartile range: IQR) was 39 years (30-46), 43.6% were

male and BMI was 24.0 kg/m². The median (IQR) interval between the second dose of primary series and the ID booster vaccination was shorter in the ChAdOx1-BNT162b2, but was not statistically significant compared to the CoronaVac-primed groups. Consequently, the ChAdOx1-BNT162b2 group also had a higher baseline antibody concentration than CoronaVac-primed groups.

Humoral immune responses of intradermal ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 booster

Two weeks following the intradermal booster, the anti-RBD IgG GMC significantly increased in all three groups ($p < 0.0001$). The CoronaVac-BNT162b2 group had significantly higher GMCs than CoronaVac-ChAdOx1 and ChAdOx1-BNT162b2 groups. The ratio between post-vaccination and pre-vaccination for the CoronaVac-ChAdOx1, CoronaVac-BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1-BNT162b2 were 48.2 (33.4-69.6), 57.8 (42.5-78.4) and 7.6 (6.3-9.0), respectively (Figure 2 and Supplementary Table 2). Importantly, compared to their respective intramuscular heterologous vaccine regimen previously reported [13], there was no statistically significant difference in GMC for the CoronaVac-ChAdOx1 group, while the GMC of intradermal boosting in both CoronaVac-BNT162b2 and ChAdOx1-BNT162b2 groups were around 2.6 and 1.8-fold lower than the intramuscular boosting ($P < 0.001$).

Following the intradermal booster dose, the neutralizing antibody titers against the delta variant in all three groups were marginally lower (1.3-1.6-fold) than intramuscular booster of the same regimens, although the titers for ChAdOx-BNT162b2 was significantly lower for intradermal compared with titers for intramuscular vaccination (Figure 3A and Supplementary Table 2). Interestingly, compared to their respective intramuscular vaccine regimens, the neutralizing antibody titers against omicron variant were significantly lower (5.4-5.8-fold) with

intradermal BNT162b2, but were 5.7-fold higher with intradermal ChAdOx1 (Figure 3B and Supplementary Table 2).

Cellular immune responses of intradermal ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 booster

An intradermal booster increased the T cell responses against the spike protein for all three groups, with significantly higher spike-specific T cell responses induced by intradermal BNT162b2 booster compared with intradermal ChAdOx1 booster (Figure 4A, and Supplementary Table 2). For T cell responses against the NMO proteins, no statistically significant differences were observed for all groups following intradermal booster (Figure 4B and Supplementary Table 2).

Reactogenicity of intradermal booster injections

Local injection site reactions were similarly common among the groups and the proportion were not different compared with the reactogenicity of intramuscular injection of the similar regimens (Figure 5A). However, the severity for intradermal injection were milder compared to intramuscular injection. The systemic adverse effects were significantly less frequent and milder in intradermal compared to intramuscular booster injections (Figure 5B).

4. Discussion

This study found that the administration of fractional ChAdOx1 (1/5th of standard dose) and BNT162b2 (1/6th of the standard dose) as a booster via intradermal injection to individuals previously vaccinated with two-dose CoronaVac or ChAdOx1 standard primary series, generated robust immune responses against the delta and omicron variant. Importantly, similar

immunogenicity, with higher neutralizing antibody against omicron, were generated following intradermal compared to standard intramuscular ChAdOx1 booster to CoronaVac-prime participants. However, lower antibody responses were found for intradermal administration of fractional dosage of BNT162b2 compared with corresponding vaccine regimen given via intramuscular injection, their antibody concentrations were similar to CoronaVac-ChAdOx1 group. This is the first study to report the immunogenicity of intradermal fractional dosing against omicron variant. Our findings have important implications on the use of COVID-19 vaccines in Thailand and in settings where COVID-19 vaccines are in limited supplies. It is important to note that this study was conducted when there was a major shortage of COVID-19 vaccines. For future vaccines there may be a similar situation and novel strategies such as intradermal vaccination may be needed.

Intradermal vaccination is touted to improve global access to COVID-19 because of the use of smaller dosing, provided it offers the same immunogenicity and protection [14,15]. However, to date, there are only a few studies that have evaluated this strategy for COVID-19 vaccines. The initial phase of the study revealed some important findings of each vaccine when administering intradermally following various priming vaccination. This includes the concentration of antibodies at the time of booster dose effecting the booster responses. Another observation is that while participants vaccinated with CoronaVac had much lower IgG antibodies after 12 weeks, the strong anamnestic response following the booster dose suggests that sufficient immune memory was induced. This was substantiated in the extended phase. While neutralizing antibodies are thought to be the primary mechanism of protection [4], there is currently no identified level for protection.

Our findings that robust immunogenicity is generated following an intradermal booster dose of ChAdOx1 given at 1/5th of the standard dose in participants who previously received the standard intramuscular Coronavac is consistent with the findings from two other studies. These two studies found similar and non-inferior humoral and cellular immune responses between the standard intramuscular ChAdOx1 booster dose and the intradermal ChAdOx1 booster dose at 1/5th of standard dosing [16,17]. For intradermal boosting using BNT162b2, our study findings were also consistent with a previous study that have reported significantly lower anti-RBD IgG concentrations and neutralizing antibodies against the delta variant when compared with corresponding intramuscular injection in individuals vaccinated with CoronaVac primary series [18]. This is despite the use of different vaccine dosage for intradermal injection (1/3rd vs 1/6th of standard dose). Of note, none of these studies examined neutralizing antibodies against omicron. The neutralizing antibodies titers against omicron found in our study following intradermal boosting of fractional dose were similar across the three groups, but the titers in each group were different when compared with their corresponding vaccine regimen given via intramuscular injection. High vaccine effectiveness (>93%) against symptomatic COVID-19, COVID-19-related hospitalization, ICU admission, and death have been reported for individuals who were vaccinated with CoronaVac primary series and boosted with ChAdOx1 [19]. However, this study was conducted pre-omicron. Whether the immunogenicity induced by intradermal vaccination observed in our study is sufficient to protect against circulating omicron BA.2, BA.4 and BA.5 subvariants remains to be determined.

We found intradermal boosting with BNT162b2 induced higher T-cell response to spike protein than ChAdOx1 among individuals previously vaccinated with CoronaVac. However, we were not able to directly compare the T cell responses between those induced by intradermal

injection and intramuscular injection. Previous studies of intradermal fractional ChAdOx1 booster in individuals who received CoronaVac primary series found similar T cell responses as standard intramuscular ChAdOx1 booster at two weeks post booster dose; these responses however were lower in intradermal injection than intramuscular injection at four weeks post booster dose [16,17]. For BNT162b2, the T cell responses was lower following intradermal fractional dose than the standard intramuscular dose at two weeks [18]. The clinical relevance of the lower T cell responses through intradermal injection is unclear but may be due to the lower vaccine dosage. Further studies, including dose escalation, titrating the vaccine dosage to reach expected immunity levels but within acceptable adverse reactions may be needed. This may also be relevant for new COVID-19 vaccines such as the bivalent Wuhan- and omicron-variant vaccine and omicron-specific mRNA vaccines that are currently being investigated.

Our findings of lower and milder systemic reaction are consistent with what was reported for intradermal injection of COVID-19 vaccines and other vaccines [9,16,17]. Intradermal administration may therefore increase vaccine uptake among those hesitant about vaccination due to high reactogenicity concern associated with the standard intramuscular injection of some COVID-19 vaccines. However, intradermal injection would require specific training on administration and supply of special syringes, which have implications on implementation programs.

Our study has some limitations. Our sample size is small, and we did not have direct comparison group in the same cohort with intramuscular injection, therefore the results should be interpreted with caution. Another limitation is that our results on ChAdOx1 and BNT162b2 fractional intradermal booster may not be generalizable to other COVID-19 vaccines and populations who have received other COVID-19 vaccines as primary series. We also

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, we found that intradermal injection of fractional BNT162b2 following CoronaVac- and ChAdOx1-prime generate robust antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 delta and omicron variants, but at a lower concentration than intramuscular route. On the other hand, intradermal fractional ChAdOx1 booster induced similar antibody responses to intradermal route following CoronaVac-prime. Intradermal route had lower and milder systemic adverse reactions. Further studies are needed to evaluate the clinical relevance of these findings and the feasibility of administration of intradermal COVID-19 vaccines. Our study has significant implications for Thailand and other similar settings, where CoronaVac and ChAdOx1 vaccines were given as primary series and have limited access to mRNA vaccines.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, S.N., S.C., K.C.; Methodology, S.N., S.C., K.C.; Formal Analysis, S.N., S.C., C.P., Z.Q.T., K.C.; Investigation, S.N., S.C., S.S., S.P.; Data Curation, S.N., C.P.; Writing – Original Draft Preparation, S.C., Z.Q.T., S.P., K.C.; Writing – Review & Editing, Z.Q.T., P.V.L., K.C.; Funding Acquisition, S.N., S.C., K.C.

Funding: This study was supported by Health Systems Research Institute, Thailand. (Grant number 64-209 and 65-009)

Institutional Review Board Statement: This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of the Committee on Ethics, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University. Certificate of approval number Si635/2021 and Si894/2021

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements: We thank SICRES staff and all the participant for their contribution to the study.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationship that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this article.

References

1. The World Health Organization. 11 Vaccines Granted Emergency Use Listing (EUL) by WHO. Available online: (accessed on 18th July 2022).
2. Ssentongo, P.; Ssentongo, A.E.; Voleti, N.; et al. SARS-CoV-2 vaccine effectiveness against infection, symptomatic and severe COVID-19: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis* **2022**, *22*, 439.
3. Accorsi, E.K.; Britton, A.; Fleming-Dutra, K.E.; et al. Association Between 3 Doses of mRNA COVID-19 Vaccine and Symptomatic Infection Caused by the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron and Delta Variants. *JAMA* **2022**, *327*, 639-651.
4. Khoury, D.S.; Cromer, D.; Reynaldi, A.; et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med* **2021**, *27*, 1205-1211.
5. Moss, P. The T cell immune response against SARS-CoV-2. *Nat Immunol* **2022**, *23*, 186-193.
6. Ritchie, H.; Mathieu, E.; Rodés-Guirao, L; et al. Coronavirus Pandemic (COVID-19). Available online: (accessed on 18th July 2022).

7. Roozen, G.V.T.; Roukens, A.H.E.; Roestenberg, M. COVID-19 vaccine dose sparing: strategies to improve vaccine equity and pandemic preparedness. *Lancet Glob Health* **2022**, *10*, e570-e573.
8. Levin, C.; Perrin, H.; Combadiere, B. Tailored immunity by skin antigen-presenting cells. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **2015**, *11*, 27-36.
9. Meijer, W.J.; Wensing, A.M.J.; Bos, A.A.; et al. Influenza vaccination in healthcare workers; comparison of side effects and preferred route of administration of intradermal versus intramuscular administration. *Vaccine* **2017**, *35*, 1517-1523.
10. The World Health Organization. Interim recommendations for heterologous COVID-19 vaccine schedules. Available online: (accessed on 18th July 2022).
11. The World Health Organization. *Intradermal Delivery of Vaccines*; [https://media.path.org/documents/TS_opt_idd_review.pdf?_gl=1*14mu43d*_ga*MTk5O TI1MzI5Ny4xNjU3Nzg1MzQ5*_ga_YBSE7ZKDQM*MTY1Nzc4NTM0OC4xLjAuMTY1Nzc4NTM0OC4w](https://media.path.org/documents/TS_opt_idd_review.pdf?_gl=1*14mu43d*_ga*MTk5O TI1MzI5Ny4xNjU3Nzg1MzQ5*_ga_YBSE7ZKDQM*MTY1Nzc4NTM0OC4xLjAuMTY1Nzc4NTM0OC4w, 2009), 2009.
12. Angkasekwinai, N.; Sewatanon, J.; Niyomnaitham, S.; et al. Comparison of safety and immunogenicity of CoronaVac and ChAdOx1 against the SARS-CoV-2 circulating variants of concern (Alpha, Delta, Beta) in Thai healthcare workers. *Vaccine X* **2022**, *10*, 100153.
13. Angkasekwinai, N.; Niyomnaitham, S.; Sewatanon, J.; et al. The immunogenicity against variants of concern and reactogenicity of four COVID-19 booster vaccinations following CoronaVac or ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 primary series. <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2021.11.29.21266947v2.article-metrics>, 2022.

14. Schweiger, M. Intradermal covid-19 vaccination could solve supply problems. *BMJ* **2021**, *374*, n1980.
15. Wilder-Smith, A.; Desai, S.; Cravioto, A.; Nohynek, H.; Hombach, J. Caution before fractionating COVID-19 vaccines. *Nat Med* **2021**, *27*, 1856-1857.
16. Pinpathomrat, N.; Intapiboon, P.; Seepathomnarong, P.; et al. Immunogenicity and safety of an intradermal ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 boost in a healthy population. *NPJ Vaccines* **2022**, *7*, 52.
17. Tawinprai, K.; Siripongboonsitti, T.; Porntharukchareon, T.; et al. Immunogenicity and safety of an intradermal fractional third dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19/AZD1222 vaccine compared with those of a standard intramuscular third dose in volunteers who previously received two doses of CoronaVac: A randomized controlled trial. *Vaccine* **2022**, *40*, 1761-1767.
18. Intapiboon, P.; Seepathomnarong, P.; Ongarj, J.; et al. Immunogenicity and Safety of an Intradermal BNT162b2 mRNA Vaccine Booster after Two Doses of Inactivated SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine in Healthy Population. *Vaccines (Basel)* **2021**, *9*.
19. Jara, A.; Undurraga, E.A.; Zubizarreta, J.R.; et al. Effectiveness of homologous and heterologous booster doses for an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine: a large-scale prospective cohort study. *Lancet Glob Health* **2022**, *10*, e798-e806.

Figure Legend

Figure 1. Consort Diagram showing enrollment of each group in initial phase and extended phase. The Group 1 and 2 received 2-dose CoronaVac intramuscularly (CoronaVac-prime), Group 3 and 4 received 2-dose ChAdOx1 intramuscularly (ChAdOx1-prime), and Group 5 and 6 received 2-dose BNT162b2 intramuscularly (BNT162b2-prime). Each group were randomized to receive intradermal BNT162b2 (0.05 ml, 1/6th of standard dosage) or ChAdOx1 (0.1 ml, 1/5th of standard dosage). Additional participants were enrolled in the extended phase to Groups 1, 2, and 3.

Figure 2. Geometric mean concentration of anti-RBD IgG pre- and post-intradermal (ID) booster dose. Intramuscular (IM) boosting of the same vaccine regimens from the previous study [13] is included as a reference group. Error bars represent geometric mean concentration plus 95% confidence intervals. BAU: binding antibody units.

Figure 3. Neutralizing antibody titers of live virus plaque reduction neutralization assays (PRNT₅₀) against delta strain (A) and omicron strains (B) following intradermal (ID) booster. Intramuscular (IM) boosting of the similar vaccine regimens from the previous study [13] is included as the reference group. Error bars represent geometric mean titers plus 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4. SARS-CoV-2 antigen-specific T-cell response by ELISPOT after intradermal (ID) booster. (A) spike-specific T cell responses. (B) Nucleocapsid-Membrane-Open reading frame-T cell responses. Error bars represent geometric mean concentrations plus 95% confidence intervals. SFU: spot-forming units.

Figure 5. Adverse events by self-report following intradermal boosting. Intramuscular boosting of the similar vaccine regimens from the previous study [13] is included as a reference group.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the subjects of each group in the extended phase.

Extended phase Primary series (IM)+ Booster (ID)	Types of vaccines				<i>p</i> -value
	All	CoronaVac - BNT162b2	CoronaVac - ChAdOx1	ChAdOx1 - BNT162b2	
Number of subjects, N (%)	135 (100)	45 (33.3)	45 (33.3)	45 (33.3)	-
Age (years), Median (IQR)	39 (30, 46)	38.0 (29, 44)	39.0 (29, 45)	43 (30, 50)	0.186
Male, N (%)	60 44.4	18 30.0	23 38.3	19 31.7	0.533
Body mass index: BMI (kg/m ²), Median (IQR)	24.0 (21.5,26.6)	24.4 (22.3, 26.8)	23.6 (20.4, 26.5)	23.9 (21.5, 26.4)	0.719

Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.





Figure 4.





Figure 5.

