Homologous and heterologous boosting with CoronaVac and BNT162b2: a randomized trial (the Cobovax study)

Nancy H. L. Leung*[#1,2], Samuel M. S. Cheng*[1], Carolyn A. Cohen*[3], Mario Martín-Sánchez[1], Niki Y. M. Au[1], Leo L. H. Luk[1], Leo C. H. Tsang[1], Kelvin K. H. Kwan[1], Sara Chaothai[1], Lison W. C. Fung[1], Alan W. L. Cheung[3], Karl C. K. Chan[1], John K. C. Li[1], Yvonne Y. Ng[1], Prathanporn Kaewpreedee[3], Janice Z. Jia[3], Dennis K. M. Ip[1], Leo L. M. Poon[1,3,4], Gabriel M. Leung[†1,2], J. S. Malik Peiris[†1,3,4], Sophie A. Valkenburg[†3,5], Benjamin J. Cowling[†#1,2]

*Joint first authors with equal contribution

[†]Joint senior authors with equal contribution

[#]Corresponding authors

Affiliations:

1. WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

2. Laboratory of Data Discovery for Health; Hong Kong Science and Technology Park, New Territories, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

3. HKU-Pasteur Research Pole, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

4. Centre for Immunology and Infection; Hong Kong Science and Technology Park, New Territories, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China.

5. Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Peter Doherty Institute of Infection and Immunity, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.

Clinicaltrials.gov registration: NCT05057169

Running head: Crossover trial of CoronaVac and BNT162b2

Word count (abstract): 301

Word count (main text): 4,500

Corresponding authors:

Benjamin Cowling, WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong; Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China. bcowling@hku.hk

Nancy Leung, WHO Collaborating Centre for Infectious Disease Epidemiology and Control, School of Public Health, LKS Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong; Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China. leungnan@hku.hk

ABSTRACT

Background: There are few trials comparing homologous and heterologous third doses of COVID-19 vaccination with inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines.

Methods: We conducted an open-label randomized trial in adults >=18 years of age who received two doses of inactivated vaccine (CoronaVac) or mRNA vaccine (BNT162b2) >=6 months earlier, randomised in 1:1 ratio to receive a third dose of either vaccine. We compared the reactogenicity, immunogenicity and cell-mediated immune responses, and assessed vaccine efficacy against infections during follow-up.

Results: We enrolled 219 adults who previously received two doses of CoronaVac and randomised to CoronaVac ("CC-C", n=101) or BNT162b2 ("CC-B", n=118) third dose; and 232 adults who previously received BNT162b2 and randomised to CoronaVac ("BB-C", n=118) or BNT162b2 ("BB-B", n=114). There were more frequent reports of mild reactions in recipients of third-dose BNT162b2, which generally subsided within 7 days. Antibody responses against the ancestral virus, Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 subvariant by surrogate neutralization and $PRNT_{50}$ were stronger for the recipients of a third dose of BNT162b2 over CoronaVac irrespective of prior vaccine type. $CD4^+$ T cells boost only occurred in CoronaVac-primed arms. We did not identify differences in $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cell responses between arms. When Omicron BA.2 was circulating, we identified 58 infections with cumulative incidence of 15.3% and 15.4% in the CC-C and CC-B (p=0.93), and 16.7% and 14.0% in the BB-C and BB-B arms, respectively (p=0.56).

Conclusions: Similar levels of incidence of infection in each arm suggest all third dose combinations may provide similar degrees of protection against prevalent Omicron BA.2 infection, despite very weak antibody responses to BA.2 in the recipients of a CoronaVac third

dose. Further research is warranted to identify appropriate correlates of protection for inactivated COVID-19 vaccines.

INTRODUCTION

The accrual of population immunity to COVID-19 may ultimately allow communities to return to normal, or at least to a "new-normal". Immunity can be acquired through surviving infections or, preferably, by vaccination. An unprecedented global effort has led to the rapid development and deployment of COVID-19 vaccines.[1] Vaccines against COVID-19 have generally been developed initially as either a single dose, or two doses of the same vaccine technology platform i.e. a homologous two-dose regimen.[1] The emergence of variants of concern (VOCs)[2] and observed decrease in vaccine-induced immune responses within a few months after vaccination[3,4] have led to the implementations of third dose ("booster") vaccination programs.[5] While some booster campaigns have encouraged individuals to receive a homologous third dose, a third/booster dose with a different vaccine platform, i.e., heterologous vaccination, could be more feasible in some locations.[6-8] There is also a possibility that combining vaccine doses using different vaccine platforms by heterologous prime-boost strategies might enhance the immune response.[9] Heterologous vaccination has been investigated by a number of clinical trials with mixed results depending on the initial platform and sequence of vaccination.[7,10,11] Conversely, considerations over adverse events may prompt individuals to prefer one vaccine platform over the other.[8]

In Hong Kong, a subtropical city in southern China, the COVID-19 vaccination programme started in February 2021. The programme initially offered each adult in Hong Kong a choice of two doses of the inactivated whole-virion vaccine CoronaVac (Sinovac) 28 days apart, or two doses of mRNA vaccine BNT162b2 (BioNTech/Fosun Pharma, marketed by Pfizer outside China) 21 days apart, with broad eligibility criteria and availability. Subsequently, healthy adults

93 have been recommended to receive a third dose of either vaccine (i.e., allowing cross-over) as
94 soon as 90 days after the second dose.[8]
95
96 Safety, immunogenicity and efficacy are the main aspects evaluated before vaccines are licensed.
97 There are few trials[12] comparing the potential advantages of homologous or heterologous third
98 doses in individuals who have previously received two doses of an inactivated vaccine or two
99 doses of an mRNA vaccine. Here, we conducted a randomized trial to compare the
100 immunogenicity and reactogenicity to BNT162b2 or CoronaVac in individuals that had
101 previously received two doses of those vaccines. In addition, in early 2022 during the biggest
102 local (fifth) wave the antigenically distinct Omicron BA.2 variant was the major circulating
103 strain,[13] which provided us an opportunity to evaluate the comparative efficacy of these different
104 vaccine combinations against infection.
105
106 **METHODS**
107 ***Trial design and participants***
108 This study is an open-label randomized trial conducted in Hong Kong to measure the vaccine
109 (humoral) immunogenicity and reactogenicity of third doses with an mRNA vaccine
110 (BNT162b2) or an inactivated vaccine (CoronaVac) in adults who have previously received two
111 doses of either vaccine. BNT162b2 is a nucleoside-modified mRNA encoding the trimerized
112 SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein formulated in lipid nanoparticles, and each 0.3mL dose
113 contains 30µg of mRNA. CoronaVac is a Vero cell-based, aluminium hydroxide-adjuvanted, β-
114 propiolactone-inactivated vaccine, and each 0.5 ml dose includes 600SU of inactivated SARS-
115 CoV-2 virus.

116

117 Individuals were eligible for this study if they were Hong Kong residents, ≥18 years of age at
118 enrolment and had previously received a homologous two-dose primary series of either
119 BNT162b2 or CoronaVac, with the second dose received at least 6 months (180 days) earlier.
120 Exclusion criteria included: a history of confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection, a delay of ≥43 days
121 between the first two vaccine doses, contraindication for COVID-19 vaccination such as severe
122 allergies, use of medication that could impair the immune system in the last 6 months (except
123 topical steroids or short-term oral steroids), use of immunoglobulins and/or any blood products
124 within 90 days prior to enrolment, and pregnant or nursing, or planning to become pregnant. The
125 study protocol (Clinicaltrials.gov NCT05057169) was approved by the Institutional Review
126 Board of the University of Hong Kong (ref: UW 21-492).

127

128 ***Randomization and masking***

129 The random allocation process was concealed from both participants and the field investigation
130 team, by way of pre-assignment based on a computer-generated sequence of random numbers
131 administered by clicking a randomization button in the online data collection tool REDCap.
132 Participants received two-dose CoronaVac or BNT162b2 were randomised separately to receive
133 a third dose of either vaccine in a 1:1 ratio. We used a block randomization structure with block
134 sizes of 2, 4 and 6. The sequence of random numbers was generated prior to the start of the study
135 by a statistician using the computer software package R. For logistical reasons individuals were
136 randomized at the time vaccination appointments were made, and there were dropouts after
137 randomization and before vaccination. However, both the participants and field investigation
138 team were not aware of the intervention until after vaccination, as the vaccination was done by

separate unblinded nurses at the community vaccination centres. After vaccination, participants were provided with vaccination cards as required by the local government indicating which vaccine they had received, i.e. participants and field investigation team were also unblinded from this time onwards. The staff conducting laboratory tests were blinded to the third dose allocation.

Procedures

Participants were enrolled from the general community (see **Supplementary Information** for additional information on enrolment and follow-up). We collected 20ml blood samples immediately prior to vaccination (Day 0) and scheduled follow-up blood draws at 28, 182 days and 365 days after vaccination. In a voluntary subset of approximately 35% of participants we collected additional 10ml whole blood samples at day 0, 7 and 28 for analysis of cell-mediated immune responses (CMI). At each encounter for a blood draw we offered a HKD100 (USD13) incentive in the form of a supermarket gift voucher. After vaccination, participants were provided with vaccination cards and tympanic thermometers, observed for 15-30 minutes for immediate events, and then provided with an e-diary and requested to record daily on possible (delayed) adverse events or symptoms for 7 days as well as any medical encounters. From March 2022, all participants were invited to participate in active surveillance to identify COVID-19 and influenza virus infection using rapid antigen tests (RAT) at home every four days. We also ascertained whether any participants had an infection identified by RAT or PCR after enrolment but prior to the start of active surveillance. The active surveillance is continuing with information collected up to May 31 included in the present analyses.

161 ***Outcomes***

162 The primary outcome measure is the immunogenicity at 28 days after the third dose of either
163 BNT162b2 or CoronaVac, measured as geometric mean titer (GMT) of SARS-CoV-2 serum
164 neutralising antibodies using plaque reduction neutralization test ($PRNT_{50}$). The secondary
165 outcome measures included i) the geometric mean fold rise (MFR) of SARS-CoV-2 serum
166 neutralising antibody titers from baseline (Day 0) to Day 28, ii) magnitude and phenotype of
167 vaccine-specific $IFN\gamma^+CD4^+$ and $IFN\gamma^+CD8^+$ T-cell responses at Day 7 and 28, iii) the incidence
168 of solicited local and systemic adverse events, and iv) COVID-19 infections after receiving the
169 third vaccine dose.

170

171 ***Sample size justification***

172 For the primary outcome of vaccine immunogenicity, i.e. the GMT of SARS-CoV-2 serum
173 neutralising antibodies against the vaccine strain (ancestral virus) at 28 days after vaccination, a
174 sample size of 100 individuals in each study arm was chosen. Based on our preliminary data,
175 assuming $\log_{10}(GMT(PRNT_{50}$ at Day 0)) = $\log_{10}(27) = 1.4$ with a standard deviation of 0.9, a
176 sample size of 80 individuals per group would provide 80% power to detect a difference in $\log_{10}$
177 GMT of 0.4 or greater at the 5% significance level. The same calculation applies in each stratum.
178 We aimed for at least 100 individuals in each study arm to allow for the possibility of withdrawal
179 from the study prior to the day 28 assessment.

180

181 ***Laboratory analysis***

182 Blood samples were delivered to our study laboratory at the University of Hong Kong as soon as
183 possible, with the optimal delivery time within 24h. Clotted blood samples were stored in a

184 refrigerated container at 2-8°C immediately after collection and while in transit to the central
185 laboratory. Sera were extracted from the clotted blood samples within 48 hours after collection,
186 divided into 2-4 aliquots, and stored at -80°C until subsequent serologic testing. Heparinized
187 blood samples were kept at room temperature upon collection and while in transit and processed
188 within 24 hours of collection. Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) were isolated from
189 the heparinized (whole) blood using Ficoll-Paque and leucosep tubes, divided into 2 aliquots,
190 and cryopreserved in liquid nitrogen until further analysis for cell-mediated immune responses.
191
192 Details of serologic testing, including our in-house enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay
193 (ELISA) for the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the spike protein, a surrogate virus
194 neutralisation test (sVNT) (GenScript) and a plaque reduction neutralisation test (PRNT), have
195 been described in our earlier study on the immunogenicity of third-dose BNT162b2 after two
196 doses of CoronaVac[8]. We aimed to test sera collected on Day 0 and 28 with ELISA against
197 ancestral virus and sVNT against both ancestral virus and Omicron variant in all participants,
198 and with PRNT against both ancestral virus and Omicron variant in a randomly selected subset
199 of 20 participants in each study arm. We have demonstrated a good correlation (r=0.77) between
200 $PRNT_{50}$ and sVNT neutralization percentage for ancestral virus in our earlier studies[14]. The
201 ELISA has a dynamic range of between 0 to 5, although it was not designed as a quantitative
202 assay. For ELISA a single 1:100 serum dilution and for sVNT a single 1:10 serum dilution was
203 tested respectively. For PRNT, a serial two-fold serum dilutions from 1:10 to 1:320 were tested
204 initially, and in participants with an initial $PRNT_{50}$ titer of ≥320, additional PRNT using a serial
205 two-fold serum dilutions from 1:40 to 1:1280 were performed. PRNT assays were carried out
206 using ancestral SARS-CoV-2 BetaCoV/Hong Kong/VM20001061/2020 (GISAID

207 EPI_ISL_412028) isolated in Vero-E6 cells (ATCC CRL-1586), the Pango lineage B.1.1.529
208 Omicron BA.1 subvariant designated hCoV-19/Hong Kong/VM21044713_WHP5047-S5/2021
209 (GISAID EPI_ISL_6716902) and BA.2 subvariant hCoV-19/Hong
210 Kong/VM22000135_HKUVOC0588P2/2022 (GISAID EPI_ISL_9570707) isolated in Vero-E6
211 TMRSS2 cells (Vero E6 cells overexpressing TMPRSS2, kindly provided by Dr S Matsuyama
212 and colleagues),[15] and the passage level 3 virus aliquots were used. Cells were maintained in
213 DMEM medium supplemented with 10% FBS and 100 U/ml penicillin–streptomycin (all from
214 ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). The $PRNT_{50}$, $PRNT_{80}$ and $PRNT_{90}$ titers were
215 the highest serum dilutions neutralising ≥50%, ≥80% and ≥90% of input plaques, respectively.
216 The WHO control serum provided by the National Institute for Biological Standards and Control
217 20/136 gave $PRNT_{50}$ titers of 320 and 320 against the ancestral virus and 20 and 40 against the
218 Omicron variant in two titrations.
219
220 The cell-mediated immune responses to the third dose COVID-19 vaccination, proxy by the
221 cytokine production of IFNγ (in both $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cells) or IL4 (in $CD4^+$ T cells only) of T
222 cells, were assessed in a randomly-selected subset of 20 participants in each study arm by
223 intracellular cytokine staining (ICS). All testing was done in two experiments with each
224 experiment including 10 participants randomly selected from each study arm, and time point
225 samples collected from the same participant tested in parallel in the same experiment. Samples
226 with a positive value after subtracting the respective value of the DMSO control were classified
227 as having a positive response ("responder") (value of DMSO control for $CD4^+$ $IFN\gamma^+$ T cells:
228 0.001%; $CD8^+$ $IFN\gamma^+$ T cells: 0.00017%; $CD4^+$ $IL4^+$ T cells: 0.000039%). Furthermore, $CD4^+$
229 and $CD8^+$ T cell memory phenotypes (CD45RA/CD27) and cytokine polyfunctional quality

230 (TNFα/IL2) were assessed by gating on IFNγ$^+$ cells for samples which were classified as CD4$^+$
231 IFNγ$^+$ T cell or CD8$^+$ IFNγ$^+$ T cell responders[16]. Cryopreserved PBMCs collected on Day 0, 7
232 and 28 were thawed and re-stimulated with an overlapping peptide pool representing the SARS-
233 CoV-2 structural proteins (spike, nucleocapsid, envelope and membrane) (300nM) or DMSO
234 (1% in RPMI) in two independent experiments. Cells were stimulated for a total of 28 hours at
235 37ºC. Golgi Plug (BD) containing Brefeldin A (1% in PBS), and Golgi Stop (BD) containing
236 Monensin (0.67% in PBS) was added at 24 hours during stimulation for further 4-hour
237 incubation. The amino acid sequence of the peptide pools was based on βCoV/Hong
238 Kong/VM20001061/2020 strain (GISAID ID: EPI_ISL_412028). Cells were stained with
239 Zombie-NIR (all antibodies from Biolegend and clone used) followed by anti-human CD3-
240 PE/Dazzle 594 (UCHT1), CD4-BV605 (OKT4), CD8-AlexaFluor700 (SK1), CCR7-
241 PerCP/Cy5.5 (G043H7), PD-1-BV421 (NAT105), CD45RA-APC (HI100), and a dump channel
242 containing CD19-BV510 (HIB19), CD56-BV510 (5.1H11) and CD14-BV510 (M5E2).
243 Following cell permeabilization, intracellular staining with anti-IFNγ-FITC (4S.B3), IL4-PE
244 (MP4-25D2) and TNFα-BV711 (Mab11), IL2-PECy7 (MQ1-17H12), was carried out before
245 acquisition of samples. Stained cells were acquired via flow cytometry (AttuneNxT) and
246 analysed by FlowJo v10. All samples met the cell viability cut-off of at least 30% and thus have
247 been included in the analyses.
248
249 ***Statistical analysis***
250 We included all available data on participants who received a third dose of vaccination in our
251 trial. For post-vaccination reactions, solicited local and systemic events or symptoms were
252 presented as frequency (%) among participants who reported health status for ≥7 days in the

253 week following receipt of the third dose. We compared the proportions of the participants with
254 adverse events between the two study arms in individuals who had a prior recipient of two-dose
255 BNT162b2, or who had a prior recipient of two doses of CoronaVac, using the Chi-squared test
256 or Fisher's exact test. Severity score as a proxy of interference to usual activities was calculated
257 by assigning 0-reactions absent, 1-mild, 2-moderate and 3-severe and taking the average over the
258 week after vaccination, and compared between groups using Student's t-tests.
259
260 For antibody responses, for sVNT measured negative neutralization percentages were
261 transformed to zero. PRNT titers were taken as the reciprocal of the serum dilution and were
262 interval-censored, e.g. a sample that was able to neutralise virus at a 1:20 dilution but not at a
263 1:40 dilution was reported as 20 to indicate that the titer was ≥20 and <40. We estimated the
264 arithmetic mean of SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization percentages and concentrations
265 of SARS-CoV-2 Spike RBD IgG (proxy by OD_{450}) on Day 28. For PRNT titers, we imputed
266 titers <10 with the value 5 and titers ≥1280 with the value 2560, and then transformed to $\log_2$
267 scale for the estimation of GMT and MFR, and significant testing. We compared antibody levels
268 between Day 0 and Day 28 using Wilcoxon signed rank tests. We compared antibody levels at
269 Day 28 between study arms using Mann-Whitney U tests. For cell-mediated response, we
270 transformed $CD4^+$ $IFN\gamma^+$ T cell, $CD8^+$ $IFN\gamma^+$ T cell and $CD4^+$ $IL4^+$ T cell responses to log10
271 scale for the estimation of geometric means and fold-rises and significance testing. $CD4^+$ and
272 $CD8^+$ T cell memory phenotypes and cytokine polyfunctional quality were assumed zeros for
273 $CD4^+/CD8^+$ $IFN\gamma^+$ T cell non-responders. We compared T cell responses between Day 0 and
274 Day 7, and between Day 0 and Day 28, using Wilcoxon signed rank tests. We compared T cell
275 responses at Day 7, and at Day 28, between study arms using Mann-Whitney U tests.

We compared the cumulative incidence of infections in each study arm using Kaplan-Meier curves and compared the incidence of infections using proportional hazards model. The proportional hazards model was specified on a calendar time axis with follow up starting from the start of Hong Kong's fifth wave on 1 January 2022 or on the date of third dose if later, and ending at the earliest of the time of infection, the time of receiving a fourth dose, the time of withdrawing from the study, or the censoring date on 31 May 2022. If a participant reported more than one instance of positive result by RAT or PCR, the earliest date of identification was considered the time of infection. All statistical analyses were conducted using R version 4.2.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria).

RESULTS

From 12 November 2021 through 27 January 2022, we screened 994 individuals and 818 (82%) passed the initial eligibility assessment (**Figure 1, Figure S1**). We randomized 364 individuals to the CC-C (178) and CC-B (186) arms, and 406 individuals to the BB-C (202) and BB-B (204) arms. After final confirmation of eligibility, we collected baseline (Day 0) blood samples from 451 participants and then administered third doses, including 101 (57%) CC-C participants, 118 (63%) CC-B participants, 118 (58%) BB-C participants, and 114 (56%) BB-B participants. Participant characteristics were generally comparable between the CC-C and CC-B arms, and between the BB-C and BB-B arms (**Table 1**). Participants in the CC-C arm (median aged 58 years, IQR 50-64) were slightly older than those in CC-B (52 years, 43-58) ($p = 0.01$). For all 451 vaccinated participants, most reported receiving the second dose 6-8 months earlier (**Table**

298 **1**). A subset of 156 (35%) participants agreed to provide PBMCs samples on Day 0, 7 and Day
299 28 to evaluate cell-mediated immune responses ("CMI group").
300
301 We collected information on post-vaccination reactions in 424 (94%) participants, including 193
302 (64%) who reported ever feeling unwell after vaccination, with significantly more frequent
303 reactions in recipients of a third dose of BNT162b2 that mostly subsided within 7 days (**Figure**
304 **2**, **Table S3**). Fever ≥38.0ºC was reported by about 10% of participants in both BB-B and CC-B
305 arms, but by none in BB-C and CC-C arms (**Table S3**). Among 440 participants who reported
306 information on medical care and hospitalisation, 10 reported seeking ambulatory care within one
307 month of the third dose, including 4 (1 in CC-C and 3 in CC-B) for discomfort associated with
308 vaccination (**Table S4**). One BB-B participant reported hospitalisation within a month of
309 vaccination for unrelated reasons (**Table S4**).
310
311 Third-dose vaccination significantly increased neutralising antibodies, measured as sVNT
312 inhibition percentage or $PRNT_{50}$ titers, against the ancestral virus, Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 on
313 Day 28 from baseline in all four study arms regardless of third dose vaccine type (**Figure 3,**
314 **Table S5**). In particular, third-dose vaccination increased $PRNT_{50}$ titers against ancestral virus
315 by 14-, 94-, 3- and 19-folds, and against Omicron BA.2 by 1-, 16-, 1- and 13-folds, in CC-C,
316 CC-B, BB-C and BB-B arms respectively (**Figure S2A**). In both assays, antibody responses to a
317 BNT162b2 third dose were substantially and statistically significantly greater than responses to a
318 CoronaVac third dose regardless of prior two-dose vaccine type (**Figure 3, Figure S2A, Table**
319 **S5**). Similar significant differences between study arms were observed when comparing binding
320 antibodies against ancestral virus by ELISA (**Figure S3, Table S6**), or when comparing

321 neutralizing antibodies evaluated at higher neutralization inhibition thresholds ($PRNT_{80}$ or
322 $PRNT_{90}$ titers) (**Figure S4, Table S6**).
323
324 In a subset of 20 participants randomly selected from each study arm (**Table S2**), we found that
325 vaccination significantly increased the number of $IFN\gamma^+$ $CD4^+$ T cells (indicative of a Th1
326 response) in both CC-C and CC-B arms on Day 7, which remained significantly elevated from
327 Day 0 on Day 28 (**Figure 4A**, **Figure S2B**). There was no significant change in $IFN\gamma^+$ $CD4^+$ T
328 cells in both BB-C and BB-B arms on both Day 7 and Day 28 (**Figure 4A**, **Figure S2B**).
329 Separately, 30-50% participants in all arms had $IFN\gamma^+$ $CD8^+$ T cells (indicative of a CTL
330 response) at baseline, but these were only significantly boosted in CC-B arm on Day 7 and
331 contracted by Day 28 (**Figure 4B**, **Figure S2B**). Meanwhile, $IL4^+$ $CD4^+$ T cells (indicative of a
332 Th2 response) were not significantly boosted by third doses in any arm (**Figure S2B, Figure**
333 **S5**). There were no significant differences in the magnitude of $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cell responses
334 between third doses of CoronaVac or BNT162b2 (**Table S6, Table S7**). We also evaluated the
335 multi-cytokine production (TNFα and IL-2) and memory phenotype of IFNγ-producing $CD4^+$ or
336 $CD8^+$ T cells. We observed a bias towards single cytokine responses ($IFN\gamma^+$) as the majority of
337 the T cell responses, but expansions upon vaccination of double cytokine responses ($IFN\gamma^+$ with
338 $TNF\alpha^+$ or $IL\text{-}2^+$) in CC-C and CC-B; and T effector memory responses predominated across all
339 arms and were further expanded in CC-C and CC-B (**Figure 4C and 4D, Table S5**).
340
341 We identified 58 SARS-CoV-2 infections by 31 May 2022, within 4-6 months of receipt of the
342 third dose of vaccination. During this period the Omicron BA.2 variant was locally circulating.
343 The number of infections identified by arm was 13/85 (15.3%) in CC-C, 16/104 (15.4%) in CC-

344 B, 16/96 (16.7%) in BB-C and 13/93 (14.0%) in BB-B arms, with no statistically significant
345 difference detected between the CC-C and CC-B arms (p = 0.93) nor between the BB-C and BB-
346 B arms (p = 0.56) (**Figure 5**). Comparing BB-B and BB-C groups, the hazard ratio for a
347 BNT162b2 third dose compared to a CoronaVac third dose was 0.80 (95% confidence interval:
348 0.39, 1.67) corresponding to a relative vaccine efficacy of 20%, while the hazard ratio for CC-B
349 versus CC-C was 0.97 (95% confidence interval: 0.47, 2.01) corresponding to a relative vaccine
350 efficacy of 3%. Additional information on active surveillance is available in **Supplementary**
351 **Materials**.
352

353 **DISCUSSION**

354 Here, we have conducted a comprehensive assessment of the reactogenicity, antibody response,
355 T cell responses and risk of infection in a randomised trial of homologous and heterologous
356 boosting with BNT162b2 and CoronaVac. Our population had minimal COVID-19 infection
357 history prior to all three doses of vaccination,[17] and absence of known prior COVID-19 infection
358 was one of the inclusion criteria. Furthermore, SARS-CoV-2 infection attack rate in the
359 population of Hong Kong assessed by population based sero-surveillance studies was
360 approximately 1% prior to the fifth wave of infections (unpublished data), thus likelihood of
361 unsuspected infection in this cohort prior to vaccination was low. When evaluating the ability to
362 boost immune response by a third vaccine dose, we showed that regardless of the combinations,
363 a third vaccine dose increased neutralising antibody against all ancestral virus, the Omicron
364 BA.1 and BA.2 variants significantly from baseline (**Figure 3**). The phenotype of the T cell
365 responses was predominantly effector memory and single cytokine producing across all vaccine
366 arms, but $CD4^+$ and $CD8^+$ T cell responses were only boosted in CC-C and CC-B, and no

367 differences were found between all arms in total magnitude of T cell responses, phenotype or
368 proportion responders (**Figure 4**). Prior influenza research has suggested the differentiation state
369 of T cell responses can impact recall potential at infection and protection from disease.[18] Thus,
370 mRNA vaccine as a booster substantially increased antibody response, and those primed with
371 two-dose inactivated vaccines by receiving mRNA or inactivated vaccine booster will benefit the
372 T cell response, each providing an immunological layer against COVID-19. These findings
373 suggest there is immune benefit of administering either a homologous or heterologous third dose
374 six months after the second dose, especially more prominent in adults who initially received two
375 doses of an inactivated vaccine.
376
377 The humoral and cellular immune results taken together would be indicative of superior efficacy
378 of a third dose of BNT162b2 but that is not what we observed (**Figure 5**). Rates of infection,
379 with Omicron BA.2 predominant in the community, were very similar among study arms
380 (**Figure 5**). This discrepancy may indicate the challenge of using neutralising antibody as a
381 correlate or mediator of protection against infection,[19,20] at least in comparisons between
382 vaccination strategies of mRNA and inactivated vaccines. Although neutralizing antibody did
383 appear to be a correlate of protection when comparing RNA and adenovirus vectored vaccines
384 and in comparisons between vaccinated and unvaccinated individuals,[21-23] antibody alone may
385 not explain the protection provided by inactivated vaccines, especially against viruses such as
386 Omicron which have high escape from neutralizing antibody elicited by ancestral virus. T-cell
387 responses may also play a role, as well as potentially non-neutralizing antibodies to internal virus
388 genes such as the nucleocapsid. A discordance between neutralizing antibody titres and vaccine

389 effectiveness against severe disease was also noted by us previously.[24] Such differences between
390 vaccine types may not always have been accounted for in immunobridging studies[25].
391
392 The $CD4^+$ helper T cell response, which has been shown to confer heterologous protection
393 against lung damage from infection by Beta variant in mice,[26] was significantly boosted and
394 maintained by both homologous (CC-C) and heterologous (CC-B) third dose after two doses of
395 inactivated vaccine (**Figure 4**). This is consistent with earlier findings,[27,28] and these studies
396 additionally suggested cross-reactivity against the Omicron variant by a third dose. Conversely,
397 there was no boost of T cell responses neither by a homologous nor heterologous third dose after
398 two doses of BNT162b2 (**Figure 4**), however a high level of responders at baseline was observed
399 in both arms (**Figure 4A and 4B**). The $CD8^+$ cytotoxic T cell response, which may have a role in
400 limiting COVID-19 disease severity,[29,30] was significantly boosted at Day 7 although not
401 maintained to memory (Day 28) by heterologous third-dose BNT162b2 after two doses of
402 CoronaVac (**Figure 4**). While the initial two doses were not randomized and participants did
403 differ in a number of ways (**Table S9**), more participants who previously received two-dose
404 BNT162b2 (80-90% responders) had $CD4^+$ T cell responses compared to those who previously
405 received two-dose CoronaVac (60-70% responders), and similar proportions of participants had
406 $CD8^+$ T cell response at baseline between all arms (30-50% responders, **Figure 4**). In addition,
407 the baseline $CD4^+$ T cell response of participants who received prior two doses of BNT162b2
408 were similar to the levels after third-dose vaccination in participants received prior two doses of
409 CoronaVac (**Figure 4**). These may suggest a ceiling effect on the T cell response among
410 participants who previously received two doses of BNT162b2 and explain the lack of boost in

411 cell-mediated immunity in the BB-C and BB-B arms, which has also been observed
412 elsewhere.[28,31]
413
414 Our study has several limitations. First, due to logistical challenges, we were only able to
415 randomise at the time vaccination appointment was made but not at vaccination, and nearly half
416 of randomized individuals dropped out before vaccination. However, the rates of dropout were
417 similar across study arms, and we have taken great care in the randomisation and allocation
418 concealment so that individuals dropping out were not aware of their allocated vaccine type.
419 Comparisons between study arms did not identify significant differences in most baseline
420 characteristics measured, except vaccinated participants in CC-B were on average 6 years
421 younger than those in CC-C, and vaccinated participants in BB-B were over twice more likely to
422 have hypertension than those in BB-C (**Table 1**). We also did not observe any significant
423 differences in all antibody and cell-mediated response measured at baseline (**Table S6**). Second,
424 in our study we did not include an unvaccinated control group, nor a two-dose comparison
425 group, to evaluate the additional benefits of third dose over existing two doses. Third, we have
426 only studied neutralising antibodies and T cell response, while other branches of immunity such
427 as non-neutralising antibodies[32,33] may also contribute to protection and may explain the
428 discrepancy in our immunologic and efficacy data. Finally, our study population consists of
429 adults whom first immune priming was from either mRNA or inactivated vaccination, which is
430 different to many parts of the world where the first immune priming was from natural infection.
431 This might lead to differences in subsequent immune response,[34] vaccine effectiveness[35] and
432 duration of protection,[36] and our study findings should be interpreted with these considerations.
433

434 In conclusion, our results suggest there is immune benefit in both administering a homologous or
435 heterologous third dose 6 months after two doses of inactivated or mRNA vaccination, with
436 similar levels of protection against infection provided by all four combinations. Mass vaccination
437 programmes that offer both inactivated and mRNA vaccines, with explanation on their potential
438 advantages and disadvantages, will help individuals in deciding their preferred option, allow
439 flexibility in vaccine deployment, and encourage vaccine uptake.[37] Our finding that neutralizing
440 antibody may not be the dominant correlate of protection for inactivated vaccines, especially
441 against SARS-CoV-2 variants such as Omicron that have significant capacity to evade
442 neutralizing antibody, needs to be considered in the development of "variant proof" COVID-19
443 vaccines or vaccines broadly protective against sarbecoviruses currently in development.[38]
444
445

446 **REFERENCES**

447 1. Bok K, Sitar S, Graham BS, Mascola JR. Accelerated COVID-19 vaccine development:
448 milestones, lessons, and prospects. Immunity 2021;54:1636-51.

449 2. Sheikh A, McMenamin J, Taylor B, Robertson C, Public Health S, the EIIC. SARS-CoV-
450 2 Delta VOC in Scotland: demographics, risk of hospital admission, and vaccine effectiveness.
451 Lancet 2021;397:2461-2.

452 3. Cowling BJ, Wong IOL, Shiu EYC, et al. Strength and durability of antibody responses
453 to BNT162b2 and CoronaVac. Vaccine 2022;40:4312-7.

454 4. Shrotri M, Navaratnam AMD, Nguyen V, et al. Spike-antibody waning after second dose
455 of BNT162b2 or ChAdOx1. Lancet 2021;398:385-7.

456 5. Bar-On YM, Goldberg Y, Mandel M, et al. Protection of BNT162b2 Vaccine Booster
457 against Covid-19 in Israel. N Engl J Med 2021;385:1393-400.

458 6. Stuart ASV, Shaw RH, Liu X, et al. Immunogenicity, safety, and reactogenicity of
459 heterologous COVID-19 primary vaccination incorporating mRNA, viral-vector, and protein-
460 adjuvant vaccines in the UK (Com-COV2): a single-blind, randomised, phase 2, non-inferiority
461 trial. Lancet 2022;399:36-49.

462 7. Parker EPK, Desai S, Marti M, et al. Emerging evidence on heterologous COVID-19
463 vaccine schedules—To mix or not to mix? The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2022;22:438-40.

464 8. Leung NHL, Cheng SMS, Martin-Sanchez M, et al. Immunogenicity of a third dose of
465 BNT162b2 to ancestral SARS-CoV-2 & Omicron variant in adults who received two doses of
466 inactivated vaccine. Clin Infect Dis 2022.

467 9. Dangi T, Class J, Palacio N, Richner JM, Penaloza MacMaster P. Combining spike- and
468 nucleocapsid-based vaccines improves distal control of SARS-CoV-2. Cell Rep 2021;36:109664.

469 10. Atmar RL, Lyke KE, Deming ME, et al. Homologous and Heterologous Covid-19
470 Booster Vaccinations. N Engl J Med 2022;386:1046-57.
471 11. Costa Clemens SA, Weckx L, Clemens R, et al. Heterologous versus homologous
472 COVID-19 booster vaccination in previous recipients of two doses of CoronaVac COVID-19
473 vaccine in Brazil (RHH-001): a phase 4, non-inferiority, single blind, randomised study. Lancet
474 2022;399:521-9.
475 12. Parker EPK, Desai S, Marti M, et al. Emerging evidence on heterologous COVID-19
476 vaccine schedules—To mix or not to mix? Lancet Infect Dis 2022;22:438-40.
477 13. Mefsin YM, Chen D, Bond HS, et al. Epidemiology of Infections with SARS-CoV-2
478 Omicron BA.2 Variant, Hong Kong, January-March 2022. Emerg Infect Dis 2022;28.
479 14. Lau EH, Hui DS, Tsang OT, et al. Long-term persistence of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing
480 antibody responses after infection and estimates of the duration of protection. EClinicalMedicine
481 2021;41:101174.
482 15. Matsuyama S, Nao N, Shirato K, et al. Enhanced isolation of SARS-CoV-2 by
483 TMPRSS2-expressing cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2020;117:7001-3.
484 16. Mok CKP, Cohen CA, Cheng SMS, et al. Comparison of the immunogenicity of
485 BNT162b2 and CoronaVac COVID-19 vaccines in Hong Kong. Respirology 2022;27:301-10.
486 17. Chen LL, Abdullah SMU, Chan WM, et al. Contribution of low population immunity to
487 the severe Omicron BA.2 outbreak in Hong Kong. Nat Commun 2022;13:3618.
488 18. Sridhar S, Begom S, Bermingham A, et al. Cellular immune correlates of protection
489 against symptomatic pandemic influenza. Nat Med 2013;19:1305-12.
490 19. Goldblatt D, Alter G, Crotty S, Plotkin SA. Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2
491 infection and COVID-19 disease. Immunol Rev 2022.

492 20. Lim WW, Leung NHL, Sullivan SG, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, Cowling BJ. Distinguishing
493 Causation From Correlation in the Use of Correlates of Protection to Evaluate and Develop
494 Influenza Vaccines. Am J Epidemiol 2020;189:185-92.
495 21. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly
496 predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Med
497 2021;27:1205-11.
498 22. Gilbert PB, Montefiori DC, McDermott AB, et al. Immune correlates analysis of the
499 mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. Science 2022;375:43-50.
500 23. Feng S, Phillips DJ, White T, et al. Correlates of protection against symptomatic and
501 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Med 2021;27:2032-40.
502 24. McMenamin ME, Nealon J, Lin Y, et al. Vaccine effectiveness of one, two, and three
503 doses of BNT162b2 and CoronaVac against COVID-19 in Hong Kong: a population-based
504 observational study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases 2022.
505 25. ICMRA COVID-19 Vaccine development: Future steps Workshop. 2021. (Accessed
506 August 9, 2022, 2022, at https://www.icmra.info/drupal/en/covid-19/24june2021.)
507 26. Kingstad-Bakke B, Lee W, Chandrasekar SS, et al. Vaccine-induced systemic and
508 mucosal T cell immunity to SARS-CoV-2 viral variants. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A
509 2022;119:e2118312119.
510 27. Chen Y, Chen L, Yin S, et al. The Third dose of CoronVac vaccination induces broad and
511 potent adaptive immune responses that recognize SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Omicron variants.
512 Emerg Microbes Infect 2022;11:1524-36.
513 28. Jung MK, Jeong SD, Noh JY, et al. BNT162b2-induced memory T cells respond to the
514 Omicron variant with preserved polyfunctionality. Nat Microbiol 2022;7:909-17.

515 29. Kedzierska K, Thomas PG. Count on us: T cells in SARS-CoV-2 infection and
516 vaccination. Cell Rep Med 2022;3:100562.
517 30. Moss P. The T cell immune response against SARS-CoV-2. Nat Immunol 2022;23:186-
518 93.
519 31. Romero-Olmedo AJ, Schulz AR, Hochstätter S, et al. Dynamics of humoral and T-cell
520 immunity after three BNT162b2 vaccinations in adults older than 80 years. The Lancet
521 Infectious Diseases 2022;22:588-9.
522 32. Bartsch YC, Tong X, Kang J, et al. Omicron variant Spike-specific antibody binding and
523 Fc activity are preserved in recipients of mRNA or inactivated COVID-19 vaccines. Sci Transl
524 Med 2022;14:eabn9243.
525 33. López-Muñoz AD, Kosik I, Holly J, Yewdell JW. Cell surface SARS-CoV-2
526 nucleocapsid protein modulates innate and adaptive immunity. Science Advances 2022;8.
527 34. Bates TA, McBride SK, Leier HC, et al. Vaccination before or after SARS-CoV-2
528 infection leads to robust humoral response and antibodies that effectively neutralize variants.
529 Science Immunology 2022;7.
530 35. Altarawneh HN, Chemaitelly H, Ayoub HH, et al. Effects of Previous Infection and
531 Vaccination on Symptomatic Omicron Infections. N Engl J Med 2022;387:21-34.
532 36. Hall V, Foulkes S, Insalata F, et al. Protection against SARS-CoV-2 after Covid-19
533 Vaccination and Previous Infection. N Engl J Med 2022;386:1207-20.
534 37. Sprengholz P, Eitze S, Korn L, Siegers R, Betsch C. The power of choice: Experimental
535 evidence that freedom to choose a vaccine against COVID-19 improves willingness to be
536 vaccinated. Eur J Intern Med 2021;87:106-8.

537 38. Morens DM, Taubenberger JK, Fauci AS. Universal Coronavirus Vaccines — An Urgent
538 Need. N Engl J Med 2022;386:297-9.
539
540

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge colleagues including Teresa So, Justin Wan and Eileen Yu for technical support in preparing and conducting this study; Anson Ho for setting up the database; Julie Au and Lilly Wang for administrative support; Hetti Cheung, Victoria Wong, Bobo Yeung at HKU Health System; Cindy Man and other colleagues at the HKU Community Vaccination Centres at Gleneagles Hospital; and all the study participants for facilitating the study.

Funding

This project was supported by the Health and Medical Research Fund (grant no. COVID19F09), and the Theme-based Research Scheme of the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (grant no. T11-705/21-N). BJC is supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, under contract no. 75N93021C00015, and a RGC Senior Research Fellow Scheme grant (HKU SRFS2021-7S03) from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China. The funding bodies had no role in the design of the study, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, or writing of the manuscript.

Author contributions

All authors meet the ICMJE criteria for authorship. Each author's contributions to the paper are listed below according to the CrediT model:

Conceptualization: NHLL, GML, BJC.

Methodology: NHLL, SMSC, CAC, JSMP, SAV, BJC.

Formal analysis: NHLL, CAC, MM-S, SAV, BJC.

Investigation: CAC, NYMA, LLHL, LCHT, KKHK, SC, LWCF, AWLC, KCKC, JKCL, YYN, PK, JZJ.

Funding acquisition: NHLL, GML, BJC.

Project administration: NHLL, SMSC, JSMP, SAV, BJC.

Supervision: NHLL, SMSC, DKMI, LLMP, JSMP, SAV, BJC.

Writing – original draft: NHLL, CAC, MM-S, JSMP, SAV, BJC.

Writing – review & editing: NHLL, SMSC, CAC, MM-S, NYMA, LLHL, LCHT, KKHK, SC, LWCF, AWLC, KCKC, JKCL, YYN, PK, JZJ, DKMI, LLMP, GML, JSMP, SAV, BJC.

Data availability

Data to reproduce the results shown here will be posted on github after peer review and publication of our article.

Competing interests

BJC consults for AstraZeneca, Fosun Pharma, GlaxoSmithKline, Moderna, Pfizer, Roche and Sanofi Pasteur. BJC has received research funding from Fosun Pharma. The authors report no other potential conflicts of interest.



Figure 1. Flow chart of participant enrolment for this open-label randomised trial of CoronaVac or BNT162b2 provided as a third vaccine dose in adults who previously received two doses of either vaccine. A more detailed flow chart with reasons for exclusion at each stage is provided in Supplementary Figure S1.



Figure 2. Solicited local and systemic reactions during the 7 days after a randomised third dose of CoronaVac or BNT162b2 vaccine in adults who previously received two doses of either vaccine. For solicited systemic reactions only the most frequently reported reactions are shown. The four study arms included participants who previously received two-dose CoronaVac and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("CC-C") (red, left panel) or BNT162b2 ("CC-B") (blue, left panel), and participants who previously received two-dose BNT162b2 and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("BB-C") (red, right panel) or BNT162b2 ("BB-B") (blue, right panel).



Figure 3. **Serum neutralising antibodies measured by live virus plaque reduction neutralization test (PRNT) against (A) ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus, (B) Omicron BA.1 and (C) Omicron BA.2 variants, or by (D-F) surrogate virus neutralization test (sVNT) respectively, at baseline and 28 days after a randomised third dose of CoronaVac or BNT162b2 vaccine in adults who previously received two doses of either vaccine.** PRNT titers were evaluated with endpoint at 50% inhibition ($PRNT_{50}$). Data on PRNT was available from a random subset of 20 participants selected from each study arm, while data on sVNT was available from all participants with paired sera. The four study arms included participants who previously received two-dose CoronaVac and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("CC-C") or BNT162b2 ("CC-B"), and participants who previously received two-dose BNT162b2 and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("BB-C") or BNT162b2 ("BB-B"). The symbol X and the numbers above each panel indicate the mean level. P-values ≤ 0.05 *, ≤ 0.01 **, ≤ 0.001 ***



Figure 4. IFNγ-producing (A) CD4$^+$ and (B) CD8$^+$ T cell responses against structural peptides of ancestral SARS-CoV-2 virus, and (C-D) their poly-cytokine production (TNFα and IL-2) and memory phenotype respectively, at baseline, and 7 and 28 days after a randomised third dose of CoronaVac or BNT162b2 vaccine in adults who previously received two doses of either vaccine. Data was available from a random subset of 20 participants selected from each study arm. The four study arms included participants who previously received two-dose CoronaVac and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("CC-C") or BNT162b2 ("CC-B"), and participants who previously received two-dose BNT162b2 and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("BB-C") or BNT162b2 ("BB-B"). For **(A-B)**, the dotted lines represent the lower limits of detection based on DMSO controls and participants with values above these thresholds are considered as responders: 0.001% for CD4$^+$ IFNγ$^+$ T cells and 0.00017% for CD8$^+$ IFNγ$^+$ T cells. The numbers above each panel indicate the mean level, while the percentages indicate the proportion of responder. P-values ≤ 0.05 *, ≤ 0.01 **, ≤ 0.001 *** For **(C-D)**, the grey lines represent

628 percentages of IFNγ-producing cells from 0% to 100% with increments of 25%, and the position
629 of measurement on line represents the mean value of the 20 participants. Tn: naïve T cells, Tcm:
630 central memory T cells, Tem: effector memory T cells, Teem: terminal effector memory T cells.
631



632

633 **Figure 5. Cumulative incidence of SARS-CoV-2 infection after a randomised third dose of**
634 **CoronaVac or BNT162b2 vaccine, in adults who previously received two doses of (A)**
635 **CoronaVac or (B) BNT162b2, from after third-dose vaccination until 31 May 2022 and**
636 **during the period when the Omicron BA.2 subvariant was circulating.** SARS-CoV-2
637 infections were identified by rapid antigen test or PCR. The four study arms included
638 participants who previously received two-dose CoronaVac and were randomised to receive a
639 third dose of CoronaVac ("CC-C") or BNT162b2 ("CC-B"), and participants who previously
640 received two-dose BNT162b2 and were randomised to receive a third dose of CoronaVac ("BB-
641 C") or BNT162b2 ("BB-B").

642

643

644 **Table 1. Characteristics of all vaccinated participants at baseline.** We enrolled adults who
645 previously received two doses of CoronaVac or BNT162b2, and randomly assigned participants
646 to receive either vaccine as a third dose, i.e. the four study arms included participants who
647 previously received two-dose CoronaVac and were randomised to receive a homologous third
648 dose of CoronaVac ("CC-C") or a heterologous third dose of BNT162b2 ("CC-B"), and
649 participants who previously received two-dose BNT162b2 and were randomised to receive a
650 heterologous third dose of CoronaVac ("BB-C") or a homologous third dose of BNT162b2
651 ("BB-B"). Differences with p-values ≤ 0.05 were highlighted in bold.

Characteristic	**All enrolled and received third dose vaccination**	**Received two doses of CoronaVac (CC)**			**Received two doses of BNT162b2 (BB)**		
		Randomised to CoronaVac (CC-C)	**Randomised to BNT162b2 (CC-B)**	**p-value**	**Randomised to CoronaVac (BB-C)**	**Randomised to BNT162b2 (BB-B)**	**p-value**
	(N = 451)	**(N = 101)**	**(N = 118)**		**(N = 118)**	**(N = 114)**	
	n (%)	**n (%)**	**n (%)**		**n (%)**	**n (%)**	
Female	221 (49)	47 (47)	64 (54)	0.13	51 (43)	59 (52)	0.5
Age (median, IQR)	54 (47-60)	**58 (50-64)**	**52 (43-58)**	**0.01**	56 (47-60)	53 (46-59)	0.55
Chinese	443 (98)	100 (99)	116 (98)	0.31	116 (98)	111 (97)	0.79
Obesity (for Asian populations)							
Underweight (BMI < 18.5)	23 (5)	6 (6)	6 (5)	0.97	4 (3)	7 (6)	0.6
Normal (BMI 18.5 – 22.9)	187 (41)	45 (45)	52 (44)		50 (42)	40 (35)	
Overweight (BMI 23.0 – 24.9)	99 (22)	20 (20)	22 (19)		28 (24)	29 (25)	
Obese (BMI ≥ 25.0)	142 (31)	30 (30)	38 (32)		36 (31)	38 (33)	

Chronic medical conditions							
Any	104 (23)	21 (21)	21 (18)	>0.99	30 (25)	32 (28)	0.9
Lung disease, including COPD and asthma	3 (1)	2 (2)	0 (0)	0.5	0 (0)	1 (1)	>0.99
Heart disease	5 (1)	2 (2)	1 (1)	>0.99	2 (2)	0 (0)	0.5
Hypertension	45 (10)	9 (9)	10 (8)	>0.99	**7 (6)**	**19 (17)**	**0.03**
Diabetes	13 (3)	6 (6)	2 (2)	0.29	3 (3)	2 (2)	>0.99
Hypercholesterolemia	28 (6)	7 (7)	3 (3)	0.34	9 (8)	9 (8)	>0.99
Kidney disease	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	>0.99	1 (1)	0 (0)	>0.99
Liver disease	7 (2)	1 (1)	2 (2)	>0.99	2 (2)	2 (2)	>0.99
Cancer	6 (1)	3 (3)	2 (2)	>0.99	0 (0)	1 (1)	>0.99
Days between first and second dose of COVID-19 vaccination (median, IQR)	27 (21-28)	28 (28-29)	28 (28-29)	0.59	21 (21-23)	21 (21-24)	0.63
Days between second and third (study) dose of COVID-19 vaccination (median, IQR)	232 (200-247)	236 (211-245)	236 (214-247)	0.51	226 (195-246)	222 (196-249)	0.98
Smoking							
Ever	20 (4)	8 (8)	7 (6)	>0.99	2 (2)	3 (3)	>0.99
Current	11 (2)	4 (4)	5 (4)	>0.99	1 (1)	1 (1)	>0.99

652

653