1

Immune response after SARS-CoV-2 infection with residual post COVID symptoms

3	Tanyaporn Pongkunakorn, M.Sc. ¹ , Thamonwan Manosan, B.Sc. ¹ , Apinya Surawit, M.Sc. ¹ , Suphawan
4	Ophakas, B.Sc. ¹ , Pichanun Mongkolsucharitkul, M.Sc. ¹ , Sureeporn Pumiem, B.Sc. ¹ , Sophida Suta,
5	M.Sc. ¹ , Bonggochpass Pinsawas, M.Sc. ¹ , Nitat Sookrung, Ph.D. ² , Nawannaporn Saelim, M.Sc. ² ,
6	Kodchakorn Mahasongkram, Ph.D. ² , Pannathee Prangtaworn, Ph.D. ² , Anchalee Tungtrongchitr, M.D.,
7	Ph.D. ² , Watip Tangjittipokin, Ph.D. ³ , Kobporn Boonnak, Ph.D. ³ , Tassanee Narkdontri, M.Sc. ⁴ , Nipaporn
8	Teerawattanapong, M.Sc. ⁴ , Anan Jongkaewwattana, Ph.D. ⁵ , Korapat Mayurasakorn, M.D., FRCFPT ^{1, *}
9	
10	¹ Siriraj Population Health and Nutrition Research Group, Department of Research and Development, Siriraj
11	Medical Research Center, Mahidol University, ² Center of Research Excellence on Therapeutic Proteins and
12	Antibody Engineering, Department of Parasitology, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol
13	University, ³ Department of Immunology, the Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University,
14	⁴ Research Department, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, ⁵ National Center for
15	Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, National Science and Technology Development Agency,
16	Pathumthani, Thailand
17	
18	Correspondence to: Dr. Mayurasakorn can be contacted at korapat.may@mahidol.edu, or at the Siriraj
19	Population Health and Nutrition Research Group, Department of Research and Development, Siriraj Medical
20	Research Center, Mahidol University, 2 Wanglang Rd, Siriraj, Bangkok Noi, Bangkok, Thailand 10700.
21	
22	Funding: This study was supported by the Faculty of Medicine, Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University (grant
23	number R016534004). The funders had no role in study design, data collection, data measurement, publish
24	decisions, and manuscript preparation.
25	
26	Competing interests: The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

27 ABSTRACT

28 BACKGROUND

In a number of patients, post-acute COVID syndrome develops after acute infection with severe acute
respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) (Long COVID [LC]). Here, we examined the immune
responses and clinical characteristics of individuals with LC compared to age- and gender-matched healthy
recovered COVID individuals (HC) during the Omicron pandemic. Immune responses following
BNT162b2 (Pfizer) booster are also determined.

34 METHODS

This retrospective cohort study included 292 patients (LC, 158; HC, 134) confirmed to have SARS-CoV-2 infection from January to August 2022. We determined anti-SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain immunoglobulin G (anti-RBD IgG), surrogate virus neutralization test (sVNT), T-cell subsets, and neutralization of wild-type, BA.1 and BA.5. A subset of patients was voluntarily recruited for booster vaccination with BNT162b2 vaccine and immunogenicity was assessed 4weeks after vaccination.

40 **RESULTS**

Cycle thresholds were higher in the HC group than in the LC group (20.7 vs. 19.7; P<0.039). Anti-RBD
IgG was higher at ≤56 days after COVID-19 onset (PC) in 3-dose vaccines compared with 2-dose vaccines
in the LC group (P=0.02) and after 57-84 days PC in 3-dose vaccines in the HC group (P<0.001). The sVNT
in LC was significantly high against Wuhan and sVNT was 30% lower against the Omicron than the Wuhan.
sVNT was relatively sustained in 3-dose vaccines than ≤ 2-dose vaccines. sVNT in the HC group reached
its peak at 57-84 days PC as compared with the LC group.

47 CONCLUSIONS

48 These findings imply that LC produced increased neutralizing antibody responses than those with HC.

- 49 During the Omicron pandemic, immunity after LC has still waned; therefore, a booster vaccine may be
- 50 needed after 2-3 months from last infection. (ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT05484700)

51 INTRODUCTION

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) is constantly changing and accumulating 52 53 mutations in its genetic code over time.¹ Omicron lineage (B.1.1.529) which has been acknowledged in 54 November 2021 as a variant of concern (VOC), unprecedentedly spread to become globally dominant and 55 later has evolved into two more transmissible BA.5 and BA.4 sublineages.² BA.5 and BA.4 share many 56 genetic mutations with BA.2.² Omicron displaced Delta as the predominant variant during the study period. 57 Randomly selected SARS-CoV-2 variants captured by surveillance conducted by the Department of 58 Medical Science, Thailand, the UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) and Centers for Disease Control and 59 Prevention, USA during weeks 37 to 38 of 2022 demonstrated that almost all new infections in Thailand³, the U.K.⁴ and the U.S.⁵ were due to Omicron BA.5/BA.4 (49.2% - 95.5% - 96.4%) and Omicron BA.2 60 61 (59.6% - 3.4% - 1.4%). Now BA.2.75 was designated as a new variant of interest and is monitored. It would 62 be investigated once there is a significant public health impact.⁴

Variants' transmission including BA.5 and BA.4 which carry their own unique mutations can lead into a wide range of clinical presentation and biological modifications. These speed infectivity to infect more people even in fully vaccinated, boosted individuals as well as who were immune to earlier forms of Omicron and other variants.¹ Most individuals with breakthrough SARS-CoV-2 infection can experience asymptomatic or mild-to-moderate-to-severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19).^{6,7} A previous study¹ showed sera from BA.1 vaccine breakthrough infection exhibited significant reductions in neutralization against BA.5/BA.4; thereby, raising the possibility of Omicron reinfections.

Several lines of evidence show that there are multisystemic humoral responses and immune responses during acute illness and following recovery from the acute phase of COVID-19 infection. These contribute to both host defense and pathogenesis of severe COVID-19 and residual post COVID syndrome (Long COVID [LC]). Distinct immune dysregulation with lymphocytopenia, increased neutrophils and activation of the coagulation cascade have been described in the acute phase.^{6,8} Following acute COVID-19 infection, 10-70% of COVID-19 patients reported physical and mental symptoms 2-3 months after infection.⁹⁻¹¹ Numbers of hospitalized symptomatic COVID-19 patients experienced LC symptoms. Still, 77 more than half of patients with prior mild-to-moderate COVID-19 have LC persisting more than 4 months 78 after infection.^{12,13} LC manifests as diverse symptoms affecting various organs-as seen in COVID-19 patients who did not recover fully.¹⁴ The most predominant LC symptoms are headache, breathlessness, 79 80 cough, chest pain, abdominal symptoms, myalgia, fatigue, cognitive difficulties, anxiety and depression^{15,16} 81 and neurologic/psychiatric symptoms.¹⁷ Evidence demonstrates that T cells and sustained immune dysfunction following even mild COVID-19 be associated with LC.¹⁸ For instance, effector molecule 82 83 expression in memory T cells was reduced in neurologic patients with LC symptoms and sustained increases 84 in T cell activities to SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccination was observed in this group compared with healthy COVID convalescents (HC).¹⁹ Nevertheless, the driver of this immune dysfunction and the immune 85 86 response after vaccination, specific effects on LC are needed for further investigation and verification.

87

88 **RESULTS**

89 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND CLINICAL MANIFESTATION

90 292 participants following COVID-19 infection enrolled from the surrounding Bangkok area. This included 91 158 participants (86.1% women) in the LC group and 134 participants (66.4% women) in the HC group. 92 The mean age of both groups was similar (Table 1). Among those in the HC and LC groups, 130 (97%) and 93 157 (99.4%) were treated in out-patient home isolation system indicating that COVID-19 symptoms were 94 mild-to-moderate. The median peak viral RNA based on Ct values in the LC groups (19.7 [IOR=18.0-21.9]) 95 was lower than ones in the HC groups (20.7 [IQR=18.2-25.1]; P<0.037). The median of a targeted COVID-96 19 gene for envelope (E) was 18.4 (IQR = 16.3-23.3) for HC group and 17.8 (IQR = 16.5-19.9) for LC 97 group (P=0.017). Our results showed no significant correlation between vaccination status (either primary 98 two doses or booster shots) between groups (ns). Retrospective analysis revealed that patients in the LC 99 group had a higher proportion of Favipiravir treatment (65%) than in the HC group (53.7%). This finding 100 indicates that having LC was associated with lower Ct values and disease severity based on the prevalence 101 of Favipiravir treatment. In the LC group, the presence of comorbidity was found in LC group more than 102 HC group including hypertension (P=0.052) and obesity (P=0.025). It was found that most participants

received more than three doses of vaccines (93.0% in LC vs. 90.3% in HC, P=0.306). The major residual
LC symptoms included fatigue/myalgia (91.8%), breathlessness (74.7%), anorexia (55.1%), and problem
with concentration (77.8%) and memory (63.9%). Other respiratory, gastrointestinal, and musculoskeletal
symptoms were more reported in the LC groups than in the HC group (P<0.05).

107 IMMUNE RESPONSES AGAINST SARS-COV-2 VARIANTS

108 High antibody titers were observed in both LC and HC groups (Figure 2A). The IgG antibody positive rates 109 to SARS-CoV-2 S protein were found in nearly 100% at any time points in both LC and HC groups, except 110 in one patient with 2 doses of vaccines prior to breakthrough COVID-19 infection who had negative IgG 111 level at > 84 days. At least 3 doses of vaccines produced remarkedly high and comparable IgG levels 112 between LC and HC groups (ns) suggesting that the titer of anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody was still 113 detectable at high levels between two groups. Serum samples at different time points after illness onset 114 showed differences in the distribution of IgG. The RBD-IgG geometric mean titers (GMT) were higher in 115 3-dose vaccines in the LC group at \leq 56 days post COVID-19 infection (PC, P=0.02) as compared with 2-116 dose vaccines and in 3-dose vaccines in the HC group at 57-84 PC (P<0.001). The overall proportion of 117 sera with an IgG > 1000 BAU/mL decreased from <56-day to 57-84-day and >84-day PC (86.8% to 79.6%) 118 and 74.7%, ns for HC vs. LC [Figure 2A]). This implied that recent booster vaccination enhanced IgG 119 responses effectively and IgG antibodies were still remarkably high after three months PC. And the titers 120 reached their peak around 2 months PC and decreased slightly (about 25%) over the following 3 months 121 (GMT 2713 to 2085 in LC group and GMT 2482 to 2377 BAU/mL in HC group). Sera from individuals 122 presumably recently infected with BA.5/BA.4 (Figure 2A [black dots]) showed high RBD-IgG GMT levels 123 4630 BAU/mL) as compared with other groups (Figure 2A [pink and blue dots], P<0.001). This implies 124 that previous infection with BA.5/BA.4 but not an older Omicron variant (such as BA.1, BA.2) offers 125 substantial more immune response regardless of individual vaccine heterogenous profile.

- 126
- 127
- 128

129 NEUTRALIZING ANTIBODY RESPONSES

130 Ninety nine percent of the patients had positive sVNT against wild type and Omicron (Figure 2B). In the 131 LC group, sVNT was high against Wuhan regardless of doses of vaccines and at any time points PC even 132 at >84-day PC, whereas positive sVNT titers were chiefly observed since at <56 days PC (Omicron GMT 133 59.3%) and sVNT was approximately 30% lower against the Omicron variant in most time points as 134 compared with the Wuhan. sVNT was relatively sustained in 3-dose vaccination than < 2-dose vaccination. 135 In the HC group, sVNT was also high against Wuhan regardless of doses of vaccines and at all time points 136 PC. However, sVNT against the Omicron was also 30% lower than those against Wuhan. Of note, sVNT 137 in the HC group reached its peak at 57-84 days PC as compared with the LC group, sVNT of which was 138 still at its high level after 84 days. This can imply that LC produced increased and more sustainable 139 neutralizing antibody responses than those with full recovery. Additionally, those with recent BA.4/BA.5 140 breakthrough infection showed higher SVNT titers against the overall Omicron variant. This benefit has 141 helped to prevention reinfection at least 2-3 months PC in the LC group and in those with BA.4/BA.5 prior 142 infection.

....

143 IMMUNE RESPONSE AFTER A VACCINE BOOSTER

144 The immunogenicity against SARS-CoV-2 after a booster dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccine 145 measured at 4 weeks after the vaccination in a subgroup of participants were analyzed. IgG antibodies 146 directed against RBD were double after a booster vaccine (P<0.0001). However, the average GMT 147 concentration of anti-RBD IgG in the LC group was 10% higher than that in the HC group (4665 ± 1.76 vs. 148 4152±2.15 BAU/mL, P<0.05) (Figure 3A). Of note, sVNT against the Omicron variant was similarly 149 increased in nearly all participants irrespective of having LC (LC 92.87% vs. HC 90.09%, ns [Figure 3B]). 150 This implies that a booster mRNA vaccination may be beneficial to enhance immunity after COVID-19 151 infection especially for vulnerable individuals.

- 152
- 153
- 154

155 **DISCUSSION**

156 In this study, we ascertained the following central findings. First, LC presents as a constellation of 157 enervating symptoms most commonly including unremitting fatigue/myalgia, post-exertional malaise, breathlessness, anorexia, and cognitive dysfuntion.²⁰ In accordance with previous studies, this syndrome 158 159 was more prevalent in women, middle-aged patients and in patients with even mild-to-moderate COVID-160 19 irrespective of vaccination status.^{9,21} Age is recognized as the general determinant of disease severity 161 mainly because the immune response deteriorates in aging people.²² With regard to the uncertainty about 162 the frequency and prevalence of such individual symptoms of LC and how long they last, several patients 163 reported fatigue shortly after COVID-19 recovery. A systematic review showed that self-report fatigue after 164 recovery from COVID-19 infection can last up to 6 months and immunological dysfunction can persist for 165 8 months post mild-to-moderate COVID-19.18,20 SARS-CoV-2 may remain within some patients with the 166 long-term symptoms, thereby leading to chronic inflammation and some organ and tissue dysfunction.²³ In 167 a previous cohort study, chronic post-COVID "brain fog" had significant associations with sex (female), respiratory symptoms at the onset, and the severity of the illness.²⁴ However, increasing evidence indicates 168 that LC can develop regardless of the severity of the original symptoms²⁵ but it may depend on antigen 169 170 persistence and sustained specific immune responses to SARS-CoV-2.26

171 Second, a well-defined understanding of innate and adaptive immune response in LC in association 172 with vaccination status and heterogeneous characteristics of the virus and host responses is indispensable 173 for planning for therapeutic and vaccination strategies. Our results showed that there were no significant 174 differences in immune response between LC and individuals with complete recovery, regardless of 175 vaccination status before COVID-19 infection. Significant decreases in levels of IgG and neutralizing 176 antibodies were also observed among participants without booster vaccines prior to COVID-19 infection, 177 which are classically associated with waned immunity. High levels of antibodies were still remarkably 178 observed after three-month PC. An analysis of immune responses of those who were presumably infected 179 with BA.5/BA.4 displayed significant increases in the immunity as compared with those who were infected 180 with other Omicron variants. More interestingly among a subset of participants with LC, anti-RBD IgG

antibody but not sVNT after a Pfizer-BioNTech booster shot was significantly increased compared with the
 HC group. These findings are supported by prior reports that LC pathogenesis might include persistent viral
 antigen, reactivation of latent herpesviruses, and chronic inflammation, which may be associated with the
 elevation in antibody responses.^{11,27}

185 There were some limitations in this study. During the study period, most COVID-19 cases had 186 mild-to-moderate symptoms and they were most likely to self-quarantine at home. Therefore, we only had 187 patients under home isolation conditions, and it does not provide a fair comparison about the long COVID 188 in the hospitalized patients and the results could not be generalized to all types of long COVID community. 189 In addition, our study focused on post-acute residual COVID-19 symptoms at 1-4 months post. The onset 190 of COVID-19; therefore, it cannot discern whoever will develop long-term chronic LC. An additional 191 limitation is sample size. Patients who exhibited both a classic LC symptom and risk factors may constitute 192 only a minute subset, making it difficult to draw specific, novel predictors.

193

194 CONCLUSION

No clinical and laboratory differences have been identified between participants with long COVID and demographically and medically matched convalescent and healthy control groups and all were responded remarkedly after a booster dose of an mRNA vaccine after the COVID-19 infection. Sera from participants infected during the Omicron BA.5/BA.4 but not the Omicron BA.1, BA.2 showed the better immune responses against the overall Omicron variants. Our study provides a basis of immunological and evidence for vaccination program after COVID-19 infection with or without long COVID symptoms.

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of participants*										
	Healthy COVID-19 convalescents (HC) group (n = 134)			Long COVID (LC) group (n = 158)						
Characteristics		Long COVID symptoms								p-value‡
	n	(%)	n	(%)	3 major symptoms (n=132)		1-2 major symptoms (n=26)		<i>p</i> -value ⁺	
					n	(%)	n	(%)		
Female	89	66.4	136	86.1	114	86.4	22	84.6	0.814	< 0.001
Age (yr.), mean (SD)	36.3	(9.6)	38.4	(8.4)	38.7	(8.5)	37.0	(7.5)	0.338	0.078
18-30	42	31.3	24	15.2	19	14.4	5	19.2	0.344	0.362
31-45	72	53.7	99	62.7	81	61.4	18	69.2		
>45	20	14.9	35	22.2	32	24.2	3	11.5		
Time from symptom onset to detection, months	COVID									0.353
1-2	40	29.9	37	23.4	34	25.8	3	11.5	0.147	
3	60	44.8	83	52.5	65	49.2	18	69.2		
>3	34	25.4	38	24.1	33	25.0	5	19.2		
Types of hospital admission									0.024	0.123
Home isolation	130	97.0	157	99.4	132	100.0	25	96.2		
Hospitel	4	3.0	1	0.6	0	0.00	1	3.8		
COVID-19 detection									0.379	0.362
RT-PCR§	129	96.3	146	92.4	122	92.4	24	92.3		
ATK ¶	5	3.7	12	7.6	10	7.6	2	7.7		
Cycle Threshold**, median (IQR)	20.7	(18.2- 25.1)	19.7	(18.0 - 21.9)	19.7	(17.7 - 22.1)	19.5	(18.5 - 21.0)	0.921	0.039
<20	52	43.7	80	55.9	64	54.2	16	64.0	0.466	0.037
20-30	51	42.9	55	38.5	48	40.7	7	28.0		
>30	16	13.4	8	5.6	6	5.1	2	8.0		
Envelope, median (IQR)	18.4	(16.3- 23.3)	17.8	(16.5 - 19.9)	17.7	(16.3 - 19.7)	18.1	(17.0 - 19.9)	0.588	0.017
RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp), median (IQR)	19.9	(18.0 - 24.8)	19.2	(17.9 - 22.5)	19.4	(17.8 - 21.4)	18.9	(18.1 - 21.5)	0.670	0.807
Presence of comorbidities										
None	121	90.3	125	79.1	104	78.8	21	80.8	0.820	0.009
Hypertension	5	3.7	15	9.5	10	7.6	5	19.2	0.064	0.052
Obesity	3	2.2	13	8.2	12	9.1	1	3.8	0.374	0.025
Diabetes mellitus	5	3.7	6	3.8	5	3.8	1	3.8	0.989	0.976
Cancer	0	0.0	3	1.9	3	2.3	0	0.0	0.349	0.109
Chronic respiratory disease	2	1.5	3	1.9	3	2.3	0	0.0	0.438	0.791
Kidney disease	0	0.0	1	0.6	1	0.8	0	0.0	0.656	0.356
Lifestyle										
Smoking									0.027	0.016
Never	114	85.1	144	91.1	122	92.4	22	84.6		
Stop smoking	12	9.0	5	3.2	2	1.5	3	11.5		
Smoking	8	6.0	9	5.7	8	6.1	1	3.9		
Vaccination									0.485	0.306
0-2 doses	13	9.7	11	7.0	9	6.8	2	7.7		

1 booster dose	66	49.3	64	40.5	52	39.4	12	46.2		
2 booster doses	55	41.0	83	52.5	71	53.8	12	46.2		
Medication									0.922	0.048
No treatment	9	6.7	3	1.9	3	2.3	0	0.0		
Symptomatic treatment	53	39.6	51	32.5	42	32.1	9	34.6		
Symptomatic + Favipiravir treatment	69	51.5	94	59.8	79	60.3	15	57.7		
Symptomatic + Favipiravir treatment + Dexamethasone	3	2.2	9	5.7	7	5.3	2	7.7		
Long COVID symptoms										
Fatigue/myalgia	0	0.0	145	91.8	126	95.5	19	73.1	< 0.001	< 0.001
Breathlessness	0	0.0	118	74.7	116	87.9	2	7.7	< 0.001	< 0.001
Anorexia	0	0.0	87	55.1	85	64.4	2	7.7	< 0.001	< 0.001
Problem with concentration	0	0.0	123	77.8	116	87.9	7	26.9	< 0.001	< 0.001
Problem with memory	0	0.0	101	63.9	99	75.0	2	7.7	< 0.001	< 0.001
Headache	40	29.8	88	55.7	75	56.8	13	50.0	0.522	< 0.001
Cough/chest pain/chest discomfort	52	38.8	111	70.3	92	69.7	19	73.1	0.730	< 0.001
Loss of smell/taste	23	17.2	52	32.9	43	32.6	9	34.6	0.840	0.001
Muscle pain/joint pain	37	27.6	91	57.6	78	59.1	13	50.0	0.391	< 0.001
Diarrhea	20	14.9	46	29.1	39	29.5	7	26.9	0.788	0.004

* Continuous data demographic, clinic finding of all patients referred back presented as mean (standard deviation; SD), median (interquartile rang; IQR and range at *p*<0.05 indicates statistical significance

⁺ The statistical significance was assessed by the Fisher's exact test and Kruskal-wallis test, statistical difference within Long COVID symptoms at p < 0.05

⁺ The statistical significance was assessed by the Fisher's exact test and Kruskal-wallis test, statistical difference between participants with healthy COVID-19 convalescents (HC) and Long COVID (LC) group at *p*<0.05

§ RT-PCR is a real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) test for the qualitative detection of nucleic acid from SARS-CoV-2 in upper and lower respiratory specimens.

¶ ATK is SARS-CoV-2 rapid antigen self-test kits.

** Cycle Threshold (Ct) value from RT-PCR tests represents the cycle number at which the signal breaches the threshold for positivity, a lower Ct valu is indicative of a high viral.





203 Figure 1. Study source recruitment and enrollment





Figure 2. Immune responses after breakthrough COVID-19 infection with prior vaccination as compared between patients with healthy COVID-19 recovery (HC, pink dots), patients with residual long COVID (LC, blue dots) during the Omicron pandemic and patients during the BA.5/BA.4 (black color). (A) Geometric mean titers (GMTs) of SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike protein receptor-binding domain antibodies' (Anti-RBD IgG) concentrations in serum samples obtained from subjects after COVID-19 infection and with prior various vaccination status and duration post COVID-19 onset (PC). All sera were from the patients during the Omicron pandemic. The dotted line (red) represents the threshold for positive

in this assay. (B) Scatter plots demonstrate an inhibition rate of Wuhan and Omicron RBD-blocking
antibodies measured using a surrogate viral neutralization test (sVNT) by vaccination/reinfection status;
the lower dot line represents the cut-off level for seropositivity. The generalized linear model (GLM) was
applied to evaluate the association between immune response (including antibody IgG and sVNT responses)

and potential factors (i.e., vaccination, sex, and age). * P<0.05; ** P<0.01; **** P<0.0001.





218 Figure 3. Immunogenicity against SARS-CoV-2 after a booster dose of the Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA 219 vaccine compared between patients with healthy COVID-19 recovery (HC, red color) patients and 220 patients with residual long COVID (LC, blue color) during the Omicron pandemic by scatter plots 221 analysis. (A) A SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike protein receptor-binding domain antibodies' (Anti-RBD IgG) 222 concentrations in serum samples obtained from subjects after a 30-ug Pfizer booster vaccine at 4 weeks 223 after vaccination. (B) An inhibition rate of the Omicron RBD-blocking antibodies measured using a 224 surrogate viral neutralization test (sVNT). The generalized linear model (GLM) was applied to evaluate the 225 association between immunogenicity of anti-RBD IgG and sVNT, and the potential factors (i.e., sex and age). * P<0.05; ** P<0.01; **** P<0.0001. 226

227 METHODS

This retrospective cohort study compared immunogenicity post COVID-19 between individuals with residual LC symptoms and ones with HC related to pathophysiology, immunology, and clinical consequence. In addition, immune responses at 4 weeks were determined after a subset of these participants was voluntarily administered with additional 30 ug of BNT162b2 (Pfizer) (Figure 1). The Institutional Review Board (IRB), Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University reviewed and approved the follow-up study (COA no. Si 1036/2021).

234 STUDY POPULATION

235 All patients (age 18-65 years) were invited for volunteer participation in the study of the immune responses 236 against SARS-CoV-2 after breakthrough infection. The eligible participants were those who had confirmed 237 SARS-CoV-2 infection based on a patient's medical certificate from January to May 2022 (during the 238 Omicron-dominant pandemic), and they had not received any additional COVID -19 vaccine after infection. 239 Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Pregnant participants and people having a 240 history of allergic reactions after COVID-19 vaccination, or any drugs were excluded. Participants were 241 defined as having LC when they had residual self-reported LC symptoms longer than 1-month after 242 COVID-19 onset. LC symptoms were based on the presence of one of the three major symptoms: 243 fatigue/myalgia, breathlessness, and anorexia.¹⁸ On the other hand, patients without LC symptoms were 244 called "healthy COVID-19 recovery; HC". These two groups were gender and age (± 5 years) matched with 245 each other (Table 1). Based on their reported residual symptoms from questionnaires, 158 participants with 246 LC symptoms and 134 participants with HC were enrolled into the study. We performed a subset of analyses 247 on an independent group of 36 post-acute COVID-19 patients (ambulatory adults infected during the 248 Omicron with BA.5/BA.4 pandemic) to compare the immune responses with our primary cohort. Previous 249 infections were classified as Omicron BA.1/BA.2 dominant versus Omicron BA.5/BA.4 dominant previous 250 infections based on if they occurred before or after the emergence of BA.5/BA.4 wave that started in 251 Thailand since June 2022.³

253 A BOOSTER AND IMMUNOGENICITY

In the studied cohort, a subset of 100 patients (age≥18 years) were voluntarily recruited for immunogenicity 254 255 follow-up study after receiving 30 ug of BNT162b2 (Pfizer) as a booster shot at 29-84 days post COVID-256 19 onset. All participants provided informed consent for this study. They were tested for SARS-CoV-2 257 antibodies and a surrogate virus neutralization (sVNT) against SARS-CoV-2 Wuhan and Omicron variants. 258 Those who denied this booster dose were asked to come back for IgG testing again before their next booster 259 shot to determine levels of waned immunity. The Department of Disease Control, Ministry of Public Health 260 (Thailand) kindly provided the Pfizer-BioNTech (Comirnaty) BNT162b2 vaccine, designated Lot. 261 1L085A. This RNA vaccines belong to a state-of-art approach that uses genetically engineered mRNA of 262 viral spike proteins included in a lipid nanoparticle, which subsequently inject intramuscularly into human 263 body and allow the ribosomes in the cell to synthesize the viral spike proteins that safely prompts an immune 264 response.²⁸ We further explore the immunogenicity of this boosting at 4-week post booster shot.

265 OMICRON BA.5/BA.4 IMMUNOGENICITY

For the pilot study, 36 patients who were diagnosed with COVID-19 during July 15 to September 14, 2022,
were recruited. This provided a proxy for BA.5/BA.4 infections, considering the incidence of this variants
during the recruitment time. Immune responses against the overall Omicron variants were evaluated for
viral neutralization against BA.5/BA.4.³

270 OUTCOME MEASURES

The primary outcome was to compare patients' baseline clinical and biological characteristics between LC and HC groups. The outcome included demographic data, clinical and biochemical characteristics. Participants shared a copy of their government-issued documents with study staff to verify their vaccination information. The "date of disease onset" was defined as the day when new-onset self-reported respiratory symptoms were observed. Viral loads were considered in cycle threshold (Ct) value analyses. Analyses considered viral load for comparisons of Ct values by vaccine exposure groups and self-reported symptoms as previously described.⁶

279 SARS-COV-2 RT-QUANTITATIVE PCR ASSAY (RT-PCR)

Diagnosis of COVID-19 was made based on the detection of ≥2 SARS-CoV-2 genes by RT-PCR from
nasopharyngeal (NP) swab, throat swab, and/or any respiratory samples as previously described.²⁹ COVID19 diagnostic assay was a probe-based qualitative RT-PCR probe. AllplexTM 2019-nCoV Assay (Seegene,
Seoul, South Korea) was used for SARS-CoV2 detection. The targeted COVID-19 genes detected here
included nucleocapsid (N), envelope (E) of Sarbecovirus and RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp) of
COVID-19 according to the manufacturer's instructions and described previously.³⁰ Antigen test kit (ATK)
was also accepted as a confirmation of COVID-19; in case that RT-PCR could not be assessed.

287 SEROLOGICAL ASSAYS

288 Blood samples were collected at baseline (pre-booster), and 4 weeks after a booster shot (post-boost) in a 289 subset of participants from both groups. Briefly, plasma samples were processed for anti-SARS-CoV-2 290 receptor-binding domain immunoglobulin G (anti-RBD IgG, (S1 subunit, No. 06S600), SARS-CoV-2 IgG 291 II Quant for use with ARCHITECT; Abbott Laboratories, USA) as described previously.⁶ This assay 292 linearly measures the antibody level between 21.0 - 80,000.0 arbitrary unit (AU)/mL, which was converted 293 later to WHO International Standard concentration as binding antibody unit per mL (BAU/mL) following 294 the equation provided by the manufacturer ($BAU/mL = 0.142 \times AU/mL$). The level greater or equal to the 295 cutoff value of 50 AU/mL or 7.1 BAU/mL was defined as seropositive.

A surrogate virus neutralization test (sVNT) was undertaken against the or wild type (Wuhan) strain and the Omicron (B.1.1.529) strain. Briefly, plasma was pre-incubated with horseradish-peroxidaseconjugated receptor-binding domain protein (HRP-conjugated RBD protein). Subsequently, the mixture was transferred to each well containing Streptavidin bound with Biotin-conjugated angiotensin-converting enzyme 2 (ACE2). Finally, the optical density absorbance was measured using a spectrophotometer at 450 nm. Sample diluent was used as the negative control. The inhibition rate was calculated through this formula:

Inhibition rate (%) =
$$\left(1 - \frac{OD_{450} \text{ of Sample}}{OD_{450} \text{ of Negative control}}\right) \times 100.$$

304 PERIPHERAL BLOOD MONONUCLEAR CELLS ISOLATION AND COLLECTION

305 Isolation of peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) was done from peripheral blood supplemented with anticoagulants by using Ethylenediamin tetra-acetic acid (EDTA) tube.³¹ Briefly, blood was diluted 306 307 1:1 with phosphate buffer saline (PBS [HyCloneTM, Utah, USA]) pH 7.2.3 ml of a density gradient medium 308 (Lymphoprep [STEMCELL Technologies, Germany]) were added into a 15 ml tube. After that, 10 of 309 diluted blood samples were carefully layered on top and centrifuged at 400xg for 30 min at 25°C (Allegra 310 X-15R Centrifuge, Beckman Coulter). The PBMC were transferred to a new 15 ml tube, and 10 ml of PBS 311 were filled, mixed, and centrifuged at 400xg for 5 min at 25°C. The supernatant was completely removed, 312 and the cells were resuspended with a small volume of PBS. When most of the platelets were removed, the 313 cells were suspended in a complete cryoprotective media with 10% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO [SIGMA 314 Life Science, USA]) and fetal bovine serum (FBS [GibcoTM, Thermo Fisher Scientific Inc., USA]) in the 315 cryovials. Finally, the cryovials were frozen at -80°C for 1 day and then were transferred and stored in 316 liquid nitrogen.

317 MICRONEUTRALIZATION ASSAYS USING THE AUTHENTIC SARS-COV-2 VIRUSES

318 Sera from participants were used to assess the neutralization against wild type (WA1), and Omicron 319 (B.1.1.529, BA.2 and BA.5). SARS-CoV-2 isolates (kindly provided by Prof. Florian Krammer, Icahn 320 school of medicine at Mount Sinai, NY, USA). All procedures were performed in a certified biosafety level 321 3 (BSL-3) facility following standard safety guidelines. In brief, Vero.E6-TMPRSS2 cells were seeded in 322 96-well high binding cell culture plates (Costar, cat. no. 07620009) at a density of 20,000 cells per well in 323 complete Dulbecco's modified Eagle medium (cDMEM) one day before the infection. Heat inactivated 324 serum samples (56 °C for 1 h) were serially diluted (three-fold) in minimum essential media (Gibco, life 325 technology, Grand Island, NY, USA) supplemented with 2 mM L-glutamine (Gibco, life technology, Grand 326 Island, NY, USA), antibiotic-antimycotic (Invitrogen-Gibco, Carlsbad, CA, USA) and 0.2% fetal bovine 327 serum (Gibco, life technology, NY, USA). Serially diluted sera were incubated with 10,000 TCID of SARS-328 CoV-2 viruses for one hour at room temperature, followed by the transfer of 120 μ L of the virus-serum 329 mix to Vero.E6-TMPRSS2 plates. Infection proceeded for 1 h at 37°C and inoculum was removed. One 330 hundred μ L per well of the corresponding antibody dilutions plus 100 μ L per well of infection media 331 supplemented with 2% fetal bovine serum (Gibco, life technology, NY, USA) were added to the cells. 332 Plates were incubated for 48 h at 37°C followed by fixation overnight at 4°C in 200 μ L per well of a 10% 333 formaldehyde solution. For staining of the nucleoprotein, formaldehyde solution was removed, and cells 334 were washed with and permeabilized by adding 150 µL per well of PBS with 0.1% Triton X-100 (Fisher 335 Bioreagents, Pennsylvania, USA) for 15 min at room temperature. Permeabilization solution was 336 removed, plates were washed with 200 µL per well of PBS (Gibco, life technology, NY, USA) twice and 337 blocked with PBS, 3% BSA for 1 h at room temperature. Blocking solution was removed and 100 μ L per 338 well of biotinylated monoclonal antibody 1C7C7 (Center for Therapeutic Antibody Development at The 339 Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai ISMMS) at a concentration of 1µg /ml in PBS, 1% BSA was 340 added for 1 h at room temperature. Cells were washed with 200 μ L per well of PBS twice and 100 μ L per 341 well of HRP-conjugated streptavidin (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA) diluted in PBS, 1% 342 BSA were added at a 1:2000 dilution for 1 h at room temperature. Cells were washed twice with PBS, and 343 100 µL per well of O-phenylenediamine dihydrochloride (Sigmafast OPD; Sigma-Aldrich, Massachusetts, 344 USA) were added for 10 min at room temperature, followed by addition of 50 μ L per well of a 3 M HCl 345 solution (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). Optical density (OD) was measured (490 nm) 346 using a microplate reader. Analysis was performed using Prism 7 software (GraphPad). After subtraction 347 of background and calculation of the percentage of neutralization with respect to the 'virus-only' control, a 348 nonlinear regression curve fit analysis was performed to calculate the 50% inhibitory dilution (ID50), with 349 top and bottom constraints set to 100% and 0% respectively. All samples were analyzed in a blinded 350 manner.

351 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Normally distributed continuous variables were summarized as the mean ± standard deviation (SD);
otherwise, the median (interquartile range, IQR) was used. Categorical variables were described as
percentages and compared using the Chi-squared test. Continuous variables were described using geometric
mean antibody titers (GMT), median, and IQR. The Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare differences

between groups. The generalized linear model (GLM) was applied to evaluate the association between
immune responses (including anti-RBD IgG and sVNT) and potential factors (i.e., vaccination, sex, and
age). The statistical significance of anti-RBD IgG, sVNT, and others was determined using Kruskal–Wallis
and Dunn's multiple comparisons tests using GraphPad Prism 9 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA)
and STATA version 17 (Stata Corp, College Station, TX, USA). Two-tailed P values less than 0.05 were
considered significant (*P<0.05, **P<0.01, ***P<0.001 and ****P<0.0001).

362

363 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

364 The authors are grateful to the participants in this study. We would like to thank all the COVID-19 teams 365 for their dedication and expertise in recruitment, specimen processing and biobanking. We thank Kantapat 366 Boriuttham, Patcharaporn Thabsuwan, Pimchanok Boonariya, Thaksaphon Siripant, Supinya Piwlaor, 367 Boonjira Wetprasit, Noppanat Wachiranan, Suavaluk Songlilitchuwong, and Sirapassorn Ditkasem from 368 the Department of Biotechnology, Faculty of Applied Science, King Mongkut's University of Technology 369 North Bangkok for participant recruitment. We appreciate grant support from Faculty of Medicine, Siriraj 370 Hospital, Mahidol University and the Department of Disease Control (DDC), the Department of Medical 371 Services Ministry of Public Health (MoPH). Authors are very grateful for all support for this study: 372 Tassanee Narkdontri and Nipaporn Teerawattanapong from Siriraj Center of Research Excellence for 373 Diabetes and Obesity (SiCORE-DO); Utane Runpanich from the Department of Immunology; Population 374 Health and Nutrition Research Group; Department of Parasitology; and Center of Research Excellence on 375 Therapeutic Proteins and Antibody Engineering. We acknowledge Prof. Florian Krammer and Dr. Juan 376 Manuel Carreno, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, NY, USA for their contribution to 377 microneutralization assay. We also would like to acknowledge Professor Kulkanya Chokephaibulkit, 378 professor of Pediatric Infectious Diseases and Director of the Siriraj Institute of Clinical Research 379 (SICRES) for her guidance for initiation of this project.

380

382 AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS

383 T.P., T.M., S.O. and A.S. contributed to the experimental design, collected patient data, performed data 384 experimentation and interpretation. T.P., K.M., and N.K. drafted and finalized the manuscript. A.S. 385 performed the statistical analysis. W.T. performed the anti-RBD IgG testing and provided data establishing 386 testing. Ni.S., Na.S. and A.T. performed sVNT testing. Ko.M. and P.P performed T cell immunity analysis. 387 A.J. performed a pseudotyped virus neutralization test. K.B. performed microneutralization assays using 388 live virus. K.B. and A.J. proofread. All authors read the manuscript and agreed with its content. The 389 corresponding author (K.M.) attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others have 390 been omitted.

391

392 DATA AVAILABILITY

Raw data used in this study, including de-identified patient metadata and test results, are available uponrequest.

395 REFERENCES

- 3961.Tuekprakhon A, Nutalai R, Dijokaite-Guraliuc A, et al. Antibody escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron
- **397** BA.4 and BA.5 from vaccine and BA.1 serum. Cell 2022;185(14):2422-2433.e13.
- Tegally H, Moir M, Everatt J, *et al.* Emergence of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron lineages BA.4 and BA.5
 in South Africa. Nat Med 2022;28(9):1785-1790.
- World Health Organization Thailand. COVID-19 WHO Thailand situation reports. World Health
 Organization. (https://www.who.int/thailand/emergencies/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports).
- 402 4. UK Health Security Agency. SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern and variants under investigation in
- 403 England: technical briefing 45. United Kingdom: UK Health Security Agency, September 2022.
- 404 (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/fil
- 405 e/1103869/Technical-Briefing-45-9September2022.pdf).
- 406 5. Centers for disease control and prevention. Monitoring variant proportions. Atlanta, GA: U.S.
 407 Department of Health & Human Services, CDC, October 2 2022. (https://covid.cdc.gov/covid408 data-tracker/#variant-proportions).
- 409 6. Mongkolsucharitkul P, Surawit A, Pumeiam S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody response against mild-
- 410 to-moderate breakthrough COVID-19 in home isolation setting in Thailand. Vaccines (Basel)
 411 2022;10(7):1131.
- 412 7. Cervia C, Zurbuchen Y, Taeschler P, *et al.* Immunoglobulin signature predicts risk of post-acute
 413 COVID-19 syndrome. Nat Commun 2022;13(1):446.
- 414 8. Carvalho T, Krammer F, Iwasaki A. The first 12 months of COVID-19: a timeline of
 415 immunological insights. Nat Rev Immunol 2021;21(4):245-256.
- 416 9. Sudre CH, Murray B, Varsavsky T, *et al.* Attributes and predictors of long COVID. Nat Med
 417 2021;27(4):626-631.
- 418 10. Ortona E, Malorni W. Long COVID: to investigate immunological mechanisms and sex/gender
 419 related aspects as fundamental steps for tailored therapy. Eur Respir J 2022;59(2):2102245.

- 420 11. Su Y, Yuan D, Chen DG, *et al.* Multiple early factors anticipate post-acute COVID-19 sequelae.
 421 Cell 2022;185(5):881-895.e20.
- Halpin SJ, McIvor C, Whyatt G, *et al.* Postdischarge symptoms and rehabilitation needs in survivors
 of COVID-19 infection: A cross-sectional evaluation. J Med Virol 2021;93(2):1013-1022.
- 424 13. Yaksi N, Teker AG, Imre A. Long COVID in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: A retrospective
 425 cohort study. Iran J Public Health 2022;51(1):88-95.
- 426 14. Yan Z, Yang M, Lai CL. Long COVID-19 syndrome: A comprehensive review of its effect on
 427 various organ systems and recommendation on rehabilitation plans. Biomedicines 2021;9(8):966.
- 42815.World Health Organization. A clinical case definition of post COVID-19 condition by a Delphi429consensus.(https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/345824/WHO-2019-nCoV-Post-
- 430 COVID-19-condition-Clinical-case-definition-2021.1-eng.pdf).
- 431 16. Sugiyama A, Miwata K, Kitahara Y, *et al.* Long COVID occurrence in COVID-19 survivors. Sci
 432 Rep 2022;12(1):6039.
- 433 17. Hanson BA, Visvabharathy L, Ali ST, *et al.* Plasma biomarkers of neuropathogenesis in
 434 hospitalized patients with COVID-19 and those with postacute sequelae of SARS-CoV-2 infection.
 435 Neurol Neuroimmunol Neuroinflamm 2022;9(3):e1151.
- 436 18. Phetsouphanh C, Darley DR, Wilson DB, *et al.* Immunological dysfunction persists for 8 months
 437 following initial mild-to-moderate SARS-CoV-2 infection. Nat Immunol 2022;23(2):210-216.
- 438 19. Visvabharathy L, Hanson B, Orban Z, *et al.* Neuro-COVID long-haulers exhibit broad dysfunction
 439 in T cell memory generation and responses to vaccination. medRxiv 2021
- Rao S, Benzouak T, Gunpat S, *et al.* Fatigue symptoms associated with COVID-19 in convalescent
 or recovered COVID-19 patients; a systematic review and meta-analysis. Ann Behav Med
 2022;56(3):219-234.
- de Erausquin GA, Snyder H, Carrillo M, Hosseini AA, Brugha TS, Seshadri S. The chronic
 neuropsychiatric sequelae of COVID-19: The need for a prospective study of viral impact on brain
 functioning. Alzheimers Dement 2021;17(6):1056-1065.

- 446 22. Sumi T, Harada K. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2 in severe disease and long COVID-19.
 447 iScience 2022;25(8):104723.
- Vibholm LK, Nielsen SSF, Pahus MH, *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 persistence is associated with antigenspecific CD8 T-cell responses. EBioMedicine 2021;64:103230.
- 450 24. Asadi-Pooya AA, Akbari A, Emami A, *et al.* Long COVID syndrome-associated brain fog. J Med
 451 Virol 2022;94(3):979-984.
- 452 25. Townsend L, Dyer AH, Jones K, *et al.* Persistent fatigue following SARS-CoV-2 infection is
 453 common and independent of severity of initial infection. PLoS One 2020;15(11):e0240784.
- 454 26. Files JK, Sarkar S, Fram TR, et al. Duration of post-COVID-19 symptoms is associated with
 455 sustained SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses. JCI Insight 2021;6(15):e151544.
- 456 27. Klein J, Wood J, Jaycox J, *et al.* Distinguishing features of Long COVID identified through
 457 immune profiling. medRxiv 2022:2022.08.09.22278592.
- 458 28. Mascellino MT, Di Timoteo F, De Angelis M, Oliva A. Overview of the main anti-SARS-CoV-2
 459 vaccines: Mechanism of action, efficacy and safety. Infect Drug Resist 2021;14:3459-3476.
- 460 29. Sirijatuphat R, Suputtamongkol Y, Angkasekwinai N, *et al.* Epidemiology, clinical characteristics,
- 461 and treatment outcomes of patients with COVID-19 at Thailand's university-based referral hospital.
- 462 BMC Infect Dis 2021;21(1):382.
- 463 30. Aranha C, Patel V, Bhor V, Gogoi D. Cycle threshold values in RT-PCR to determine dynamics of
- 464 SARS-CoV-2 viral load: An approach to reduce the isolation period for COVID-19 patients. J Med
 465 Virol 2021;93(12):6794-6797.
- 466 31. Riedhammer C, Halbritter D, Weissert R. Peripheral blood mononuclear cells: Isolation, freezing,
 467 thawing, and culture. In: Weissert R, ed. Multiple Sclerosis: Methods and Protocols. New York,
 468 NY: Springer New York; 2016:53-61.





Α



Days after illness onset

В



Days after illness onset

Α





В