

1 **Longitudinal Humoral and Cell-Mediated Immune Responses in a Population-Based Co-**  
2 **hort in Zurich, Switzerland between March and June 2022 - Evidence for Protection**  
3 **against Omicron SARS-CoV-2 Infection by Neutralizing Antibodies and Spike-specific**  
4 **T cell responses**

5  
6 K.D. Zens<sup>1,2</sup>, D. Llanas-Cornejo<sup>1#</sup>, D. Menges<sup>1#</sup>, J.S. Fehr<sup>1</sup>, C. Münz<sup>2</sup>, M.A. Puhan<sup>1</sup>, and A.  
7 Frei<sup>1\*</sup>

8  
9 <sup>1</sup>Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Prevention Institute (EBPI), University of Zurich (UZH), Zur-  
10 ich, Switzerland.

11 <sup>2</sup>Institute for Experimental Immunology, University of Zurich (UZH), Zurich, Switzerland.

12  
13 #These authors contributed equally to this work.

14  
15 \*Corresponding Author

16 Anja Frei

17 Hirschengraben 84

18 8001 Zurich, Switzerland

19 [anja.frei@uzh.ch](mailto:anja.frei@uzh.ch)

20

1 **ABSTRACT (word count 200)**

2

3 Background: The correlate(s) of protection against SARS-CoV-2 remain incompletely defined.  
4 Additional information regarding the combinations of antibody and T cell-mediated immunity  
5 which can protect against (re)infection are needed.

6

7 Methods: We conducted a population-based, longitudinal cohort study including 1044 individ-  
8 uals of varying SARS-CoV-2 vaccination and infection statuses. We assessed Spike (S)- and  
9 Nucleocapsid (N)-IgG and wildtype, delta, and omicron neutralizing antibodies. In a subset of  
10 328 individuals, we evaluated S, Membrane (M) and N-specific T cells. 3 months later, we  
11 reassessed antibody (n=964) and T cell (n=141) responses and evaluated factors associated  
12 with protection from (re)infection.

13

14 Results: At study start, >98% of participants were S-IgG seropositive. N-IgG and M/N-T cell  
15 responses increased over time, indicating viral (re)exposure, despite existing S-IgG. Com-  
16 pared to N-IgG, M/N-T cells were a more sensitive measure of viral exposure. N-IgG titers in  
17 the top 33% of participants, omicron neutralizing antibodies in the top 25%, and S-specific T  
18 cell responses were all associated with reduced likelihood of (re)infection over time.

19

20 Conclusions: Population-level SARS-CoV-2 immunity is S-IgG-dominated, but heterogenous.  
21 M/N T cell responses can distinguish previous infection from vaccination, and monitoring a  
22 combination of N-IgG, omicron neutralizing antibodies and S-T cell responses may help esti-  
23 mate protection against SARS-CoV-2 (re)infection.

24

25

26 **KEY WORDS**

27

28 SARS-CoV-2

29 Hybrid Immunity

30 Seroprevalence

31 Neutralizing Antibodies

32 T cell Responses

33 Interferon-gamma Release Assay

34

35

36

37

## 1 INTRODUCTION (total word count 3454)

2

3 It is now well-understood that exposure to SARS-CoV-2 elicits robust antibody and T cell-  
4 mediated immune responses to multiple viral proteins – in particular spike (S), nucleocapsid  
5 (N) and membrane (M) proteins<sup>1-5</sup>. In contrast to infection, Covid-19 vaccination elicits re-  
6 sponses to the viral S protein; the only antigenic component of the vaccines most widely-used  
7 in the United States and Europe<sup>6,7</sup>. As the correlate(s) of protection, and level of said corre-  
8 late(s), needed to prevent infection or severe illness have yet to be clearly defined<sup>8</sup>, data on  
9 population-level humoral and cellular immune responsiveness to SARS-CoV-2 remain im-  
10 portant for understanding 1) the scope of viral exposure and 2) what proportion of the popula-  
11 tion possesses some degree of virus-specific immunity.

12

13 While much is now known regarding population-level antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in-  
14 fection, our understanding of T cell-mediated immunity is much less comprehensive. T cell  
15 responses have been described following both vaccination<sup>9-13</sup> and infection; including mild or  
16 asymptomatic cases even without seroconversion<sup>1-3,5,13-16</sup>. However, extensive studies of T  
17 cell responses, particularly at the population level, are lacking, partially due to the labor-inten-  
18 sive and relatively low-throughput nature of assays designed to evaluate them, such as  
19 ELISpot and flow cytometry-based assays. To address this, adaptation of interferon (IFN)-  
20 gamma release assays (IGRAs), such as those used in *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* and Cy-  
21 tomegalovirus screening<sup>17,18</sup>, may aid in the detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells in a  
22 larger number of samples. Importantly, as both humoral and cellular responses contribute to  
23 immunity against SARS-CoV-2, a better understanding of the heterogenous combinations of  
24 immune memory which can protect against disease may help to inform vaccination strategies,  
25 including the administration of additional booster vaccine doses.

26

27 Here, we conducted a population-based cohort study evaluating antibody and T cell responses  
28 to SARS-CoV-2 among individuals aged 16+ in Zurich, Switzerland, including individuals of  
29 varying vaccination and infection statuses. In March 2022, for all study participants (n=1044)  
30 we evaluated total SARS-CoV-2 S- and N-IgG antibody levels, as well as neutralizing antibody  
31 activity to wildtype (WT) virus and delta and omicron variants. In a randomly selected subset  
32 of individuals (n=328), we further assessed T cell responses to S, M and N proteins by IGRA.  
33 To investigate longitudinal changes in immune responses over time we reassessed antibody  
34 (n=964) and T cell (n=141) responses 3 months later, in June 2022. Overall, we found distinct  
35 immune response patterns among participants depending on reported infection and vaccina-  
36 tion statuses. Already at the beginning of the study, nearly all participants had detectable S-  
37 IgG responses. In contrast, N-IgG and M/N-specific T cell responses increased significantly

1 over time, in spite of existing S-IgG, indicating viral (re)exposure. Importantly, participants with  
2 N-IgG titers in the to 33%, omicron neutralizing antibody activity in the top 25%, and those  
3 with IFN-gamma-producing S-reactive T cells all had significantly reduced likelihood of (re)in-  
4 fection between March and June 2022. Together, our results indicate that population-level  
5 immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 are S-IgG-dominated, but heterogenous. They suggest a  
6 role for assessing M/N-specific T cells in estimating previous viral exposure, and further sug-  
7 gest that monitoring a combination of N-IgG, omicron neutralizing antibodies and S-reactive T  
8 cell responses may help to predict population-level protection against omicron SARS-CoV-2  
9 (re)infection. Our findings are consistent with SARS-CoV-2-specific immunity which is medi-  
10 ated by co-correlates, rather than a single correlate, of protection.

11

12

### 13 **ABBREVIATED METHODS**

14

15 Detailed methods and information on statistical analyses can be found in the supplementary  
16 materials.

17

#### 18 Participant Recruitment and Sample Collection

19

20 Individuals aged 16+ residing in the canton of Zurich, Switzerland were randomly selected by  
21 age-stratified intervals from a population registry and invited to participate. In total, 4875 indi-  
22 viduals were contacted and 1044 enrolled (21.4% participation, Supplementary Fig.1). Initial  
23 study visits were conducted from March 1st through 31st, 2022 and second study visits  
24 (964/1044, 92.3% participation, Supplementary Fig.1) were conducted from June 7th through  
25 July 11th, 2022. At each visit, participants provided information regarding previous Covid-19  
26 vaccination and positive SARS-CoV-2 tests. From each participant, 10mL of venous blood  
27 were collected and plasma cryopreserved prior to analysis of S-Ig and N-Ig levels and WT,  
28 delta, and omicron SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody activity. For participants selected for T  
29 cell assessment, an additional 5mL of venous blood were collected and immediately used for  
30 IFN-gamma Release Assay analysis.

31

#### 32 Spike- and Nucleocapsid-Specific IgG and SARS-CoV-2 Neutralizing Antibody Activity

33

34 Cryopreserved plasma samples were thawed and analyzed for S- and N-specific IgG by Lu-  
35 minex assay as described<sup>19</sup>. Mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) values for each sample were  
36 divided by the mean value of negative control samples to yield an MFI ratio. Individuals were  
37 considered seropositive if the MFI ratio exceeded a lower limit of detection (LOD) of 6.0<sup>19</sup>.

1 Plasma samples were further evaluated for WT, delta, and omicron SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing  
2 antibodies using a cell- and virus-free assay as described<sup>20</sup>. Half maximal inhibitory concen-  
3 tration (IC50) values of 50.0 and 2430.0 were set as lower and LODs, respectively.

#### 4 5 Interferon-gamma Release Assay (IGRA)

6  
7 T cell responses were assessed by IGRA from whole blood stimulated overnight with overlap-  
8 ping 15mer peptide pools spanning the entire M and N proteins (M/N pool) or the S1 domain  
9 of the spike protein and a mix of the predicted immunodominant peptides from spike contain-  
10 ing the majority of the S2 domain (S pool) (M, N, S1 and S PepTivator peptide pools, respec-  
11 tively; Miltenyi Biotec). After incubation, stimulated plasma was collected and IFN-gamma as-  
12 sessed using the Human IFN-gamma ELISA assay (Human IFN-gamma DuoSet ELISA kit,  
13 R&D Systems, Catalog DY285B, and DuoSet ELISA Ancillary Reagent Kit 2, R&D Systems,  
14 Catalog DY008) according to manufacturer's instructions.

## 15 16 17 **RESULTS**

### 18 19 Participant Demographics and Overall Antibody and T cell Immune Responses

20  
21 Of March 2022 study participants (n=1044, Supplementary Fig.1, Supplementary Table 1),  
22 45.5% were male and 54.3% were female. 73.7% were aged 16-64 and 26.3% were 65+.  
23 93.5% reported previous SARS-CoV-2 vaccination; 90.8% were fully vaccinated (2+ vaccine  
24 doses) and 72.1% had received at least one booster (3+ vaccine doses)<sup>21,22</sup>. 32.6% of partic-  
25 ipants reported a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection (defined as having received a positive PCR  
26 or antigen test result) at some point from the pandemic start up to the study visit. Older par-  
27 ticipants (65+) were more likely to report being immunized against Covid-19 (OR 2.87, 95%  
28 CI 1.36-6.09, p=0.006) and less likely to report previous infection (OR 0.44, 0.32-0.61,  
29 p<0.0001) compared to participants aged 16-64, possibly reflecting both the emphasis on vac-  
30 cination for those 65+, as well as the preventative effect of vaccination on subsequent infec-  
31 tion.

32  
33 98.4% of participants were S-IgG seropositive and 23.2% were N-IgG seropositive  
34 (Fig.1A)<sup>21,22</sup>. 96.8%, 93.7% and 89.5% of participants had detectable neutralization IC50 val-  
35 ues to WT, delta and omicron viral variants, respectively. Geometric mean IC50 values, how-  
36 ever, differed significantly between variants, being highest for WT and lowest for omicron  
37 (p<0.0001 for all comparisons, Friedman test with Dunn's multiple comparisons, Fig.1B). In a

1 subset of study participants (n=328), circulating T cell responses to S, or a combination of M  
2 and N proteins<sup>14</sup>, were assessed. 89.6% had detectable S-specific T cell responses, while  
3 57.3% had detectable M/N-specific T cell responses; geometric mean IFN-gamma production  
4 was greater for S-, as compared to M/N-stimulation (Fig.1C). Taken together, these data indi-  
5 cate that, as of March 2022, nearly 99% of the population had previous SARS-CoV-2 antigen  
6 exposure (either through vaccination, infection, or both). As M/N proteins are not present in  
7 available vaccines<sup>6,7</sup> but are generated in response to infection, and, as M- and N-T cell re-  
8 sponses are longer-lasting than N-IgG<sup>1,3,14</sup>, these findings further suggest that at least 57% of  
9 the population had been previously infected by this time.

### 11 Impacts of Infection and Vaccination on Antibody and T cell Responses

12  
13 We next assessed the impacts of infection and vaccination on antibody titers and T cell re-  
14 sponses by multivariable linear regression. Increasing age (65+ vs. 16-64) was significantly  
15 and independently associated with lower S- and N-IgG titers, lower anti-WT, -delta, and -omi-  
16 cron neutralization IC50 values and lower S-T cell responses (Fig.2). Previous SARS-CoV-2  
17 infection and receiving an increasing number of vaccine doses were both associated with sig-  
18 nificantly increased S-IgG titers, anti-WT, -delta, and -omicron neutralization IC50 values, and  
19 S-T cell responses (Fig.2). Previous infection was further associated with increased N-IgG  
20 titers and M/N-T cell responses (Fig.2). Participants were stratified into four groups: in-  
21 fected/vaccinated (n=285 antibody-, 80 T cell-tested), uninfected/vaccinated (n=686 antibody,  
22 229 T cell-tested), infected/unvaccinated (n=53 antibody, 14 T cell-tested), and uninfected/un-  
23 vaccinated (n=15 antibody, 3 T cell-tested) (Fig.3A and B). S-IgG and neutralizing activity  
24 tended to be higher in vaccinated individuals (both previously infected and uninfected, Fig.3A),  
25 and these did not correlate with N-IgG responses (Fig.3B). In contrast, N-IgG and M/N-T cell  
26 responses were higher among previously infected individuals (both vaccinated and unvac-  
27 cinated, Fig.3A and B). Unsurprisingly, the lowest overall responses were observed in unin-  
28 fected/unvaccinated individuals and, due to low sample number, there were insufficient data  
29 to assess T cell correlation patterns for this group (Fig.3A and B). In general, however, anti-  
30 body and T cell response patterns appeared more similar between vaccinated participants  
31 compared to infected participants, with robust S-IgG and neutralizing antibody responses fol-  
32 lowing vaccination and greater N-IgG and M/N-T cell responses among infected individuals.

### 34 Longitudinal Responses and Protection from (Re)infection

35

1 964 participants returned for a second study visit, 3 months later, in June 2022 (Supplemen-  
2 tary Fig.1, Supplementary Table 1). 141 were assessed for T cell responses (118 longitudi-  
3 nally from March and an additional 23 not evaluated for T cell responses in the March round;  
4 Supplementary Table 1). At this time, 6.4% of participants were unvaccinated, 2.4% had re-  
5 ceived a single vaccine dose, 17.0% had received 2 doses, and 74.2% had received 3 or more  
6 doses. 19 individuals (2.0% of the study population) received an additional vaccination be-  
7 tween March and June, all of which were 2nd or booster doses. 16.0% reported a positive  
8 SARS-CoV-2 PCR or antigen test (infection) between March and June. Of these, 14.3% also  
9 reported previous infection in March (repeated infections; 85.7% new infections). In total,  
10 45.3% of the population reported at least one SARS-CoV-2 infection.

11  
12 98.8% of participants were S-IgG seropositive (similar to March) and 36.7% were N-IgG sero-  
13 positive (increasing from March;  $p < 0.0001$ , Two-sample test of proportions). Geometric mean  
14 MFI ratio titers for both S-IgG and N-IgG increased between March and June (Fig.4A; S-IgG  
15  $p < 0.0001$ , N-IgG  $p < 0.0001$ , Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test). 97.2% and 72.3% of  
16 participants had detectable S- and M/N-T cell responses, respectively; significantly more than  
17 in March (Fig.4A and B, S  $p = 0.043$ , M/N  $p = 0.001$ , Fisher's exact test) and geometric mean  
18 IFN-gamma production among the overall population was higher for both in June (Fig.4B, S  
19  $p = 0.05$ , M/N  $p = 0.053$ , Mann-Whitney test). M/N-T cell responses tended also to be higher in  
20 the longitudinal subset, though this was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.109$ , Wilcoxon  
21 matched-pairs signed rank test). Between March and June, 0.4% (4/948) of those who were  
22 seropositive for S-IgG became seronegative while 50% (8/16) of those who were seronegative  
23 became seropositive. For N-IgG, 32.3% (72/223) of those who were seropositive became sero-  
24 onegative and 27.4% (203/741) of those who were seronegative became seropositive. Of in-  
25 dividuals tested longitudinally for T cell responses, 1.9% (2/107) of those S-T cell positive in  
26 March were negative in June, while 81.8% (9/11) of those negative in March were positive in  
27 June. 13.3% (8/60) of those who were M/N-T cell positive in March were negative in June,  
28 while 58.6% (34/58) of those negative in March were positive in June. Of those that became  
29 N-IgG seropositive or M/N-T cell reactive, only 59.1% (120/203) and 29.4% (10/34), respec-  
30 tively, reported infection, highlighting the importance of immune monitoring efforts in under-  
31 standing SARS-CoV-2 exposures.

32  
33 Overall, we observed three dominant immune response patterns among participants, which  
34 were similar in both March and June. In March we observed 17.7% group1 (S-IgG+/N-IgG+/S-  
35 T cell+/M/N-T cell+ -> positive for all factors), 36.3% group2 (S-IgG+/N-IgG-/S-T cell+/M/N-T  
36 cell+ -> positive for everything except N-IgG), and 34.2% group3 (S-IgG+/N-IgG-/S-T  
37 cell+/M/N-T cell- -> S-IgG and S-T cell positive only). In June, we observed 30.5% group1,



1 39.0% group2, and 23.4% group3 (Supplementary Fig.2A and B). Interestingly, only 5.2% of  
2 those in group1 (positive of all factors) reported an infection between March and June com-  
3 pared to 26.6% of those in group2 (positive for everything except N-IgG) and 21.9% of those  
4 in group3 (S-IgG and S-T cell positive only), potentially suggesting superior protection by the  
5 group1 combination of immune responses. In order to evaluate which immune response com-  
6 ponents might be capable of providing protection against (re)infection, we assessed whether  
7 an individual's levels of S- and N-IgG and S- and M/N-T cells in March were associated with  
8 infection between March and June (Fig.5). As vaccination is expected to influence SARS-CoV-  
9 2-specific immune responses, individuals vaccinated between March and June (n=19) were  
10 excluded from the analysis. Having an N-IgG MFI ratio titer above 10 (titers in the top 33% of  
11 the population) was associated with an 84% reduced odds of infection between March and  
12 June (OR 0.16, 95% 0.03-0.85, p=0.031; compared to the lowest 33%). Having omicron neu-  
13 tralizing IC50 titers above 360 (titers in the top 25% of the population) was associated with a  
14 94% reduced odds of infection (OR 0.06, 0.006-0.60, p=0.017; compared to the lowest 25%),  
15 while having S-T cells was associated with a 60% reduced likelihood of infection (production  
16 of  $\geq 25$  to  $< 65$  pg/mL IFN-gamma, OR 0.39, 0.17-0.92, p=0.030; compared to the lowest 25%).  
17 Therefore, N-IgG, omicron neutralizing antibodies, and S-specific T cells are associated with  
18 protection from omicron (re)infection, and monitoring a combination of these responses may  
19 aid in the assessment of population-level immunity against omicron SARS-CoV-2 (re)infection.

20  
21

## 22 **DISCUSSION**

23

24 While antibody responses among individuals in the Zurich area, and throughout Switzerland  
25 have been well-described<sup>21-24</sup>, much less is known regarding population-level T cell respon-  
26 siveness to SARS-CoV-2. Here, we utilized an interferon (IFN)-gamma release assay (IGRA)  
27 based on short-term culture of whole blood with SARS-CoV-2-specific peptides to assess T  
28 cell responses, which demonstrated good concordance with an ELISpot assay which we used  
29 previously<sup>14</sup>. We found that, by June 2022, 97% and 72%, of study participants had S- and  
30 M/N-specific T cells, respectively. In comparison, 99% of participants were S-IgG seropositive  
31 and slightly less than 40% were N-IgG seropositive. That S-specific antibody and T cell re-  
32 sponses were higher, in general, than N-specific antibody and M/N-specific T cell responses  
33 is consistent with the high vaccination coverage in the population (>90% fully vaccinated), as  
34 available vaccines contain S, but not M or N antigens<sup>6,7</sup>. Furthermore, the half-life of S-IgG is  
35 substantially longer than that of N-IgG<sup>14,25,26</sup>, consistent with our observation that the fraction  
36 of participants who were initially seropositive in March but became seronegative by June was  
37 greater for N-IgG (14.1%) compared to S-IgG (1.2%). The higher percentage of M/N-T cell



1 positivity compared to N-IgG positivity is worth noting and is possibly due to 1) the use of both  
2 M- and N-specific peptides in the IGRA, 2) that the half-lives of circulating M- and N-specific  
3 T cells are longer than that of N-IgG<sup>1,3,14</sup>, 3) that some individuals develop only M- and N-  
4 specific T cell responses after infection<sup>14</sup>, and, 4) that previous exposure to endemic human  
5 coronaviruses (HCoV)-229E, -NL63, -OC43, and -HKU1) can generate low levels of T cells  
6 cross-reactive to SARS-CoV-2<sup>2,4,5</sup>. Our findings, however, indicate that assessing SARS-CoV-  
7 2 M/N-T cells is likely a more sensitive method for evaluating exposure to SARS-CoV-2 com-  
8 pared to N-IgG and that monitoring M/N-T cells may help to assess population-level “hybrid  
9 immunity”.

10

11 An additional takeaway from our findings is that the majority of individuals had more than one  
12 type of virus-specific memory response and that protection was not clearly mediated only by  
13 a single subset. The most common patterns, representing over 90% of the study population  
14 were group1 (S-IgG+/N-IgG+/S-T cell+/M/N-T cell+), group2 (S-IgG+/N-IgG+/S-T cell+/M/N-  
15 T cell-), and group3 (S-IgG+/N-IgG-/S-T cell+/M/N-T cell-). All of these patterns included S-  
16 IgG, but nearly 95% of those in group1 did not report an infection between March and June  
17 compared to 73-78% of those in groups 2 and 3. Furthermore, despite high S-IgG seroposi-  
18 tivity already in March 2022, the percentage of participants with detectable N-IgG titers and  
19 M/N-T cells increased significantly by June 2022, indicating continued viral (re)infections, even  
20 among individuals with some level of S-specific immunity. In assessing potential mediators of  
21 protective immunity, we found that having a high N-IgG titer and/or high omicron neutralizing  
22 antibody activity were both protective against omicron SARS-CoV-2 infection. As the half-life  
23 of N-IgG is relatively short at approximately 60-90 days<sup>14,25,26</sup>, individuals with high titers were  
24 likely recently infected – perhaps in the 3-6 months prior to March. It would also make sense  
25 that these individuals were infected with the omicron variant, which was responsible for >99%  
26 of reported Covid-19 cases in late January 2022 in Switzerland<sup>27</sup>. As recent infection may  
27 contribute to a state of “trained immunity”<sup>28</sup> with enhanced baseline activation of the innate  
28 immune system, we speculate that N-IgG is likely not a sole mediator of protection in and of  
29 itself, but may serve as a marker for a persisting “antiviral” state which, in turn, limits reinfec-  
30 tion. We additionally found that S-T cells were associated with reduced likelihood of infection.  
31 S-reactive T cells are known to be generated following SARS-CoV-2 infection and SARS-CoV-  
32 2 vaccination<sup>1-3,9-15</sup>, and individuals can also possess pre-existing memory T cell responses  
33 generated from previous endemic human coronavirus exposure<sup>2,4,5</sup>. Though a role for S-T cell  
34 responses as a correlate of protection against SARS-CoV-2 is not completely clear<sup>8</sup>, it is  
35 known that T cell-mediated immunity is more cross-reactive than corresponding antibody re-  
36 sponses<sup>29</sup>. Furthermore, it has been observed in animal models that, in the absence of anti-  
37 body responses, protection from SARS-CoV-2 can be mediated solely by T cell immunity<sup>30</sup>,

1 and, similarly, we recently observed that individuals can clear SARS-CoV-2 infection in the  
2 absence of detectable antibody responses<sup>14</sup>, highlighting the importance of this subset in pro-  
3 tection from infection.

4

5 Some limitations to our study include, first, that we relied on self-reported SARS-CoV-2 infec-  
6 tions based on receiving a positive PCR or antigen test result. While false positive results are  
7 possible, it is also likely that, as many individuals use self-tests, which have limited sensitivity  
8 especially early in infection, that true infections are under-reported. Similarly, we observed  
9 that a substantial fraction - 20% (3/15) - of participants that reported being uninfected/unvac-  
10 cinated had detectable S- or N-IgG titers, which we would expect only in responses to SARS-  
11 CoV-2 antigen exposure. An additional limitation was the low number of uninfected/unvac-  
12 cinated individuals, and as we collected T cell data only from a subset of individuals, we did  
13 not have sufficient data to thoroughly assess this group, which represents an interesting im-  
14 mune “baseline”. Furthermore, in terms of the assays used, we assessed only IFN-gamma as  
15 a measure of T cell activity. Studies have demonstrated that IL-2-producing T cell responses  
16 are also generated in SARS-CoV-2 infection and vaccination<sup>5,16</sup>. It would be valuable to test  
17 the IGRA approach in evaluating IL-2 responses in further studies as well. In addition, we  
18 limited our T cell analysis to the three dominant antigens for cellular immune responses (S, M  
19 and N), and furthermore, for experimental feasibility, S1 and S2 domains as well as M and N  
20 responses were pooled, although they have been shown in other studies to exhibit some dis-  
21 tinct behaviors<sup>1,2,14,16</sup>. We cannot exclude the importance of subdominant T cell responses  
22 against other viral antigens in some of the participants, which may have led to an underesti-  
23 mation of T cell responses. Another limitation is that, although the IGRA results had a high  
24 degree of concordance with ELISpot assay (Supplementary Methods, Supplementary Fig3A  
25 and B), they did not strongly correlate. This is not unexpected, though, as IGRA measures  
26 total IFN-gamma output in pg/mL which could be produced by few specific T cells, while  
27 ELISpot assesses only the number of IFN-gamma-producing cells without taking the amount  
28 of IFN-gamma produced by individual cells into account, making it difficult to compare values  
29 from these two assays directly. Furthermore, we used a surrogate assay to indirectly quantify  
30 neutralizing activity by measuring competitive inhibition of trimeric SARS-CoV-2 S protein  
31 binding to the Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2 (ACE2) receptor. However, this assay  
32 showed high sensitivity compared to live virus assays during validation<sup>20</sup> and permitted simul-  
33 taneous assessment of neutralization against WT-SARS-CoV-2, delta and omicron variants.

34

35 Nevertheless, we provide here population-level estimates of cellular immunity as well as fac-  
36 tors which may be associated with protection from omicron SARS-CoV-2 infection. Our results  
37 suggest that, while the majority of individuals possess anti-S-IgG, these responses in and of

1 themselves are likely not a good predictor of protection from (re)infection. In terms of estimat-  
2 ing what fraction of the population has been infected with SARS-CoV-2, monitoring M/N-reac-  
3 tive T cells responses may be helpful. However, to assess what fraction of the population  
4 might be protected from (re)infection with omicron SARS-CoV-2, our data suggest that moni-  
5 toring a combination of anti-N-IgG responses, omicron-specific neutralizing antibody re-  
6 sponses, and S-reactive T cell responses may be beneficial. Our findings indicate a pattern  
7 where co-correlates of protection, rather than simply S-IgG, are likely important for mediating  
8 long-term protective immunity against SARS-CoV-2 and future variants and provide important  
9 information for policy makers regarding vaccination strategy in the case of changing disease  
10 epidemiology.

11

12

### 13 **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

14

15 The authors declare no competing interests.

16

17

### 18 **FUNDING**

19

20 The Corona Immunitas research network is coordinated by the Swiss School of Public Health  
21 (SSPH+) and funded by fundraising of SSPH+ including funds of the Swiss Federal Office of  
22 Public Health and private funders (ethical guidelines for funding stated by SSPH+ were re-  
23 spected), by funds of the cantons of Switzerland (Vaud, Zurich, and Basel), and by institutional  
24 funds of the Universities.

25

26

### 27 **ETHICAL APPROVAL**

28

29 We obtained written, informed consent from all participants upon study enrollment. Partici-  
30 pants were compensated with a flat fee for any travel expenses related to study visits, but  
31 otherwise did not receive any compensation for their participation. The study protocol was  
32 approved by the Cantonal Ethics Committee of Zurich (BASEC Registration No. 2020-01247)  
33 and registered (ISRCTN registry 18181860, date of registration 13 July 2020, retrospectively  
34 registered).

35

36

### 37 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

The authors would like to thank Danusia Vanoaica and Osman Yoztekin for their support with the T cell assays, and the study administration team and the study participants for their dedicated contribution to this research project.




## REFERENCES

- 1 Dan, J. M. *et al.* Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science* **371**, eabf4063 (2021).  
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1126/science.abf4063>
- 2 Grifoni, A. *et al.* Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. *Cell* **181**, 1489-1501.e1415 (2020). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015>
- 3 Cohen, K. W. *et al.* Longitudinal analysis shows durable and broad immune memory after SARS-CoV-2 infection with persisting antibody responses and memory B and T cells. *Cell Reports Medicine* **2**, 100354 (2021).  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2021.100354>
- 4 Le Bert, N. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. *Nature* **584**, 457-462 (2020).  
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2550-z>
- 5 Sekine, T. *et al.* Robust T Cell Immunity in Convalescent Individuals with Asymptomatic or Mild COVID-19. *Cell* **183**, 158-168.e114 (2020).  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.017>
- 6 Creech, C. B., Walker, S. C. & Samuels, R. J. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines. *JAMA* **325**, 1318-1320 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2021.3199>
- 7 Amanat, F. & Krammer, F. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines: Status Report. *Immunity* **52**, 583-589 (2020). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.immuni.2020.03.007>
- 8 Goldblatt, D., Alter, G., Crotty, S. & Plotkin, S. A. Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 disease. *Immunol Rev* **310**, 6-26 (2022).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/imr.13091>
- 9 Goel, R. R. *et al.* mRNA vaccines induce durable immune memory to SARS-CoV-2 and variants of concern. *Science* **374**, abm0829 (2021).  
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1126/science.abm0829>
- 10 Zhang, Z. *et al.* Humoral and cellular immune memory to four COVID-19 vaccines. *Cell* **185**, 2434-2451.e2417 (2022).  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.05.022>

- 1 11 Mateus, J. *et al.* Low-dose mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine generates durable  
2 memory enhanced by cross-reactive T cells. *Science* **374**, eabj9853 (2021).  
3 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1126/science.abj9853>
- 4 12 Tarke, A. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 vaccination induces immunological T cell memory able  
5 to cross-recognize variants from Alpha to Omicron. *Cell* **185**, 847-859.e811 (2022).  
6 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2022.01.015>
- 7 13 Sette, A. & Crotty, S. Immunological memory to SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-  
8 19 vaccines. *Immunological Reviews* **310**, 27-46 (2022).  
9 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/imr.13089>
- 10 14 Menges, D. *et al.* Heterogenous humoral and cellular immune responses with distinct  
11 trajectories post-SARS-CoV-2 infection in a population-based cohort. *Nature*  
12 *Communications* **13**, 4855 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32573-w>
- 13 15 Rodda, L. B. *et al.* Functional SARS-CoV-2-Specific Immune Memory Persists after  
14 Mild COVID-19. *Cell* **184**, 169-183.e117 (2021).  
15 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.11.029>
- 16 16 Thieme, C. J. *et al.* Robust T Cell Response Toward Spike, Membrane, and  
17 Nucleocapsid SARS-CoV-2 Proteins Is Not Associated with Recovery in Critical  
18 COVID-19 Patients. *Cell Reports Medicine* **1**, 100092 (2020).  
19 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100092>
- 20 17 Pai, M. *et al.* Gamma Interferon Release Assays for Detection of Mycobacterium  
21 tuberculosis Infection. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews* **27**, 3-20 (2014).  
22 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1128/CMR.00034-13>
- 23 18 Giulieri, S. & Manuel, O. QuantiFERON®-CMV assay for the assessment of  
24 cytomegalovirus cell-mediated immunity. *Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics* **11**,  
25 17-25 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1586/erm.10.109>
- 26 19 Fenwick, C. *et al.* Changes in SARS-CoV-2 Spike versus Nucleoprotein Antibody  
27 Responses Impact the Estimates of Infections in Population-Based Seroprevalence  
28 Studies. *J Virol* **95** (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1128/jvi.01828-20>
- 29 20 Fenwick, C. *et al.* A high-throughput cell- and virus-free assay shows reduced  
30 neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 variants by COVID-19 convalescent plasma. *Science*  
31 *Translational Medicine* **13**, eabi8452 (2021).  
32 <https://doi.org/doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.abi8452>
- 33 21 Amati, R. *et al.* Functional immunity against SARS-CoV-2 in the general population  
34 after a booster campaign and the Delta and Omicron waves, Switzerland, March  
35 2022. *Euro Surveill* **27** (2022). [https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2022.27.31.2200561)  
36 [7917.Es.2022.27.31.2200561](https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2022.27.31.2200561)


- 1 22 Frei, A. *et al.* Development of hybrid immunity during a period of high incidence of  
2 infections with Omicron subvariants: A prospective population based multi-region  
3 cohort study. *medRxiv*, 2022.2010.2014.22281076 (2022).  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.10.14.22281076>
- 5 23 West, E. A. *et al.* Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, associated factors,  
6 experiences and attitudes of nursing home and home healthcare employees in  
7 Switzerland. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **22**, 259 (2022).  
8 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-022-07222-8>
- 9 24 Stringhini, S. *et al.* Seroprevalence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies 6 months into the  
10 vaccination campaign in Geneva, Switzerland, 1 June to 7 July 2021. *Euro Surveill*  
11 **26** (2021). <https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.Es.2021.26.43.2100830>
- 12 25 Lumley, S. F. *et al.* The Duration, Dynamics, and Determinants of Severe Acute  
13 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Antibody Responses in  
14 Individual Healthcare Workers. *Clin Infect Dis* **73**, e699-e709 (2021).  
15 <https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciab004>
- 16 26 Wheatley, A. K. *et al.* Evolution of immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 in mild-  
17 moderate COVID-19. *Nature Communications* **12**, 1162 (2021).  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21444-5>
- 19 27 COVID-19 Switzerland Information on the current situation, *Epidemiological*  
20 *course, Switzerland and Liechtenstein*,  
21 <<https://www.covid19.admin.ch/en/epidemiologic/virus-variants>> (2022).
- 22 28 Netea, M. G. *et al.* Defining trained immunity and its role in health and disease.  
23 *Nature Reviews Immunology* **20**, 375-388 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0285-6)  
24 [020-0285-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41577-020-0285-6)
- 25 29 Sewell, A. K. Why must T cells be cross-reactive? *Nature Reviews Immunology* **12**,  
26 669-677 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1038/nri3279>
- 27 30 Kingstad-Bakke, B. *et al.* Vaccine-induced systemic and mucosal T cell immunity to  
28 SARS-CoV-2 viral variants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **119**,  
29 e2118312119 (2022). <https://doi.org/doi:10.1073/pnas.2118312119>  
30







**Figure 1. Quantitative Antibody and T cell Responses among Participants, March 2022.** A) anti-S- and N-IgG geometric mean MFI titer ratios (n=1044), assay Limit of Detection (LOD)=6.0. B) anti-wildtype, delta and omicron geometric mean neutralizing antibody titers (n=1044), assay LOD 50.0-2430.0. C) Geometric mean IFN-gamma production following S or M/N peptide stimulation of whole blood (n=328).

Estimate (95% CI)




**Figure 2. Factors Associated with March 2022 S- or N-IgG, N-Ab Titers, or S- or M/N-T cell IFN-gamma Levels.** Multivariable linear regression modeling was used to assess the relationship between gender (female vs. male), age group (65+ vs. 16-64 years), reporting a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection (positive PCR or antigen test) (yes vs. no), and the number of Covid-19 vaccine doses received (1, 2, 3+ vs. 0), and S- or N-IgG, N-Ab MFI ratio titers, or S- or M/N-T cell IFN-gamma levels (natural logarithm-transformed). \* $p > 0.05$ , \*\* $p > 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p > 0.005$ .




**Figure 3. Antibody and T cell Responses among Participants by Infection and Vaccination Status, March 2022.** A) Quantitative Antibody and T cell Responses. Log<sub>10</sub> anti-S- and N-IgG geometric mean MFI titer ratios, anti-wildtype, delta and omicron geometric mean neutralizing antibody titers and geometric mean IFN-gamma production following S or M/N peptide stimulation of whole blood. B) Correlation between Antibody and T cell Responses. Top left: Infected and Unvaccinated individuals (n=53 antibody tested, 14 T cell tested), Top right: Infected and Vaccinated (n=285 antibody tested, 80 T cell tested), Bottom left: Uninfected and Unvaccinated (n=15 antibody tested, 3 T cell tested), Bottom right: Uninfected and Vaccinated (n=686 antibody tested, 229 T cell tested). Values represent Spearman correlation coefficients for indicated antibody and T cell response pairs. Crosses indicate pairs with insufficient data for analysis.





**Figure 4. Quantitative Antibody and T cell Responses, June 2022.** A) S- and N-IgG geometric mean MFI ratio titers (n=964). B) Geometric mean IFN-gamma production following S or M/N peptide stimulation of whole blood (n=141).

Odds Ratio (95% CI)



**Figure 5. Factors Associated with Reporting a SARS-CoV-2 Infection between March and June 2022.** Multivariable logistic regression modeling was used to assess the relationship between gender (female vs. male), age group (65+ vs. 16-64 years), quantiles of S- or N-IgG, N-Ab Titers, or S- or M/N-T cell IFN-gamma levels in March 2022, and reporting a previous SARS-CoV-2 infection (positive PCR or antigen test) (yes vs. no) in June/July 2022. For S- and N-IgG MFI ratio titers, individuals were assigned to one of three expression quantiles (<33%, 33-67%, 67+% of all participants); for N-Ab IC50 values, and S- and M/N-T cell IFN-gamma levels, individuals were assigned to one of four expression quantiles (<25%, 25->50%, 50->75%, 75+% of all participants). Corresponding MFI ratios/IC50 titers/IFN-gamma levels are listed next to each variable. \* $p > 0.05$ , \*\*\* $p > 0.005$ .