

-
- 1 **Immunogenicity and safety of heterologous Omicron BA.1 and bivalent SARS-CoV-2**
 - 2 **recombinant spike protein booster vaccines: a phase 3, randomized, clinical trial**
 - 3 Chijioke Bennett, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD, 20878, USA;
 - 4 E Joy Rivers, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;*
 - 5 Wayne Woo, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
 - 6 Mark Bloch, Holdsworth House Medical Practice, Sydney, AU and Kirby Institute, University of
 - 7 New South Wales, Sydney, AU;
 - 8 King Cheung, Emeritus Research, Camberwell, AU;
 - 9 Paul Griffin, Mater Misericordiae Ltd and University of Queensland, South Brisbane, AU;
 - 10 Rahul Mohan, Paratus Clinical Research Western Sydney, Blacktown, AU;
 - 11 Sachin Deshmukh, Griffith University, Southport, AU;
 - 12 Mark Arya, Australian Clinical Research Network (ACRN), Anzac Parade Maroubra, AU;
 - 13 Oscar Cumming, Novatrials, Newcastle, AU;
 - 14 A. Munro Neville, AusTrials, Brisbane, AU;
 - 15 Toni McCallum Pardey, Novatrials, Newcastle, AU;
 - 16 Joyce S Plested, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
 - 17 Shane Cloney-Clark, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
 - 18 Mingzhu Zhu , Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
 - 19 Raj Kalkeri, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
 - 20 Nita Patel, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;

21 Agi Buchanan, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;**
22 Alex Marcheschi, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
23 Jennifer Swan, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
24 Gale Smith, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
25 Iksung Cho, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
26 Gregory M. Glenn, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA;
27 Robert Walker, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA; and
28 Raburn M. Mallory, Novavax, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD 20878, USA; on behalf of the Novavax
29 Inc. 2019nCoV-311 Study Group

30 *formerly Novavax and currently at Protara Therapeutics

31 **formerly Novavax and currently HilleVax, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts, United States

32

33 **Corresponding Author:**

34 Chijioke Bennett, MD

35 Novavax, 21 Firstfield Rd., Gaithersburg, MD, 20878

36 CBennett@novavax.com; T: +1 (240) 268-2000

37

38 **Alternate Corresponding Author:**

39 Alex Marcheschi

40 21 Firstfield Rd., Gaithersburg, MD 20878

41 AMarcheschi@Novavax.com

42

43 **Running title:** NVX-CoV2373 BA.1/bivalent vaccine

44 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2; COVID-19; vaccine; booster; immunogenicity

45

46 Abstract word count (limit 200): 200

47 Manuscript word count (limit 3500): 3500

48 Figures/tables (limit 7): 7

49 References (limit 50): 22

50

51 **Background.** Mutations present in emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants permit evasion of
52 neutralization with prototype vaccines. A novel Omicron BA.1 subvariant-specific vaccine
53 (NVX-CoV2515) was tested alone, or as a bivalent preparation in combination with the
54 prototype vaccine (NVX-CoV2373), to assess antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2.

55 **Methods.** Participants aged 18 to 64 years immunized with 3 doses of prototype mRNA vaccines
56 were randomized 1:1:1 to receive a single dose of NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, or bivalent
57 mixture in a phase 3 study investigating heterologous boosting with SARS-CoV-2 recombinant
58 spike protein vaccines. Immunogenicity was measured 14 and 28 days after vaccination for the
59 SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 sublineage and ancestral strain. Safety profiles of vaccines were
60 assessed.

61 **Results.** Of participants who received trial vaccine (N=829), those administered NVX-CoV2515
62 (n=286) demonstrated superior neutralizing antibody response to BA.1 versus NVX-CoV2373
63 (n=274) at Day 14 (geometric mean titer ratio [95% CI]: 1.6 [1.33, 2.03]). Seroresponse rates
64 [n/N; 95% CI] were 73.4% [91/124; 64.7, 80.9] for NVX-CoV2515 versus 50.9% [59/116; 41.4,
65 60.3] for NVX-CoV2373. All formulations were similarly well-tolerated.

66 **Conclusions.** NVX-CoV2515 elicited a superior neutralizing antibody response against the
67 Omicron BA.1 subvariant compared with NVX-CoV2373 when administered as a fourth dose.
68 Safety data were consistent with the established safety profile of NVX-CoV2373.

69

70 **Introduction**

71 Since the COVID-19 outbreak in late 2019, several variants of SARS-CoV-2 (e.g., Alpha, Beta,
72 Gamma, and Delta) have emerged with mutations in key antigenic sites in the receptor binding
73 domain and spike protein. In late 2021, the Omicron variant emerged as the dominant circulating
74 SARS-CoV-2 virus throughout the world, replacing earlier strains/variants. The emergence and
75 propagation of SARS-CoV-2 variants, such as the Omicron sublineages, has complicated the
76 COVID-19 vaccine landscape. Initial actions to stay ahead of SARS-CoV-2 evolution included
77 directives from the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to develop vaccines containing an
78 Omicron component [1,2].

79 Large phase 3 clinical trials for prototype COVID-19 vaccines were conducted prior to the
80 extensive prevalence of variant strains [3-6]. High vaccine efficacy against the ancestral
81 (Wuhan) strain of SARS-CoV-2 was reported in the phase 3 trial of BNT162b2
82 (Pfizer/BioNTech, July 2020-November 2020) [3], the phase 3 trial of mRNA-1273 (Moderna,
83 July 2020-October 2020) [4], the UK-based phase 3 trial of the Matrix-M–adjuvanted,
84 recombinant spike protein COVID-19 vaccine NVX-CoV2373 [5], and the pivotal US phase 3
85 trial of NVX-CoV2373 [6]. Multiple recent studies have demonstrated that newly emerging
86 Omicron sublineages are less efficiently neutralized than the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain by
87 approved prototype COVID-19 mRNA vaccines, including the BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273
88 vaccines [7-9]. As of June 2022, regulatory bodies have instructed COVID-19 vaccine
89 manufacturers to develop bivalent vaccines consisting of the ancestral and Omicron BA.4/BA.5
90 subvariant strains to potentially provide increased protection from COVID-19 infection [1];
91 notably, a number of manufacturers already had bivalent vaccines consisting of the ancestral and
92 Omicron BA.1 subvariant strains in development. Currently, the US FDA has granted emergency

93 use authorization of two mRNA-based bivalent vaccines targeting the Omicron sublineage
94 [10,11]; however, sparse real-world data exist about the comparative effectiveness of
95 monovalent versus bivalent SARS-CoV-2 vaccines. In June 2023 during a Vaccines and Related
96 Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC) Meeting, the FDA recommended
97 development of a monovalent Omicron XBB-sublineage vaccine for the 2023–2024 vaccination
98 campaign [12]. The World Health Organization (WHO) Technical Advisory Group on COVID-
99 19 Vaccine Composition (TAG-CO-VAC), as well as the European Center for Disease
100 Prevention and Control (ECDC) and European Medicines Agency (EMA) have made similar
101 recommendations about updating vaccines to target XBB strains [13,14].

102 As part of the evaluation of Omicron-targeted vaccines, Novavax produced a novel Omicron
103 BA.1 subvariant-specific vaccine (NVX-CoV2515) based on the same recombinant spike protein
104 technology as its authorized prototype vaccine, NVX-CoV2373. Similarly, NVX-CoV2515 is
105 also a co-formulated product consisting of full-length, pre-fusion recombinant S protein trimers
106 with the saponin-based adjuvant, Matrix-M™. NVX-CoV2515 was prepared for use either alone
107 or in combination with the prototype vaccine (NVX-CoV2373) as a bivalent mixture to
108 determine whether it would enhance or broaden antibody responses across variants of concern.

109 To provide real-world applicable data, the population planned for investigation included
110 participants who had already received 3 prior vaccinations with mRNA-based vaccines produced
111 by Moderna and Pfizer BioNTech (i.e., mRNA-1273 and BNT162b2, respectively).

112 Here, we describe interim results from an ongoing, phase 3, randomized, observer-blinded
113 clinical trial (NCT05372588) evaluating the immunogenicity and safety of an Omicron BA.1-
114 containing monovalent vaccine (NVX-CoV2515) and a bivalent vaccine (NVX-CoV2373 +
115 NVX-Cov2515) compared with the original NVX-CoV2373 booster. The goal of this interim

116 analysis was to determine if NVX-CoV2515 induces superior antibody responses to the Omicron
117 BA.1 subvariant compared with the antibody response induced by NVX-CoV2373.

118 **Methods**

119 As part of an ongoing phase 3, randomized, observer-blinded study (NCT05372588), participants
120 who previously received a regimen of 3 doses of mRNA-1273 and/or BNT162b2 were
121 randomized 1:1:1 to receive NVX-CoV2373, NVX-CoV2515, or bivalent mixture as a
122 heterologous fourth dose. Eligible participants were ≥ 18 and ≤ 64 years of age and received their
123 last dose of mRNA vaccine ≥ 90 days prior to their planned study vaccination. Baseline
124 SARS-CoV-2 positivity by either polymerase chain reaction (PCR) or anti-nucleocapsid (anti-N)
125 diagnostics was confirmed.

126 Participants received randomized investigational vaccines containing 5 μg SARS-CoV-2
127 recombinant Spike (rS) protein and 50 μg Matrix-M adjuvant administered via a 0.5 mL
128 intramuscular injection. The bivalent vaccine was prepared on-site as a 1:1 mixture of NVX-
129 CoV2373 and NVX-CoV2515. Following vaccination, participants utilized an electronic diary to
130 record daily solicited local and systemic reactions for 7 days. Unsolicited adverse events (AEs)
131 were collected for 28 days following vaccination. Data were analyzed from three participant
132 analysis sets: the Safety Analysis Set included all participants who provided consent, were
133 randomized, and received the study vaccine; the Per-Protocol Analysis Set 1 (PP1) population
134 included participants who received the study vaccine, had serology results for baseline and an
135 analyzed time point, were negative at baseline for SARS-CoV-2, and had no major protocol
136 violations or event (e.g., COVID-19 infection) that could potentially impact immune responses;
137 the Per-Protocol Analysis Set 2 (PP2) population was defined exactly as the PP1 population

138 excluding the requirement for participants to have a negative baseline anti-N result. PP1 and PP2
139 results were determined for each strain/subvariant, serology assay, and study visit.

140 Immune responses were assessed at 14 and 28 days following vaccination. Participant serum
141 collected at each timepoint was analyzed using live-virus neutralization [15], anti-spike
142 immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibody [15], and pseudovirus neutralization assays [16]. Live-virus
143 neutralization assays provided microneutralization with an inhibitory concentration of 50%
144 (MN_{50}) data for the Omicron BA.1 sublineage (Day 14, primary endpoint) and ancestral strain
145 (validated by 360biolabs [Melbourne, Australia]). The 95% CI for geometric mean titer (GMT)
146 and geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) were obtained based on a t-distribution of the log-
147 transformed values. The GMT ratio (GMTR) at Day 14 and the two-sided 95% CIs were
148 computed using the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with the vaccine group as the fixed
149 effect and the titer at Day 0 as the covariate under a two-sided type I error rate of 0.05. Statistical
150 significance was achieved if the lower-bound of the two-sided 95% CI was above unity (i.e., >1).
151 Seroresponse rates (SRRs) in MN_{50} titers (defined as a ≥ 4 -fold increase from baseline values) of
152 the Omicron BA.1 subvariant at Day 14 following study vaccination were analyzed as part of the
153 primary endpoint. Two-sided exact binomial 95% CIs were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson
154 method. The difference in SRR between groups (expressed as NVX-CoV2515 minus NVX-
155 CoV2373) was also calculated, with the 95% CI for the difference based on the method of
156 Miettinen and Nurminen. For the analysis of difference of SRRs, assuming 80% SRR for NVX-
157 CoV2373 and 85% SRR for NVX-CoV2515, there was 90% power to conclude non-inferiority
158 using a margin of -5% (NVX-CoV2515 relative to NVX-CoV2373). Serum anti-spike IgG
159 enzyme linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs) measured participant serum antibody
160 concentrations (EU/mL) against the recombinant spike protein of the ancestral strain and

161 Omicron BA.1 sublineage (validated by Novavax Clinical Immunology [Gaithersburg,
162 Maryland, USA]). As an exploratory endpoint, pseudovirus neutralization assays provided 50%
163 inhibitory dilution (ID₅₀) data for the ancestral strain and Omicron BA.1 sublineage (validated by
164 Monogram Biosciences [South San Francisco, CA, USA]).

165 Sample size determination was based on the co-primary endpoints of MN₅₀ GMT and SRR. For
166 the GMTR analysis a standard deviation of 0.6 for log₁₀-transformed neutralization titers based
167 on data from previous studies, a 15% non-evaluable allowance, and an overall one-sided type I
168 error of 2.5% was assumed. Study enrollment was halted ahead of reaching the planned
169 population after re-examination of the sample size approximations suggested that the necessary
170 number of participants had already been achieved to assess the primary endpoints.

171 The trial protocol was approved by the Alfred Hospital Ethics Committee (Melbourne, Victoria,
172 Australia) and the Bellberry Human Research Ethics Committee (Adelaide, South Australia), and
173 is registered on Clinicaltrials.gov (NCT05372588). This study was performed in accordance with
174 the International Conference on Harmonization, Good Clinical Practice guidelines. All
175 participants provided informed consent prior to study participation.

176 Randomization was managed by a contract research organization (CRO), and treatments were
177 assigned using an Interactive Web Response System (IWRS). The block size was blinded
178 information and known only by the CRO statistician. Predetermined site personnel were
179 unblinded to enable vaccine preparation and administration without breaking the blind for other
180 personnel or participants. Only blinded personnel could perform study related assessments or
181 have participant contact for data collection after administration of study vaccine.

182 **Results**

183 From 31 May 2022 to 17 July 2022, a total of 835 participants (from 19 study sites across
184 Australia) were screened and 831 participants were randomized to one of three treatment groups.
185 Of the randomized participants, 829 received vaccine: 286 received NVX-CoV2515, 274
186 received NVX-CoV2373, and 269 received bivalent vaccine (Safety Analysis Set) (**Supp Figure**
187 **1**).

188 Demographic and other baseline characteristics of the participants in the Safety Analysis Set
189 were similar across all vaccine groups (**Table 1**). The median age was 41.0 to 42.0 years, the
190 majority of participants in each group were female (52.2% [NVX-CoV2373, 143/274] to 56.1%
191 [bivalent, 151/269]), and most participants were White ($\geq 78.5\%$ [NVX-CoV2515, 233/286;
192 NVX-CoV2373, 215/274; bivalent, 220/269]) and of Australian ethnicity ($\geq 86.1\%$ [NVX-
193 CoV2515, 252/286; NVX-CoV2373, 236/274; bivalent, 233/269]). Baseline SARS-CoV-2
194 exposure was substantial, with $\geq 50.9\%$ (NVX-CoV2515, 149/286; NVX-CoV2373, 145/274;
195 bivalent, 137/269) of participants testing positive by either PCR or anti-N serology. These
196 participants were excluded from the primary endpoint analysis of the Per-Protocol Analysis Set 1
197 (PP1), however were included in complementary analyses of the Per-Protocol Analysis Set 2
198 (PP2) to provide data more representative of a “real world” population. Demographic and other
199 baseline characteristics of participants in the PP1 and PP2 populations were similar to those in
200 the Safety Analysis Set and were generally well balanced across the treatment groups (**Supp**
201 **Table 1**).

202 ***Per Protocol Analysis Set 1:***

203 Among participants with no evidence of SARS-CoV-2 exposure at baseline (PP1 population),
204 strong immune responses were observed following administration with all 3 investigational
205 vaccines at 14 days post-vaccination (**Table 2**). At Day 14, microneutralization assay GMTs
206 against the Omicron BA.1 sublineage were the highest in participants receiving NVX-CoV2515,
207 followed by those receiving the bivalent vaccine and NVX-CoV2373 (MN₅₀ titers [95% CI] of
208 130.8 [109.2, 156.7], 97.9 [81.3, 117.9], and 83.9 [69.6, 101.2], respectively) (**Figure 1**). Formal
209 comparison of NVX-CoV2515 and NVX-CoV2373 resulted in a GMTR of 1.6 (95% CI: 1.33,
210 2.03) indicating a significant difference between the vaccines (**Table 2**). NVX-CoV2515 induced
211 a non-inferior SRR against the Omicron BA.1 subvariant virus versus NVX-CoV2373 (73.4%
212 [91/124] vs 50.9% [59/116]) at Day 14, with a difference in SRRs of 22.5% (95% CI: 10.3, 34.2)
213 (**Table 2**). MN₅₀ GMTs for the ancestral strain microneutralization assay were somewhat lower
214 in participants receiving NVX-CoV2515 compared with the bivalent vaccine and NVX-
215 CoV2373 alone (MN₅₀ titers [95% CI] of 1076.3 [908.4, 1275.4], 1319.9 [1120.1, 1555.3], and
216 1442.5 [1192.4, 1745.0], respectively) (**Figure 1**). Similar findings were seen at Day 28.

217 Anti-spike IgG assay data indicate that the highest concentrations of Omicron BA.1 IgG are
218 achieved with NVX-CoV2373, highlighting the vaccine's cross-reactive nature with the Omicron
219 BA.1 sublineage. Anti-spike IgG antibody levels (geometric mean ELISA units, GMEU) [95%
220 CI] for the BA.1 assay were 30,170.9 [25,663.7, 35,469.6], 24,174.8 [20,943.6, 27,904.6], and
221 23,045.5 [20,113.5, 26,404.8] EU/mL for NVX-CoV2373, NVX-CoV2515, and the bivalent
222 vaccine, respectively (**Figure 1**). A somewhat similar pattern of response was seen using the
223 ancestral strain anti-spike IgG assay, with GMEUs of 53,531.1 [46,055.5, 62,220.1], 40,423.4

224 [35,120.0, 46,527.7] and 42,783.9 [37,649.7, 48,618.1] EU/mL for NVX-CoV2373, NVX-
225 CoV2515, and the bivalent vaccine, respectively (**Figure 1**).

226 Pseudovirus neutralization GMTs against the Omicron BA.1 sublineage were the highest in
227 participants receiving NVX-CoV2515, followed by those receiving the bivalent vaccine and
228 NVX-CoV2373 (ID₅₀ titers [95% CI] of 816.1 [639.9, 1040.7], 562.0 [439.6, 718.6], and 449.1
229 [345.3, 584.2], respectively) (**Figure 1**). ID₅₀ GMTs for the ancestral strain pseudovirus
230 neutralization assay were somewhat lower in participants receiving NVX-CoV2515 and the
231 bivalent vaccine compared with NVX-CoV2373 (ID₅₀ titers [95% CI] of 1181.1 [976.6, 1428.3],
232 1195.1 [1012.1, 1411.2], and 1473.0 [1227.1, 1768.3], respectively) (**Table 2**).

233 ***Per Protocol Analysis Set 2:***

234 Microneutralization assay GMTs against the Omicron BA.1 sublineage for participants in the
235 PP2 population, which included those with a positive baseline SARS-CoV-2 result, were the
236 highest in participants receiving NVX-CoV2515, followed by those receiving the bivalent
237 vaccine and NVX-CoV2373 (MN₅₀ titers [95% CI] of 318.2 [269.8, 375.3], 252.7 [213.1, 299.7],
238 and 218.1 [186.0, 255.7], respectively) (**Figure 2**). NVX-CoV2515 induced a non-inferior SRR
239 against the Omicron BA.1 subvariant virus versus NVX-CoV2373 (54.3% [134/247] vs 32.0%
240 [78/244]) at Day 14, with similar results on Day 28 (**Table 3**). MN₅₀ GMTs for the ancestral
241 strain microneutralization assay were somewhat lower in participants receiving NVX-CoV2515
242 compared with the bivalent and NVX-CoV2373 vaccines (MN₅₀ titers [95% CI] of 2206.2
243 [1910.0, 2548.4], 2544.7 [2194.5, 2950.9], and 2702.0 [2347.9, 3109.4], respectively) (**Table 3**).

244 Similar to the PP1 population, anti-spike IgG assay data indicate the highest levels of BA.1 IgG
245 are achieved with vaccination using NVX-CoV2373, indicating cross-reactivity with the
246 Omicron BA.1 sublineage (**Table 3**). Anti-spike IgG GMEUs [95% CI] for the BA.1 assay were

247 49,727.7 [44,331.1, 55,781.1], 42,835.5 [37,883.8, 48,434.4], and 42,462.1 [37,628.9, 47,916.2]
248 EU/mL for NVX-CoV2373, NVX-CoV2515, and the bivalent vaccine, respectively (**Figure 2**).
249 A relatively similar pattern of response was seen using the ancestral strain anti-spike IgG assay,
250 with GMEUs of 90,962.2 [81,361.1, 101,696.2], 78,191.9 [69,489.1, 87,984.5], and 71,076.4
251 [63,012.1, 80,172.9] EU/mL for NVX-CoV2373, bivalent vaccine, and NVX-CoV2515,
252 respectively (**Figure 2**).

253 ***Safety Analysis Set:***

254 The overall rates of solicited local and systemic reactions reported within 7 days after booster
255 vaccination were similar across all 3 investigational products (**Figure 3**). Rates of solicited local
256 events of any grade were 69.3% (196/286; Grade 3+: 1.8% [5/286]), 71.0% (193/274; 0.4%
257 [1/274]), and 64.6% (173/269; 1.1% [3/269] for NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, and the
258 bivalent vaccine, respectively). No Grade 4 solicited local treatment-emergent adverse events
259 (TEAEs) were reported. Local reactions were generally short-lived, with a median duration of
260 1.0 day for all events except tenderness (2.0 days). Solicited systemic reactions were similar
261 across the groups with event rates [Grade 3+ rates] of 62.2% [7.3%], 58.1% [3.7%], and 61.9%
262 [3.0%] for NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, and the bivalent vaccine, respectively. There was
263 one Grade 4 solicited systemic TEAE (fever) reported in the NVX-CoV2515 group. Solicited
264 systemic reactions were transient in nature, with a median duration of 1.0 day for all events
265 except fatigue, which had a median duration of 2.0 days.

266 Through 28 days after vaccination, unsolicited TEAEs occurred in 34.3% (98/286), 38.0%
267 (104/274), and 33.8% (91/269) of participants in the NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, and the
268 bivalent vaccine groups, respectively (**Table 4**). Unsolicited serious TEAEs occurred in 0.3%
269 (1/286) and 0.4% (1/274) of participants in the NVX-CoV2515 and NVX-CoV2373,

270 respectively, though neither of these events were reported as vaccine related. No unsolicited
271 serious TEAEs occurred in the bivalent vaccine group. There were no treatment-related
272 medically attended adverse events (MAAEs) or potential immune-mediated medical conditions
273 (PIMMCs) in any vaccine group.

274 **Discussion**

275 In this report, we describe the first immunogenicity and safety data for Omicron-specific (NVX-
276 CoV2515) and bivalent SARS-CoV-2 rS protein subunit vaccines. These results are from an
277 interim analysis of an ongoing phase 3, randomized, observer-blinded, clinical trial in
278 participants who previously received a regimen of 3 doses of prototype mRNA vaccine.

279 After participants received a single booster dose of either NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, or
280 the bivalent vaccine (NVX-CoV2515 + NVX-CoV2373), immunogenicity assessments—
281 microneutralization (MN₅₀), anti-S IgG (GMEU), and pseudovirus neutralization (ID₅₀) assays—
282 were analyzed on Days 14 and 28 post-vaccination.

283 The primary endpoint analysis demonstrated that the Omicron BA.1-specific vaccine, NVX-
284 CoV2515, produced a superior neutralizing antibody response (MN₅₀) against the Omicron BA.1
285 subvariant when compared with the prototype vaccine, NVX-CoV2373, and met the non-
286 inferiority criterion for SRR versus NVX-CoV2373 at Day 14 following booster administration,
287 thereby successfully achieving the study's primary objective.

288 Although NVX-CoV2515 demonstrated superior MN₅₀ titers against the Omicron BA.1 strain,
289 when compared with NVX-CoV2373, this trend did not persist through all assay types. NVX-
290 CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, and the bivalent vaccine elicited similar MN₅₀ and pseudovirus ID₅₀
291 responses against the ancestral strain. Trends with the MN₅₀ assays were maintained both in

292 participants with no evidence of previous infection (PP1) and in participants with evidence of
293 previous infection, as determined by anti-NP status at baseline (PP2). With regard to prevention
294 of severe disease and hospitalization due to COVID-19, both neutralizing and non-neutralizing
295 antibodies play a role in vaccine efficacy [17]. Thus, lower titers for neutralizing antibodies do
296 not necessarily indicate lower vaccine efficacy. Overall, these assays revealed no consistent
297 immunogenic differences between the prototype and the bivalent vaccine.

298 In a recent study, the immunogenicity of the mRNA-1273.214 bivalent vaccine (ancestral SARS-
299 CoV-2 strain + Omicron BA.1) was investigated in individuals who previously received three
300 doses of the prototype mRNA-1273 vaccine [11]. Compared with individuals who received the
301 prototype mRNA.1273 vaccine as a fourth booster dose, those who received mRNA.1273.214 as
302 a fourth dose exhibited higher binding antibody responses against Omicron BA.1 and Omicron
303 BA.4/5 variants, resulting in the acknowledged superiority of mRNA.1273.214 to the mRNA-
304 1273 prototype vaccine. An additional study conducted with the same bivalent mRNA vaccine
305 showed that both the Omicron-BA.1-monovalent mRNA-1273.529 and bivalent mRNA-
306 1273.214 vaccines elicited superior neutralizing antibody responses against Omicron BA.1
307 compared with the prototype mRNA-1273 vaccine [18].

308 After receiving a single dose of either NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, or bivalent vaccine,
309 participant sera from each of the 3 study groups achieved anti-Spike IgG antibody concentrations
310 against the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain that were previously associated with vaccine efficacy
311 levels of 88%-95% in pivotal phase 3 studies of the prototype vaccine [6,19]. Anti-Spike IgG
312 antibody responses using the Omicron BA.1-specific assay were balanced across the 3 study
313 groups, regardless of baseline status of confirmed prior infection, displaying similar benefits of
314 NVX-CoV2515, the bivalent vaccine, and the prototype vaccine. The consistent anti-Spike IgG

315 responses (agnostic of strain) suggest the development of broadly cross-reacting IgG antibodies
316 following administration of SARS-CoV-2 rS protein subunit vaccines, either as the prototype,
317 BA.1 variant, or bivalent vaccine.

318 Overall, the variant specific vaccine (NVX-CoV2515) induced a superior neutralizing antibody
319 response against the Omicron BA.1 subvariant when compared with the prototype vaccine,
320 NVX-CoV2373. The NVX-CoV2515 and bivalent SARS-CoV-2 rS protein subunit vaccines
321 demonstrated similar immunogenicity 14 days post-vaccination, with no added benefits when
322 compared with the prototype product (NVX-CoV2373) across several ancestral strain- and
323 Omicron BA.1-specific immunoassays. Immunogenicity results at Day 28 were generally similar
324 to those at Day 14.

325 The PP2 population assessed in this study most accurately represents a real-world population in
326 which previous SARS-CoV-2 infection is not uncommon. In Australia as of November 2022, at
327 least 66% of the population were estimated to had been previously infected by SARS-CoV-2
328 [20]. Anti-S IgG antibody responses against the Omicron BA.1 subvariant for the PP2 population
329 were generally 1.5- to 2-fold greater than those for the PP1 population. These results align with
330 studies that assessed immune responses in both participants with and without previous SARS-
331 CoV-2 infection that showed that neutralization of subvariant SARS-CoV-2 strains was higher
332 after a booster with bivalent mRNA vaccine than after a booster dose with prototype mRNA
333 vaccine [10,11].

334 The incidence of solicited local and systemic reactogenicity reported in this study was consistent
335 with previous studies of NVX-CoV2373, with pain/tenderness being the most common local
336 solicited AE and fatigue being the most common solicited systemic AE [6,21]. Incidence rates
337 for all local and systemic events were similar across all vaccine groups.

338 Incidences of unsolicited TEAEs and serious AEs were also unremarkable with respect to prior
339 research on the prototype vaccine, and there were no reports of related MAAEs, PIMMCs, or
340 SAEs. Collectively, these data were consistent with the safety profile of other variant-specific
341 SARS-CoV-2 rS protein subunit vaccines, bivalent combination, or with use as a heterologous
342 booster in combination with mRNA vaccines.

343 Our study was subject to certain limitations. As these results are from an ongoing phase 3 study
344 conducted with a limited sample size, clinical efficacy of the booster dose was not evaluated.
345 Safety follow-up in this study, at present, is also limited to 28 days. Furthermore, it remains to be
346 seen if the conclusions based on the prototype versus variant-specific vaccines in this study can
347 be extrapolated to newer strains or newer vaccines. For example, in a recent study comparing the
348 neutralization activity of a bivalent BA.4/5 BNT162b2 vaccine to the prototype BNT162b2
349 vaccine against newly emerged Omicron sublineages descended from BA.2 and BA.4/BA.5 in
350 persons who previously received three doses of BNT162b2, the bivalent BA.4/5 vaccine was
351 more immunogenic than the original BNT162b2 monovalent vaccine against circulating
352 Omicron sublineages [10]. Additionally, newer Omicron subvariants such as BQ and XBB show
353 marked evasion of vaccine-induced neutralization and evasion from monoclonal antibodies with
354 known neutralization capability against the original Omicron variant [22]. Therefore, responses
355 to the Omicron BA.5 variant after immunization with NVX-CoV2515, NVX-CoV2373, or
356 bivalent vaccine, and the effect of a subsequent booster dose at 3 months, will be addressed in
357 future work, given that BA.5 is more closely related phylogenetically to XBB and BQ than to the
358 ancestral strain.

359 In conclusion, the variant-specific vaccine NVX-CoV2515 demonstrated superior neutralizing
360 response against the matched Omicron BA.1 subvariant virus. The prototype and bivalent

361 vaccines also induced robust immune responses to ancestral and Omicron subvariant strains of
362 SARS-CoV-2 when administered as a fourth dose. Moreover, the safety profile of updated
363 variant-specific SARS-CoV-2 rS protein subunit vaccines remained consistent with the prototype
364 vaccine when administered as a heterologous booster dose following 3 vaccinations with mRNA
365 vaccines.

366

367 **Funding**

368 This work was supported by Novavax, Inc.

369 **Acknowledgments**

370 We thank all the study participants who volunteered for this study. This study was funded by
371 Novavax, Inc. Editorial support was provided by Kelly Cameron, PhD, and Amanda Cox, PhD,
372 of Ashfield MedComms (New York, USA), an Inizio company, supported by Novavax, Inc.

373 **Contributors**

374 RMM, KA, JSP, and NP were involved in the study design, data collection, and interpretation.
375 SG performed the statistical analyses. All authors reviewed, commented on, and approved this
376 manuscript prior to submission for publication. The authors were not precluded from accessing
377 data in the study, and they accept responsibility to submit the manuscript for publication.

378 **Declaration of interests**

379 CB, EJR, WW, JSP, SCC, MZ, RK, NP, AB, AM, JS, GS, IC, GMG, RW, and RMM are current
380 or former Novavax employees and as such receive or received a salary for their work, and may
381 hold Novavax stock. OC and TMP act as investigators at Novatrials on clinical trials and have
382 not received personal financial payment from Novavax. AMN acts an investigator at AusTrials
383 on clinical trials of COVID-19 and other vaccines sponsored by vaccine manufacturers,
384 including Pfizer, GlaxoSmithKline, Novavax, Seqirus and Moderna. He receives no personal
385 financial payment for this work. KC acts as an investigator at Emeritus Research and has not
386 received any personal financial payment from Novavax. RM acts as an investigator at Paratus
387 Clinical Research and has not received any personal financial payment from Novavax. MB has
388 received payment or honoraria as well as support for meeting attendance and/or travel from

389 Gilead Sciences and ViiV Healthcare, and has received research funding from Gilead Sciences,
390 ViiV Healthcare, GlaxoSmithKline, Merck & Co, Eli Lilly, Amgen, Pfizer, Bristol-Myers
391 Squibb, Novartis, and Sanofi. He has also participated on a data safety monitoring board or
392 advisory board for Gilead Sciences, ViiV Healthcare, and Cymra. MA, PG, and SD report no
393 conflicts of interest.

394 **Data sharing**

395 Study information is available at <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05372588>, and requests
396 will be considered.

397 References

- 398 1. Marks P. Coronavirus (COVID-19) Update: FDA Recommends Inclusion of Omicron
399 BA.4/5 Component for COVID-19 Vaccine Booster Doses: U.S. Food & Drug
400 Administration; 2022. Available from: [https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-
401 announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-recommends-inclusion-omicron-ba45-
402 component-covid-19-vaccine-booster](https://www.fda.gov/news-events/press-announcements/coronavirus-covid-19-update-fda-recommends-inclusion-omicron-ba45-component-covid-19-vaccine-booster)
- 403 2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. SARS-CoV-2 variant classifications and
404 definitions [updated 2023 March 20; cited 2023 May 5]. Available from:
405 [https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/variant-
406 classifications.html#anchor_1632154493691](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/variants/variant-classifications.html#anchor_1632154493691)
- 407 3. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA
408 Covid-19 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2020 Dec 31;383(27):2603-2615.
- 409 4. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-
410 CoV-2 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Feb 4;384(5):403-416.
- 411 5. Heath PT, Galiza EP, Baxter DN, et al. Safety and Efficacy of NVX-CoV2373 Covid-19
412 Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2021 Sep 23;385(13):1172-1183.
- 413 6. Dunkle LM, Kotloff KL, Gay CL, et al. Efficacy and Safety of NVX-CoV2373 in Adults
414 in the United States and Mexico. *N Engl J Med.* 2022 Feb 10;386(6):531-543.
- 415 7. Tartof SY, Slezak JM, Puzniak L, et al. BNT162b2 vaccine effectiveness against SARS-
416 CoV-2 omicron BA.4 and BA.5. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022 Dec;22(12):1663-1665.
- 417 8. Kurhade C, Zou J, Xia H, et al. Neutralization of Omicron BA.1, BA.2, and BA.3 SARS-
418 CoV-2 by 3 doses of BNT162b2 vaccine. *Nat Commun.* 2022 Jun 23;13(1):3602.

-
- 419 9. Tseng HF, Ackerson BK, Bruxvoort KJ, et al. Effectiveness of mRNA-1273 vaccination
420 against SARS-CoV-2 omicron subvariants BA.1, BA.2, BA.2.12.1, BA.4, and BA.5. *Nat*
421 *Commun.* 2023 Jan 12;14(1):189.
- 422 10. Zou J, Kurhade C, Patel S, et al. Neutralization of BA.4-BA.5, BA.4.6, BA.2.75.2,
423 BQ.1.1, and XBB.1 with Bivalent Vaccine. *N Engl J Med.* 2023 Mar 2;388(9):854-857.
- 424 11. Chalkias S, Harper C, Vrbicky K, et al. A Bivalent Omicron-Containing Booster Vaccine
425 against Covid-19. *N Engl J Med.* 2022 Oct 6;387(14):1279-1291.
- 426 12. US Food and Drug Administration (FDA). FDA Briefing Document: Vaccines and
427 Related Biological Products Advisory Committee Meeting. *Selection of Strain(s) to be*
428 *Included in the Periodic Updated COVID-19 Vaccines for the 2023-2024 Vaccination*
429 *Campaign.* 2023 June 15.
- 430 13. World Health Organization (WHO). Statement on the antigen composition of COVID-19
431 vaccines 2023 May 18 [cited 2023 June 27]. Available from:
432 [https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2023-statement-on-the-antigen-composition-of-](https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2023-statement-on-the-antigen-composition-of-covid-19-vaccines)
433 [covid-19-vaccines](https://www.who.int/news/item/18-05-2023-statement-on-the-antigen-composition-of-covid-19-vaccines)
- 434 14. European Medicines Agency (EMA). EMA and ECDC statement on updating COVID-19
435 Vaccines to target new SARS-CoV-2 virus variants 2023 June 6 [cited 2023 June 27].
436 Available from: [https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-ecdc-statement-updating-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-ecdc-statement-updating-covid-19-vaccines-target-new-sars-cov-2-virus-variants#:~:text=In%20line%20with%20the%20outcome,other%20parts%20of%20the%20world.)
437 [covid-19-vaccines-target-new-sars-cov-2-virus-](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-ecdc-statement-updating-covid-19-vaccines-target-new-sars-cov-2-virus-variants#:~:text=In%20line%20with%20the%20outcome,other%20parts%20of%20the%20world.)
438 [variants#:~:text=In%20line%20with%20the%20outcome,other%20parts%20of%20the%](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-ecdc-statement-updating-covid-19-vaccines-target-new-sars-cov-2-virus-variants#:~:text=In%20line%20with%20the%20outcome,other%20parts%20of%20the%20world.)
439 [20world.](https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/news/ema-ecdc-statement-updating-covid-19-vaccines-target-new-sars-cov-2-virus-variants#:~:text=In%20line%20with%20the%20outcome,other%20parts%20of%20the%20world.)
-

-
- 440 15. Madhi SA, Moodley D, Hanley S, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of a SARS-CoV-2
441 recombinant spike protein nanoparticle vaccine in people living with and without HIV-1
442 infection: a randomised, controlled, phase 2A/2B trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2022 May;9(5):e309-
443 e322.
- 444 16. Huang Y, Borisov O, Kee JJ, et al. Calibration of two validated SARS-CoV-2
445 pseudovirus neutralization assays for COVID-19 vaccine evaluation. *Sci Rep*. 2021 Dec
446 14;11(1):23921.
- 447 17. Bates TA, Lu P, Kang YJ, et al. BNT162b2-induced neutralizing and non-neutralizing
448 antibody functions against SARS-CoV-2 diminish with age. *Cell Rep*. 2022 Oct
449 25;41(4):111544.
- 450 18. Lee IT, Cosgrove CA, Moore P, et al. A Randomized Trial Comparing Omicron-
451 Containing Boosters with the Original Covid-19 Vaccine mRNA-1273. *medRxiv*. 2023.
- 452 19. Fong Y, Huang Y, Benkeser D, et al. Immune correlates analysis of the PREVENT-19
453 COVID-19 vaccine efficacy clinical trial. *Nat Commun*. 2023 Jan 19;14(1):331.
- 454 20. Australian COVID-19 Serosurveillance Network. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2-
455 specific antibodies among Australian blood donors: Round 3 update. [updated 03
456 November 2022; cited 2023 14 April]. Available from:
457 [https://kirby.unsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/COVID19-Blood-Donor-Report-Round3-](https://kirby.unsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/COVID19-Blood-Donor-Report-Round3-Aug-Sep-2022.pdf)
458 [Aug-Sep-2022.pdf](https://kirby.unsw.edu.au/sites/default/files/COVID19-Blood-Donor-Report-Round3-Aug-Sep-2022.pdf)
- 459 21. Mallory RM, Formica N, Pfeiffer S, et al. Safety and immunogenicity following a
460 homologous booster dose of a SARS-CoV-2 recombinant spike protein vaccine (NVX-
-

-
- 461 CoV2373): a secondary analysis of a randomised, placebo-controlled, phase 2 trial.
462 Lancet Infect Dis. 2022 Nov;22(11):1565-1576.
- 463 22. Wang Q, Iketani S, Li Z, et al. Alarming antibody evasion properties of rising SARS-
464 CoV-2 BQ and XBB subvariants. Cell. 2023 Jan 19;186(2):279-286 e8.
- 465

466 **Tables and Figures**

Table 1. Demographics and baseline disease characteristics (Safety Analysis Set^a)

Parameters	NVX-CoV2515 N = 286	NVX-CoV2373 N = 274	Bivalent (NVX-CoV2373 + NVX-CoV2515) N = 269
Age (years)			
Mean (SD)	40.4 (12.1)	40.1 (11.5)	39.9 (12.4)
Median	42.0	41.0	41.0
Min–max	18–64	18–64	18–64
Sex, n (%)			
Male	133 (46.5)	131 (47.8)	118 (43.9)
Female	153 (53.5)	143 (52.2)	151 (56.1)
Race, n (%)			
White	233 (81.5)	215 (78.5)	220 (81.8)
Black or African American	0	2 (0.7)	0
Aboriginal Australian	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1 (0.3)	0	1 (0.4)
Asian	37 (12.9)	45 (16.4)	39 (14.5)
Mixed Origin	5 (1.7)	3 (1.1)	1 (0.4)
Other	8 (2.8)	8 (2.9)	6 (2.2)
Not Reported	0	0	0
Ethnicity, n (%)			
Australian	252 (88.1)	236 (86.1)	233 (86.6)
Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islanders	4 (1.4)	3 (1.1)	2 (0.7)
Hispanic or Latino	6 (2.1)	8 (2.9)	6 (2.2)
Not reported	12 (4.2)	15 (5.5)	17 (6.3)

Unknown	10 (3.5)	11 (4.0)	9 (3.3)
Missing	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)	2 (0.7)
BMI (kg/m²)			
n	284	270	267
Mean (SD)	28.07 (6.4)	28.01 (5.3)	27.40 (5.7)
Median	26.9	27.5	26.3
Min-max	18.1-55.8	17.4-47.2	17.7-50.1
BMI (kg/m²) category, n (%)			
Underweight (<18.0)	0	3 (1.1)	2 (0.7)
Normal (18.0-24.9)	106 (37.1)	75 (27.4)	104 (38.7)
Overweight (25.0-29.9)	87 (30.4)	108 (39.4)	90 (33.5)
Obese (≥30.0)	91 (31.8)	84 (30.7)	71 (26.4)
Missing	2 (0.7)	4 (1.5)	2 (0.7)
Regimen of previous COVID-19 vaccine, n (%)			
Moderna	0	2 (0.7)	5 (1.9)
Pfizer-BioNTech	213 (74.5)	214 (78.1)	200 (74.3)
Mixed	73 (25.5)	58 (21.2)	64 (23.8)
Moderna-Moderna-Pfizer	1 (0.3)	1 (0.4)	0
Moderna-Pfizer-Pfizer	2 (0.7)	0	1 (0.4)
Moderna-Pfizer-Moderna	0	0	0
Pfizer-Pfizer-Moderna	70 (24.5)	56 (20.4)	63 (23.4)
Pfizer-Moderna-Moderna	0	1 (0.4)	0
Pfizer-Moderna-Pfizer	0	0	0
Previous COVID-19, n (%)			
Yes	18 (6.3)	19 (6.9)	17 (6.3)
No	268 (93.7)	255 (93.1)	252 (93.7)
Qualitative anti-N, n (%)			
Positive	145 (50.7)	141 (51.5)	134 (49.8)

Negative	141 (49.3)	133 (48.5)	135 (50.2)
PCR, n (%)			
Positive	11 (3.8)	12 (4.4)	14 (5.2)
Negative	275 (96.2)	262 (95.6)	255 (94.8)
Anti-N / PCR, n (%)¹			
Positive	149 (52.1)	145 (52.9)	137 (50.9)
Negative	137 (47.9)	129 (47.1)	132 (49.1)
Time between last previous COVID-19 vaccine and booster dose of study vaccine (days)			
Mean (SD)	178.2 (38.5)	182.4 (36.4)	178.7 (36.6)
Median	177.0	182.0	180.0
Min-max	84-440	91-329	77-313
Interval between last previous COVID-19 vaccine and booster dose of study vaccine, n (%)			
<90 days	1 (0.3)	0	1 (0.4)
90-120 days	15 (5.2)	15 (5.5)	18 (6.7)
>120-150 days	43 (15.0)	35 (12.8)	36 (13.4)
>150-180 days	98 (34.3)	81 (29.6)	81 (30.1)
>180-210 days	87 (30.4)	97 (35.4)	94 (34.9)
>210-240 days	26 (9.1)	32 (11.7)	25 (9.3)
>240-270 days	10 (3.5)	9 (3.3)	11 (4.1)
>270-300 days	4 (1.4)	2 (0.7)	1 (0.4)
>300-330 days	1 (0.3)	3 (1.1)	2 (0.7)
>330-360 days	0	0	0
>360 days	1 (0.3)	0	0

Abbreviations: anti-N = anti-nucleocapsid; BMI = body mass index; COVID-19 = coronavirus disease 2019;

max = maximum; min = minimum; NVX-CoV2515 = 5 µg SARS-CoV-2 rS with 50 µg Matrix-M adjuvant;

NVX-CoV2373 = 5 µg SARS-CoV-2 rS with 50 µg Matrix-M adjuvant; NVX-CoV2373 + NVX-CoV2515 =

5 µg SARS-CoV-2 rS with 50 µg Matrix-M adjuvant (total); PCR = polymerase chain reaction; SARS-CoV-2 =

severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SARS-CoV-2 rS = severe acute respiratory syndrome

coronavirus 2 recombinant spike protein nanoparticle vaccine; SD = standard deviation.

^aParticipants in the safety analysis set are counted according to the treatment received to accommodate for treatment errors.

Note: Age was calculated at the time of informed consent.

Note: n for continuous parameters represents the number of participants with non-missing values for that parameter.

Note: BMI was calculated as weight (kg) divided by squared height (m). Percentages were based on the Safety Analysis Set within each treatment and overall.

1. Participants with either anti-N or PCR are reported.

467

Table 2. Summary of serum microneutralization titers, anti-rS IgG antibody concentrations, and pseudovirus neutralization titers against the Ancestral and Omicron BA.1 variant strain following a heterologous 4th booster dose (PP1 Analysis Set)

Vaccine Group	NVX-CoV2515 N = 126		NVX-CoV2373 N = 119		Bivalent N = 118	
	Ancestral	BA.1	Ancestral	BA.1	Ancestral	BA.1
Microneutralization titers (MN₅₀)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	126	126	119	119	114	114
Median	640.0	20.0	640.0	20.0	480.0	20.0
Min, max	20–5120	10–320	20–10240	10–1280	40–5120	10–320
GMT (MN ₅₀)	457.6	25.2	486.7	27.9	431.1	26.0
95% CI ^b	378.2, 553.5	21.5, 29.5	393.3, 602.3	22.9, 33.9	359.4, 517.0	21.8, 30.9
Day 14						
n1	124	124	116	116	113	113
Median	1280.0	160.0	1280.0	80.0	1280.0	80.0
Min, max	80–10240	10–1280	160–40960	10–1280	80–10240	10–1280
GMT (MN ₅₀)	1076.3	130.8	1442.5	83.9	1319.9	97.9
95% CI ^b	908.4, 1275.4	109.2, 156.7	1192.4, 1745.0	69.6, 101.2	1120.1, 1555.3	81.3, 117.9
n2	124	124	116	116	113	113
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.4	5.2	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.7
95% CI ^b	2.0, 2.8	4.4, 6.1	2.5, 3.5	2.6, 3.6	2.6, 3.6	3.2, 4.4
SRR ≥4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	54/124 (43.5)	91/124 (73.4)	57/116 (49.1)	59/116 (50.9)	64/113 (56.6)	74/113 (65.5)

95% CI ^d	34.7, 52.7	64.7, 80.9	39.7, 58.6	41.4, 60.3	47.0, 65.9	56.0, 74.2
Day 28						
n1	116	116	110	110	102	102
Median	1280.0	160.0	1280.0	80.0	1280.0	80.0
Min, max	40–10240	10–2560	80–40960	10–2560	160–10240	10–640
GMT (MN ₅₀)	960.8	122.3	1442.8	77.5	1087.4	87.4
95% CI ^b	798.0, 1156.9	101.0, 148.0	1188.1, 1752.1	63.1, 95.3	906.5, 1304.3	72.0, 106.1
n2	116	116	110	110	102	102
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.0	4.8	3.0	2.9	2.4	3.3
95% CI ^b	1.7, 2.4	4.1, 5.7	2.5, 3.6	2.4, 3.6	2.1, 2.8	2.8, 3.8
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	37/116 (31.9)	86/116 (74.1)	54/110 (49.1)	52/110 (47.3)	42/102 (41.2)	56/102 (54.9)
95% CI ^d	23.6, 41.2	65.2, 81.8	39.4, 58.8	37.7, 57.0	31.5, 51.4	44.7, 64.8
Serum anti-rS IgG antibodies (EU/mL)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	126	126	118	118	118	118
Median	18549.0	9709.0	18415.0	8654.0	16869.5	9021.5
Min, max	2915–146257	652–64111	2232–1002823	864–249167	2279–212765	814–117381
GMEU (EU/mL)	18773.6	9117.3	20168.6	9770.2	17803.1	8598.7
95% CI ^e	16206.3, 21747.5	7796.7, 10661.7	16760.8, 24269.2	8107.6, 11773.8	15264.7, 20763.6	7326.9, 10091.1
Day 14						
n1	124	124	115	115	116	116
Median	42975.0	26627.5	55183.0	32732.0	40265.0	23036.0

Min, max	3973–399697	1623–234270	5604–518336	2097–358950	6811–232384	3178–233435
GMEU (EU/mL)	40423.4	24174.8	53531.1	30170.9	42783.9	23045.5
95% CI ^e	35120.0, 46527.7	20943.6, 27904.6	46055.5, 62220.1	25663.7, 35469.6	37649.7, 48618.1	20113.5, 26404.8
n2	124	124	115	115	116	116
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.2	2.7	2.7	3.1	2.4	2.7
95% CI ^e	1.9, 2.4	2.4, 3.0	2.3, 3.0	2.7, 3.5	2.1, 2.7	2.4, 3.0
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^f n3/n2 (%)	17/124 (13.7)	31/124 (25.0)	31/115 (27.0)	41/115 (35.7)	23/116 (19.8)	29/116 (25.0)
95% CI ^d	8.2, 21.0	17.7, 33.6	19.1, 36.0	26.9, 45.1	13.0, 28.3	17.4, 33.9
Day 28						
n1	116	116	110	110	108	108
Median	41916.5	25590.5	56963.5	32178.0	39302.5	21025.0
Min, max	3572–338495	1595–183367	5668–675805	1606–361845	6763–340211	2699–256572
GMEU (EU/mL)	40833.4	22732.1	54598.2	28448.6	41070.0	21772.1
95% CI ^e	35196.6, 47373.1	19381.6, 26661.8	46668.3, 63875.5	24062.8, 33633.8	35625.2, 47346.9	18753.6, 25276.5
n2	116	116	110	110	108	108
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.1	2.5	2.8	3.0	2.3	2.5
95% CI ^e	1.9, 2.4	2.2, 2.8	2.4, 3.2	2.6, 3.4	2.0, 2.5	2.2, 2.8
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^f n3/n2 (%)	19/116 (16.4)	27/116 (23.3)	33/110 (30.0)	35/110 (31.8)	17/108 (15.7)	22/108 (20.4)
95% CI ^d	10.2, 24.4	15.9, 32.0	21.6, 39.5	23.3, 41.4	9.4, 24.0	13.2, 29.2
Pseudovirus neutralization titers (ID₅₀)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	111	111	105	105	105	105

Median	584.0	116.0	431.0	124.0	476.0	96.0
Min, max	20–4746	20–2937	20–26040	20–7900	50–7541	20–5317
GMT (ID ₅₀)	496.7	99.6	517.1	103.6	483.3	89.2
95% CI ^b	401.0, 615.2	77.1, 128.8	409.3, 653.1	77.9, 137.8	400.7, 583.0	68.2, 116.9
Day 14						
n1	110	110	102	102	103	103
Median	1341.0	930.5	1476.0	433.5	1084.0	496.0
Min, max	20–19256	20–30281	273–34712	20–15337	153–11739	20–6949
GMT (ID ₅₀)	1181.1	816.1	1473.0	449.1	1195.1	562.0
95% CI ^b	976.6, 1428.3	639.9, 1040.7	1227.1, 1768.3	345.3, 584.2	1012.1, 1411.2	439.6, 718.6
n2	110	110	102	102	103	103
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.4	8.2	2.9	4.4	2.5	6.3
95% CI ^b	2.0, 2.8	6.5, 10.5	2.5, 3.4	3.6, 5.5	2.2, 2.8	5.0, 7.9
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	21/110 (19.1)	81/110 (73.6)	25/102 (24.5)	48/102 (47.1)	25/103 (24.3)	68/103 (66.0)
95% CI ^d	12.2, 27.7	64.4, 81.6	16.5, 34.0	37.1, 57.2	16.4, 33.7	56.0, 75.1
Day 28						
n1	101	101	98	98	97	97
Median	1219.0	953.0	1390.0	425.5	1043.0	502.0
Min, max	20–15355	20–9668	20–26603	20–25073	154–9349	20–5474
GMT (ID ₅₀)	1085.8	661.6	1420.2	404.1	1106.1	502.1
95% CI ^b	891.5, 1322.4	509.7, 858.7	1141.9, 1766.2	305.4, 534.7	937.7, 1304.8	393.7, 640.4
n2	101	101	98	98	97	97
GMFR referencing Day 0	2.2	6.7	2.9	4.1	2.3	5.6

95% CI ^b	1.9, 2.6	5.2, 8.7	2.3, 3.5	3.2, 5.3	2.0, 2.6	4.4, 7.0
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	20/101 (19.8)	69/101 (68.3)	29/98 (29.6)	46/98 (46.9)	18/97 (18.6)	58/97 (59.8)
95% CI ^d	12.5, 28.9	58.3, 77.2	20.8, 39.7	36.8, 57.3	11.4, 27.7	49.3, 69.6

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; GMEU= geometric mean ELISA units; GMFR = geometric mean fold rise; GMT = geometric mean titer;

ID₅₀ = inhibitory dilution with a 50% concentration; Max = maximum; Min = minimum; N = number of participants in the assay-specific analysis Set; n1 = number of participants within each visit with non-missing data; n2 = number of participants with non-missing data at both visits of interest; n3 = number of participants who reported \geq 4-fold increase with percentages calculated based on n2 as the denominator; LLOQ = lower limit of quantitation; SRR = seroresponse rate.

^aBaseline was defined as the last non-missing assessment prior to first vaccination. ^bThe 95% CI for GMT and GMFR were calculated based on the t-distribution of the log-transformed values then back transformed to the original scale for presentation. ^cThe SRR was defined as percentage of participants at each post vaccination visit with a titer \geq 4-fold rise in MN₅₀ or ID₅₀ level. ^dThe 95% CI for SRR was calculated using the exact Clopper-Pearson method. ^eThe 95% CI for GMEU and GMFR were calculated based on the t-distribution of the log-transformed values then back transformed to the original scale for presentation. ^fThe SRR was defined as percentage of participants at each post vaccination visit with a titer \geq 4-fold rise in anti-S IgG antibody level.

Note: Values less than LLOQ were replaced by $0.5 \times$ LLOQ

Table 3. Summary of serum microneutralization titers, anti-rS IgG antibody concentrations, and pseudovirus neutralization titers against the Ancestral and Omicron BA.1 variant strain following a heterologous 4th booster dose (PP2 Analysis Set)

Vaccine Group	NVX-CoV2515 N = 286		NVX-CoV2373 N = 274		Bivalent N = 269	
	Ancestral	BA.1	Ancestral	BA.1	Ancestral	BA.1
Microneutralization titers (MN₅₀)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	255	255	250	250	236	236
Median	1280.0	160.0	1280.0	160.0	1280.0	160.0
Min–max	20–40960	10–2560	20–40960	10–2560	40–81920	10–10240
GMT (MN ₅₀)	1151.3	97.3	1280.0	105.9	1232.0	106.1
95% CI ^b	973.6, 1361.4	79.6, 118.9	1078.1, 1519.7	86.4, 129.7	1026.0, 1479.5	85.8, 131.1
Day 14						
n1	247	247	244	244	232	232
Median	2560.0	320.0	2560.0	320.0	2560.0	320.0
Min–max	80–40960	10–5120	160–81920	10–2560	80–163840	10–5120
GMT (MN ₅₀)	2206.2	318.2	2702.0	218.1	2544.7	252.7
95% CI ^b	1910.0, 2548.4	269.8, 375.3	2347.9, 3109.4	186.0, 255.7	2194.5, 2950.9	213.1, 299.7
n2	247	247	244	244	232	232
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.9	3.3	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.4
95% CI ^b	1.8, 2.1	2.9, 3.7	1.9, 2.4	1.8, 2.3	1.9, 2.3	2.1, 2.7
SRR ≥4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	79/247 (32.0)	134/247 (54.3)	80/244 (32.8)	78/244 (32.0)	83/232 (35.8)	95/232 (40.9)
95% CI ^d	26.2, 38.2	47.8, 60.6	26.9, 39.1	26.2, 38.2	29.6, 42.3	34.6, 47.6

Day 28						
n1	238	238	234	234	215	215
Median	2560.0	320.0	2560.0	160.0	2560.0	160.0
Min–max	40–20480	10–5120	80–40960	10–2560	160–81920	10–10240
GMT (MN ₅₀)	1918.8	284.8	2456.0	195.7	2144.0	218.7
95% CI ^b	1657.9, 2220.6	241.8, 335.4	2145.2, 2811.8	165.7, 231.2	1842.3, 2495.2	183.1, 261.3
n2	238	238	234	234	215	215
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.6	2.9	1.9	1.9	1.7	2.0
95% CI ^b	1.5, 1.8	2.5, 3.3	1.7, 2.2	1.6, 2.2	1.5, 1.9	1.8, 2.2
SRR ≥4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	56/238 (23.5)	125/238 (52.5)	68/234 (29.1)	65/234 (27.8)	59/215 (27.4)	72/215 (33.5)
95% CI ^d	18.3, 29.4	46.0, 59.0	23.3, 35.3	22.1, 34.0	21.6, 33.9	27.2, 40.2
Serum anti-rS IgG antibodies (EU/mL)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	258	258	250	250	240	240
Median	45426.5	22876.0	54982.0	28832.0	49528.0	25602.0
Min–max	2915–576831	652–353367	2232–1002823	864–254105	2279–2034472	814–1121904
GMEU (EU/mL)	44166.7	21446.9	47810.6	23215.7	45047.6	22400.7
95% CI ^e	38369.6, 50839.6	18570.6, 24768.7	41184.3, 55503.1	19953.4, 27011.3	38572.8, 52609.1	19088.9, 26287.2
Day 14						
n1	250	250	244	244	235	235
Median	72765.5	41964.5	95097.0	50675.0	79657.0	43289.0
Min–max	3973–894339	1623–813679	5604–822744	2097–395875	6811–1656933	3178–1074179
GMEU (EU/mL)	71076.4	42835.5	90962.2	49727.7	78191.9	42462.1

95% CI ^e	63012.1, 80172.9	37883.8, 48434.4	81361.1, 101696.2	44331.1, 55781.1	69489.1, 87984.5	37628.9, 47916.2
n2	250	250	244	244	235	235
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.6	2.0	1.9	2.1	1.7	1.9
95% CI ^e	1.5, 1.7	1.8, 2.2	1.8, 2.1	2.0, 2.3	1.6, 1.9	1.7, 2.0
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^f n3/n2 (%)	18/250 (7.2)	34/250 (13.6)	35/244 (14.3)	42/244 (17.2)	23/235 (9.8)	29/235 (12.3)
95% CI ^d	4.3, 11.1	9.6, 18.5	10.2, 19.4	12.7, 22.5	6.3, 14.3	8.4, 17.2
Day 28						
n1	241	241	235	235	221	221
Median	72699.0	42388.0	92903.0	44971.0	70184.0	36642.0
Min–max	3572–755671	1595–543014	5668–675805	1606–375634	6763–2299922	2699–1217244
GMC (EU/mL)	70523.9	40044.9	87969.9	44756.4	73321.3	38315.6
95% CI ^e	62487.3, 79594.2	35308.6, 45416.6	78701.3, 98330.0	39966.0, 50120.9	64771.3, 83000.0	33783.4, 43455.9
n2	241	241	235	235	221	221
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.0	1.6	1.7
95% CI ^e	1.4, 1.7	1.7, 2.0	1.7, 2.0	1.8, 2.1	1.5, 1.8	1.6, 1.8
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^f n3/n2 (%)	19/241 (7.9)	28/241 (11.6)	34/235 (14.5)	37/235 (15.7)	17/221 (7.7)	22/221 (10.0)
95% CI ^d	4.8, 12.0	7.9, 16.4	10.2, 19.6	11.3, 21.0	4.5, 12.0	6.3, 14.7
Pseudovirus neutralization titers (ID₅₀)						
Day 0 (baseline)^a						
n1	232	232	226	226	206	206
Median	1788.5	808.0	2224.5	962.0	1425.5	623.5
Min, max	20–39721	20–30397	20–28737	20–18494	50–81399	20–84031

GMT (ID ₅₀)	1491.2	548.4	1646.5	579.2	1476.4	491.9
95% CI ^b	1237.3, 1797.1	421.7, 713.2	1357.6, 1996.8	445.6, 752.8	1208.2, 1804.1	366.8, 659.6
Day 14						
n1	223	223	220	220	201	201
Median	2464.0	2202.0	3121.5	1690.5	2526.0	1677.0
Min, max	20–34131	20–41483	273–34859	20–23694	153–71353	20–72247
GMT (ID ₅₀)	2514.9	2071.5	3027.9	1390.3	2390.1	1480.4
95% CI ^b	2149.8, 2942.0	1701.1, 2522.5	2625.7, 3491.6	1134.6, 1703.8	2050.2, 2786.3	1202.8, 1822.1
n2	223	223	220	220	201	201
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.7	3.9	1.8	2.4	1.6	3.0
95% CI ^b	1.5, 1.9	3.3, 4.6	1.7, 2.0	2.1, 2.8	1.5, 1.8	2.5, 3.5
SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	25/223 (11.2)	102/223 (45.7)	26/220 (11.8)	53/220 (24.1)	25/201 (12.4)	71/201 (35.3)
95% CI ^d	7.4, 16.1	39.1, 52.5	7.9, 16.8	18.6, 30.3	8.2, 17.8	28.7, 42.4
Day 28						
n1	214	214	212	212	191	191
Median	2445.0	2127.5	2875.0	1332.5	2193.0	1303.0
Min, max	20–45309	20–70894	20–31723	20–25073	154–168338	20–95088
GMT (ID ₅₀)	2411.6	1918.0	2716.9	1195.7	2236.0	1272.4
95% CI ^b	2055.6, 2829.2	1558.2, 2361.0	2340.0, 3154.5	974.9, 1466.6	1909.8, 2617.9	1033.5, 1566.6
n2	214	214	212	212	191	191
GMFR referencing Day 0	1.6	3.4	1.7	2.1	1.5	2.6
95% CI ^b	1.5, 1.8	2.9, 4.0	1.5, 1.9	1.8, 2.5	1.4, 1.7	2.2, 3.0

SRR \geq 4-fold increase, ^c n3/n2 (%)	22/214 (10.3)	84/214 (39.3)	29/212 (13.7)	48/212 (22.6)	19/191 (9.9)	61/191 (31.9)
95% CI ^d	6.6, 15.2	32.7, 46.1	9.4, 19.1	17.2, 28.9	6.1, 15.1	25.4, 39.1

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; GMEU = geometric mean ELISA units; GMFR = geometric mean fold rise; GMT = geometric mean titer;

ID₅₀ = inhibitory dilution with a 50% concentration; Max = maximum; Min = minimum; N = number of participants in the assay-specific analysis Set; n1 = number of participants within each visit with non-missing data; n2 = number of participants with non-missing data at both visits of interest; n3 = number of participants who reported \geq 4-fold increase with percentages calculated based on n2 as the denominator; LLOQ = lower limit of quantitation; SRR = seroresponse rate.

^aBaseline was defined as the last non-missing assessment prior to first vaccination. ^bThe 95% CI for GMT and GMFR were calculated based on the t-distribution of the log-transformed values then back transformed to the original scale for presentation. ^cThe SRR was defined as percentage of participants at each post vaccination visit with a titer \geq 4-fold rise in MN₅₀ or ID₅₀ level. ^dThe 95% CI for SRR was calculated using the exact Clopper-Pearson method. ^eThe 95% CI for GMEU and GMFR were calculated based on the t-distribution of the log-transformed values then back transformed to the original scale for presentation. ^fThe SRR was defined as percentage of participants at each post vaccination visit with a titer \geq 4-fold rise in anti-S IgG antibody level.

Note: Values less than LLOQ were replaced by $0.5 \times$ LLOQ

Table 4. Overall summary of unsolicited treatment-emergent adverse events through 28 days after vaccination (Safety Analysis Set^a)

Parameter	NVX-CoV2515 N = 286	NVX-CoV2373 N = 274	Bivalent N = 269
Solicited local TEAEs ¹	196 (69.3)	193 (71.0)	173 (64.6)
Grade 3 or higher	5 (1.8)	1 (0.4)	3 (1.1)
Solicited systemic TEAEs ²	176 (62.2)	158 (58.1)	166 (61.9)
Grade 3 or higher	21 (7.4)	10 (3.7)	8 (3.0)
Any unsolicited TEAE	98 (34.3)	104 (38.0)	91 (33.8)
Treatment-related	14 (4.9)	8 (2.9)	9 (3.3)
Severe	0	4 (1.5)	0
Treatment-related severe	0	0	0
Any unsolicited serious TEAE	1 (0.3)	1 (0.4)	0
Treatment-related	0	0	0
Any unsolicited TEAE leading to vaccination discontinuation	1 (0.3)	1 (0.4)	0
Treatment-related	1 (0.3)	0	0
Any unsolicited TEAE leading to study discontinuation	0	1 (0.4)	0
Treatment-related	0	0	0
Any unsolicited treatment-emergent MAAE	14 (4.9)	18 (6.6)	13 (4.8)
Treatment-related	1 (0.3)	0	0
Treatment-related serious MAAE	0	0	0
Severe MAAE	0	3 (1.1)	0
Related Severe MAAE	0	0	0
Any unsolicited AESI: PIMMC ³	0	1 (0.4)	0
Treatment-related	0	0	0
Any unsolicited AESI: complications due to COVID-19	0	0	0


Any myocarditis/pericarditis	0	0	0
------------------------------	---	---	---

Abbreviations: AESI = adverse event of special interest; MAAE = medically attended adverse event; PIMMC = potentially immune-mediated medical condition; TEAE = treatment-emergent adverse event.


^aParticipants in the safety analysis set are counted according to the treatment received to accommodate for treatment errors.

Figure 1. Immunogenicity against ancestral and BA.1 variant strains of SARS-CoV-2, following booster vaccination with NVX-CoV2515, NVX CoV2373, or Bivalent NVX-CoV2373 + NVX-CoV2515 (PP1 Analysis Set). (A) Microneutralization titers for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. (B) Anti-rS IgG concentrations for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. Dotted lines represent approximate correlates of protection (CoP) titers reported in phase 3 studies (**Fong 2023**). (C) Pseudovirus neutralization titers for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. Dotted lines represent approximate CoP titers reported in phase 3 studies (**Fong 2023**).

A



B



C






Figure 2. Immunogenicity against ancestral and BA.1 variant strains of SARS-CoV-2, following booster vaccination with NVX-CoV2515, NVX CoV2373, or Bivalent NVX-CoV2373 + NVX-CoV2515 (PP2 Analysis Set). (A) Microneutralization titers for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. (B) Anti-rS IgG concentrations for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. Dotted lines represent approximate CoP titers reported in phase 3 studies (Fong 2023). (C) Pseudovirus neutralization titers for the ancestral and BA.1 variant. Dotted lines represent approximate CoP titers reported in phase 3 studies (Fong 2023).



B



C





Figure 3. Solicited adverse events within 7 days of vaccination (Safety Analysis Set). (A) Frequencies of solicited local treatment-emergent adverse events.

(B) Frequencies of solicited systemic treatment-emergent adverse events.



B