A Phase III Randomized Controlled Trial Assessing the Safety and Immunogenicity of Biological E's XBB 1.5 RBD Subunit COVID-19 Booster Vaccine in Individuals Aged 5 to 80 Years

Subhash Thuluva[1], Vikram Paradkar[1], SubbaReddy Gunneri[1], Rammohan Reddy Mogulla[1], Vijay Yerroju[1], Chirag Dhar[1], Siddalingaiah Ningaiah[1], Mallikarjuna Panchakshari[1], Chandrashekhar S. Gillurkar[2], Manish Narang[3], Shivnitwar Sachin Kisan[4], A.Venkateshwar Rao[5]

[1]Biological E Limited, Hyderabad, India

[2]Gillurkar Multispeciality Hospital, Nagpur, India

[3]GTB Hospital, Delhi, India

[4]St. Theresa's Hospital, Hyderabad, India

Corresponding Author Name:

Subhash Thuluva, Sr. VP & Head, Clinical Development

Biological E Limited, 18/1&3, Azamabad, Hyderabad – 500 020

Telangana, India

Phone: +91 40 7121 6248.

E-mail: subhash.thuluva@biologicale.com

Summary

Background

The SARS-CoV-2 virus continues to evolve with recent iterations such as the Omicron sub-variants having potential for increased transmissibility. Of particular interest, the XBB.1.5 variant has been shown to cause vaccine-breakthrough cases. Biological E (BE) has utilized the same platform it used to develop CORBEVAX^{TM}, an ancestral Wuhan strain COVID-19 RBD subunit vaccine (control vaccine), to now develop an XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine (test vaccine).

Methods

To assess the safety and immunogenicity of BE's new XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine, a prospective, randomized, single-blind Phase III study was conducted in 5 to 80 year olds. Participants who had not received any other approved COVID-19 vaccine within the last 6 months prior were enrolled and randomized 2:1 to receive two booster doses of either the test vaccine or the control vaccine. The vaccines were administered on Day 0 and Day 28 with immunogenicity assessments on Day 0, Day 28, and Day 42. Safety assessments included the collection of solicited and unsolicited adverse events (AEs) up until Day 56. The primary objective of the study was to show immunogenic superiority of the test vaccine booster series compared to the control vaccine series. This superiority objective was to be concluded if the lower limit of the two-sided 95% confidence interval of the anti-XBB.1.5.RBD neutralizing antibody (nAb) geometric mean titer (GMT) ratio of test : control was >1.0 on either Day 28 or Day 42. Given the emergence of JN.1 as the SARS-CoV-2 strain during the conduct of this study, Day 42 anti-JN.1 nAb were measured in a *post hoc* immunogenicity assessment. In addition, anti-XBB.1.5 RBD protein IgG concentration in the sera samples were also measured by ELISA on Day 0, Day 28, and Day 42.

Findings

A total of 360 participants were enrolled and randomized across 7 sites in India. The nAb GMT ratio of test : control participants was 2.08 (95% CI 1.64 to 2.63) on Day 28 and 2.91 (95% CI 2.38 to 3.56) on Day 42. The geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) of neutralizing antibodies (nAb) was 7.637 (95% CI 6.090 to 9.578) on Day 28 and 17.02 (95% CI 13.79 to 21.01) on Day 42 in the test booster series arm. The nAb GMFRs in the control booster series arm at the same time points were 3.033 (95% CI 2.340 to 3.932) and 4.824 (95% CI 3.731 to 6.236) respectively. *Post hoc* analyses revealed an nAb GMT ratio of 1.90 (95% CI 1.56 to 2.31) of test : control against the JN.1 SARS-CoV-2 strain. The safety profile of the new XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was found to be very similar to that of the Ancestral strain vaccine with 59 AEs (about 1 AE for every 8 doses administered) and 27 AEs (a little less than 1 AE for every 8 doses administered) respectively during the study. No serious AEs or AEs of special interest were reported in either the test or control arm of the study. Two cases of pyrexia were medically attended to, one in each arm.

Interpretations

Biological E's new XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was found to be both safe and robustly immunogenic when administered as a two-dose booster series in 5 to 80 year olds. In particular, the vaccine induced a significant rise in neutralizing antibodies against the XBB.1.5 strain as well as cross-protective neutralizing antibodies against the JN.1 SARS-CoV-2 strain. These data are in line with studies of other XBB.1.5 monovalent vaccines and support a positive risk-benefit profile. Real world studies may provide additional evidence about the effectiveness of this new updated vaccine.

CTRI Trial Registration Identifier: CTRI/2024/01/061423

Funding: Biological E Limited.

Research in context

Evidence before this study

The SARS-CoV-2 virus has been circulating worldwide ever since its emergence in late 2019. Vaccinations have been particularly useful in preventing hospitalizations and deaths even in those that acquire COVID-19. Multiple technology platforms have been utilized to develop vaccines including mRNA and protein subunit platforms. More recently, immune-evasive SARS-CoV-2 strains have emerged fueling the need for variant-directed boosters. Multiple mRNA monovalent boosters and one protein subunit targeting the XBB.1.5 strain have been approved by different national regulatory agencies across the world.

Added value of this study

In this study, we tested a new XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine that was developed using an established yeast-expression system. We ran a single-blinded randomized Phase III study to compare two booster doses of this updated vaccine versus two booster doses of the ancestral strain vaccine developed on the same yeast-expression system. We showed that the safety profile of the two vaccines were comparable. The older of these vaccines has now been safely administered to over 40,000,000 people and has been shown to have an acceptable safety profile. Additionally, the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was found to be superior to the ancestral strain vaccine in inducing neutralizing antibodies against the XBB.1.5 strain. Importantly, this updated vaccine also induced neutralizing antibodies against the JN.1 strain, which became the most prevalent circulating SARS-CoV-2 strain during and after the conduct of the study. This study demonstrates a favourable risk-benefit profile of the updated monovalent XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine when administered as a booster series across multiple age groups including children as young as 5 years.

Implications of all the available evidence

Our study adds to the growing body of evidence suggesting the use of updated monovalent booster vaccines will be useful in curtailing the spread of SARS-CoV-2 virus. Various real-world studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of such updated vaccines in preventing hospitalizations and deaths. Protein subunit vaccines such as ours have been extensively used over the past many decades and are more likely to be accepted in an environment of growing vaccine-hesitancy. SARS-CoV-2 vaccines developed on newer platforms such as the mRNA platform and the adenoviral vector platform, while faster to market, have been shown to induce rare but serious adverse events such as myocarditis and thrombosis. Protein subunit SARS-CoV-2 vaccines do not seem to produce the same rare adverse events suggesting a superior safety profile.

Introduction

About five years in to the COVID-19 pandemic, the SARS-CoV-2 virus continues to evolve and presents ongoing challenges to global public health efforts. While COVID-19 has transitioned towards an endemic status, the emergence of novel Omicron sub variants, particularly the XBB lineages, have driven new surges of infections worldwide [1, 2]. The Omicron variant (B.1.1.529) had been the predominant SARS-CoV-2 strain in circulation since January 2022, spawning over 680 sub-lineages [3]. Its high transmissibility and capacity for immune evasion had resulted in widespread vaccine-breakthrough infections and reinfections [4, 5]. Among the Omicron subvariants, the World Health Organization (WHO) designated BQ.1.1 and XBB* (XBB and its sub-lineages, including XBB.1.5) as "Omicron subvariants under monitoring" due to their potential for increased transmissibility and immune escape [6]. Fortunately, no significant increase in disease severity has been observed to date despite these evolving variants.

Of particular concern is the XBB.1.5 subvariant, a recombinant of two Omicron predecessors, BA.2.10.1 and BA.2.75. Preliminary research indicates that XBB.1.5 exhibits enhanced immune evasion properties and increased binding affinity to the human ACE2 receptor compared to other circulating Omicron subvariants [7, 8]. The F486P mutation in the receptor-binding domain of the spike glycoprotein distinguishes XBB.1.5 from its XBB or XBB.1 predecessor and has been associated with increased ACE2 binding [9]. XBB was the most prevalent sub-lineage (63.2 per cent) circulating all over India as of December 2023. The World Health Organization (WHO) TAG-CO-VAC recommended that new formulations of COVID-19 vaccines should aim to induce antibody responses that neutralize XBB descendent lineages in order to improve the protection against XBB.1-related variants. One approach recommended was to use a monovalent XBB.1 descendent lineage, such as XBB.1.5 as the vaccine antigen [10].

Biological E (BE) presently has a subunit COVID vaccine, CORBEVAX™ (targeting the ancestral Wuhan strain) that has market authorization in India and has been granted Emergency Use Listing by the WHO [11, 12, 13].

To contain the spread of the new variant, BE developed a new XBB.1.5-RBD subunit vaccine on the same platform as was used for the vaccine against the ancestral strain. Animal toxicity and immunology studies indicated a favourable risk-to-benefit profile (unpublished data) and the vaccine was advanced for clinical development. This manuscript describes the design and results of a Phase III safety and immunogenicity study of BE's XBB.1.5-RBD vaccine in ≥5 to ≤80 years old individuals, when administered as a booster series.

Methods

Study design and participants

This was a prospective, multicenter, single-blind, randomized, comparative phase III clinical study conducted at 7 study sites across India between January 2024 to June 2024 (site names and locations provided in the supplementary data). The study adhered to the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki, the International Conference on Harmonisation guidelines for Good Clinical Practices, and local regulatory standards. The protocol received approval from the Investigational Review Board or Ethics Committee at each study site. All participants and/or their parents gave their written informed consent prior to enrolment.

A total of 360 healthy individuals, aged between 5 to 80 years were enrolled in the study. The participants were further stratified into three age subsets: ≥50 to ≤80 years (older adults), ≥18 to ≤49 years (younger adults) and ≥5 to ≤17 years (children/adolescents). Within each age subset, participants were randomized in a 2:1 ratio between test and control vaccine groups.

Medically stable individuals who were previously vaccinated with any existing COVID-19 vaccine either as a primary series only or a primary series and a booster dose, with the most recent dose at least six months prior to enrolment were eligible to participate in the study. Health status was assessed during the screening period and included an assessment of medical history, clinical laboratory tests, vital signs, and a physical examination. Other key eligibility criteria applicable were: virologically negative to SARS-CoV-2 infection confirmed by an RT-PCR test at the screening visit (day -1 to -3), seronegative to HIV 1 & 2, HBV and HCV infection. All those with an axillary temperature of more than 38·0°C, those part of any other clinical trial, those with a known allergy to vaccine components, those living in the same household of SARS-CoV-2 positive person(s), those with symptoms suggestive of an acute illness, and those with other chronic illnesses/immunodeficient conditions or on immunosuppressants were excluded from the study. A complete list of eligibility criteria is provided as supplementary information.

The total duration of the study was 56 days for each subject from the day of the first dose of vaccination. Study participants received two doses of test or control vaccine, administered on Day 0 and Day 28. Three participants did not receive the second dose of the vaccine as they dropped out of the study before Day 28. Immunogenicity was assessed at Day 0 (pre-vaccination), Day 28 and at Day 42 (14 days post second dose) while the safety profile was assessed until 28 days after the second dose (Day 56). A time window of +4 days was allowed for Day 28 and Day 42 visits and a time window of 14 days was allowed for the Day 56 visit to ensure participant compliance.

During the course of this study, no major protocol deviations were reported at any of the study sites. Few participants reported for their visits out of window period but these deviations were not found to be significant and were duly reported to ethics committees of the respective study sites.

Randomization and masking:

Enrolled participants were randomized in a 2:1 ratio to either receive the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine (test) or CORBEVAX™ ancestral strain RBD vaccine (control). An interactive web response system-based (IWRS) platform was utilized for randomization, that occurred after completion of all screening-related activities and prior to the administration of first booster dose. A participant was considered randomized once they met all the eligibility criteria and received a randomization number from the IWRS platform. The randomization scheme was generated by a SAS statistical software program. This was a single-blind study where study participants were unaware of the vaccination group to which they were assigned.

Vaccines

Biological E's CORBEVAX™ – a subunit vaccine containing the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain – was used as a control vaccine. As a test vaccine,

a new formulation was developed that had the XBB.1.5 RBD antigen of SARS-CoV-2. Both RBD proteins were produced on the same *Pichia pastoris* yeast platform and both the formulated vaccines contained the RBD protein antigen and Aluminum Hydroxide gel as Al^{3+} and CpG1018 as adjuvants [14]. A 0·5 mL dose of the candidate XBB.1.5 RBD antigen of SARS-CoV-2 test vaccine or the CORBEVAX™ vaccine containing RBD from the ancestral strain (control vaccine) was administered via an intramuscular (IM) injection into the deltoid muscle of the non-dominant arm in a two-dose booster schedule with 28 days interval between doses. Both the vaccines contained 25 µg of RBD Antigen, 750 µg of Aluminium Hydroxide (as Al^{3+}) and 750 µg of CpG1018.

Outcomes

This Phase III study was designed to assess both the immunogenicity and safety of BE's new XBB.1.5 subunit COVID-19 test vaccine. The primary objective was to assess the immunogenic superiority against the monovalent CORBEVAX™ control vaccine (containing the ancestral Wuhan strain) administered in two doses, with 28 days interval between doses, in terms of virus neutralizing antibodies at Day 28 and Day 42. The primary endpoint was the geometric mean titer (GMT) of anti-XBB.1.5.RBD neutralizing antibodies at Day 28 and at Day 42 in cohorts that received the test and control vaccine for superiority demonstration. Superiority was to be concluded if the lower limit of the two-sided 95% confidence interval of the GMT ratio of test : control of anti-XBB.1.5.RBD neutralizing antibody titers was >1.0 either at Day 28 or Day 42. The secondary endpoint was to assess GMT at baseline, and to calculate the geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) at Day 28 and at Day 42 in both the test and control group. Another secondary immunogenicity endpoint was to calculate the proportion of participants at Day 28 and Day 42 with a ≥2-fold rise of neutralizing antibodies in those with pre-existing antibody titers, and a ≥4-fold rise in those without pre-existing antibody titers when compared with baseline titers.

The secondary objective was to descriptively assess the overall safety, reactogenicity and tolerability of BE's XBB.1.5-RBD subunit Covid-19 test vaccine in comparison with CORBEVAX™ control vaccine (containing the ancestral Wuhan strain) for a period of 28 consecutive days after each dose in all enrolled individuals. The secondary endpoints were defined as occurrence of any adverse reactions within 60 minutes post-vaccination after each booster dose, occurrence of any solicited adverse events (AEs) within 7 consecutive days after both doses, and occurrence of any unsolicited AEs; medically attended AEs; AEs of special interest in the 28 days' post-vaccination period.

In April 2024 – about midway through the conduct of this study - the WHO's TAG-CO-VAC team, determined that the JN.1 strain of SARS-CoV-2 was the dominant strain circulating worldwide. Hence, additional *post hoc* outcomes relating to protection against the JN.1 strain were included in this study. Briefly, neutralizing antibodies directed against the JN.1 strain were assessed on Day 0, Day 28, and Day 42 in the test and control groups, and descriptively compared.

Safety Assessments:

The safety assessments were based on a descriptive comparison of incidence rates of solicited local and systemic AEs up to 7 days (Day 0-6), captured through subject diary after each vaccine dose. Participants were observed for 60 minutes post-vaccination to assess reactogenicity. Solicited local AEs were pain, redness, swelling, itching or warmth at injection site. Solicited systemic AEs were fever, headache, chills, Myalgia, arthralgia, fatigue, nausea, urticaria, rhinorrhea, irritability, hypotonic-hyporesponsive episodes, somnolence, seizure, and acute allergic reaction. Unsolicited adverse events (AEs) were assessed up to Day 28 after each dose and serious AEs (SAEs), medically attended AEs (MAAEs), and AEs of special interest (AESIs) were followed up throughout the study duration. As of writing the manuscript, the

safety database for Day 56 (28 days after the second booster dose) was yet to be locked. All safety data are preliminary as reported to the regulatory authorities in an interim safety report.

Immunogenicity Assessments:

Detection of anti-XBB.1.5 RBD IgG concentration

The concentration of IgG that specifically bound to the XBB.1.5 receptor-binding domain (RBD) protein in the sera samples was measured in a sandwich ELISA. Purified XBB.1.5 RBD protein was bound to the 96-well plate and the sera samples were added to the wells to enable attachment of the RBD specific IgGs. After washing the plate, a secondary antibody directed against Human IgG and linked to an enzyme was added to the plate. Finally, the enzyme substrate was added resulting in a reaction that produced a color signal which was detected and quantified by spectrophotometry. The intensity of the color is directly proportional to the concentration of RBD specific IgG in the sera sample. A pooled serum sample was used as a reference standard for comparison and the anti-RBD IgG concentration is reported in ELISA Units/mL (EU/mL). Day 0, Day 28 and Day 42 sera samples of all the clinical trial participants were tested for anti-RBD IgG concentration by ELISA.

Detection of anti-XBB.1.5 neutralizing antibody

Neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) were measured to assess level of antibodies that were capable of blocking the SARS-CoV-2- XBB.1.5 strain from infecting mammalian cells. To enable testing in conventional laboratories, a pseudovirus based on the HIV-1 Lentivirus expressing the spike protein prepared via transfection was utilized in this study [15]. This Lentivirus expressed the Spike Protein from the SARS-CoV-2-XBB.1.5 strain as well as a reporter enzyme viz. Nano-luciferase. This XBB.1.5-Pseudovirus (PSV) was shown to infect HEK-293T-ACE2 cells, a human cell line that overexpresses the ACE-2 receptor. Once the pseudovirus infects cells, the enzyme Nano-luciferase is produced and can convert the specific

substrate into a reaction product that can be detected by a chemiluminescence detector. When the PSV were pre-incubated with sera samples, the nAbs present in the sera blocked the PSV's ability to infect the HEK-293T-ACE2 cells thereby reducing the chemiluminescence signal directly proportional to the degree of neutralization. Thus, by conducting neutralization of the PSV at different dilutions of the sera and measuring the observed PSV neutralization, a dilution (i.e. titer) of the sera that represented 50% neutralization of the PSV added to the cells was calculated and termed as Pseudo-Virus Neutralization Titer50 or PSVNT (directly proportional to the nAb titer in the sera sample). Day 0, Day 28 and Day 42 sera samples from all the clinical trial participants were tested for PSVNT.

Detection of anti-JN.1 neutralizing antibodies and anti-JN.1 RBD IgG antibodies

The JN.1-PSV consisted of the same HIV-1 Lentivirus that was utilized to generate the PSV representing the XBB.1.5 strain, except for the use of the JN.1 spike protein sequence. Day 0 and Day 42 sera samples collected from the study were tested and nAb titers against the JN.1-PSV were determined. Similar statistical analysis, as performed for XBB.1.5-PSV nAb titers, was also performed for JN.1-PSV nAb titers.

Sample Size calculations

In this study, the power and sample size were calculated to demonstrate superiority of XBB.1.5-RBD vaccine with that of the control by one-sided two independent sample t-test from a parallel-group design. This approach deals with the case in which the statistical hypotheses are expressed in terms of mean ratio (Lower Limit of 95% CI of the mean ratio of test to control to be above 1.0). The sample size estimation was based on an assumed geometric standard deviation of 3.9 for superiority assessment derived from data generated out of an in-house study against a known Omicron variant. With a sample size of 240 participants in Group-1 (test) and 120 participants in Group-2 (control) randomized in a 2:1 ratio allocation (assuming a 10%

dropout rate), the study would achieve an actual power of 0.90005 (planned 90% power) at a one-sided significance level of 2.5%.

Statistical Methods

The geometric mean titers (GMT) of the virus neutralization antibodies for each of the age groups was calculated separately. A two-sided 95% confidence interval (CI) for the post vaccination geometric mean titers was calculated. Immunogenicity was compared using a two-sample t-test on the means of log-transformed titers at the 2.5% significance level (one-sided) in order to allow for pairwise comparisons. For each comparison, the ratio of the GMTs along with their corresponding 95% CI was presented. All the immunogenicity data was log transformed and are anti-logged before interpretation.

Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted in accordance with the principles defined in the Declaration of Helsinki, International Conference on Harmonization guidelines (Good Clinical Practices), and the New Drugs and Clinical Trial Rules, 2019 from the Central Drugs Standard Control Organization of India. The investigational review board or ethics committee at each study site approved the protocol.

Results

Subject disposition

A total of 372 children and adults were screened of which 360 participants were enrolled with 240 randomized to the test vaccine and 120 to the control vaccine. The mean age in sub group-1, -2, and -3 were 55.41 years, 32.53 years, 13.01 years in the group that received the test vaccine, and 55.78 years, 34.06 years, and 13.35 years in the group that received the control vaccine. All participants were Indian by nationality. Participants were predominantly male,

comprising nearly 68% in the test vaccine group and 65% in the control vaccine group. These data are summarized in table 1 and supplementary table 1. All 360 participants had received 2 doses of a primary COVID-19 vaccine series and about 1 in 6 participants had received a booster dose as well.

Of the 240 that received the test vaccine, 1 participant was lost to follow-up. Similarly, 2 of the 120 that received the control vaccine were lost to follow up. Therefore, all immunogenicity analyses on Day 28 and Day 42 included 357 participants while Day 0 included all 360 participants (CONSORT flow chart of study participants shown in figure 1).

Table 1: Demographic characteristics

Demographic Variables Statistics / Category		BE's XBB 1.5 Vaccine (N=240) n (%)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (N=120) n (%)
Sex	Male	164 (68.3%)	78 (65%)
	Female	76 (31.7%)	42 (35%)
Age (years)	Mean	34.2	33.9
	Standard deviation	18.34	18.27
	Median	33.0	32.5
	IQR (q1: q3)	(15.0 , 52.0)	(16.0 , 51.0)
	Range: min, max	5.0 , 68.0	6.0 , 68.0
	95% CI	(31.8 , 36.5)	(30.6 , 37.2)
BMI (kg/m^2)	Mean	21.9	21.9
	Standard deviation	4.94	4.61
	Median	22.9	22.4
	IQR (q1: q3)	(17.3 , 26.0)	(18.4 , 25.0)
	Range: min, max	10.4 , 35.0	12.6 , 32.5
	95% CI	(21.2 , 22.5)	(21.1 , 22.7)
Height (cms)	Mean	158.2	157.9
	Standard deviation	13.99	13.43
	Median	164.0	161.0
	IQR (q1: q3)	(152.0 , 167.5)	(152.0 , 167.0)
	Range: min, max	110.0 , 179.0	115.0 , 183.0
	95% CI	(156.4 , 160.0)	(155.5 , 160.3)
Weight (gms)	Mean	56.3	55.9
	Standard deviation	17.98	16.91
	Median	61.1	59.5
	IQR (q1: q3)	(40.3 , 72.3)	(43.2 , 68.3)
	Range: min, max	15.6 , 86.2	17.5 , 90.4
	95% CI	(54.0 , 58.6)	(52.9 , 59.0)
Ethnicity	Indian	240 (100%)	240 (100%)

Percentages were calculated using column header group count as denominator.
n: Subject count in specified category. N= Total number of subject.

Figure 1: CONSORT study flowchart



Immunogenicity findings

XBB.1.5 subunit test vaccine induced superior immune responses

The primary objective of this Phase III study was to assess the immunogenicity of the XBB.1.5 subunit test vaccine in comparison with Corbevax™ control vaccine directed against the ancestral COVID-19 strain. As primary endpoint, the neutralizing antibody titers against the XBB.1.5 strain were measured on Day 28 and Day 42 in participants that either received the test or control vaccine. Superiority was to be determined and concluded if the lower limit of the 95% confidence interval of the test : control GMT was >1 on either Day 28 or Day 42. As shown in table 2, this ratio was 2.08 (lower limit of 1.64) on Day 28 and 2.91 (lower limit of 2.38) on Day 42. These data show that the updated XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine is superior to the vaccine directed against the ancestral Wuhan strain.

One of the secondary immunogenicity objectives was to assess the GMFR of both nAbs as well as IgGs. These data are presented in table 3 and show that the GMFR for neutralizing antibodies on Day 28 is nearly 8 after the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine while only about 3 after CORBEVAX™. At Day 42, the GMFR levels are more than 17 after the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine and about 5 after CORBEVAX™. The GMFR differences were more modest when it came to IgG antibody levels with a GMFR of about 8 on Day 42 after the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine while a little more than 6.5 after CORBEVAX™. Lastly, the proportion of participants that underwent seroconversion on Day 28 (after dose -1) and on Day 42 (after dose -2) were assessed. For the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine, 79.1% and 89.1% were seroconverted by nAbs on Day 28 and Day 42 respectively. For the Corbevax™ arm, the same seroconversion rates 58.5% and 68.6% respectively. Anti-XBB.1.5 IgG seroconversion rates were comparable in the two arms at both time points. Additional measures of 2- and 4-fold-rise in neutralizing antibodies are provided in Table 4.

XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine induced cross-reactive neutralizing antibodies against the JN.1 strain

Given the emergence of JN.1 during the conduct of the study, neutralizing antibodies titers against the JN.1 strain were measured on Day 0 and Day 42 in both arms of the study. *Post hoc* analyses of these data showed that the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine induced nearly 2-times the levels of neutralizing antibodies against the JN.1 strain than the ancestral strain control vaccine (GMT ratio of 1.90 with 95% CI from 1.56 to 2.31). This finding meets the *a priori* superiority criteria drawn up for protection against the XBB.1.5 strain, suggesting significant cross-protection against the JN.1 strain as well (Table 2). The individual titers and geometric mean titers of those vaccinated with either the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine or control vaccine against both the XBB.1.5 and JN.1 stains is presented in Figure 3. Evidently, the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine elicits significant cross-protection against the JN.1 strain. The GMTs induced by the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine against the JN.1 strain were significantly higher than those induced by the ancestral strain vaccine.

These immunogenecity data when taken together point towards enhanced neutralization ability by the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine compared to the CORBEVAX^{TM} control ancestral Wuhan strain vaccine. Additionally, the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine also provides significant cross-protection against the JN.1 strain of SARS-CoV-2.

Table 2: Geometric mean neutralizing antibody titer (GMT) ratios of XBB.1.5 arm : CORBEVAX™ at different time points

Parameter		XBB.1.5-RBD Vaccine	CORBEVAX™ Ancestral Strain Vaccine	GMT Ratio (95% CI)
PSVNT Geometric mean titers (95% Confidence interval) N = Number of participants	**Day 0**	31.72 (26.49 – 37.98) N=240	38.12 (30.56 – 47.56) N=120	**-**
	Day 28	242.0 (204.3 – 286.5) N=239	116.4 (92.85 – 146.0) N= 118	**2.08** (**1.64** – 2.63)
	Day 42	539.1 (468.6 – 620.3) N=239	185.2 (152.1 – 226.5) N=118	**2.91** (**2.38 –** 3.56)

Table 3: Geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) of neutralizing antibody and anti-XBB.1.5 IgG titers in the two arms at different time points

GMFR (95% CI)		XBB.1.5 subunit test vaccine	CORBEVAX™ control vaccine
Neutralizing antibodies (PSVNT)	**Day 28**	7.637 (6.090 – 9.578)	3.033 (2.340 – 3.932)
	Day 42	**17.02** (13.79 – 21.01)	**4.824** (3.731 – 6.236)
Anti-XBB.1.5 IgG antibodies by ELISA	**Day 28**	3.772 (3.208 – 4.434)	4.047 (3.284 – 4.986)
	Day 42	8.130 (6.975 – 9.476)	6.575 (5.356 – 8.070)

Figure 1: A) Geometric mean titers B) Geometric mean titer ratio of XBB.1.5 neutralizing antibodies. C) Geometric mean concentration anti-XBB.1.5 IgG antibodies ("XBB.1.5" represents the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit test vaccine and "Ancestral" represents CORBEVAX™, the Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain RBD subunit control vaccine)







Table 4: Percentage of participants that were seroprotected, with a ≥2-fold rise, and ≥4-fold rise in neutralizing antibodies after the test and control vaccine on Day 28 and Day 42

Percentage			XBB.1.5 RBD subunit test vaccine	CORBEVAX™ control vaccine
Neutralizing antibodies (PSVNT)	**Day 28**	**Seroconverted***	79.1%	58.5%
		≥2-fold rise	80.3%	62.7%
		≥4-fold rise	64.8%	38.1%
	Day 42	**Seroconverted***	**89.1%**	68.6%
		≥2-fold rise	**89.5%**	69.5%
		≥4-fold rise	**81.2%**	54.2%
Anti-XBB.1.5 IgG antibodies by ELISA	**Day 28**	**Seroconverted***	64.8%	71.2%
		≥2-fold rise	71.1%	73.7%
		≥4-fold rise	48.9%	53.4%
	Day 42	**Seroconverted***	84.5%	89.0%
		≥2-fold rise	87.8%	89%
		≥4-fold rise	81.2%	77.1%

***Seroconversion Definition:** For participants with PSVNT below detection level (assigned titer of 5) at Day-0; the subject was considered Seroconverted if the Fold Rise in PSVNT or IgG Concentration was ≥ 4.0. For participants with detected PSVNT at Day-0 (PSVNT ≥ 10.0); the subject was considered Seroconverted if the Fold Rise in PSVNT or IgG Concentration was ≥ 2.0.

Figure 3: Geometric mean titers of neutralizing antibodies measured by PSVNT 50 induced against the JN.1 and XBB.1.5 strains of SARS-CoV-2 14 days after the two-dose booster series.



Safety findings

Overall, 59 adverse events (AEs) were reported after the XBB.1.5-RBD subunit vaccine with these events being reported in 54 (22.50%) participants. The most frequently reported AEs were injection site pain [30 events in 27 (11.25%) participants], pyrexia [13 events in 13 (5.42%) participants], and headache [9 events in 9 (3.75%) participants]. The unsolicited AEs reported after the XBB.1.5-RBD subunit vaccine were headache [2 events in 2 (0.83%) participants], and pyrexia, fatigue, nausea, abdominal pain, cough and rhinorrhea all reported in 1 participant each [1 event in 1 (0.41%) participant each].

On the other hand, 27 AEs were reported after CORBEVAX™, the ancestral SARS-CoV-2 strain control vaccine in 27 (22.50%) participants. The most frequently reported AEs in this control arm were injection site pain [14 events in 14 (11.67%) participants], pyrexia [5 events in 5 (4.16%) participants], injection site erythema, and headache [3 events in 3 (2.50%) participants each]. Unsolicited AEs reported after CORBEVAX™ were miliaria (prickly heat), headache, fatigue, pyrexia, and injection site pain [1 event in 1 (0.83%) participant each].

Importantly, no serious AEs were reported in either arm of the study. Only 2 AEs required medical attention of any kind, both were cases of pyrexia with 1 each after CORBEVAX™ and the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine. While most AEs were found to be causally related to the test vaccine (58 of 59 AEs) and control vaccine (25 of 27 AEs), the severity was mostly mild (56 of 59 AEs in the test vaccine group and 26 of 27 AEs in the control vaccine group). Adverse event data are presented in a tabular form in tables 5 and 6 and additional AE data are presented in supplementary tables 2 to 5. Overall, the new XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was found have an acceptable safety profile when administered in a two dose series across multiple age groups.

Table 5: Summary of AEs in the safety population

Parameter/Visit N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE	54(22.50%) (17.38,28.31),59	27(22.50%) (15.38,31.02),27
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 60 minutes post-vaccination.	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 60 minutes post 1st dose vaccination.	14(5.83%) (3.23,9.59),14	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 60 minutes post 2nd dose vaccination.	4(1.67%) (0.46,4.21),4	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 7-day diary period.	47(19.58%) (14.76,25.18),51	22(18.33%) (11.86,26.43),22
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 7-day diary period post 1st dose of vaccination.	39(16.25%) (11.82,21.54),40	13(10.83%) (5.90,17.81),13
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during 7-day diary period post 2nd dose of vaccination.	11(4.58%) (2.31,8.05),11	9(7.50%) (3.49,13.76),9
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during Day 0 to Day 28.	40(16.67%) (12.18,22.00),41	14(11.67%) (6.53,18.80),14
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during Day 28 to Day 42	16(6.67%) (3.86,10.60),16	12(10.00%) (5.27,16.82),12
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during Day 42 to Day 56	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AE reported during Day 28 to Day 56	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	13(10.83%) (5.90,17.81),13
Number (%) of Participants with at least one Solicited AE	47(19.58%) (14.76,25.18),51	22(18.33%) (11.86,26.43),22
Number (%) of Participants with at least one unsolicited AE	7(2.92%) (1.18,5.92),8	5(4.17%) (1.37,9.46),5
Number (%) of Participants with at least one Local AE	29(12.08%) (8.24,16.89),32	17(14.17%) (8.47,21.71),17
Number (%) of Participants with at least one Systemic AE	26(10.83%) (7.20,15.47),27	10(8.33%) (4.07,14.79),10
Number (%) of Participants with at least one Serious AE	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Number (%) of Participants with at least one Medically attended AE	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Number (%) of Participants with at least one AESI	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0

Parameter/Visit N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number (%) of Participants with Severity grading		
Mild	51(21.25%) (16.25,26.97),56	26(21.67%) (14.67,30.11),26
Moderate	3(1.25%) (0.26,3.61),3	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Severe	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Number (%) of Participants with Causality grading		
Related	54(22.50%) (17.38,28.31),58	25(20.83%) (13.96,29.20),25
Unrelated	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	2(1.67%) (0.20,5.89),2

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of participants, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Table 6: Summary of AEs by System-Organ-Class and preferred term in the safety Population

SOC/ Preferred Term N1 (%) (95% CI) n	Overall BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	 BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one AE	54(22.50%) (17.38,28.31),59	27(22.50%) (15.38,31.02),27
Gastrointestinal disorders	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Abdominal Pain Upper	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Nausea	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
General disorders and administration site condition	43(17.92%) (13.28,23.36),46	23(19.17%) (12.56,27.36),23
Fatigue	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Injection Site erythema	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Injection site Pain	27(11.25%) (7.55,15.94),30	14(11.67%) (6.53,18.80),14
Pyrexia	13(5.42%) (2.92,9.08),13	5(4.17%) (1.37,9.46),5
Nervous System Disorder	9(3.75%) (1.73,7.00),9	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Headache	9(3.75%) (1.73,7.00),9	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Cough	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Rhinorrhoea	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Skin and Subcutaneous tissue disorder	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Miliaria	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Discussion

This Phase III study was designed to assess the immunogenicity and safety of a new updated XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine. The test vaccine was compared to Biological E's CORBEVAX™, a subunit vaccine that has the RBD of the ancestral Wuhan COVID-19 strain. Both these vaccines have been developed on the same platform which uses a *Pichia pastoris* yeast expression system [16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21]. The primary objective was to assess if two booster doses of the XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine were superior to two booster doses of the ancestral strain vaccine by XBB.1.5 RBD neutralizing antibody titers and the *a priori* defined superiority criteria was met. Four weeks after the first XBB.1.5 booster, the neutralizing antibody titers were more than twice that in the arm that received the ancestral strain vaccine as a booster. Two weeks after a second booster this differential was nearly three times showing meaningful superiority of the updated XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine over the Ancestral strain RBD subunit vaccine. Secondary immunogenicity endpoints included calculating the GMFR of neutralizing antibodies and anti-XBB.1.5 IgGs as well as the rate of seroconversion by neutralizing antibody titer assessments. More than 89% of the participants that received the updated vaccine demonstrated detectable nAb titers by Day 42, which is two weeks after the second booster. These neutralizing antibodies are of particular importance given that they are likely correlates of protection against COVID-19 infection [22, 23]. The GMFR of neutralizing antibodies was nearly 8 in the XBB.1.5 arm at Day 28 and more than 17 on Day 42. In comparison, in the ancestral strain the GMFR was about 3 on Day 28 and a little less than 5 on Day 42. Anti-XBB.1.5 IgG GMFRs in the two arms were comparable while being slightly higher after the updated subunit vaccine. Importantly, a *post hoc* analysis showed that participants in this study vaccinated with the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine also produced neutralizing antibodies against the JN.1 SARS-CoV-2 strain. The test vaccine produced a near two-fold rise in post-boost to pre-boost neutralizing antibodies on Day 42 suggesting robust cross protection against JN.1. These

immunogenicity data when taken together support the robust immunogenic response to the XBB.1.5 strain by the updated XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine administered as two booster doses.

Safety-wise, the XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was found to have a comparable safety profile to CORBEVAX™ which in turn has gone through an extensive clinical development program with nearly 10,000,000 doses having been administered [11, 12, 13]. The safety profile of the ancestral strain vaccine was found to be consistent with other protein subunit vaccines.

Multiple biopharmaceutical companies have developed or are developing monovalent vaccines targeting the XBB.1.5 strain. Presently, the only vaccine targeting the XBB.1.5 strain with Emergency Use Listing from the WHO is NUVAXOVID™ Omicron XBB.1.5 developed by Novavax [24]. This vaccine, and two other mRNA vaccines from Pfizer and Moderna have received emergency use authorization from the United States FDA [25]. Pfizer conducted a Phase II/III study to assess the safety and immunogenicity of their XBB.1.5 in participants ≥12 years of age who had received 3 or more doses of an mRNA vaccine with the most recent one being against the BA.4/BA.5-adapted bivalent one. This study showed strong neutralizing antibody response to the Omicron XBB.1.5 strain and the authors concluded that the vaccine had a favourable risk-benefit profile [26]. Another study showed that after a XBB.1.5 Moderna mRNA booster, the neutralizing antibody titer GMFR against JN.1 was 27 suggesting that vaccines that target XBB.1.5 may also protect against the JN.1 sub-lineage [27]. A recent preprint supports this notion by showing that nursing home residents in the United States had robust neutralizing antibody GMFRs against both XBB.1.5 and JN.1 strains [28] after being vaccinated with a monovalent XBB.1.5 vaccine. Recent observational data also shows that the clinical severity of those vaccinated with a XBB.1.5 COVID-19 vaccine and then infected with the JN.1 strain was not worse than those that acquired the XBB.1.5 strain [29].

This Phase III study of a new XBB.1.5 subunit vaccine is limited as it did not include efficacy assessments of the updated booster series. Immunogenicity assessments for this study were conducted in about 360 participants putting the level of evidence generated lower than large efficacy Phase III trials that enroll thousands of participants. While the *a priori* defined superiority objective was met, it remains to be seen if the vaccine reduces the incidence of symptomatic COVID-19 infections, hospitalizations, and deaths due the new strain. Large real-world studies of other XBB.1.5 have shown a reduction in hospitalizations and deaths due to COVID-19 supporting the widespread use of this updated vaccine [30]. Another important limitation is that participants in this Phase III study were followed up for only 42 days for this study. It is therefore unclear how long these protective neutralizing antibody titers remain for. A common limitation to all strain-specific booster vaccines and their trials is the ever evolving nature of the SARS-CoV-2 virus. At the time of conduct of this study, JN.1 became the predominant strain in India [32]. We showed that our vaccine elicited robust cross-protection against the JN.1 strain. While there is evidence that XBB.1.5-specific vaccines, like ours, also protect against JN.1, it remains to see if these vaccines also provide protection against the later FLiRT strains. An administrative disadvantage of our XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine was that it tested as a two-dose booster series compared to other single-dose boosters. But, we demonstrate significant neutralizing antibodies post the first booster dose itself. As of writing this manuscript, Biological E is developing a monovalent variant-specific vaccine against the JN.1 strain as recommended by the WHO (SAGE committee recommendation on 23rd December, 2024). For the clinical development of this vaccine, it will be tested as a single-dose booster likely improving uptake of boosters in general.

In conclusion, we provide strong evidence to suggest a favourable risk-benefit profile for the use of Biological E's updated XBB.1.5 RBD subunit vaccine as a two-dose booster for 5 to 80

year-olds. Based on these data, the vaccine received permission for restricted use in an emergency situation from the Central Drug Standard Control Organization, the Indian national regulatory agency. This vaccine – if approved for use by the WHO – will be particularly important for the rest of the Global South as well, given its lower cost and easier cold-chain management than existing mRNA vaccines. Post-approval real-world and Phase IV studies may provide additional evidence about the continued safety and efficacy of this vaccine.

Conflicts of Interest Statement

ST, VP, SG, RRM, VY, SN, CD, and MP are all employed by Biological E Limited and receive no stock options. CD has patents pending with InterVenn Biosciences relating to the diagnosis and staging of Ovarian Cancer, and for biomarkers that predict response to immunotherapy. CD also received consulting fees from InterVenn Biosciences. CD owns stocks of InterVenn Biosciences, Pfizer, and Vaxcyte. CSG, MN, SSK, and AVR were principal investigators on the study and received funding for the same from Biological E Limited.

1. Padhi, A.K. & Tripathi, T. Can SARS-CoV-2 Accumulate Mutations in the S-Protein to Increase Pathogenicity? *ACS Pharmacol Transl Sci* **3**, 1023-1026 (2020).

2. Ahmad, L. Implication of SARS-CoV-2 Immune Escape Spike Variants on Secondary and Vaccine Breakthrough Infections. *Front Immunol* **12**, 742167 (2021).

3. SARS-CoV-2 lineages.

4. Rahimi, F. & Talebi Bezmin Abadi, A. Omicron: A highly transmissible SARS-CoV-2 variant. *Gene Rep* **27**, 101549 (2022).

5. Dhawan, M. *et al.* Omicron variant (B.1.1.529) and its sublineages: What do we know so far amid the emergence of recombinant variants of SARS-CoV-2? *Biomed Pharmacother* **154**, 113522 (2022).

6. TAG-VE statement on Omicron sublineages BQ.1 and XBB. (2022).

7. Davis-Gardner, M.E. *et al.* Neutralization against BA.2.75.2, BQ.1.1, and XBB from mRNA Bivalent Booster. *N Engl J Med* **388**, 183-185 (2023).

8. Can Yue, W.S., Lei Wang, Fanchong Jian, Xiaosu Chen, Fei Gao, Zhongyang Shen, Youchun Wang, Xiangxi Wang, Yunlong Cao. Enhanced transmissibility of XBB.1.5 is contributed by both strong ACE2 binding and antibody evasion *bioRxiv* (2023).

9. Starr, T.N. *et al.* Deep mutational scans for ACE2 binding, RBD expression, and antibody escape in the SARS-CoV-2 Omicron BA.1 and BA.2 receptor-binding domains. *PLoS Pathog* **18**, e1010951 (2022).

10. Statement on the antigen composition of COVID-19 vaccines. (2024).

11. Thuluva, S. *et al.* Immunogenicity and safety of Biological E's CORBEVAX vaccine compared to COVISHIELD (ChAdOx1 nCoV-19) vaccine studied in a phase-3, single blind, multicentre, randomized clinical trial. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **19**, 2203632 (2023).

12. Thuluva, S. *et al.* Safety, tolerability and immunogenicity of Biological E's CORBEVAX vaccine in children and adolescents: A prospective, randomised, double-blind, placebo controlled, phase-2/3 study. *Vaccine* **40**, 7130-7140 (2022).

13. Subhash Thuluva, V.P., SubbaReddy Gunneri, Vijay Yerroju, Rammohan Mogulla, Pothakamuri Venkata Suneetha, Kishore Turaga, Akshay Binayke, Aymaan Zaheer, Amit Awasthi, Rashmi Virkar, Manish Narang, Pradeep Nanjappa, Niranjana Mahantshetti, BishanSwarup Garg, Mandal RavindraNath Ravi. Immunogenicity and safety of Biological E's CORBEVAX™ vaccine as a heterologous booster dose in adult volunteers previously vaccinated with two doses of either COVISHIELD™ or COVAXIN: A Prospective double-blind randomised phase III clinical study. *medRxiv* (2022).

14. Thuluva, S. *et al.* Evaluation of safety and immunogenicity of receptor-binding domain-based COVID-19 vaccine (Corbevax) to select the optimum formulation in open-label, multicentre, and randomised phase-1/2 and phase-2 clinical trials. *EBioMedicine* **83**, 104217 (2022).

15. Schmidt, F. *et al.* Measuring SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody activity using pseudotyped and chimeric viruses. *J Exp Med* **217** (2020).

16. Chen, W.H. *et al.* Genetic modification to design a stable yeast-expressed recombinant SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain as a COVID-19 vaccine candidate. *Biochim Biophys Acta Gen Subj* **1865**, 129893 (2021).

17. Pollet, J. *et al.* SARS-CoV-2 RBD219-N1C1: A yeast-expressed SARS-CoV-2 recombinant receptor-binding domain candidate vaccine stimulates virus neutralizing antibodies and T-cell immunity in mice. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **17**, 2356-2366 (2021).

18. Lee, J. *et al.* Process development and scale-up optimization of the SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain-based vaccine candidate, RBD219-N1C1. *Appl Microbiol Biotechnol* **105**, 4153-4165 (2021).

19. Chen, W.H. *et al.* Yeast-expressed SARS-CoV recombinant receptor-binding domain (RBD219-N1) formulated with aluminum hydroxide induces protective immunity and reduces immune enhancement. *Vaccine* **38**, 7533-7541 (2020).

20. Chen, W.H. *et al.* Yeast-expressed recombinant SARS-CoV-2 receptor binding domain RBD203-N1 as a COVID-19 protein vaccine candidate. *Protein Expr Purif* **190**, 106003 (2022).

21. Yang, J. *et al.* A vaccine targeting the RBD of the S protein of SARS-CoV-2 induces protective immunity. *Nature* **586**, 572-577 (2020).

22. Addetia, A. *et al.* Neutralizing Antibodies Correlate with Protection from SARS-CoV-2 in Humans during a Fishery Vessel Outbreak with a High Attack Rate. *J Clin Microbiol* **58** (2020).

23. Huang, A.T. *et al.* A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and association with severity. *Nat Commun* **11**, 4704 (2020).

24. Patel, N. *et al.* XBB.1.5 spike protein COVID-19 vaccine induces broadly neutralizing and cellular immune responses against EG.5.1 and emerging XBB variants. *Sci Rep* **13**, 19176 (2023).

25. FDA Takes Action on Updated mRNA COVID-19 Vaccines to Better Protect Against Currently Circulating Variants. (2023).

26. Gayed, J. *et al.* Safety and Immunogenicity of the Monovalent Omicron XBB.1.5-Adapted BNT162b2 COVID-19 Vaccine in Individuals >/=12 Years Old: A Phase 2/3 Trial. *Vaccines (Basel)* **12** (2024).

27. Lustig, Y. *et al.* Humoral response superiority of the monovalent XBB.1.5 over the bivalent BA.1 and BA.5 mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. *Vaccine* **42**, 126010 (2024).

28. Abul, Y. *et al.* Broad immunogenicity to prior SARS-CoV-2 strains and JN.1 variant elicited by XBB.1.5 vaccination in nursing home residents. *medRxiv* (2024).

29. Ma, K.C. *et al.* Effectiveness of Updated 2023-2024 (Monovalent XBB.1.5) COVID-19 Vaccination Against SARS-CoV-2 Omicron XBB and BA.2.86/JN.1 Lineage Hospitalization and

a Comparison of Clinical Severity-IVY Network, 26 Hospitals, October 18, 2023-March 9, 2024. *Clin Infect Dis* (2024).

30. Lin, D.Y. *et al.* Durability of XBB.1.5 Vaccines against Omicron Subvariants. *N Engl J Med* **390**, 2124-2127 (2024).

31. Pollard, A.J. & Bijker, E.M. A guide to vaccinology: from basic principles to new developments. *Nat Rev Immunol* **21**, 83-100 (2021).

32. Karyakarte, R.P. *et al.* Appearance and Prevalence of JN.1 SARS-CoV-2 Variant in India and Its Clinical Profile in the State of Maharashtra. *Cureus* **16**, e56718 (2024).

Supplementary table 1: Demographic and Baseline Characteristics (by age subgroup) - ITT Population

Parameter	Statistic	Subgroup 1		Subgroup 2		Subgroup3	
		BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)
Age (Years)	n	80	40	80	40	80	40
	Mean	55.4	55.8	34.1	32.5	13.0	13.4
	SD	4.98	5.29	8.55	7.58	3.15	2.96
	Median	53.0	54.5	33.0	32.5	14.0	14.0
	IQR (q1: q3)	(52.0,59.0)	(51.0,59.5)	(27.0,40.5)	(26.5,36.0)	(11.0,15.0)	(11.0,16.0)
	Range: min, max	50.0, 68.0	50.0, 68.0	19.0, 49.0	19.0, 49.0	5.0, 17.0	6.0, 17.0
	95% CI	(54.3,56.5)	(54.1,57.4)	(32.2,36.0)	(30.1,34.9)	(12.3,13.7)	(12.4,14.3)
Sex	Male, n (%)	68(85.0)	30(75.0)	63(78.8)	28(70.0)	33(41.3)	20(50.0)
	Female, n (%)	12(15.0)	10(25.0)	17(21.3)	12(30.0)	47(58.8)	20(50.0)
BMI (kg/ m2)	n	80	40	80	40	80	40
	Mean	24.9	24.7	24.4	24.4	16.3	16.7
	SD	2.80	2.73	3.24	3.21	2.84	2.24
	Median	25.0	24.6	25.1	23.5	16.2	16.5
	IQR (q1: q3)	(23.3,26.8)	(23.0,26.6)	(22.3,26.5)	(21.9,26.5)	(14.5,17.4)	(15.0,18.4)

Parameter	Statistic	Subgroup 1		Subgroup 2		Subgroup3	
		BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=80)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=40)
	Range: min, max	18.2, 31.7	18.8, 29.4	16.7, 35.0	19.6, 32.5	10.4, 27.3	12.6, 24.0
	95% CI	(24.2,25.5)	(23.8,25.5)	(23.7,25.1)	(23.3,25.4)	(15.6,16.9)	(16.0,17.4)
Length (cms)	n	80	40	80	40	80	40
	Mean	163.9	163.5	166.2	163.8	144.7	146.4
	SD	7.64	8.63	4.89	8.40	15.08	14.18
	Median	166.0	165.0	167.0	164.5	148.5	149.5
	IQR (q1: q3)	(160.5,168.5)	(158.0,170.0)	(164.0,170.0)	(158.0,170.0)	(134.0,155.0)	(135.5,157.5)
	Range: min, max	140.0, 179.0	146.0, 183.0	147.0, 175.0	143.0, 178.0	110.0, 170.0	115.0, 170.0
	95% CI	(162.1,165.6)	(160.7,166.3)	(165.1,167.3)	(161.1,166.5)	(141.3,148.0)	(141.9,150.9)
Weight (gms)	n	80	40	80	40	80	40
	Mean	66.8	66.1	67.5	65.3	34.5	36.4
	SD	8.92	10.32	9.51	9.30	9.54	9.52
	Median	67.1	66.6	69.2	64.3	34.6	36.0
	IQR (q1: q3)	(61.1,74.1)	(58.8,72.6)	(61.0,74.6)	(58.7,71.8)	(28.0,40.3)	(30.8,43.2)
	Range: min, max	42.0, 86.2	45.0, 90.4	45.0, 84.0	45.0, 86.2	15.6, 69.0	17.5, 60.8
	95% CI	(64.8,68.8)	(62.8,69.4)	(65.4,69.6)	(62.3,68.3)	(32.4,36.7)	(33.3,39.4)
Ethnicity	Asian, n (%)	80(100.0)	40(100.0)	80(100.0)	40(100.0)	80(100.0)	40(100.0)

Supplementary table 2: Summary of AEs within 60 minutes' post vaccination by SOC and PT – Safety Population (N=360)

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one AE within 60 minutes post vaccination	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4
General Disorders and Administration Site Condition	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Injection Site Pain	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Supplementary table 3: Summary of Solicited AEs (7-days post vaccination) by SOC and PT – Safety Population (N=360)

SOC/ Preferred Term N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one Solicited AE	47(19.58%) (14.76,25.18),51	22(18.33%) (11.86,26.43),22
General Disorders And Administration Site Condition	41(17.08%) (12.55,22.45),44	20(16.67%) (10.49,24.56),20
Injection Site Erythema	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Injection Site Pain	27(11.25%) (7.55,15.94),30	13(10.83%) (5.90,17.81),13
Pyrexia	12(5.00%) (2.61,8.57),12	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4
Nervous System Disorder	7(2.92%) (1.18,5.92),7	2(1.67%) (0.20,5.89),2
Headache	7(2.92%) (1.18,5.92),7	2(1.67%) (0.20,5.89),2

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Supplementary table 4: Summary of Unsolicited AEs by SOC and PT – Safety Population (N=360)

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one Unsolicited AE	7(2.92%) (1.18,5.92),8	5(4.17%) (1.37,9.46),5
Gastrointestinal Disorders	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Abdominal Pain Upper	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Nausea	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
General Disorders And Administration Site Condition	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Fatigue	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Injection Site Pain	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Pyrexia	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Nervous System Disorder	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Headache	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Respiratory, Thoracic And Mediastinal Disorder	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Cough	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Rhinorrhoea	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Skin And Subcutaneous Tissue Disorder	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Miliaria	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Supplementary table 5: Summary of AEs by SOC and PT, Severity & Causality– Safety Population (N=360)

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	Severity	Causality	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one AE			54(22.50%) (17.38,28.31),59	27(22.50%) (15.38,31.02),27
Gastrointestinal Disorders			2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Abdominal Pain Upper			1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Possible	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Nausea			1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Possible	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
General Disorders And Administration Site Condition			43(17.92%) (13.28,23.36),46	23(19.17%) (12.56,27.36),23
Fatigue			1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
	Mild	Possible	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Probable	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	Severity	Causality	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Injection Site Erythema			2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
	Mild	Probable	2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Injection Site Pain			27(11.25%) (7.55,15.94),30	14(11.67%) (6.53,18.80),14
	Mild	Certain	17(7.08%) (4.18,11.10),18	4(3.33%) (0.92,8.31),4
	Mild	Possible	7(2.92%) (1.18,5.92),9	8(6.67%) (2.92,12.71),8
	Mild	Probable	3(1.25%) (0.26,3.61),3	2(1.67%) (0.20,5.89),2
Pyrexia			13(5.42%) (2.92,9.08),13	5(4.17%) (1.37,9.46),5
	Mild	Certain	3(1.25%)(0.26,3.61),3	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Possible	1(0.42%)(0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%)(0.02,4.56),1
	Mild	Probable	6(2.50%)(0.92,5.36),6	3(2.50%)(0.52,7.13),3
	Mild	Unlikely	0(0.0%)	1(0.83%)(0.02,4.56),1
	Moderate	Possible	1(0.42%)(0.01,2.30),1	0(0.0%)
	Moderate	Probable	2(0.83%)(0.10,2.98),2	0(0.0%)
Nervous System Disorder			9(3.75%) (1.73,7.00),9	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
Headache			9(3.75%) (1.73,7.00),9	3(2.50%) (0.52,7.13),3
	Mild	Certain	3(1.25%) (0.26,3.61),3	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
	Mild	Possible	3(1.25%) (0.26,3.61),3	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
	Mild	Probable	3(1.25%) (0.26,3.61),3	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Moderate	Probable	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Respiratory, Thoracic And Mediastinal Disorder			2(0.83%) (0.10,2.98),2	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Cough			1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Possible	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
Rhinorrhoea			1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0
	Mild	Unlikely	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	Severity Causality	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Skin And Subcutaneous Tissue Disorder		0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Miliaria		0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
	Mild Unrelated	0(0.00%) (0.00,0.00),0	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count

Supplementary table 6: Summary of MAAEs by SOC and PT – Safety Population (N=360)

Parameter N1 (%) (95% CI) n	BE's XBB.1.5 Covid-19 Vaccine (Group 1) (N=240)	BE's CORBEVAX Vaccine (Group 2) (N=120)
Number of Subjects with at least one MAAE	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
General Disorders And Administration Site Condition	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1
Pyrexia	1(0.42%) (0.01,2.30),1	1(0.83%) (0.02,4.56),1

N = No. of subject per arm,
N1 = Subject count, % = Percentage of subjects, CI = Confidence Interval, n = Event count