Modelling the population-level protection conferred by COVID-19 vaccination

Pranesh Padmanabhan^{1,*}, Rajat Desikan^{2,‡}, Narendra M. Dixit^{2,3,*}

¹Clem Jones Centre for Ageing Dementia Research, Queensland Brain Institute, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia 4072

²Department of Chemical Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India 560012

³Centre for Biosystems Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India 560012

[‡]Current Address: Certara QSP, Certara UK Limited, Sheffield, UK

*Correspondence:

Pranesh Padmanabhan, Narendra M. Dixit

Email: p.padmanabhan@uq.edu.au; narendra@iisc.ac.in

One sentence summary:

Viremic control by the spectrum of neutralizing antibodies elicited by vaccination determines COVID-19 vaccine efficacies.

Manuscript details:

Abstract: 125 words; Text: ~2500 words; Figures: 4; References: 58 (30 in main text)

Supplementary Materials: Tables: 3; Figures: 5

22 **Although severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) vaccines work**
 23 **predominantly by eliciting neutralizing antibodies (NAbs), how the protection they confer**
 24 **depends on the NAb response to vaccination is unclear. Here, we collated and analysed *in***
 25 ***vitro* dose-response curves of >70 NAbs and constructed a landscape defining the**
 26 **spectrum of neutralization efficiencies of NAbs elicited. We mimicked responses of**
 27 **individuals by sampling NAb subsets of known sizes from the landscape and found that**
 28 **they recapitulated responses of convalescent patients. Combining individual responses**
 29 **with a mathematical model of within-host SARS-CoV-2 infection post-vaccination, we**
 30 **predicted how the population-level protection conferred would increase with the NAb**
 31 **response to vaccination. Our predictions captured the outcomes of vaccination trials. Our**
 32 **formalism may help optimize vaccination protocols, given limited vaccine availability.**

33
 34 Approved SARS-CoV-2 vaccines have shown remarkable but varying efficacies in
 35 clinical trials, reducing the incidence of symptomatic infections by 62-96% (1-4). The
 36 protection has been found to be predominantly due to NAbs elicited by the vaccines; cellular
 37 immunity appeared to play a secondary role (1, 2). The NAb response elicited by primary
 38 SARS-CoV-2 infection is diverse, spanning >1000-fold variation in Ab titres and *in vitro*
 39 neutralization efficiencies across individuals (5, 6), and appears not to correlate with disease
 40 severity (7). NAb titres following vaccination were comparable to or even lower at times than
 41 those from convalescent patients (1, 2, 8). The protection accorded by the vaccines is thus
 42 surprising. It is possible, based on animal studies (9), that lower NAb titres are protective at the
 43 time of challenge than post infection. Knowledge of how the level of protection depends on the

44 NAb titres and their neutralization efficiencies is lacking. This knowledge gap hinders rational
 45 optimization of vaccination protocols, which is important today given limited vaccine supplies
 46 (10). Here, we developed a mathematical model that quantitatively predicts the population-
 47 level protection conferred by vaccines as a function of the NAb responses they elicit.

48 A major challenge to describing the effects of vaccination is the diversity of the NAb
 49 responses elicited; no formalism exists to predict the diversity or its effects on protection. We
 50 addressed this challenge by adapting the classic idea of *shape space*, which has aided
 51 quantification of the immune repertoire (11), for characterizing NAbs. Accordingly, we sought
 52 features, also termed shape parameters, of the NAbs that would predict their neutralization
 53 efficiencies. Numerous studies have isolated individual NAbs from patients and assessed their
 54 neutralization efficiencies *in vitro*, with the aim of developing NAbs for therapeutic
 55 applications. We compiled dose-response curves (DRCs) of >70 NAbs thus isolated and fit
 56 them using the standard sigmoidal function as well as the median-effect equation (12)
 57 (materials and methods, fig. S1, table S1). The equations fit the data well (Fig. 1A, and figs.
 58 S2 and S3), indicating that two parameters, the 50% inhibitory concentration, IC_{50} , and the
 59 slope, m , of the DRC, were sufficient to characterize the neutralization efficiency of the NAbs
 60 (Fig. 1A and table S1). The best-fit IC_{50} and m varied widely across NAbs (Fig. 1B). IC_{50}
 61 ranged from $\sim 10^{-3}$ $\mu\text{g/ml}$ to ~ 140 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ (Fig. 1B), in close agreement with reported estimates,
 62 giving us confidence in the fits (fig. S4A and table S1). m , the importance of which has been
 63 recognized with HIV-1 and hepatitis C (12, 13) but has not typically been reported for SARS-
 64 CoV-2, spanned the range of ~ 0.2 to 2 (Fig. 1). This variability in IC_{50} and m was not restricted

65

66

67

68

69 **Figure 1. Analysis of dose-response curves of SARS-CoV-2 NABs.** (A) Fits (lines) of the
70 standard sigmoidal equation and the median-effect equation (*inset*) to published experimental
71 data (circles) of the fraction of infection events blocked, f_u , as a function of NAb concentration,
72 shown for two NABs, BD-236 (left) and 47D11 (right). Experimental data points with $1\% < f_u$
73 $< 99\%$ (filled circles) were considered for parameter estimation. Fits for the remaining NABs
74 are in figs. S2 and S3. The best-fit estimates of (B) IC_{50} and (C) m for all the NABs analysed.

75

76 to a particular pseudotyped virus construct or backbone used (fig. S4, B and C), the cell line
77 used (fig. S4, D and E), or assay conditions, which could vary across studies (fig. S4, F and G).
78 The variability was thus intrinsic to the NABs, indicating the spectrum of NABs elicited.
79 Furthermore, akin to HIV-1 antibodies (12), the variations in IC_{50} and m of the SARS-CoV-2
80 NABs appeared independent. For instance, the NABs BD-361 and REGN10954 had similar IC_{50}
81 (both ~ 0.04 μg/ml), but vastly different m (~ 0.7 and ~ 1.5 , respectively), whereas the NABs
82 CC12.3 and 515-5 had vastly different IC_{50} (~ 0.02 μg/ml and 1.6 μg/ml, respectively), but

83 similar m (both ~ 1). IC_{50} and m were thus not only sufficient but also necessary for quantifying
84 the neutralization efficiencies of NAb. We therefore employed IC_{50} and m as the required
85 shape parameters. Plotting the NAb on an IC_{50} - m plot, we identified the NAb shape space
86 (Fig. 2), which, because of its two-dimensional nature, we termed the ‘landscape of SARS-
87 CoV-2 NAb’.

88

89

90 **Figure 2. The landscape of SARS-CoV-2 NAb.** (A) SARS-CoV-2 NAb analysed in Fig. 1
91 depicted on an IC_{50} - m plot. Each dot represents a NAb. 8 NAb that have multiple neutralisation
92 curves reported are represented multiple times (table S1). Solid lines are loci of points
93 corresponding to fixed IIP values computed at 100 $\mu\text{g/ml}$. The ellipse (blue dashed line)
94 circumscribes the landscape of SARS-CoV-2 NAb elicited. (B) The distribution of IIP_{100}
95 values of NAb. Average IIP_{100} values are used for the 8 NAb mentioned above.

96

97 The landscape contains potent NAb, with low IC_{50} and high m , as well as weak NAb,
98 with the opposite traits. To compare the NAb, we employed the instantaneous inhibitory
99 potential (IIP), a composite metric of IC_{50} and m (12-14). IIP_D represents the $\log_{10}$ decline in
100 viral load in a single round infection assay due to the NAb present at concentration D . Thus,
101 the higher is the IIP_D , the more potent is the NAb at concentration D . NAb displayed a wide
102 distribution of IIP_{100} values (Fig. 2B and table S1): We found that 5 NAb had the highest IIP_{100}

Figure 3. NAb landscape and patient responses. (A) Schematic of the procedure to predict plasma dilution curves. We represent an individual's plasma by a sample of NAb from the landscape. We predict the fraction of infection events unaffected by NAb, f_u , at a given plasma dilution in *in vitro* pseudovirus neutralization assays and repeat this at different dilutions to obtain the dilution curve. (B) Representative plasma dilution curves obtained as fits (lines) of the equation $f_u = \frac{(g)^n}{(g)^n + (NT_{50})^n}$ to reported data (circles) from three patients (15), where n is the Hill coefficient, γ is the plasma dilution and NT_{50} is the half-maximal inhibitory plasma neutralizing titre. Experimental data points with $1\% < f_u < 99\%$ (filled circles) were considered for parameter estimation. (C) Predictions (lines) of plasma dilution curves. We assumed ten NAb per patient. Blue lines are fits shown in B. $D_0 = 30 \mu\text{g/ml}$. (D) Half-maximal inhibitory plasma neutralizing titre, NT_{50} , as a function of total NAb concentration. Blue circles are reported estimates from convalescent patients. Red squares and orange circles are the mean of NT_{50} values predicted from 100 virtual patients at each NAb concentration using Bliss independence and Loewe additivity, respectively. The error bars are standard deviations.

118 values, >5 , and 9 had the least, <1 ($D = 100 \mu\text{g/mL}$) (Fig. 2B and table S1). This distribution
 119 of IIP_{100} values demonstrated further the wide spectrum of neutralization efficiencies of NAb.

120 The landscape established bounds on the neutralization efficiencies of the NAb elicited.
 121 We reasoned next that the diversity of the NAb responses across individuals would arise from
 122 the way NAb are sampled from the landscape. Although a large number of NAb can be
 123 isolated from individuals, studies of convalescent patient plasma (5, 6, 16-18) as well as on
 124 NAb epitope profiling (19) have argued that the NAb response of an individual can be attributed
 125 to a small subset of 5-10 distinct NAb. Furthermore, while some epitopes on the SARS-CoV-
 126 2 spike protein, S, are targeted more than others by NAb, the collection of NAb produced
 127 differs substantially across individuals (20). We therefore assumed that the response elicited
 128 by an infected individual would be a *small, random subset* of the landscape. We analysed DRCs
 129 of NAb isolated from individual patients and found that they indeed constituted such random
 130 subsets in the landscape (fig. S5). Accordingly, we sampled random combinations of 10 NAb
 131 each, each combination representing the response of an individual. We let NAb concentrations
 132 vary across individuals, to mimic the observed variation of the NAb titres (16-18). We
 133 quantified the neutralization efficiency of the NAb response by simulating standard plasma
 134 dilution assays (materials and methods, Fig. 3A). We let the NAb exhibit Bliss independence
 135 or Loewe additivity, the former representing NAb targeting distinct, non-occluding epitopes
 136 and the latter the same or occluding epitopes (21). Our simulations recapitulated the dilution
 137 curves associated with patient plasma (Fig. 3, B and C). The values of NT_{50} , the dilution at
 138 which the neutralization efficiency of the plasma decreases by 50%, were in agreement with
 139 experimental observations (17) (Fig. 3D). The data was described better by Bliss independence

at low NAb titres and Loewe additivity at high titres. This is expected because at low titres, the NAb titres are unlikely to interact with each other and would thus follow Bliss independence, whereas at high titres, they may compete for binding sites on S or occlude each other and thus exhibit Loewe additivity (21). At any NAb titre, there existed substantial variation in NT_{50} , attributed to the random combinations of NAb titres sampled. The variation, however, was outweighed by the overall rise of NT_{50} with the NAb titre, consistent with patient data (Fig. 3D). For instance, the NT_{50} was 17 ± 13 at the IgG titre of $0.1 \mu\text{g/ml}$ and 1300 ± 1000 at $10 \mu\text{g/ml}$. Sampling from the NAb landscape thus successfully recapitulated patient responses. We were able to describe the diversity of the NAb responses elicited across patients. Armed with this description, we examined next the protection accorded by vaccines in clinical trials.

Following vaccination, NAb titres rise and are expected to remain stable (or decay slowly) over weeks to months (22), protecting individuals who might get exposed to the virus during this period. Individuals were assumed to be protected if they did not report symptomatic infection; loss of protection involved symptoms and a positive result on a nucleic acid amplification test (1, 2). Protection with NAb titres is expected not to be sterilizing, as suggested by animal studies (9); NAb titres help suppress the peak in viremia, thereby reducing symptoms, and facilitate more rapid clearance of the infection. If the peak is sufficiently suppressed, no symptoms may result, as is the case with the ~40% of natural infections that remain asymptomatic (7). Here, we assumed that an individual would be detected as symptomatically infected if the viral load rose above a threshold during the infection.

To estimate the peak viral load, we developed a mathematical model of the early time course of the infection, where the viral load typically rises, attains a peak, and declines (23),

Figure 4. SARS-CoV-2 dynamics and protection post-vaccination. (A) Schematic of the model of within-host SARS-CoV-2 dynamics post-vaccination depicting the interactions between target cells, T , infected cells, I , refractory cells, R , virions, V , innate immune response, X , and pre-existing NAb, sampled from the landscape. (B) Predictions of viral load in non-vaccinated (black line) and vaccinated (coloured lines) individuals with different fixed efficacies of NAb indicated. *Inset*: Predicted peak viral load at different efficacies. (C) Predictions of peak viral load at different NAb titres. Each dot represents a patient. (D) Model predictions of the relationship between mean protection and NT_{50} (solid line) compared with data from vaccination trial (symbols). The number of doses of the vaccine administered is mentioned in brackets. The error bars (dashed lines) in the protection curve are the standard deviation from 5 realizations of *in silico* patient populations. The data from the trials used is summarized in table S3. The model equations and simulation procedure are described in materials and methods.

and applied it to describe the effect of vaccination (Fig. 4A, table S2, materials and methods). The structure of the model mimics recent models that have captured patient data of viral load changes following primary infection (24, 25) (see Fig. 4B, $\epsilon=0$). In addition, we assumed that

180 NABs generated following vaccination would exist at the start of infection and neutralize free
181 viruses, effectively reducing viral infectivity. The greater the reduction in infectivity, the lower
182 the peak viral load (Fig. 4B, $\epsilon > 0$). Significant *de novo* NAb production post-infection typically
183 occurs after the peak in viremia (7). We therefore considered pre-existing NABs as responsible
184 for protection and assumed their titres not to vary substantially during the course of the
185 infection, given the typically short course of the infection and the much longer durability of the
186 NAB response to vaccination (22). (Our model is not applicable to natural infection before
187 vaccination; no models are currently capable of correctly describing NAB responses following
188 primary infection.) We let the pre-existing NABs be drawn as random subsets from the
189 landscape, as we did above. The NABs neutralized free viruses with an efficiency that we
190 estimated using Loewe additivity between the individual NABs (Fig. 4). NAB titres in the lung
191 airways are expected to be similar to those in the blood given the close coupling between the
192 lungs and the circulatory system (7). We simulated a virtual patient population of 3500
193 individuals, on the order of the number of individuals infected in the placebo arms of clinical
194 trials. The individuals all had distinct viral dynamics parameters drawn from known ranges
195 (table S2), to mimic interpatient variability in addition to the variability arising from NAB
196 sampling from the landscape. Our model predicted wide variability in the peak viral load (Fig.
197 4C). At low pre-existing NAB concentrations (0.01 $\mu\text{g/mL}$), indicative of the scenario without
198 vaccination, the predicted peak viral load ranged from $\sim 10^3$ to 10^9 copies/ml, consistent with
199 the range in symptomatic individuals (26). The peaks declined as NAB titres increased. The
200 limit of detection is $\sim 10^2$ copies/ml (27), which we set as the threshold for symptomatic

infection that would be detected in trials. The fraction of individuals with peaks below detection would indicate the level of protection due to the vaccine.

To quantify the mean level of protection and test it against data from clinical trials, we used viral dynamics parameters representative of symptomatic infections (24, 25) (table S2) and simulated the dynamics in 5 cohorts of 2000 infected individuals each. Vaccination studies report the NT_{50} values of the NAb responses elicited and the associated mean protection level, or efficacy (table S3). We binned the different individuals into narrow NT_{50} bands and calculated the mean protection in each band. We found that the mean protection was low for $NT_{50} \sim 1$. It increased in a sigmoidal manner to 50% at $NT_{50} \sim 20$ and asymptotically reached 100% at $NT_{50} \sim 200$. Remarkably, the data for nearly all approved vaccines fell on this ‘protection curve’, explaining the protection they confer (Fig. 4D). Thus, for instance, a single dose of the vaccine BNT 162b2 elicited NAbs with NT_{50} of 14 and accorded 49% protection. Following two doses, the corresponding values were 361 and 94%, respectively. These values as well as those for other vaccines were captured accurately by our model predictions. The only exception was ChAdOx1 nCoV-19, which had a lower protection than predicted, the reasons for which remain to be elucidated.

Our study provides the first conceptual, mechanistic and quantitative understanding of the protection conferred by COVID-19 vaccines. Our findings would inform strategies for optimal vaccine deployment. With limited vaccine availability, it would be useful to estimate the protection realizable by a single dose of a prime-boost vaccine, especially in younger, less vulnerable adults (10). Our formalism would enable this estimation: measurements of corresponding NT_{50} values would allow reading off the expected protection levels from our

protection curve. Similarly, using measurements of the waning of NAb titres post-vaccination, how the population-level protection due to pre-existing NAb would fade could be predicted. Protection would then rely on memory B cell responses, which are yet to be fully understood (28), or indicate the need for revaccination. Our study did not consider viral mutations because with 5-10 NAb active, viral escape from NAb responses is expected to be unlikely (19, 29). With the new circulating strains (30), however, the NAb landscape may have to be reconstructed. Future studies may report DRCs of NAb against the new strains, facilitating such reconstruction.

References

1. L. R. Baden *et al.*, Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **384**, 403-416 (2021).
2. F. P. Polack *et al.*, Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 2603-2615 (2020).
3. M. Voysey *et al.*, Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (AZD1222) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* **397**, 99-111 (2021).
4. D. Y. Logunov *et al.*, Safety and efficacy of an rAd26 and rAd5 vector-based heterologous prime-boost COVID-19 vaccine: an interim analysis of a randomised controlled phase 3 trial in Russia. *Lancet* **397**, 671-681 (2021).
5. L. Liu *et al.*, Potent neutralizing antibodies against multiple epitopes on SARS-CoV-2 spike. *Nature* **584**, 450-456 (2020).
6. D. F. Robbiani *et al.*, Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature* **584**, 437-442 (2020).
7. A. Sette, S. Crotty, Adaptive immunity to SARS-CoV-2 and COVID-19. *Cell* **184**, 861-880 (2021).

- 249 8. P. M. Folegatti *et al.*, Safety and immunogenicity of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine
250 against SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary report of a phase 1/2, single-blind, randomised
251 controlled trial. *Lancet* **396**, 467-478 (2020).
- 252 9. K. McMahan *et al.*, Correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 in rhesus macaques.
253 *Nature* **590**, 630-634 (2021).
- 254 10. K. M. Bubar *et al.*, Model-informed COVID-19 vaccine prioritization strategies by age and
255 serostatus. *Science* **371**, 916-921 (2021).
- 256 11. A. S. Perelson, G. F. Oster, Theoretical studies of clonal selection: Minimal antibody
257 repertoire size and reliability of self-non-self discrimination. *J Theor Biol* **81**, 645-670
258 (1979).
- 259 12. N. E. Webb, D. C. Montefiori, B. Lee, Dose-response curve slope helps predict therapeutic
260 potency and breadth of HIV broadly neutralizing antibodies. *Nat Commun* **6**, 8443 (2015).
- 261 13. P. Padmanabhan, N. M. Dixit, Inhibitors of hepatitis C virus entry may be potent
262 ingredients of optimal drug combinations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **114**, E4524-E4526
263 (2017).
- 264 14. B. L. Jilek *et al.*, A quantitative basis for antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection. *Nat*
265 *Med* **18**, 446-451 (2012).
- 266 15. P. J. M. Brouwer *et al.*, Potent neutralizing antibodies from COVID-19 patients define
267 multiple targets of vulnerability. *Science* **369**, 643-650 (2020).
- 268 16. B. Isho *et al.*, Persistence of serum and saliva antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 spike
269 antigens in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol* **5**, eabe5511 (2020).
- 270 17. A. S. Iyer *et al.*, Persistence and decay of human antibody responses to the receptor binding
271 domain of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein in COVID-19 patients. *Sci Immunol* **5**, eabe0367
272 (2020).
- 273 18. K. Röltgen *et al.*, Defining the features and duration of antibody responses to SARS-CoV-
274 2 infection associated with disease severity and outcome. *Sci Immunol* **5**, eabe0240 (2020).
- 275 19. E. Shrock *et al.*, Viral epitope profiling of COVID-19 patients reveals cross-reactivity and
276 correlates of severity. *Science* **370**, eabd4250 (2020).
- 277 20. M. Yuan *et al.*, Structural basis of a shared antibody response to SARS-CoV-2. *Science*
278 **369**, 1119-1123 (2020).
- 279 21. C. T. Meyer *et al.*, Quantifying drug combination synergy along potency and efficacy axes.
280 *Cell Systems* **8**, 97-108.e116 (2019).

281 22. A. T. Widge *et al.*, Durability of responses after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccination.
282 *N Engl J Med* **384**, 80-82 (2021).

283 23. R. Wölfel *et al.*, Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-2019. *Nature*
284 **581**, 465-469 (2020).

285 24. A. Goyal, E. F. Cardozo-Ojeda, J. T. Schiffer, Potency and timing of antiviral therapy as
286 determinants of duration of SARS-CoV-2 shedding and intensity of inflammatory
287 response. *Sci Adv* **6**, eabc7112 (2020).

288 25. A. Gonçalves *et al.*, Timing of antiviral treatment initiation is critical to reduce SARS-
289 CoV-2 viral load. *CPT: Pharmacometrics & Systems Pharmacology* **9**, 509-514 (2020).

290 26. J. Fajnzylber *et al.*, SARS-CoV-2 viral load is associated with increased disease severity
291 and mortality. *Nat Commun* **11**, 5493 (2020).

292 27. R. Arnaout *et al.*, SARS-CoV2 testing: the limit of detection matters. *bioRxiv*
293 10.1101/2020.1106.1102.131144 (2020).

294 28. R. R. Goel *et al.*, Longitudinal analysis reveals distinct antibody and memory B cell
295 responses in SARS-CoV2 naïve and recovered individuals following mRNA vaccination.
296 *medRxiv* 10.1101/2021.1103.1103.21252872 (2021).

297 29. A. Baum *et al.*, Antibody cocktail to SARS-CoV-2 spike protein prevents rapid mutational
298 escape seen with individual antibodies. *Science* **369**, 1014-1018 (2020).

299 30. T. C. Williams, W. A. Burgers, SARS-CoV-2 evolution and vaccines: cause for concern?
300 *Lancet Respiratory Medicine* 10.1016/S2213-2600(1021)00075-00078 (2021).

301 31. X. Chi *et al.*, A neutralizing human antibody binds to the N-terminal domain of the Spike
302 protein of SARS-CoV-2. *Science* **369**, 650-655 (2020).

303 32. C. Wang *et al.*, A human monoclonal antibody blocking SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat*
304 *Commun* **11**, 2251 (2020).

305 33. E. Seydoux *et al.*, Analysis of a SARS-CoV-2-infected individual reveals development of
306 potent neutralizing antibodies with limited somatic mutation. *Immunity* **53**, 98-105 e105
307 (2020).

308 34. R. Shi *et al.*, A human neutralizing antibody targets the receptor-binding site of SARS-
309 CoV-2. *Nature* **584**, 120-124 (2020).

310 35. A. Z. Wec *et al.*, Broad neutralization of SARS-related viruses by human monoclonal
311 antibodies. *Science* **369**, 731-736 (2020).

312 36. C. Lei *et al.*, Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 spike pseudotyped virus by recombinant
313 ACE2-Ig. *Nat Commun* **11**, 2070 (2020).

314 37. Z. Lv *et al.*, Structural basis for neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV by a potent
315 therapeutic antibody. *Science* **369**, 1505-1509 (2020).

316 38. S. J. Zost *et al.*, Potently neutralizing and protective human antibodies against SARS-CoV-
317 2. *Nature* **584**, 443-449 (2020).

318 39. B. Ju *et al.*, Human neutralizing antibodies elicited by SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature* **584**,
319 115-119 (2020).

320 40. Y. Cao *et al.*, Potent neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 identified by high-
321 throughput single-cell sequencing of convalescent patients' B cells. *Cell* **182**, 73-84 e16
322 (2020).

323 41. J. Hansen *et al.*, Studies in humanized mice and convalescent humans yield a SARS-CoV-
324 2 antibody cocktail. *Science* **369**, 1010-1014 (2020).

325 42. T. F. Rogers *et al.*, Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection
326 from disease in a small animal model. *Science* **369**, 956-963 (2020).

327 43. C. O. Barnes *et al.*, Structures of human antibodies bound to SARS-CoV-2 spike reveal
328 common epitopes and recurrent features of antibodies. *Cell* **182**, 828-842 e816 (2020).

329 44. D. Pinto *et al.*, Cross-neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 by a human monoclonal SARS-CoV
330 antibody. *Nature* **583**, 290-295 (2020).

331 45. L. Hanke *et al.*, An alpaca nanobody neutralizes SARS-CoV-2 by blocking receptor
332 interaction. *Nat Commun* **11**, 4420 (2020).

333 46. X. Chen *et al.*, Human monoclonal antibodies block the binding of SARS-CoV-2 spike
334 protein to angiotensin converting enzyme 2 receptor. *Cell Mol Immunol* **17**, 647-649
335 (2020).

336 47. J. Wan *et al.*, Human-IgG-neutralizing monoclonal antibodies block the SARS-CoV-2
337 infection. *Cell Rep* **32**, 107918 (2020).

338 48. P. Padmanabhan, N. M. Dixit, Modeling suggests a mechanism of synergy between
339 hepatitis C virus entry inhibitors and drugs of other classes. *CPT Pharmacometrics Syst*
340 *Pharmacol* **4**, 445-453 (2015).

341 49. T. C. Chou, Theoretical basis, experimental design, and computerized simulation of
342 synergism and antagonism in drug combination studies. *Pharmacol Rev* **58**, 621-681
343 (2006).

344 50. P. Padmanabhan, R. Desikan, N. M. Dixit, Targeting TMPRSS2 and Cathepsin B/L
345 together may be synergistic against SARS-CoV-2 infection. *PLoS Comput Biol* **16**,
346 e1008461 (2020).

347 51. V. I. Zarnitsyna *et al.*, Mathematical model reveals the role of memory CD8 T cell
348 populations in recall responses to Influenza. *Front Immunol* **7**, 165 (2016).

349 52. R. Ke, C. Zitzmann, R. M. Ribeiro, A. S. Perelson, Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 infection in
350 the human upper and lower respiratory tracts and their relationship with infectiousness.
351 *medRxiv* 10.1101/2020.1109.1125.20201772 (2020).

352 53. D. A. Swan *et al.*, Vaccines that prevent SARS-CoV-2 transmission may prevent or dampen
353 a spring wave of COVID-19 cases and deaths in 2021. *medRxiv*
354 10.1101/2020.1112.1113.20248120 (2020).

355 54. A. S. Perelson, R. Ke, Mechanistic modeling of SARS-CoV-2 and other infectious diseases
356 and the effects of therapeutics. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 10.1002/cpt.2160 (2020).

357 55. N. Dagan *et al.*, BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine in a nationwide mass vaccination
358 setting. *N Engl J Med*, 10.1056/NEJMoa2101765 (2021).

359 56. E. E. Walsh *et al.*, Safety and immunogenicity of two RNA-Based COVID-19 vaccine
360 candidates. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 2439-2450 (2020).

361 57. E. J. Anderson *et al.*, Safety and immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 vaccine in
362 older adults. *N Engl J Med* **383**, 2427-2438 (2020).

363 58. M. Voysey *et al.*, Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of the booster
364 dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled
365 analysis of four randomised trials. *Lancet* **397**, 881-891 (2021).

366

367

Acknowledgements

Funding: This work was supported by the DBT/Wellcome Trust India Alliance Senior Fellowship IA/S/14/1/501307 to NMD. **Author contributions:** PP: Conceptualization, Investigation, Formal analysis, Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing; RD: Formal analysis, Writing-review & editing. NMD: Conceptualization, Writing-original draft, Writing-review & editing. **Competing interests:** The authors declare that no conflicts of interests exist. **Data and materials availability:** All relevant data are available within the manuscript and supplementary materials.