1 Comprehensive mapping of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2

2 variants induced by natural infection or vaccination

3

4 Xinhua Chen, BSc ^{1,*}, Zhiyuan Chen, BSc ^{1,*}, Andrew S. Azman, PhD ^{2,3,4,*}, Ruijia Sun, BSc ¹,

5 Wanying Lu, BSc ¹, Nan Zheng, BSc ¹, Jiabin Zhou MSc¹, Qianhui Wu MSc ¹, Xiaowei Deng

6 MSc ¹, Zeyao Zhao, BSc ¹, Xinghui Chen, BSc ¹, Shijia Ge, BSc ⁵, Juan Yang, PhD ¹, Daniel T.

7 Leung, M.D.^{6,†}, Hongjie Yu, PhD ^{1,5,7†}

8

9 *These authors are co-first authors contributed equally to this work.

10 †These authors are joint senior authors contributed equally to this work.

11 Corresponding author: Hongjie Yu, Shanghai Institute of Infectious Disease and

12 Biosecurity, School of Public Health, Fudan University, Shanghai 200032, China; E-mail:

13 yhj@fudan.edu.cn

14

15 Affiliations:

16 1. School of Public Health, Fudan University, Key Laboratory of Public Health Safety,

17 Ministry of Education, Shanghai, China

18 2. Department of Epidemiology, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,

19 Baltimore, MD, USA

20 3. Unit of Population Epidemiology, Division of Primary Care Medicine, Geneva

21 University Hospitals, Switzerland

22 4. Institute of Global Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, Switzerland

23 5. Department of Infectious Diseases, Huashan Hospital, Fudan University, Shanghai,

24 China

25 6. Division of Infectious Diseases, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City,

26 UT, USA

27 7. Shanghai Institute of Infectious Disease and Biosecurity, Fudan University, Shanghai,

28 China

29

30 Word count (Abstract): 250

31 Word count (main text): 3,184

32 Running Title: Review of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants

33 Keywords: SARS-CoV-2 variants; neutralizing antibodies; natural infection; vaccination

34

35 **Disclaimer:** The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily

36 represent the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

37 **Research in context**

38 ***Evidence before this study***

39 Several newly emerged SARS-CoV-2 variants have raised significant concerns globally ,
 40 and there is concern that SARS-CoV-2 variants can evade immune responses that are
 41 based on the prototype strain. It is not known to what extent do emerging SARS-CoV-2
 42 variants escape the immune response induced by previous infection or vaccination.
 43 However, existing studies of neutralizing potency against SARS-CoV-2 variants are based
 44 on limited numbers of samples and lack comparability between different laboratory
 45 methods. Furthermore, there are no studies providing whole picture of neutralizing
 46 antibodies induced by prior infections or vaccination against emerging variants.
 47 Therefore, we systematically reviewed and quantitatively synthesized evidence on the
 48 degree to which antibodies from previous SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination
 49 effectively neutralize variants.

50

51 ***Added value of this study***

52 In this study, 56 studies, including 2,483 individuals and 8,590 neutralization tests, were
 53 identified. Antibodies from natural infection or vaccination are likely to effectively
 54 neutralize B.1.1.7, but neutralizing titers against B.1.351 and P1 suffered large
 55 reductions. Lineage B.1.351 escaped natural-infection-mediated neutralization the most,
 56 with GMT of 79.2 (95% CI: 68.5-91.6), while neutralizing antibody titers against the
 57 B.1.1.7 variant were largely preserved (254.6, 95% CI: 214.1-302.8). Compared with

lineage B, we estimate a 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.0-2.2) reduction in neutralization against the B.1.1.7, 8.7-fold (95% CI: 6.5-11.7) reduction against B.1.351 and 5.0-fold (95% CI: 4.0-6.2) reduction against P.1. The neutralizing antibody response after vaccinating with non-replicating vector vaccines against lineage B.1.351 was worse than responses elicited by vaccines on other platforms, with levels lower than that of individuals who were previously infected. The neutralizing antibodies induced by administration of inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were also remarkably reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.2-1.9).

Implications of all the available evidence

Our findings indicate that antibodies from natural infection of the parent lineage of SARS-CoV-2 or vaccination may be less able to neutralize some emerging variants, and antibody-based therapies may need to be updated. Furthermore, standardized protocols for neutralizing antibody testing against SARS-CoV-2 are needed to reduce lab-to-lab variations, thus facilitating comparability and interpretability across studies.

73 **Abstract**

74 **Background:** Immunity after SARS-CoV-2 infection or vaccination has been threatened
75 by recently emerged SARS-CoV-2 variants. A systematic summary of the landscape of
76 neutralizing antibodies against emerging variants is needed.

77 **Methods:** We systematically searched PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and 3
78 pre-print servers for studies that evaluated neutralizing antibodies titers induced by
79 previous infection or vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 variants and comprehensively
80 collected individual data. We calculated lineage-specific GMTs across different study
81 participants and types of neutralization assays.

82 **Findings:** We identified 56 studies, including 2,483 individuals and 8,590
83 neutralization tests, meeting the eligibility criteria. Compared with lineage B, we
84 estimate a 1.5-fold (95% CI: 1.0-2.2) reduction in neutralization against the B.1.1.7,
85 8.7-fold (95% CI: 6.5-11.7) reduction against B.1.351 and 5.0-fold (95% CI: 4.0-6.2)
86 reduction against P.1. The estimated neutralization reductions for B.1.351 compared to
87 lineage B were 240.2-fold (95% CI: 124.0-465.6) reduction for non-replicating vector
88 platform, 4.6-fold (95% CI: 4.0-5.2) reduction for RNA platform, and 1.6-fold (95% CI:
89 1.2-2.1) reduction for protein subunit platform. The neutralizing antibodies induced by
90 administration of inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were also
91 remarkably reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI:
92 1.2-1.9).

93 **Interpretation:** Our findings indicate that the antibody response established by
94 natural infection or vaccination might be able to effectively neutralize B.1.1.7, but

95 neutralizing titers against B.1.351 and P.1 suffered large reductions. Standardized
96 protocols for neutralization assays, as well as updating immune-based prevention and
97 treatment, are needed.

98 **Funding:** Chinese National Science Fund for Distinguished Young Scholars

99   **Introduction**

100   Since the first sequence of SARS-CoV-2 was published in January of 2020¹, over 1.1
 101   million strains have been documented in Global Influenza Surveillance and Response
 102   System (GISAID)², with recent reports of several newly emerged lineages, which has
 103   raised significant concerns globally. Of particular concern has been the emergence of
 104   lineage B.1.1.7 (UK variant, also known as 501Y.V1), lineage B.1.351 (South Africa
 105   variants, 501Y.V2), and lineage P.1 (Brazil variant, 501Y.V3), harboring several
 106   significant mutations in spike glycoproteins, which are key domains of virus-neutralizing
 107   antibodies³. These mutants rapidly became the dominant circulating virus strains in the
 108   regions where they were first isolated, and especially for B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, spread
 109   globally. Several vital mutations in the receptor-binding domain (RBD), such as N501Y in
 110   B.1.1.7 and E484K in B.1.351 and P.1, are associated with increased infectivity and
 111   decreased neutralizing potency, with potential to evade humoral immunity from prior
 112   infections or vaccinations⁴⁻⁸. Another variant of lineage B.1.427/B.1.429, which first
 113   emerged in California, was categorized as a Variant of Concern (VOC) in March 2021
 114   according to classification developed by SARS-CoV-2 Interagency Group (SIG) in United
 115   States, containing a single L452R mutation in RBD in spike, whose ability of reduced
 116   sensitivity to neutralization has yet to be determined⁹.

117

118   There is concern that SARS-CoV-2 variants can evade immune responses elicited by
 119   natural infections and vaccines that are based on the prototype strain (Wuhan-Hu-1). It
 120   has been shown that neutralization against variants by convalescent plasma is

121 remarkably reduced by several mutations, including E484K shared by lineage B.1.351
 122 and P.1¹⁰. Serum collected from recipients of licensed vaccines have a decreased ability
 123 to neutralize emerging SARS-CoV-2 mutants to varying degrees, from 1.6-fold reduction
 124 for China's protein subunit vaccines to over 6-fold reduction for mRNA vaccines¹¹⁻¹⁵.
 125 Additionally, consistent with immunogenicity results, a major loss of efficacy against
 126 B.1.351 was seen in NVX-CoV2373 and ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccines^{16,17}, though the
 127 efficacy was retained against B.1.1.7 for other vaccines¹⁸. However, existing studies of
 128 neutralizing potency against SARS-CoV-2 variants are based on limited numbers of
 129 samples and lack comparability between different laboratory methods. Furthermore,
 130 there are no studies providing whole picture of neutralizing antibodies induced by prior
 131 infections or vaccination against emerging variants.
 132
 133 Here, we systematically summarize the evidence on neutralization ability against
 134 various SARS-CoV-2 variants among those previously-infected with strains from the
 135 original SARS-CoV-2 lineage and those who have been vaccinated.

136   **Methods**

137   **Study Selection and Data Extraction**

138   We conducted a systematic search from six databases, including three peer-reviewed
 139   databases (PubMed, Embase and Web of Science) and three preprint servers (medRxiv,
 140   bioRxiv and Europe PMC), for studies published in English between Sep 1, 2020 and Apr
 141   18, 2021 with predefined search terms (**Table S1**). We included studies that 1) reported
 142   neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants by using serum or plasma collected
 143   from individuals with virologically or serologically-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infections,
 144   and vaccine recipients; and 2) reported or displayed individual antibody titers with
 145   summary tables or high-resolution images. Studies that 1) investigated the efficacy of
 146   monoclonal and therapeutic antibodies against variants; 2) reported seroprevalence of
 147   variants; 3) only detected non-neutralizing antibodies; or 4) reported specific mutation
 148   sites from a view of biological mechanism, were excluded. We also excluded abstracts of
 149   congress meetings or conference proceedings, study protocols, media news,
 150   commentaries, and reviews.

151

152   We screened all eligible studies to extract the study characteristics, study participants,
 153   types of variants, laboratory methods and antibody titers (**Table S2**). Data were
 154   digitized from the figures in papers by pre-trained investigators with a digital extraction
 155   tool if individual titer values were not available in table format¹⁹. We only extracted the
 156   titers expressed as reciprocal dilution of serum that neutralizes or inhibits 50% of the
 157   virus (e.g., NT50, PRNT50, etc.). When titers were not explicitly stated, but a category

defined as less than some value exists, we assumed a titer of half of this value (e.g., titer of 10 is assumed when “<20” was present). For individuals with multiple specimens, we only included one sample that most likely to have neutralization antibodies for each study participant to avoid repeated inclusion. The inclusion and exclusion of studies, screening and scrutinization of included studies, data extraction and verification were performed by two independent researchers, a third researcher was consulted when disagreement arose.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

The primary outcome variable was a pooled geometric mean titer (GMT), expressing an average level SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing titers for a group of individual titers. To be specific, we calculated lineage-specific GMT with extracted dataset across different study participants and types of neutralization assays, indicating three stratified factors (i.e., study participants, types of neutralization assays and lineages).

Individual-level data were classified into four groups (**Table S3**). Briefly, 1) non-variant-infected individuals, which indicates acutely-infected or convalescent COVID-19 patients infected with parental strains or asymptomatic cases infected with non-variants; 2) variant-infected individuals, which refers to individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 variants; 3) uninfected vaccine recipients, which refers to healthy vaccines who were not infected with either parental strains or the variants of SARS-CoV-2; 4) previously-infected vaccine recipients, which refers to vaccines who had been infected

180 with parental strains.

181

182 Among different study participants, we further stratified studies by types of

183 neutralization assays. Multiple neutralization assays used in included studies were

184 classified into three categories based on the type of virus (authentic or pseudo) used and

185 the types of vectors [lentivirus or vesicular stomatitis virus (VSV)] used in pseudovirus

186 neutralization assays, namely, live virus neutralization assays, lentivirus-vector

187 pseudovirus neutralization assays, and VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assays.

188

189 Within specific study participants and types of neutralization assays, we calculated

190 lineage-specific GMTs. The categories of SARS-CoV-2-variant lineages among included

191 studies was consistent with taxonomy and classification of Phylogenetic Assignment of

192 Named Global Outbreak Lineage (PANGO lineage)²⁰. Specifically, lineage B.1.1.117,

193 B.1.1.26, B.1.1.50, and B.1.1.29 served as the reference strains when comparing with

194 SARS-CoV-2 variants in some studies^{11,16,21,22}, and they were classified as lineage B.1 due

195 to close phylogenetic distance and shared mutation site of 614G^{22,23}. Emerging and

196 circulating SARS-CoV-2 variants have been divided into three classes by SIG: variant of

197 interest (VOI), variant of concern (VOC), and variant of high consequence (VOHC)²⁴. VOIs

198 include lineage B.1.526, B.1.525 and P.2, with increased transmissibility and disease

199 severity, and VOCs include lineage B.1.1.7, B.1.351, P.1, B.1.427, and B.1.429, with

200 significant reduction in neutralization and increased hospitalizations or deaths²⁴. At the

201 time of writing, no variants have been classified as VOHC²⁴. The classification of all

202 lineages involved in eligible studies were shown in **Table S4**.

203

204 For non-variant-infected subjects, we further explored potential determinants affecting

205 the GMT, such as the sampling interval post symptom onset, and disease severity.

206 Disease severity was assessed by classifying individuals as either hospitalized or

207 non-hospitalized, based on World Health Organization COVID-19 Clinical management

208 criteria²⁵. We divided the post-symptom-onset sampling interval into three periods (i.e.,

209 0-30 days, 31-90 days, and >90 days) according to the distribution of sampling times in

210 the extracted data (**Figure S9**). We stratified the uninfected vaccine recipients by

211 vaccine platforms (e.g., non-replicating vector, RNA, inactivated, and subunit protein)

212 and the sampling interval post vaccination (i.e., <14 days, 14-90 days, and >90 days)

213 based on a study that evaluated antibody persistence through 6 months after

214 vaccination²⁶. Furthermore, we conducted a matched analysis for samples that had been

215 tested simultaneously against reference strains and variants and calculated the fold

216 changes of GMT.

217

218 **Statistical Analysis**

219 We first performed univariate subgroup analysis, then used multivariate linear

220 regression models to control for potential confounding among non-variant-infected

221 individuals and uninfected vaccinees to quantitatively explore potential factors that may

222 affect GMT. For the multivariate regression model, we included pango lineage, vaccine

223 platform, sampling interval after last dose, and sampling intervals post symptom onset,

224 and disease severity with available data. GMT was calculated as arithmetic mean of
 225 log-transformed titer based on natural logarithm form, and t-test 95% CI was estimated.
 226 Statistical significance was tested by Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test with Nemenyi's
 227 post-hoc test. For paired samples, we used Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-rank test.
 228 Only P-value less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$,
 229 **, $P \leq 0.001$, ***). All statistical analyses were done using R (version 4.0.1).

230 **Results**

231 **Study selection and data extraction**

232 We identified a total of 5,182 studies after systematically searching multiple data
 233 sources with 2,307 coming from peer-reviewed databases, and 2,875 from preprint
 234 servers (**Figure 1**). After screening title, abstract, and full-text, 56 studies containing a
 235 total of 2,483 individuals and 8,590 neutralization measurements were included in our
 236 analysis, with previously uninfected vaccine recipients comprising more than half of
 237 studies (44 studies; 4,697/8,590 samples, 54.7%), followed by non-variant-infected
 238 individuals (41 studies; 3,440/8,590 samples, 40.0%), variant-infected individuals (8
 239 studies; 288/8,590 samples, 3.4%), and previously-infected vaccine recipients (6 studies;
 240 165/8,590 samples, 1.9%) (**Figure 1**). Live virus neutralization assays were most
 241 common (24 studies, 24/56, 42.9%), followed by lentivirus-vector pseudovirus
 242 neutralization assay (22 studies, 22/56, 39.3%) and VSV-vector pseudovirus
 243 neutralization assay (13 studies, 13/56, 23.2%) (**Table S7**). The lineage B.1.1.7 and
 244 B.1.351 were the two SARS-CoV-2 variants that had been studied the most, comprising
 245 more than two third of studies (B.1.1.7: 37 studies, 66.1%; B.1.351: 40 studies, 71.4%)
 246 and nearly half of measurements (B.1.1.7: 1,852 measurements, 21.6%; B.1.351: 2,422
 247 measurements, 28.2%) (**Table S7**). Other VOCs, such as lineage P.1 and B.1.427/B.1.429
 248 were the subject of 20 studies including 863 data points (**Table S7**).

250 **Level of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants among**

251 **non-variant-infected individuals**

Overall, among studies that evaluated neutralizing antibodies in individuals previously infected with nonvariants, 26.3% (5/19), 95.7% (22/23), and 88.9% (8/9) of the studies found a significant decrease in neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1, respectively. The neutralization levels of 6.2% (47/757), 20.0% (204/1,028), and 6.4% (16/249) samples against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 were reduced to below the limitation of detection.

In aggregate, neutralizing titers against B.1.351 were significantly reduced, followed by P.1, while titers against B.1.17 were not, when compared to reference lineages titers. With live virus neutralization assays, the pooled GMT was 254.6 (95% CI: 214.1-302.8) for lineage B.1.1.7, 79.2 (95% CI: 68.5-91.6) for B.1.351, 253.1 (95% CI: 194.9-328.8) for P.1, and 275.5 (95% CI: 146.4-518.5) for B.1.427/B.1.429, with an average of 3.4-fold (95% CI: 3.0-4.0) in B.1.351 when comparing to lineage B (**Figure 2A**). The decrease in neutralization for B.1.351 (3.5, 95% CI: 3.0-4.0) is similar when compared to lineage B.1, which has the 614G mutation. In matched analyses, the reduction in the ability of neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 was 1.5 (95% CI: 1.0-2.2), 8.7 (95% CI: 6.5-11.7) and 5.0-fold (95% CI: 4.0-6.2) compared with lineage B (**Figure S2**). For lentivirus-vector pseudovirus assays, the average reductions of GMT were 8.1-9.7 fold, 4.2-5.1 fold, and 1.4-1.6 fold for lineage B.1.351, P.1, and B.1.1.7 compared to lineage B/B.1/B+D614G (**Figure 2B**). In terms of VSV-vector pseudovirus assays, the average reductions of GMT were 2.0-12.3 fold, 1.2-7.9 fold, and 1.2-7.5 fold for lineage B.1.351, P.1, and B.1.1.7 respectively when compared to reference strains (**Figure 2C**).

274

275 Serum collected from individuals infected with SARS-CoV-2 variants show increased
276 neutralizing antibodies level against corresponding mutant strains (**Figure S3**). Notably,
277 B.1.1.7-infected persons also show significant decreased neutralizing antibodies titers
278 against B.1.351 (**Figure S3**). Multivariate analysis also indicated B.1.351 had significantly
279 reduced neutralizing activity for all three neutralization assays after controlling for
280 sampling intervals post symptom onset and/or clinical severity, compared to reference
281 lineages (**Table S8**).

282

283 **Level of neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants among vaccine** 284 **recipients**

285 Significant reductions in neutralization against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and P.1 were found in
286 48.1% (13/27), 100.0% (26/26) and 66.7% (6/9) of the studies in SARS-CoV-2 naïve
287 vaccine recipients, respectively. Partial reductions reached the background levels, with
288 the proportion of 4.0 (41/1,014), 19.1 (237/1,239), and 11.3 (32/281) against B.1.1.7,
289 B.1.351 and P.1, respectively.

290

291 Serum collected from uninfected vaccine recipients had diverse neutralizing antibody
292 levels against SARS-CoV-2 variants across different vaccine platforms. In studies using
293 the live virus neutralization assay, the non-replicating adenoviral vectored vaccine
294 showed generally low GMT against B.1.351 in contrast to other vaccine delivery
295 platforms, with an average of GMTs of 2.1 (95% CI: 1.1-4.1), 70.9 (95% CI: 50.8-98.9),

296 85.9 (95% CI: 75.9-97.2), and 66.6 (95% CI: 51.0-86.9) for platforms of non-replicating
297 vector, inactivated virus, RNA, and protein subunit, respectively (**Figure 3A**). Using
298 lineage B as a reference lineage, we found that the average reduction fold of neutralizing
299 antibodies against B.1.351 was 240.2-fold (95% CI: 124.0-465.6) for non-replicating
300 vector platform, 4.6-fold (95% CI: 4.0-5.2) for RNA platform, and 1.6-fold (95% CI:
301 1.2-2.1) for protein subunit platform (**Figure 3A**). The neutralizing antibodies induced
302 by administration of inactivated vaccines and mRNA vaccines against lineage P.1 were
303 also remarkably reduced by an average of 5.9-fold (95% CI: 3.7-9.3) and 1.5-fold (95% CI:
304 1.2-1.9) (**Figure 3A**).

305
306 In paired-sample analysis, neutralizing titers induced by mRNA vaccine were reduced
307 3.1-fold (95% CI: 2.4-3.9) against B.1.1.7, 2.7-fold (95% CI: 2.3-3.2) against P.1, and
308 7.4-fold (95% CI: 6.4-8.5) against B.1.351, compared to prototype strain Wuhan-Hu-1
309 that was used for vaccine design (**Figure S4**). In comparison to lineage B+D614G,
310 significant reductions of antibody levels elicited by all included vaccine platforms
311 against lineage B.1.351 were also found in two pseudovirus neutralization assays
312 ($P<0.05$). Neutralizing antibodies against lentiviral-encapsulated P.1, P.2, and
313 B.1.427/B.1.429 were also significantly reduced when comparing to lineage B+614G
314 ($P<0.01$) (**Figure 3B**). Additionally, antibodies in serum collected from
315 previously-infected vaccine recipients receiving RNA vaccines or non-replicating-vector
316 vaccines were significantly higher than uninfected vaccine recipients in pseudovirus
317 assays (**Figure S7**). In multivariate regression mode, we found that B.1.351, P.1 and

318 B.1.427/1.429 had significant lower GMT of neutralizing antibodies assessed by live
319 virus neutralization assay, and we found that other vaccine platform shows significant
320 higher antibody level than non-replicating-vector vaccine across all included virus
321 strains (**Table S9**).

322

323 **Comparison between GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by natural infection** 324 **and vaccination**

325 Comparisons of the GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by natural infections
326 (non-variant-infected individuals) and vaccination (uninfected vaccine recipients)
327 showed that individuals infected with parental strains had similar antibodies titers with
328 individuals vaccinated with mRNA vaccines, but significantly higher antibodies titers
329 than individuals administrated with non-replicating vector vaccines against lineage B.1,
330 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, when using live virus neutralization assay to detect neutralizing
331 antibodies (**Figure 4A**). No significant differences between titers were found between
332 non-variant-infected individuals and RNA vaccine-recipients against B.1.1.7, B.1.351 and
333 P.1 tested by VSV-based pseudovirus neutralization assays (**Figure 4C**).

334

335 **Discussion**

336 Overall, we comprehensively estimate the antibody levels against preexisting
337 SARS-CoV-2 viruses and recently emerging variants among different study participants
338 using neutralizing antibodies as a protective biomarker. Our analyses found that
339 antibodies in both naturally-infected and vaccine-immune sera/plasma had slightly

340 reduced but largely retained neutralizing activity against B.1.1.7. The neutralizing
341 potency against B.1.351 and P.1 was significantly reduced compared to reference
342 lineages. The antibody response after vaccinating with non-replicating vector vaccines
343 against lineage B.1.351 was worse than responses elicited by vaccines on other
344 platforms, and the level of neutralizing antibodies is lower than that of individuals who
345 were previously infected. This finding suggests that immunity derived from natural
346 infection or vaccination might be less able to neutralize some recently emerging variants,
347 and antibody-based therapies may need to be updated.

348

349 Neutralizing antibodies titers induced from both natural infections and vaccination
350 against B.1.351 and P.1 were significantly lower than that against other variants or
351 reference strains, mainly due to mutations in spike protein that were associated with
352 decreased neutralizing potency to evade humoral immunity (e.g., E484K)²⁷. However,
353 the decrease of neutralizing potency was more obvious in B.1.351 than P.1, although both
354 variants shared the E484K mutation, which could be partly explained by the distinct set
355 of other mutations and/or deletions in the NTD region or enhanced neutralization of P.1
356 by anti-RBD antibodies that bind outside of the RBD²⁸. We found that convalescent and
357 vaccine-induced immune sera had neutralizing potency against B.1.1.7 and B.1.427/
358 B.1.429 that are comparable with reference strains, suggesting that those mutations do
359 not remarkably affect neutralizing activity. While mutations at 501 can increase affinity
360 for angiotensin converting enzyme 2 (ACE2) and enhance transmissibility of B.1.1.7²⁹⁻³¹,
361 variants of B.1.427/B.1.429 bearing spike mutations L452R, S13I, and W152C were only

362 associated with modest increases in secondary household attack rates, while no
363 evidence of reduced neutralization capacity for these L452R SARS-CoV-2 variants were
364 found³². However, continued vigilance is warranted given the potential for further
365 mutations that might affect the immunogenicity of the vaccines or reduce the
366 cross-reactivity of previously-induced antibodies by natural infections.

367
368 Both previous infection and vaccination have been shown to provide potent protection
369 against similar strains, but it is unclear how neutralizing antibodies against variants
370 induced by natural infection and vaccination might be different. For the other two most
371 prevalent variants, B.1.1.7 and B.1.351, natural infection-induced sera/plasma had
372 significantly higher neutralizing levels than that attained by those vaccinated with
373 non-replicating vector vaccine in live virus neutralization assay. Additionally, antibodies
374 induced by RNA-vaccine had similar neutralizing level with antibodies derived from
375 naturally-infected individuals against prevalent variants. This suggests that the
376 neutralizing potency elicited by natural infection of previous prototype strains is
377 relatively robust, whereas the immunity induced by vaccination depends on vaccine
378 platform.

379
380 Although some studies have shown that the neutralization levels from live virus and
381 pseudovirus correlate well,³³⁻³⁵ we stratified the results by each of three neutralization
382 assays to enhance comparability. The results from live virus assays could provide a
383 comprehensive way to assess inherent viral fitness and the potential impact of other

384 mutations outside the spike region^{6,33-35}. However, even within the same live virus
 385 neutralization test, different methods were used for experimental endpoints (e.g.,
 386 cytopathic effect, fluorescence, etc.), and to report their final individual titers (e.g., NT50,
 387 NT80, etc.). In addition, experimental procedures, such as virus titration, serum dilution,
 388 virus-serum neutralization, varied greatly across reports from different laboratories.
 389 Thus far, there is no integrated or standardized operation procedure for SARS-CoV-2
 390 neutralization assay (neither live virus nor pseudovirus), making comparison between
 391 studies difficult. International efforts to standardize laboratory methods for SARS-CoV-2
 392 neutralization tests are urgently needed. The previous work by WHO in standardizing
 393 procedures for avian influenza neutralization assays provides one useful example.^{36,37}

394
 395 Our study has several limitations. First, this study synthesized different neutralization
 396 assay results to estimate pooled GMTs. While we stratified analyses by neutralization
 397 assays according to virus types and vectors to get the most comparable results,
 398 significant variation between assays persists. Second, in many studies, individual-level
 399 details were not reported, thus limiting our ability to adjust for potential confounding
 400 factors in multivariate regression. We tried to contact study authors, but the response
 401 rate was generally low. Thirdly, we did not assess the impact of preexisting cellular
 402 immunity, which could provide a degree of protection as reported in previous studies³⁸.

403
 404 In conclusion, our study provides a comprehensive mapping of the neutralizing potency
 405 against SARS-CoV-2 variants induced by natural infection or vaccination. Our findings

406 suggest that immune sera/plasma retained most of its neutralizing potency against
 407 B.1.1.7 and B.1.427 / B.1.429 variants, but significantly lost neutralizing potency against
 408 B.1.351 and P.1 variants, with B.1.351 having the worst reductions. The evolution of
 409 SARS-CoV-2 lineage is still in process, and it's unknown whether long-term
 410 accumulation of mutations can erode the neutralizing effectiveness of natural and
 411 vaccine elicited immunity, especially in the context of waning immunity. Therefore,
 412 longitudinal monitoring of emerging variants and antibody-induced immunity is of high
 413 importance, and standardized protocols for neutralizing antibody testing against
 414 SARS-CoV-2 are urgently needed.

415 **Contributors**

416 H.Y. designed and supervised the study. X.C. and Z.C. did the literature search, set
417 up the database and did all statistical analyses. X.C., Z.C., A.S.A., and D.T.L.
418 co-drafted the first version of the article. X.C., Z.C., R.S., W.L., N.Z., J.Z., Q.W., X.D.,
419 Z.Z., X.C, S.G., and helped with checking data and did the figures. D.T.L., A.S.A., J.Y,
420 and H.Y. commented on the data and its interpretation, revised the content
421 critically. All authors contributed to review and revision and approved the final
422 manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

423

424 **Declaration of interests**

425 H.Y. has received research funding from Sanofi Pasteur, and Shanghai Roche
426 Pharmaceutical Company; D.T.L. and A.S.A. has received research funding from
427 the US National Institutes of Health. None of those research funding is related to
428 COVID-19. All other authors report no competing interests.

429

430 **Role of the funding source**

431 The funder had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data
432 interpretation, or writing of the report. The corresponding author had full access
433 to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
434 for publication.

435

436 **Acknowledgments**

437 We thank Junbo Chen, Qianli Wang, and Yuxia Liang from the Fudan University.
 438 This study was funded by the National Science Fund for Distinguished Young
 439 Scholars (grant no. 81525023), Program of Shanghai Academic/Technology
 440 Research Leader (grant no. 18XD1400300), National Science and Technology
 441 Major project of China (grant no. 2018ZX10713001-007, 2017ZX10103009-005,
 442 2018ZX10201001-010), the US National Institutes of Health (R01 AI135115 to
 443 D.T.L. and A.S.A.)
 444

445   **References**

- 446   1.   Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, et al. A new coronavirus associated with human
447   respiratory disease in China. *Nature* 2020; **579**(7798): 265-9.
- 448   2.   Elbe S, Buckland-Merrett G. Data, disease and diplomacy: GISAID's innovative
449   contribution to global health. 2017; **1**(1): 33-46.
- 450   3.   Du L, He Y, Zhou Y, Liu S, Zheng BJ, Jiang S. The spike protein of SARS-CoV--a
451   target for vaccine and therapeutic development. *Nature reviews Microbiology*
452   2009; **7**(3): 226-36.
- 453   4.   Weisblum Y, Schmidt F, Zhang F, et al. Escape from neutralizing antibodies by
454   SARS-CoV-2 spike protein variants. *eLife* 2020; **9**.
- 455   5.   Leung K, Shum MH, Leung GM, Lam TT, Wu JT. Early transmissibility
456   assessment of the N501Y mutant strains of SARS-CoV-2 in the United Kingdom,
457   October to November 2020. *Euro Surveill* 2021; **26**(1).
- 458   6.   Planas D, Bruel T, Grzelak L, et al. Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7
459   and B.1.351 variants to neutralizing antibodies. *Nat Med* 2021.
- 460   7.   Supasa P, Zhou D, Dejnirattisai W, et al. Reduced neutralization of
461   SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 variant by convalescent and vaccine sera. *Cell* 2021.
- 462   8.   Wang P, Nair MS, Liu L, et al. Antibody Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 Variants
463   B.1.351 and B.1.1.7. *Nature* 2021.
- 464   9.   Li Q, Wu J, Nie J, et al. The Impact of Mutations in SARS-CoV-2 Spike on Viral
465   Infectivity and Antigenicity. *Cell* 2020; **182**(5): 1284-94.e9.
- 466   10. Greaney AJ, Loes AN, Crawford KHD, et al. Comprehensive mapping of

- 467 mutations to the SARS-CoV-2 receptor-binding domain that affect recognition by
- 468 polyclonal human serum antibodies. *Cell host & microbe* 2021:
- 469 2020.12.31.425021.
- 470 11. Huang B, Dai L, Wang H, et al. Neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 VOC 501Y.V2 by
- 471 human antisera elicited by both inactivated BBIBP-CorV and recombinant
- 472 dimeric RBD ZF2001 vaccines. 2021: 2021.02.01.429069.
- 473 12. Liu Y, Liu J, Xia H, et al. Neutralizing Activity of BNT162b2-Elicited Serum —
- 474 Preliminary Report. *NEJM* 2021.
- 475 13. Wu K, Werner AP, Moliva JI, et al. mRNA-1273 vaccine induces neutralizing
- 476 antibodies against spike mutants from global SARS-CoV-2 variants. *NEJM* 2021:
- 477 2021.01.25.427948.
- 478 14. Wu K, Werner AP, Koch M, et al. Serum Neutralizing Activity Elicited by
- 479 mRNA-1273 Vaccine. 2021.
- 480 15. Wang GL, Wang ZY, Duan LJ, et al. Susceptibility of Circulating SARS-CoV-2
- 481 Variants to Neutralization. *N Engl J Med* 2021.
- 482 16. Madhi SA, Baillie V, Cutland CL, et al. Efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19
- 483 Covid-19 Vaccine against the B.1.351 Variant. 2021.
- 484 17. Shinde V, Bhikha S, Hossain Z, et al. Preliminary Efficacy of the NVX-CoV2373
- 485 Covid-19 Vaccine Against the B.1.351 Variant. *MedRxiv* 2021.
- 486 18. Tarke A, Sidney J, Methot N, et al. Negligible impact of SARS-CoV-2 variants
- 487 on CD4+ and CD8+ T cell reactivity in COVID-19 exposed donors and vaccinees.
- 488 bioRxiv; 2021.

19. Rohatgi A. WebPlotDigitizer. 2020.
<https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/citation.html> (accessed Mar 1 2021).
20. Rambaut A, Holmes EC, O'Toole Á, et al. A dynamic nomenclature proposal for SARS-CoV-2 lineages to assist genomic epidemiology. *Nature microbiology* 2020; **5**(11): 1403-7.
21. Becker M, Dulovic A, Junker D, et al. Immune response to SARS-CoV-2 variants of concern in vaccinated individuals. 2021: 2021.03.08.21252958.
22. Cele S, Gazy I, Jackson L, et al. Escape of SARS-CoV-2 501Y.V2 from neutralization by convalescent plasma. 2021: 2021.01.26.21250224.
23. Elbe S, Buckland-Merrett G. Data, disease and diplomacy: GISAID's innovative contribution to global health. *Global challenges (Hoboken, NJ)* 2017; **1**(1): 33-46.
24. CDC U. SARS-CoV-2 Variant Classifications and Definitions. 2021.
<https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/variant-surveillance/variant-info.html> (accessed Mar 24 2021).
25. WHO. COVID-19 clinical management. 2021.
<https://www.who.int/teams/health-care-readiness-clinical-unit/covid-19> (accessed Mar 24 2021).
26. Doria-Rose N, Suthar MS, Makowski M, et al. Antibody Persistence through 6 Months after the Second Dose of mRNA-1273 Vaccine for Covid-19. 2021.
27. Liu Z, VanBlargan LA, Bloyet L-M, et al. Identification of SARS-CoV-2 spike mutations that attenuate monoclonal and serum antibody neutralization. *Cell host & microbe* 2021; **29**(3): 477-88.e4.

- 511 28. Chen RE, Zhang X, Case JB, et al. Resistance of SARS-CoV-2 variants to
512 neutralization by monoclonal and serum-derived polyclonal antibodies. *Nature*
513 *Medicine* 2021.
- 514 29. Starr TN, Greaney AJ, Hilton SK, et al. Deep Mutational Scanning of
515 SARS-CoV-2 Receptor Binding Domain Reveals Constraints on Folding and ACE2
516 Binding. *Cell* 2020; **182**(5): 1295-310.e20.
- 517 30. Davies NG, Abbott S, Barnard RC, et al. Estimated transmissibility and impact
518 of SARS-CoV-2 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Science* 2021; **372**(6538).
- 519 31. Volz E, Mishra S, Chand M, et al. Assessing transmissibility of SARS-CoV-2
520 lineage B.1.1.7 in England. *Nature* 2021.
- 521 32. Peng J, Liu J, Mann SA, et al. Estimation of secondary household attack rates
522 for emergent spike L452R SARS-CoV-2 variants detected by genomic surveillance
523 at a community-based testing site in San Francisco. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021.
- 524 33. Rogers TF, Zhao F, Huang D, et al. Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing
525 antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. *Science* 2020;
526 **369**(6506): 956.
- 527 34. Sholukh AM, Fiore-Gartland A, Ford ES, et al. Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2
528 neutralization assays for antibody monitoring in natural infection and vaccine
529 trials. *medRxiv* 2020.
- 530 35. Riepler L, Rossler A, Falch A, et al. Comparison of Four SARS-CoV-2
531 Neutralization Assays. *Vaccines (Basel)* 2020; **9**(1).
- 532 36. World Health Organization (WHO). Serological detection of avian influenza

533 A(H7N9) virus infections by modified horse red blood cells
534 haemagglutination-inhibition assay. 2013.
535 [https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf)
536 [_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_hai_a_h7n9_20131220.pdf) (Accessed 20 December 2019).
537 37. World Health Organization (WHO). Serological detection of avian influenza
538 A(H7N9) infections by microneutralization assay. 2013.
539 [https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis mic](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_microneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf)
540 [roneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf](https://www.who.int/influenza/gisrs_laboratory/cnic_serological_diagnosis_microneutralization_a_h7n9.pdf) (Accessed 20 December 2019).
541 38. Motozono C, Toyoda M, Zahradnik J, et al. An emerging SARS-CoV-2 mutant
542 evading cellular immunity and increasing viral infectivity. 2021:
543 2021.04.02.438288.
544

545 **Figure legends**

546 **Figure 1. Selection flowchart of studies, study participants, and variants**

547 **studied.**

548

549 **Figure 2. Neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants in**

550 **non-variant-infected individuals.** Neutralizing antibodies against reference

551 strains (blue dot) and variants of concern (red dot) were determined in **A)** live

552 virus neutralization assay, **B)** lentivirus-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay,

553 and **C)** VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay. The solid point represents

554 the GMT and the error bar represents the 95% confidence interval. The

555 scattering dot represents individual titers. The numbers in the bottom orange

556 rectangle represent the number of studies and sample sizes (no. of studies/no. of

557 samples). Significant statistical differences are indicated by asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *;

558 $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***).

559

560 **Figure 3. Neutralizing antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 variants in uninfected**

561 **vaccine recipients after the administration of different vaccine platforms.**

562 Neutralizing antibodies against reference strains (blue dot), variants of concern

563 (red dot), variants of interest (green dot), and other variants (black dot) were

564 determined in **A)** live virus neutralization assay, **B)** lentivirus-vector pseudovirus

565 neutralization assay, and **C)** VSV-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay. The

566 solid point represents the geometric mean titer (GMT) and the error bar

567 represents the 95% confidence interval. The scattering dot represents individual
568 titers. The numbers in the bottom orange rectangle represent the number of
569 studies and sample sizes (no. of studies/no. of samples). Significant statistical
570 differences are indicated by asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***).

571

572 **Fig 4. Comparison between GMT of neutralizing antibodies induced by**
573 **natural infection and vaccination by platforms.** Neutralizing antibodies
574 comparison were determined in **A)** live virus neutralization assay, **B)**
575 lentivirus-vector pseudovirus neutralization assay, and **C)** VSV-vector
576 pseudovirus neutralization assay. Neutralization against same lineage induced by
577 natural infection and different platforms of vaccination was compared. The solid
578 point represents the GMT and the error bar represents the 95% confidence
579 interval. The scattering dot represents individual titers. The numbers in the
580 bottom orange rectangle represent the number of studies and sample sizes (no.
581 of studies/no. of samples). Significant statistical differences are indicated by
582 asterisks ($P \leq 0.05$, *; $P \leq 0.01$, **; $P \leq 0.001$, ***). N-R vector, non-replicating
583 vector.

A. Live virus neutralization assay

B. Lentivirus-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay

C. VSV-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay

A. Live virus neutralization assay

B. Lentivirus-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay

C. VSV-vector Pseudovirus neutralization assay