

FULL TITLE: Immune responses of the third dose of AZD1222 vaccine or BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine after two doses of CoronaVac vaccines against Delta and Omicron variants

Running Header: Real-world COVID-19 Vaccine Effectiveness in Southeast Asia

Authors: Suvimol Niyomnaitham^{1#}, Anan Jongkaewwattana^{2#}, Atibordee Meesing³, Sarunyou Chusri⁴, Sira Nanthapisal⁵, Nattiya Hirankarn⁶, Sarawut Siwamogsatham⁷, Suppachok Kirdlarp⁸, Romanee Chaiwarith⁹, Saranath Lawpoolsri Niyom¹⁰, Arunee Thitithanyanont¹¹, Pokrath Hansasuta¹², Kanokwan Pornprasit¹³, Sansanee Chaiyaroj¹⁴, Punnee Pitisuttithum^{15*}

Affiliations:

¹ Department of Pharmacology, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

² National Center for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, National Science and Technology Development Agency, Pathumthani, Thailand

³ Faculty of Medicine, Khon Kaen University, Khon Kaen, Thailand

⁴ Clinical research center, Faculty of Medicine, Prince of Songkla University, Songkhla, Thailand

⁵ Clinical Research center, Faculty of Medicine, Thammasat University, Pathumthani, Thailand

⁶ Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

⁷ Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Clinical Research Center, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

⁸ Chakri Naruebodindra Medical Institute, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Samut Prakarn, Thailand

⁹ Division of Infectious Diseases and Tropical Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai University, Chiang Mai, Thailand

¹⁰ Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

¹¹ Faculty of Science, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

¹² Division of Virology, Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand

¹³ Clinixir Co., Ltd., Bangkok, Thailand

¹⁴ Department of Microbiology, Faculty of Science, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

¹⁵ Vaccine Trial Centre, Faculty of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

*Correspondence: punnee.pit@mahidol.ac.th

These authors contributed equally

Competing Interest Statement. All authors report no relevant disclosures.

Funding Statement: Funding was provided by the Program Management Unit for Competitiveness Enhancement (PMU-C) National research, National Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation Policy Council, Thailand through Clinixir Ltd.

Role of the Funding Source: PMU-C funded the trial but had no other involvement in the study. Clinixir provided logistical and monitoring supports.

Author Contributions: The authors were involved in the study design; in the interpretation of data; in reviewing the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. All authors had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Acknowledgment: The authors wish to thank the staff of all seven medical schools, Clinixir, Biotec, MHSRI and Faculty of Science, Mahidol University and Shawna Tan of Medical Writers Asia for assisting in drafting manuscript.

Word Count: 3761 (limit: 4500 for randomised controlled trials)

ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05049226

The protocol has received approval from Central and each Institutional Ethical Review Boards.

All participants had signed consent forms before enrolling into the study

Abstract (245 of 250 WORDS)

Summary.

Half-dose AZD1222 or BNT162b2 boosters maintained immunogenicity and safety, and were non-inferior to full doses. All doses elicited high immunogenicity and best with extended post-CoronaVac primary-series intervals (120-180 days) and high-transmissibility Omicron.

Methods.

At 60-to-<90, 90-to-<120, or 120-to-180 days ('intervals') post-CoronaVac primary-series, participants were randomized to full-dose or half-dose AZD1222 or BNT162b2, and followed up at day-28, -60 and -90. Vaccination-induced immunogenicity to Ancestral, Delta and Omicron BA.1 strains were evaluated by assessing anti-spike ('anti-S'), anti-nucleocapsid antibodies, pseudovirus neutralization ('PVNT'), micro-neutralization titers, and T-cells assays. Descriptive statistics and non-inferiority cut-offs were reported as geometric mean concentration (GMC) or titer (GMT) and GMC/GMT ratios comparing baseline to day-28 and day-90 seroresponses, and different intervals post-CoronaVac primary-series. Omicron immunogenicity was only evaluated in full-dose recipients.

Findings.

No serious or severe vaccine-related safety events occurred. All assays and intervals showed non-inferior immunogenicity between full-doses and half-doses. However, full-dose vaccines and/or longer, 120-to-180-day intervals substantially improved immunogenicity (in GMC measured by anti-S assays or GMT measured by PVNT50; $p < 0.001$). Within platforms and

regardless of dose or platform, seroconversions were over 97%, and over 90% for pseudovirus neutralizing antibodies, but similar against the SARS-CoV-2 strains. Immunogenicity waned more quickly with half-doses than full-doses between day 60-to-90 follow-ups, but remained high against Ancestral or Delta strains. Against Omicron, the day-28 immunogenicity increased with longer intervals than shorter intervals for full-dose vaccines.

Interpretation.

Combining heterologous schedules, fractional dosing, and extended post-second dose intervals, broadens population-level protection and prevents disruptions, especially in resource-limited settings.

Funding.

Funding was provided by the Program Management Unit for Competitiveness Enhancement (PMU-C) National research, National Higher Education, Science, Research and Innovation Policy Council, Thailand through Clinixir Ltd.

Research in Context

Evidence before this study:

1. Although nAb titers from CoronaVac primary series waned after 3-4 months, nAb were more increased when boosted at 8 months than at 2 months post-primary series.
2. Six months post-vaccination with a one-fourth dose of primary mRNA-1273, nAb responses were half as robust as full doses, but VE was over 80% of that of full-dose vaccinations.
3. Thai adults boosted with 30µg-BNT162b2 and 15µg-BNT162b2 at 8-12 weeks after two-dose CoronaVac or AZD1222 had high antibodies to the virus receptor-binding domain, nAb titers against all variants, and T-cell responses.
4. Third-dose boosting at a 44–45-week interval significantly increased antibody levels compared to boosting at 15-25-week or 8-12-week intervals.
5. A third dose of CoronaVac administered eight months after the second dose increased antibody levels more than when administered at two months, while antibody responses were two-fold higher with a booster dose of AZD1222 administered at a 12-weeks or longer interval than a 6-weeks or shorter interval. Error! Bookmark not defined.
6. In the UK, third doses of AZD1222 led to higher antibody levels that correlated with high efficacy and T-cell responses, after a prolonged, dose-stretched interval between vaccine doses, than shorter intervals.
7. Omicron-neutralizing antibodies were detected in only 56% of short-interval vaccine recipients versus all (100%) prolonged-interval vaccine recipients, 69% of whom also demonstrated Omicron-neutralizing antibodies at 4-6 months post-booster.
8. Israeli studies noted a restoration of antibody levels and enhanced immunogenic protection against severe disease when a second booster (fourth dose) was given 4 months or longer after a first booster, with no new safety concerns.

Added value of this study:

There were no studies designed specifically aimed to analyzed non inferiority between the full dose and half dose of AZD1222 or BNT162b2 boosters after CoronaVac two doses which is important research question when we started the study and the situation of limited vaccine supply, global inequity and high disease burden in the Lower middle-income countries

Data on the optimal prime-boost interval is limited, especially data that combines lower (fractional) dosing from resource-limited countries, which is provided by our study.

Implications of all the available evidence:

We confirm the feasibility of a booster strategy that accounts for the needs of resource-limitations, through the use of fractional dosing, dose-stretching and heterologous schedules, which can broaden population-level protection and prevent vaccination disruptions.

1 *Introduction*

2 COVID-19 vaccines approved in Thailand include the mRNA-based vaccines, BNT162b2 ('PF';
3 Pfizer Inc, New York, United States, US; BioNTech Manufacturing GmbH, Mainz, Germany) and
4 mRNA-1273 (Moderna Inc, Cambridge, US); the inactivated virus vaccine, CoronaVac (Sinovac
5 Biotech, Beijing, China); and the adenovirus vector vaccine, AZD1222 ('AZ'; Oxford-AstraZeneca,
6 United Kingdom, UK). However, variants of concern like Delta (B.1.617.2) and Omicron, especially
7 BA.1 (B.1.1.529), are driving infection surges amid waning vaccine effectiveness (VE)¹. Although
8 Thailand has administered over 136 million vaccine doses, Omicron has increased deaths slightly
9 among elderly, bedridden individuals, highlighting a need to sustain vaccinations. Thailand used
10 CoronaVac widely but its immunogenicity and VE are inconsistent or limited.² In China³ and
11 Chile⁴, 2-dose CoronaVac (known as 'primary series') neutralizing antibody (nAb) titres were
12 lowest against Delta, resulting in breakthrough infections, severe COVID-19 disease and deaths.
13 Although nAb titres from CoronaVac primary-series waned after 3-4 months, nAb were increased
14 more substantially when boosters were administered at 8 months than at 2 months post-primary
15 series⁵.

16
17 In 2021, Thailand initiated heterologous regimens with AZD1222, BNT162b2 or mRNA-1273, but
18 was limited by mRNA vaccine shortages. While COVID-19 vaccines are widely available in many
19 Western countries, vaccine inequity and supply constraints remain problematic in many low- and
20 middle-income countries. Thus, different vaccination strategies should be explored, including
21 extended dosing intervals (or dose-stretching), dose reductions or fractional dosing, and vaccine
22 platform combinations. Fractional dosing conserves supplies while increasing coverage without

23 compromising immunogenicity, and can help resource-limited countries extend supplies and
24 reduce mortality.^{6,7} Fractional dosing may also broaden population coverage and facilitate herd
25 immunity, as has been proven in polio. In the COVID-19 pandemic, 6 months post-vaccination
26 with a fractional one-fourth dose of primary mRNA-1273 regimens, nAb responses were half as
27 robust as full doses, but VE was over 80% of that of full-dose vaccinations⁸. During the AZD1222
28 trials in UK recipients inadvertently primed with half doses and subsequently administered full-
29 dose boosters, VE was 90% (95%CI: 67-97).⁹ Thai adults boosted with 30µg-BNT162b2 and 15µg-
30 BNT162b2 8-12 weeks after two-dose CoronaVac or AZD1222, had high anti-receptor-binding
31 domain (anti-RBD) IgG concentrations¹⁰, nAb titres against all variants, and T-cell responses^{11,12}.
32 Reducing vaccine doses does not necessarily reduce VE, and lower doses could quickly increase
33 the immunity of at-risk populations when vaccine supply is low or during serious disease
34 outbreaks and epidemics. To this end, Moderna has now halved the dose of its mRNA-1273
35 vaccine from 100-µg to 50-µg, without compromising immunogenicity.^{8,13}
36
37 Prolonged or different booster intervals may also enhance immunogenicity.^{14,15} In one study,
38 third-dose boosting at 44–45-week intervals significantly increased antibody levels versus
39 boosting at 15-25-week or 8-12-week intervals. Alternatively, SARS-CoV-2 immune responses
40 can also be restored using different booster intervals. A third dose of CoronaVac¹⁶ administered
41 8 months after the second dose increased antibody levels more than when administered at 2
42 months, while antibody responses were 2-fold higher with a booster dose of AZD1222
43 administered at 12-weeks or longer intervals than 6-weeks or shorter intervals.¹⁵

44 In at-risk populations in the United Kingdom, third doses of AZD1222 led to higher antibody
45 levels that correlated with high efficacy and T-cell responses after a prolonged, dose-stretched
46 interval between doses, than at shorter intervals.¹⁴ In fact, the odds ratios for symptomatic
47 disease following shorter intervals between second and booster (third) doses¹⁷ was higher than
48 at longer intervals, along with VE estimates of 93.2% (95% CI, 92.8–93.6) versus 95.6% (95% CI,
49 94.9–96.1), respectively. A Chinese trial of the ZF2001 vaccine¹⁸ found that it may be feasible to
50 combine these strategies, as ZF2001 neutralizing activity and resilience to all tested variants
51 was higher with extended prime-boost (third dose) intervals, than with shorter intervals.
52 Extended intervals may allow antibodies to mature for longer, thus enhancing this regimen. In
53 fact, Omicron-neutralizing antibodies were detected in only 56% of short-interval vaccine
54 recipients versus all (100%) prolonged-interval vaccine recipients,¹⁹ 69% of whom also
55 demonstrated Omicron-neutralizing antibodies at 4-6 months post-booster. Although data
56 remains limited on the most optimal prime-boost interval, Israeli studies^{20,21} noted a
57 restoration of antibody levels and enhanced immunogenic protection against severe disease
58 when a second booster (fourth dose) was given 4 months or longer after a first booster, with no
59 new safety concerns.²² The WHO now recommends an interval of 4–6 months post-primary
60 series²³, especially in the face of Omicron dominance, as well as heterologous or homologous-
61 schedule boosters (third or more).

62

63 To better understand the applicability of these strategies, we compared the immune responses
64 and safety of fractional (half) third-doses of heterologous COVID-19 vaccines (AZD1222 or

65 BNT162b2) to full doses after CoronaVac primary series, and when boosting after three different,
66 extended intervals.

67

68 *METHODS*

69 *Study design and participants.* This prospective, multi-centre, randomized, observer-blinded
70 Phase 2 study enrolled 1,320 healthy adults aged 20 years or older (Figure 1). Eligible
71 participants were either 60-days-to-<90 days, 90-days-to-<120 days, or 120-to-180 days
72 ('intervals') post-receipt of CoronaVac primary-series (21-28 days apart); with no history of
73 fever or symptoms within 7 days of enrolment; and were not pregnant. Written informed
74 consents were obtained prior to all study procedures. Exclusion criteria were a history of
75 COVID-19 infection within 3 months of enrolment; contraindication to ChAdOx1 or BNT162b2;
76 and confirmed or suspected immunosuppressive or immunodeficient state. Briefly, participants
77 were divided into two cohorts comprising 660 individuals each and subsequently into three
78 interval-stratified subgroups. Each subgroup was randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio to either half-
79 dose or full-dose AZD1222 or BNT162b2 vaccine (abbreviated as AZHD, AZFD, PFHD and PFFD).
80 Participants were monitored post-vaccination for immediate adverse events (AEs), and
81 recorded solicited AEs for up to 7 days. All participants completed five post-vaccination follow-
82 up visits at day 28, 60 and 90, and to assess safety at day 7, 28, 60 and 90. Blood was sampled
83 at baseline and days 28, 60 and 90 to evaluate humoral immunity, and at baseline and day 28
84 from half of participants per subgroup to evaluate T-cell-mediated immunity. Patients were
85 discontinued before study completion due to withdrawal (participant-initiated, for any reason),
86 loss to follow-up, or sponsor-initiated study termination for administrative or other reasons.

87 *Adverse events.* Safety analyses included all randomized participants with at least one vaccination
88 dose. All discontinued participants' diary cards were collected and any AEs and concomitant,
89 ongoing medications at the last visit were recorded. Newly-reported AEs since the last visit were
90 recorded, and AEs were systematically collected at all visits. Diary cards were reviewed at day 7
91 follow-ups and ongoing solicited AEs were recorded and monitored. AEs of special interest (AESI),
92 medically-assisted AEs (MAAEs), and serious AEs (SAE) were collected through day 90.

93 *Immunological Analyses.* At baseline and days 28, 60 and 90, IgG antibodies to full-length pre-
94 fusion spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 (anti-S RBD IgG) and anti-nucleocapsid (anti-N) proteins
95 levels were quantified using a validated enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA; Roche).
96 Anti-S and anti-N RBD IgG results were summarized with 95% exact confidence interval (95%CI),
97 geometric mean concentrations (GMC), geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) from baseline,
98 percentages of participants achieving IgG seroresponse, and reaching the 95%CI for a ≥ 4 -fold
99 increase from baseline. Vaccination-induced nAb inhibition of SARS-CoV-2 seroresponse was
100 quantified by SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus neutralization assay (PNA), and defined as over 50% and
101 68% inhibition of Delta and the Ancestral strain, respectively, from baseline, at 28 and 90 days.
102 Samples with >90% inhibition or 100% inhibition were evaluated for 50%-neutralizing titre
103 (NT50) of geometric mean titres (GMT) against Ancestral, Delta or Omicron pseudovirus spike
104 proteins (PVNT). PVNT results were summarized from baseline with 95%CI, GMT, GMFR, and
105 percentage of subjects with ≥ 4 -fold increase in NT50 seroresponse against SARS-CoV-2
106 pseudovirus from baseline, at 28 and 90 days. SARS-CoV-2 micro-neutralization (microNT) was
107 assayed in pre-screening samples stratified by PVNT against Delta, Ancestral or Omicron. N-
108 proteins were measured by ELISA. SARS-CoV-2 cellular responses (i.e., T-cell-mediated

109 immunity) were quantified using an interferon-gamma release ELISA assay (Euroimmun,
110 Lubeck, Germany).

111 The primary outcome of immunogenicity was assessed through IgG levels against Anti-S RBD, at
112 baseline, 28, 60 and 90 days after the third-dose/booster given at different intervals among
113 participants with CoronaVac primary series. The immunogenicity, or functional (neutralizing)
114 humoral immune response, elicited by each regimen was also assessed by the PNA at baseline,
115 28, and 90 days post-third dose. Third-dose vaccination safety and tolerability were evaluated at
116 different intervals among participants with CoronaVac primary-series. The secondary outcomes
117 of functional (neutralizing) humoral immune response at baseline, 28, 90 days was measured by
118 the microNT assay in specimens from participants with ≥ 4 -fold seroconversion, with NT50 GMT
119 assessed after third-dose vaccinations. The exploratory outcome – immunogenicity – was
120 evaluated through S-protein-specific T-cell responses at baseline and 28 days after post-third
121 dose.

122 *Statistical analyses.* Briefly, 110 participants were estimated to be required per arm. Immune
123 response was assessed using two-sided statistical testing with a significance level of 0.05, and a
124 95%CI. Baseline demographics were summarized for per-protocol (PP) populations using
125 descriptive statistics. Immunogenicity GMFR was computed using estimates of the log
126 difference of the paired samples. Anti-S RBD IgG antibody concentrations were summarized
127 using GMCs at baseline, 28-, 60- and 90-days post-vaccination, GMFR from baseline, and
128 percentage of subjects with IgG seroresponse (all with 95%CI). NT50 nAb titres against SARS-
129 CoV-2 pseudovirus were summarized using GMT at baseline, 28, 90 days post-vaccination,
130 GMFR from baseline, and percentage of subjects with NT50 seroresponse against SARS-CoV-2

131 pseudovirus at 28- and 90-days post-vaccination (all with 95%CI). Safety was assessed via the
132 Clopper-Pearson method. NT50 nAb titres (seroresponse) against SARS-CoV-2 micro-
133 neutralization titre (microNT) were summarized at baseline, 28- and 90-days post-vaccination
134 using GMT, GMFR from baseline, and percentage of subjects with NT50 seroresponse at 28- and
135 90-days post-vaccination (all with 95%CI). Non-inferiority of seroresponse rates was calculated
136 between full- and half-dose (AZ and PF) groups. GMC ratios were concluded to be non-inferior
137 when the lower bound of the two-sided 95%CI comparing vaccine groups was >0.67 and the
138 point estimate (PE) was >0.8 . The difference in percentage of individuals with ≥ 4 -fold GMFR
139 was concluded to be non-inferior when the lower bound of the two-sided 95%CI for the
140 difference in proportions between vaccine groups was greater than -10% . The difference in
141 percentage of individuals with seroresponse was concluded to be non-inferior when the lower
142 bound of the two-sided 95%CI for the difference in proportions between vaccine groups was
143 greater than -10% . To achieve 80% power to demonstrate non-inferiority it is estimated that
144 247 subjects per group would be required.

145

146 *RESULTS*

147 Between 24th September and 14th October 2021, 1243 of 1250 screened individuals were
148 recruited (Figure 1), randomized (AZHD n=312, AZFD n=307, PFHD n=316, and PFFD n=308; Table
149 1), administered the planned single-dose of vaccine and included in the safety analysis (SA). Eight
150 participants (0.6%) discontinued (AZHD n=2, AZFD n=3, PFHD n=3, and PFFD n=0), most
151 commonly due to 'Other: subject inconvenient to come into site' (n=4). One participant was
152 excluded due to developing COVID-19 (onset day 80). After excluding equal numbers of

153 participants (n=5) in the AZD1222 and BNT162b2 groups, 309 AZHD, 305 AZFD, 312 PFHD, and
154 307 PFFD participants were included in the per-protocol (PP) set. Exclusions were due to receipt
155 of fourth vaccines (n=6), failed eligibility criteria (n=2), and SARS-CoV-2 infection (n=2). Given the
156 negligible difference (0.8%) in participants in the full and PP analyses, it was reasonable to limit
157 discussions of baseline and immunogenicity to the PP set. The PP population were a mean of 41-
158 years-old and 57% female. Participants were 60-to-<90-days (33%), 90-to-<120 days (34%), or
159 120-to-180 days (33%) post-final CoronaVac dose.

160

161 Unsolicited AEs occurred in 38% of participants, including vascular (hypertension and
162 tachycardia), cardiac disorders, and general and administration site conditions (pyrexia). Solicited
163 AE occurred in 84% of participants (Figure 2), including local and systemic reactions (injection site
164 pain, musculoskeletal and connective tissue disorders (fatigue, myalgia, arthralgia), and nervous
165 system disorders (headache). Post-AZHD, three participants experienced unsolicited serious
166 adverse events (SAE) – appendicitis, SARS-CoV-2 infection and haemorrhoids, but all were
167 unrelated to the vaccine and all participants recovered. Nineteen participants (five solicited and
168 24 unsolicited) experienced medically attended adverse events (MAAE). Two participants had an
169 AESI SARS-CoV-2 infection post-AZHD or post-PFHD and both recovered, but all AESI were
170 unsolicited and unrelated to the vaccine. One PFHD recipient withdrew due to moderate AEs.
171 Neither dose of AZD1222 or BNT2162b2 was directly related to an AE or led to reports of
172 thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome or myocarditis.

173

174 Non-inferiority criteria were met (Figure 3) across all three intervals in comparisons of full-dose
175 to half-dose vaccinations in four immunogenicity assays, and maintained at each interval. To
176 summarise, more than 97% seroconversion rates (≥ 4 -folds GMFR within vaccine types using anti-
177 S IgG) were observed at 28-, 60- and 90-days post-vaccination regardless of dose (Figure 3 and
178 Table 2a). The GMC ratio for anti-S was also non-inferior for AZHD vs AZFD and PFHD vs PFFD
179 (Table 2b).

180

181 Pseudovirus neutralizing antibodies demonstrated more than 90% seroconversion rates (≥ 4 -fold
182 rise). Moreover, the responses across dose groups were of similar magnitudes between the two
183 vaccine platforms, at 28 days post-vaccination, and against the Ancestral, Delta and Omicron
184 strains (Table 3a, Figure 4). However, GMT and GMFR declined against Delta and Omicron as
185 detailed below (Table 3a). Regardless, non-inferiority in terms of nAb was met for AZHD versus
186 AZFD and for PFHD versus PFFD (Table 3b). Importantly, a longer interval between CoronaVac
187 primary-series and the booster (third) dose ('prime-boost') improved immunogenicity. Boosting
188 at 120-to-180-days substantially improved GMC as measured by anti-S IgG and GMT as measured
189 by PVNT50, especially with the full-doses of both platforms against each strain ($p < 0.001$) (Table
190 2a-2b and Figure 4A).

191

192 The GMFR (%) for AZHD was 166.9, 103 and 69.2 at days 28, 60 and 90, respectively, versus 205.3,
193 125.7 and 83.8 for AZFD at the same respective visits. The GMFR for PFHD was 308.2, 177.8 and
194 111.5 at days 28, 60 and 90, respectively, versus 355.5, 207.8 and 132.1 for PZFD at the same
195 respective visits. Anti-S RBD IgG GMC PE peaked at day 28 for all doses and vaccine platforms

196 (data not shown; AZHD PE: 8237.0, 95%CI: 7679.3-8835.2; AZFD PE: 8973.6, 95%CI: 8328.1-
197 9669.2; PFHD PE: 14073.9, 95%CI: 13236.4-14964.4; and PFFD PE: 15920.7, 95%CI: 15135.7-
198 16746.4). GMC PE was still high and comparable at day 90 between AZHD and AZFD (3435.3,
199 95%CI: 3166.7-3726.6, and 3651.3, 95%CI: 3355.8-3972.8), and between PFHD and PFFD (5097.2,
200 95%CI: 4716.2-5508.9, and 5936.1; 95%CI: 5540.1-6360.4).

201
202 At day 28 and 90, the baseline PVNT50 GMT against SARS-CoV-2 Delta and Ancestral strains
203 (Table 3a) was similar between vaccines. However, at day 90, AZHD and AZFD had similar GMT
204 against the Ancestral strain. Regardless of strain, PVNT50 GMT peaked at day 28. At days 28 and
205 90, AZHD PVNT50 GMT against Delta was non-inferior to AZFD, while PFHD was non-inferior to
206 PFFD (Table 3b). Similarly, AZHD PVNT50 GMT against the Ancestral strain was non-inferior to
207 AZFD, while PFHD was non-inferior to PFFD. Against Delta, the PVNT50 GMT PE for AZHD was
208 468.3 (95%CI: 409.8-535.2) and 175.1 (95%CI: 152.6-200.9), versus 530.6 (95%CI: 470.4-598.5)
209 and 184.1 (95%CI: 160.8-210.7) for AZFD. The PVNT50 GMT for PFHD was 801.5 (95%CI: 715.4-
210 897.8) and 221.9 (95%CI: 194.4-253.3), versus 856.1 (95%CI: 777.8-942.1) and 225.4 (95%CI:
211 200.9-252.9) for PFFD. Against the Ancestral strain, PVNT50 GMT for AZHD was 653.2 (95%CI:
212 556.88-766.28) and 407.0 (95%CI: 335.6-493.6) at days 28 and 90 respectively, versus 712.2
213 (95%CI: 607.0-835.6) and 406.1 (95%CI: 333.9-493.9) for AZFD. The PVNT50 GMT for PFHD was
214 1219.3 (95%CI: 1048.7-1417.6) and 539.6 (95%CI: 438.97-663.4), versus 1362.7 (95%CI: 1207.68-
215 1537.9) and 575.3 (95%CI: 494.1-669.8) for PFFD. Strain-specific PVNT50 GMT ratios (Table 3b,
216 Figure 4A) also showed an improved immunogenicity with longer prime-boost intervals
217 ($p < 0.001$). Against Delta, the AZHD/AZFD GMT ratio was high and increased at days 28 and 90,

218 but the PFHD/PFFD GMT ratio, though high, was relatively unchanged between day 28 [0.9 (0.8-
219 1.1)] and 90 [1.0 (0.8-1.2)]. Against the Ancestral strain, the GMT ratios for both AZHD/AZFD and
220 PFHD/PFFD were high and increased at days 28 and 90. When PVNT50 was stratified by boosting
221 interval (Figure 4 A, a-d), greater differences were seen between vaccine types at the 60-to-<90-
222 day interval, with all comparisons inferior for Delta. At the 90-to-<120-day interval all
223 comparisons were non-inferior, whereas at the 120-to-180-days interval, most comparisons were
224 non-inferior. Overall, the Ancestral strain prompted higher seroresponse rates than the Delta
225 strain. Also, seroresponses against Delta were non-inferior at day 28 between dose levels of
226 either vaccine, but seroresponses were only non-inferior between PFHD and PFFD at day 90. For
227 the Ancestral strain, non-inferiority was observed at all time points and within dose levels for
228 each vaccine.

229
230 Full-dose vaccine microNT and PVNT50 were consistent across post-baseline visits for Delta and
231 the Ancestral strain, and non-inferiority was observed at all intervals when stratified by variant
232 (Figure 4A and 4B a-d). At day 28, many participants also had ≥ 4 -fold increase in microNT titres
233 to both Delta and the Ancestral strain, with all doses and vaccines. The microNT NT50 against
234 both Delta and the Ancestral strains peaked at day 28 versus day 90 (Table 4a, 4b). Against Delta,
235 the microNT NT50 GMT PE for AZHD was 172.7 (95%CI: 142.3-209.5) versus 196.8 (95%CI: 163.2-
236 237.4) for AZFD at day 28 ($p=0.336$), and 79.5 (95%CI: 65.6-96.2) versus 84.1 (95%CI: 69.0-102.5),
237 respectively, at day 90 ($p=0.681$). Similarly, the microNT NT50 GMT for PFHD was 331.3 (95%CI:
238 274.5-399.8) versus 311.2 (95%CI: 265.7-364.4) for PFFD at day 28 ($p=0.613$), and 103.9 (95%CI:
239 84.9-127.2) versus 104.4 (95%CI: 87.5-124.5), respectively, at day 90 ($p=0.974$). Similar trends

240 were observed with the Ancestral strain: the microNT NT50 GMT for AZHD was 519.8 (95%CI:
241 435.7-620.2) versus 575.0 (95%CI: 487.3-678.4) for AZFD ($p=0.410$) at day 28, and 278.6 (95%CI:
242 231.0-336.0) versus 308.8 (95%CI: 254.4-374.8), respectively, at day 90 ($p=0.450$). Also, the
243 microNT NT50 GMT for PFHD was 930.5 (95%CI: 780.1-1110.1) versus 927.6 (95%CI: 793.7-
244 1084.0) for PFFD at day 28 ($p=0.978$), and 348.35 (95%CI: 285.5-4254.0) versus 363.0 (95%CI:
245 306.5-429.9), respectively, at day 90 ($p=0.755$). All intervals between doses of each vaccine were
246 also non-inferior between Delta and the Ancestral strain.

247
248 Day-28 T-cell levels (Table 5) were higher with BNT162b2 than AZD1222 ($p<0.01$), and higher with
249 full-dose BNT162b2 than half-dose BNT162b2 ($p=0.022$), but similar regardless of AZD1222 dose
250 ($p=0.642$) or interval duration. Thus, full-dose AZD1222 was non-inferior to half-dose AZD1222,
251 and full-dose BNT162b2 was non-inferior to half-dose BNT162b2.

252
253 Against Omicron, the day-28 PVNT50 GMT increased with longer booster intervals (Figure 4A) for
254 AZFD and PFFD. A 60-to-<90-day interval increased the PVNT50 GMT PE from 1.4 (95%CI: 1.1-1.8)
255 with AZFD and 1.6 (95%CI: 1.3-2.0) with PFFD to 58.00 (95%CI: 37.7-89.3) and 195.3 (95%CI:
256 140.4-271.6), respectively. A 90-to-<120-day interval increased the PVNT50 GMT from 1.6
257 (95%CI: 1.3273-2.1) with AZFD and 1.46 (95%CI: 1.2-1.8) with PFFD to 1260 (95%CI: 93.9-169.0)
258 and 221.6 (95%CI: 184.0-2676.0), respectively. The 120-to-180-day interval increased the
259 PVNT50 GMT from 1.6 (95%CI: 1.3-2.18) with AZFD and 1.5 (95%CI: 1.2-1.9) with PFFD to 195.3
260 (95%CI: 145.0-263.0) and 370.6 (95%CI: 307.2-447.1), respectively.

261

262 *DISCUSSION*

263 This randomized, double-blind study compared the safety and immunogenicity induced by
264 boosting with an additional (third) half-dose to full-dose AZD1222, and half-dose to full-dose
265 BNT162b2, and between three, extended post-primary vaccination intervals. Comparisons were
266 not conducted between vaccine platforms (AZD1222 versus BNT162b2). Instead, our intra-
267 platform comparisons differentiated between dose, boosting intervals and virus variants, with
268 sufficient statistical power to detect non-inferiority between different doses of the same
269 vaccine. We did so in order to understand if and how to maintain high levels of immunogenicity
270 when vaccine doses were limited.

271

272 Although our safety assessments were limited by small cohort sizes, all vaccine doses were
273 found to be very safe, with no vaccine-related or life-threatening AE occurring at any dose.
274 Thrombosis with thrombocytopenia syndrome (TTS), though rare, has been documented with
275 AZD1222.²⁴ However, no TTS occurred in our study with either AZHD or AZFD. Moreover, no
276 previously-reported BNT162b2 AESI or SAE occurred in our study.²⁵

277

278 Importantly, half-dose AZD1222 or BNT162b2 were immunologically non-inferior to the
279 corresponding full-dose in anti-spike IgG assays, PNA and microNT assays of humoral immune
280 responses and S-protein-specific IFN- γ assays for T-cell response. The non-inferiority between
281 doses of any vaccine type persisted at all intervals, even 90-120 days after primary-series
282 CoronaVac. While seroconversion was high at all doses, it declined slightly with longer intervals
283 in half-dose recipients, and more slowly in full-dose recipients. Specifically, at day 90, the half-

284 dose immune response waned more than the full-dose immune response; nevertheless, the
285 half-dose immune response at day 28 remained robust and non-inferior. Reassuringly, a high
286 and comparable proportion of participants seroconverted after the different intervals, with
287 increased seroconversion and T-cell induction rates at longer intervals, even at 120 days post-
288 primary series. Also, our full-dose vaccination induced similar immune responses to another
289 Thai study that had a smaller cohort.²⁶ A vaccination strategy which allows lower doses can
290 potentially mitigate supply constraints, especially in resource-limited settings facing an urgent
291 need to ensure high vaccination coverage. We showed, in a large, adult population, that half-
292 dose AZ1222 boosting was non-inferior to full-dose AZ1222 boosting, and half-dose BNT162b2
293 boosting was non-inferior to full-dose BNT162b2 boosting, in terms of eliciting high
294 immunogenicity. This was especially the case with longer intervals between prime-boost
295 schedules, and with the high transmissibility of Omicron. Half-dose vaccinations were not
296 evaluated for Omicron since it is associated with immune escape and must be overcome by full
297 doses.²⁷ Notably, virus neutralization declined gradually from the Ancestral strain to the Delta
298 variant, and more markedly from these strains to Omicron. Regardless, neutralization remained
299 high even with extended intervals between primary and booster doses and as recently shown,
300 nAb titres may correlate with protection against infection²⁸. Halving doses did not compromise
301 immune responses or safety, and could be an important strategy for ensuring population
302 coverage, especially when boosting. Now, a main vaccine provider, Moderna Inc., is
303 manufacturing 50- μ g doses of mRNA-1273, and will produce bivalent boosters with 25 μ g of
304 each antigen.²⁹

305

306 Low or inconsistent vaccine supplies can be circumvented with heterologous regimens. mRNA-
307 1273, BNT162b2 and AZD1222 vaccine combinations are safe, well-tolerated and comparably or
308 even more immunogenic than homologous regimens. A strategy that combines fractional
309 dosing, dose-stretching and heterologous schedules, can prevent vaccination campaign
310 disruptions even if vaccine logistics or safety are problematic. Future investigations should
311 include age-based stratifications and comparative durations of humoral immunity between
312 fractional and full doses. However, with the current spread of Omicron globally, provision of
313 full-dose AZ or PF boosters is consistent with recent effectiveness data.³⁰

314

315 *CONCLUSION*

316 We found similar immune responses after day 28 when boosting at any of the three,
317 progressively longer intervals post-primary series, and that a third dose given at a longer
318 interval was most optimal. Halving doses does not compromise immunogenicity or safety, but
319 can broaden vaccine coverage when vaccine supply is a problem.

320

321 **Competing Interest Statement.** All authors report no relevant disclosures.

322

323 **Funding Statement:** Funding was provided by the Program Management Unit for
324 Competitiveness Enhancement (PMU-C) National research, National Higher Education, Science,
325 Research and Innovation Policy Council, Thailand through Clinixir Ltd.

326

327 **Role of the Funding Source:** PMU-C funded the trial but had no other involvement in the study.
328 Clinixir provided logistical and monitoring supports.

329

330 **Author Contributions:** The authors were involved in the study design; in the interpretation of
331 data; in reviewing the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.
332 All authors had full access to all of the data in the study and can take responsibility for the
333 integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

334

335 **Acknowledgment:** The authors wish to thank the staff of all seven medical schools, Clinixir,
336 Biotec, MHSRI and Faculty of Science, Mahidol University and Shawna Tan of Medical Writers
337 Asia for assisting in drafting manuscript, Professor Kanta Subbarao, Dr. Jean-Louis Excler and
338 Assoc. Prof. Jaranit Kaewkungwal who have served as Data and Safety Monitoring Board.

339

340 ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT05049226

341 The protocol has received approval from Central and each Institutional Ethical Review Boards.

342 All participants had signed consent forms before enrolling into the study

343

1. Patel MK, Bergeri I, Bresee JS, Cowling BJ, Crowcroft NS, Fahmy K, et al. Evaluation of post-introduction COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness: Summary of interim guidance of the World Health Organization. *Vaccine*. 2021;39(30):4013-4024. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2021.05.099
2. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med* 2021;27(7):1205–11
3. Zhang Y, Zeng G, Pan H. Safety, tolerability, and immunogenicity of an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in healthy adults aged 18–59 years: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 1/2 clinical trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2021;21:181–192.
4. Jara A, Undurraga EA, González C. Effectiveness of an inactivated SARS-CoV-2 vaccine in Chile. *N Engl J Med*. 2021 doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2107715.
5. Zeng G, Wu Q, Pan H, Li M, Yang J, Wang L, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of a third dose of CoronaVac, and immune persistence of a two-dose schedule, in healthy adults: interim results from two single-centre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 clinical trials. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022;22(4):483-495. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00681-2
6. Cowling BJ, Lim WW, Cobey S. Fractionation of COVID-19 vaccine doses could extend limited supplies and reduce mortality. *Nat Med*. 2021 Aug;27(8):1321-1323. doi: 10.1038/s41591-021-01440-4. PMID: 34226735.
7. Interim statement on dose-sparing strategies for COVID-19 vaccines (fractionated vaccine doses). World Health Organization. 10 August 2021. [https://www.who.int/news/item/10-08-2021-interim-statement-on-dose-sparing-strategies-for-covid-19-vaccines-\(fractionated-vaccine-doses\)](https://www.who.int/news/item/10-08-2021-interim-statement-on-dose-sparing-strategies-for-covid-19-vaccines-(fractionated-vaccine-doses))
8. Mateus J, Dan JM, Zhang Z, Rydzynski Moderbacher C, Lammers M, Goodwin B, et al. Low-dose mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccine generates durable memory enhanced by cross-reactive T cells. *Science*. 2021 Oct 22;374(6566):eabj9853. doi: 10.1126/science.abj9853.
9. Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, Aley PK, et al. Safety and efficacy of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine (CHADOX1-S) against SARS-CoV-2: an interim analysis of four randomised controlled trials in Brazil, South Africa, and the UK. *Lancet* 2021; 397: 99–111
10. [PREPRINT] Angkasekwina N, Niyomnaitham S, Sewatanon J, Phumiamorn S, Sukapirom K, Senawong S, et al. The immunogenicity and reactogenicity of four COVID-19 booster vaccinations against SARS-CoV-2 variants of concerns (Delta, Beta, and Omicron) following CoronaVac or CHADOX1-S primary series. medRxiv 2021.11.29.21266947; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.11.29.21266947>; Preprint.
11. Angkasekwina N, Sewatanon J, Niyomnaitham S, Phumiamorn S, Sukapirom K, Sapsutthipas S, et al. Comparison of safety and immunogenicity of CoronaVac and ChAdOx1 against the SARS-CoV-2 circulating variants of concern (Alpha, Delta, Beta) in Thai healthcare workers. *Vaccine X*. 2022;10:100153. Published 2022 Mar 5. doi:10.1016/j.jvax.2022.100153
12. Niyomnaitham S, Quan Toh Z, Wongprompitak P, Jansarikit L, Srisutthisamphan K, Sapsutthipas S, et al. Immunogenicity and reactogenicity against the SARS-CoV-2 variants following heterologous primary series involving CoronaVac, ChAdox1 nCoV-19 and BNT162b2 plus BNT162b2 booster vaccination: An open-label randomized study in healthy Thai adults [published online ahead of print, 2022 Jul 11]. *Hum Vaccin Immunother*. 2022;2091865. doi:10.1080/21645515.2022.2091865
13. The Moderna COVID-19 (mRNA-1273) vaccine: what you need to know. World Health Organization. 10 June 2022. [who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/the-moderna-covid-19-mrna-1273-vaccine-what-you-need-to-know](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/the-moderna-covid-19-mrna-1273-vaccine-what-you-need-to-know)
14. Flaxman A, Marchevsky NG, Jenkin D, Aboagye J, Aley PK, Angus B, et al. Reactogenicity and immunogenicity after a late second dose or a third dose of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 in the UK: a substudy of two randomised controlled trials (COV001 and COV002). *Lancet*. 2021;398(10304):981-990. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01699-8
15. Voysey M, Clemens SAC, Madhi SA, Weckx LY, Folegatti PM, Aley PK et al. Single-dose administration and the influence of the timing of the booster dose on immunogenicity and efficacy of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 (AZD1222) vaccine: a pooled analysis of four randomised trials [published correction appears in *Lancet*. 2021 Mar 6;397(10277):880]. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10277):881-891. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)00432-3
16. Zeng G, Wu Q, Pan H, Li M, Yang J, Wang L, et al. Immunogenicity and safety of a third dose of CoronaVac, and immune persistence of a two-dose schedule, in healthy adults: interim results from two single-centre, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled phase 2 clinical trials. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2022;22(4):483-495. doi:10.1016/S1473-3099(21)00681-2
17. Andrews N, Stowe J, Kirsebom F, Toffa S, Sachdeva R, Gower C, et al. Effectiveness of COVID-19 booster vaccines against COVID-19-related symptoms, hospitalization and death in England. *Nat Med*. 2022;28(4):831-837. doi:10.1038/s41591-022-01699-1
18. Zhao X, Zheng A, Li D, Zhang R, Sun H, Wang Q, et al. Neutralisation of ZF2001-elicited antisera to SARS-CoV-2 variants. *Lancet Microbe*. 2021 Oct;2(10):e494. doi: 10.1016/S2666-5247(21)00217-2.
19. Zhao X, Li D, Ruan W, Chen Z, Zhang R, Zheng, et al. Effects of a Prolonged Booster Interval on Neutralization of Omicron Variant. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(9):894-896. doi:10.1056/NEJMc2119426
20. Bar-On YM, Goldberg Y, Mandel M, Bodenheimer O, Amir O, Freedman L, et al. Protection by a Fourth Dose of BNT162b2 against Omicron in Israel. *N Engl J Med*. 2022;386(18):1712-1720. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2201570
21. Regev-Yochay G, Gonen T, Gilboa M, Mandelboim M, Indenbaum V, Amit S, et al. Efficacy of a Fourth Dose of Covid-19 mRNA Vaccine against Omicron. *N Engl J Med*. 2022 Apr 7;386(14):1377-1380. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2202542.

-
22. Munro APS, Feng S, Janani L, Cornelius V, Aley PK, Babbage G, et al. Safety, immunogenicity, and reactogenicity of BNT162b2 and mRNA-1273 COVID-19 vaccines given as fourth-dose boosters following two doses of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 or BNT162b2 and a third dose of BNT162b2 (COV-BOOST): a multicentre, blinded, phase 2, randomised trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2022 Aug;22(8):1131-1141. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00271-7. Epub
 23. Interim statement on the use of additional booster doses of Emergency Use Listed mRNA vaccines against COVID-19. *Who.int.* <https://www.who.int/news/item/17-05-2022-interim-statement-on-the-use-of-additional-booster-doses-of-emergency-use-listed-mrna-vaccines-against-covid-19>. Published 2022. Accessed August 16, 2022.
 24. European Union Risk Management Plan AstraZeneca ChAdOx1-S (recombinant) (AZD1222). European Medicines Agency. June 2021. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/rmp-summary/vaxzevria-previously-covid-19-vaccine-astrazeneca-epar-risk-management-plan_en.pdf
 25. BNT162b2 Risk Management Plan. European Medicines Agency. February 2022. https://www.ema.europa.eu/en/documents/rmp-summary/comirnaty-epar-risk-management-plan_en.pdf
 26. [PREPRINT] Angkasekwinai N, Niyomnaitham S, Sewatanon J, Phumiamorn S, Sukapirom K, Senawong S, et al. The immunogenicity against variants of concern and reactogenicity of four COVID-19 booster vaccinations following CoronaVac or ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 primary series. *medRxiv.* 2022:2021.11.29.21266947.
 27. [PREPRINT] Khan K, Karim F, Ganga Y, Bernstein M, Jule Z, Reedoy K, et al. Omicron sub-lineages BA.4/BA.5 escape BA.1 infection elicited neutralizing immunity. *medRxiv* 2022.04.29.22274477; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.29.22274477>
 28. [PREPRINT] Khoury DS, Schlub TE, Cromer D, Steain M, Fong Y, Gilbert PB, et al. Correlates of protection, thresholds of protection, and immunobridging in SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv* 2022.06.05.22275943; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.06.05.22275943> Posted June 06, 2022.
 29. mRNA-1273.214 Moderna COVID-19 Investigational Bivalent Vaccine (Original + Omicron) Moderna, Inc. Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee June 28, 2022. <https://www.fda.gov/media/159492/download>
 30. Suphanchaimat R, Nittayasoot N, Jiraphongsa C, Thammawijaya P, Bumrungwong P, Tulyathan A, et al. Real-World Effectiveness of Mix-and-Match Vaccine Regimens against SARS-CoV-2 Delta Variant in Thailand: A Nationwide Test-Negative Matched Case-Control Study. *Vaccines.* 2022; 10(7):1080. <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines10071080>

Table 1. Participant demographics of (A) per protocol population, including their (B) medical history and (C) baseline characteristics stratified by vaccine regimen (C), and (D) anti-SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid antibody levels at baseline.

A. Patient Demographics					
	ChAdOX1-S		BNT162b2		All Subjects (N=1241)
	Half Dose (N=310)	Full Dose (N=307)	Half Dose (N=316)	Full Dose (N=308)	
Age (years)					
n (missing)	310 (0)	307 (0)	316 (0)	308 (0)	1241 (0)
Mean (SD)	41.7 (9.6)	41.0 (9.6)	40.5 (9.8)	41.9 (9.8)	41.3 (9.7)
Median	42.0	41.0	41.0	42.0	41.0
Age Categories, n (%)					
n (missing)	310 (0)	307(0)	316(0)	308(0)	1241(0)
20-59	303 (97.7)	301 (98.0)	315 (99.7)	304 (98.7)	1223(98.5)
>=60	7 (2.3)	6 (2.0)	1 (0.3)	4 (1.3)	18(1.5)
Gender, n (%)					
n (missing)	310 (0)	307(0)	316(0)	308(0)	1241(0)
Male	116 (37.4)	139 (45.3)	133 (42.1)	141 (45.8)	529 (42.6)
Female	194 (62.6)	168 (54.7)	183 (57.9)	167 (54.2)	712 (57.4)

B. Medical History					
System Organ Class Preferred Term	ChAdOX1-S		BNT162b2		All Subjects (N=1243) n(%)
	Half Dose (N=312) n(%)	Full Dose (N=307) n(%)	Half Dose (N=316) n(%)	Full Dose (N=308) n(%)	
Metabolism and nutrition disorders	34(10.9)	27(8.8)	32(10.1)	27(8.8)	120(9.7)
Vascular disorders	25(8.0)	27(8.8)	24(7.6)	28(9.1)	104 (8.4)
Respiratory, thoracic and mediastinal disorders	9(2.9)	12(3.9)	12(3.8)	10(3.2)	43 (3.5)
Nervous system disorders	11(3.5)	8(2.6)	9(2.8)	8(2.6)	36(2.9)

C. Study Vaccine Exposure					
	ChAdOX1-S		BNT162b2		All Subjects (N=1241)
	Half Dose (N=312)	Full Dose (N=307)	Half Dose (N=316)	Full Dose (N=308)	
Duration of Exposure (days)					
n (missing)	312 (0)	307 (0)	316 (0)	308 (0)	
Mean (SD)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	
Median	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Number of Injections					
n (missing)	312 (0)	307 (0)	316 (0)	308 (0)	
Mean (SD)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	
Median	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Cumulative Dose (mL)					
n (missing)	312 (0)	307 (0)	316 (0)	308 (0)	
Mean (SD)	0.25 (0.00)	0.50 (0.00)	0.15 (0.00)	0.30 (0.00)	
Median	0.25	0.50	0.15	0.30	
Interval Duration (days)					
n (missing)	310(0)	307(0)	316(0)	308(0)	1241(0)
60 to <90	102(32.9)	99(32.2)	104(32.9)	103(33.4)	408(32.9)
90 to <120	108(34.8)	105(34.2)	111(35.1)	105(34.1)	429(34.6)
120 to 180	100(32.3)	103(33.6)	101(32.0)	100(32.5)	404(32.6)
D. Baseline Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Nucleocapsid (Anti-N) Antibody					
Baseline Anti-N					
n (missing)	46 (264)	47 (260)	48 (268)	44 (264)	185 (1056)
Mean (SD)	12.03 (40.19)	12.22 (31.56)	8.48 (28.50)	5.41 (16.04)	9.58 (30.32)
Median	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.3	1.6

Table 2a. Immunogenicity according to overall anti-spike RBD IgG activity, measured in terms of geometric means concentration (U/mL), geometric mean fold rise and percentage of participants with a more than 4-fold rise in GMFR. Abbreviations: PE, point estimate; CI, confidence interval; AZHD, ChAdOx1-S half-dose; AZFD, ChAdOx1-S full-dose; PFHD, BNT162b2 half-dose; PFFD, BNT162b2 full-dose; GMC, geometric means concentration; GMFR, geometric mean fold rise.

Analysis Visit	Statistics	AZHD		AZFD		PFHD		PFFD	
		PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI
Baseline	N	310		307		316		308	
	GMC (U/mL)	48.5	43.0, 54.7	43.7	38.5,49.6	45.7	40.3, 51.9	44.8	39.8, 50.4
Day 28	N	309		307		315		308	
	GMC (U/mL)	8237.0	7679.3, 8835.2	8973.6	8328.1, 9669.2	14073.9	13236.4, 14964.4	15920.7	15135.7, 16746.4
	GMFR	166.9	147.8, 188.5	205.3	181.8, 231.9	308.2	274.7, 345.7	355.5	316.0, 400.0
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	99.4	97.7, 99.9	99.0	97.2, 99.8	99.4	97.7, 99.9	99.7	98.2, 100.0
Day 60	N	308		307		315		307	
	GMC (U/mL)	5088.3	4718.0, 5487.8	5496.2	5074.3, 5953.1	8150.6	7584.3, 8759.3	9340.6	8772.6, 9945.5
	GMFR	103.0	90.9, 116.7	125.7	111.0, 142.4	177.8	157.9, 200.3	207.8	183.9, 234.8
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	99.0	97.2, 99.8	99.0	97.2, 99.8	99.0	97.2, 99.8	99.0	97.2, 99.8
Day 90	N	307		303		312		307	
	GMC (U/mL)	3435.3	3166.7, 3726.6	3651.3	3355.8, 3972.8	5097.2	4716.2, 5508.9	5936.1	5540.1, 6360.4
	GMFR	69.2	60.9, 78.6	83.8	73.8, 95.3	111.5	98.4, 126.4	132.1	116.3, 149.9
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	98.4	96.2, 99.5	99.0	97.1, 99.8	99.0	97.2, 99.8	99.0	97.2, 99.8

Table 2b. Summary of geometric mean concentration ratios (GMC Ratio) of Anti-SARS-CoV2 Spike-RBD antibody by vaccine group. Overall geometric mean titer ratios of Anti-SARS-CoV2 Spike-RBD antibody was stratified by vaccine group and interval after booster (third) vaccination in the per protocol analysis group. Abbreviations: AZHD, ChAdOx1-S half-dose; AZFD, ChAdOx1-S full-dose; PFHD, BNT162b2 half-dose; PFFD, BNT162b2 full-dose

Anti SARS-CoV2 Spike-RBD antibody	Interval Duration (Days)	GMC ratio (95%CI)	
		AZHD/AZFD	PFHD/PFFD
Baseline (D1)	Overall	0.9 (0.8-1.1)	1.0 (0.8-1.2)
	60 to <90	0.7 (0.6-1.0)	0.9 (0.7-1.2)
	90 to < 120	1.0 (0.8-1.4)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)
	120 to 180	1.0 (0.7-1.3)	1.0 (0.7-1.4)
28 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.92 (0.83-1.02)	0.88 (0.82-0.96)
	60 to <90	1.01 (0.85-1.20)	0.91 (0.79-1.05)
	90 to < 120	0.92 (0.79-1.08)	0.88 (0.77-1.01)
	120 to 180	0.84 (0.71-1.00)	0.86 (0.77-0.98)
60 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.93 (0.83-1.03)	0.87 (0.79-0.96)
	60 to <90	1.04 (0.87-1.25)	0.91 (0.78-1.07)
	90 to < 120	0.94 (0.79-1.11)	0.88 (0.75-1.04)
	120 to 180	0.83 (0.69-0.99)	0.82 (0.71-0.96)
90 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.94 (0.84-1.06)	0.86 (0.77-0.95)
	60 to <90	1.09 (0.89-1.32)	0.90 (0.75-1.07)
	90 to < 120	0.95 (0.78-1.15)	0.87 (0.73-1.03)
	120 to 180	0.82 (0.68-1.00)	0.81 (0.68 - 0.96)

Table 3a. Immunogenicity according to Pseudovirus Neutralizing Antibody Titer (PVNT50) against different variant of concerns, measured in terms of geometric means titer (GMT), geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) and percentage of participants with a more than 4-fold rise in GMFR.

Analysis Visit	Statistics	AZHD		AZFD		PFHD		PFFD	
		PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI
Ancestral SARS-CoV-2									
Baseline	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	24.2	21.5-27.2	24.6	21.5-28.2	27.4	22.8-33.1	25.8	22.9-29.0
Day 28	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	653.2	556.9-766.3	712.2	607.0-835.6	1219.3	1048.7-1417.6	1362.7	1207.6-1537.9
	GMFR	27.0	22.5-32.4	28.9	24.2-34.7	44.4	36.5-54.1	52.9	45.0-62.1
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	97.1	94.5-98.7	97.7	95.4-99.1	100.0	98.8-100.0	100.0	98.8-100.0
Day 90	N	100		97		98		99	
	GMT	407.0	335.6-493.6	406.1	333.9-493.9	539.6	438.9-663.4	575.3	494.1-669.8
	GMFR	16.8	13.7-20.7	16.5	13.2-20.7	20.4	16.3-25.5	22.3	18.6-26.8
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	91.9	88.2-94.7	94.7	91.6-97.0	98.1	95.9-99.3	98.7	96.7-99.6
Delta (B.1.617.2)									
Baseline	N	190		187		213		202	
	GMT	22.1	20.5-23.7	23.8	21.6-26.3	22.8	20.9-24.9	21.7	20.7-22.9
Day 28	N	190		187		213		202	
	GMT	468.3	409.8-535.2	530.6	470.4-598.5	801.5	715.4-897.8	856.1	777.8-942.1
	GMFR	21.2	18.3-24.6	22.3	19.3-25.8	35.1	30.8-40.0	39.4	35.4-43.8
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	90.6	86.8-93.6	94.1	90.9-96.5	98.1	95.9-99.3	99.4	97.7-99.9
Day 90	N	190		186		210		202	
	GMT	175.1	152.6-200.9	184.1	160.9-210.8	221.9	194.4-253.3	225.4	200.9-252.9
	GMFR	7.9	6.9-9.2	7.7	6.6-9.0	9.8	8.5-11.2	10.4	9.2-11.7
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	77.5	72.4-86.1	82.2	77.4-86.3	86.9	82.6-90.4	91.2	87.5-94.1
Omicron (B.1.1.529)									
Baseline	N			238				238	
	GMT			1.6	1.4-1.8			1.5	1.3-1.8
Day 28	N			238				238	
	GMT			118.9	97.3-145.2			255.9	222.9-293.7
	GMFR			76.1	59.4-97.6			167.1	137.7-202.7
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)			90.3	85.9-93.8			97.1	94.0-98.8

Table 3b. Summary of geometric mean titer ratios (GMT Ratio) of Pseudovirus Neutralizing Antibody Titers (PVNT50) by vaccine group. Overall geometric mean titer ratios of PVNT50 was stratified by vaccine group and interval after booster (third) vaccination in the per protocol analysis group. Abbreviations: AZHD, ChAdOx1-S half-dose; AZFD, ChAdOx1-S full-dose; PFHD, BNT162b2 half-dose; PFFD, BNT162b2 full-dose

Timepoint of PVNT50 Measurement Against SARS-CoV-2	Interval Duration (Days)	GMT Ratio (95% CI)			
		Ancestral SARS-CoV-2		Delta (B.1.617.2) SARS-CoV-2	
		AZHD/AZFD	PFHD/PFFD	AZHD/AZFD	PFHD/PFFD
Baseline (D1)	Overall	0.73 (0.45-1.18)	1.25 (0.74-2.10)	0.79 (0.55-1.13)	1.04 (0.75-1.45)
	60 to <90	1.12 (0.46-2.69)	2.88 (1.12-7.36)	1.55 (0.81-2.98)	1.40 (0.73-2.69)
	90 to < 120	0.33 (0.15-0.71)	1.41 (0.58-3.46)	0.54 (0.29-1.02)	0.76 (0.44-1.34)
	120 to 180	1.05 (0.44-2.49)	0.47 (0.20-1.10)	0.69 (0.39-1.24)	1.11 (0.66-1.88)
28 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.92 (0.73-1.15)	0.89 (0.74-1.08)	0.88 (0.74-1.06)	0.94 (0.81-1.09)
	60 to <90	1.22 (0.78-1.89)	1.15 (0.8-1.64)	1.16 (0.80-1.68)	0.94 (0.71-1.23)
	90 to < 120	0.76 (0.52-1.11)	1.01 (0.73-1.41)	0.80 (0.59-1.07)	1.01 (0.79-1.30)
	120 to 180	0.84 (0.59-1.20)	0.62 (0.45-0.84)	0.81 (0.62-1.06)	0.87 (0.68-1.11)
90 days after the third vaccination	Overall	1.00 (0.76-1.32)	0.94 (0.73-1.21)	0.95 (0.78, 1.15)	0.98 (0.83, 1.17)
	60 to <90	1.40 (0.84-2.34)	1.01 (0.62-1.64)	1.25 (0.86-1.82)	1.10 (0.80-1.51)
	90 to < 120	0.71 (0.43-1.17)	1.07 (0.68-1.70)	0.87 (0.61-1.25)	1.01 (0.75-1.35)
	120 to 180	1.02 (0.69-1.53)	0.76 (0.53-1.10)	0.86 (0.65-1.13)	0.88 (0.66-1.19)

Table 4a. Immunogenicity according to Micro Neutralizing Antibody Titer (MicroNT) against different variant of concerns, measured in terms of geometric means titer (GMT), geometric mean fold rise (GMFR) and percentage of participants with a more than 4-fold rise in GMFR.

Analysis Visit	Statistics	AZHD		AZFD		PFHD		PFFD	
		PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI	PE	95% CI
Ancestral SARS-CoV-2									
Baseline	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	23.5	19.9-27.7	22.1	18.9-25.9	22.2	18.6-26.5	21.9	18.4-26.2
Day 28	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	519.8	435.7-620.2	575.0	487.3-678.4	930.5	780.1-1110.0	927.6	793.7-1084.0
	GMFR	22.2	17.9-27.4	26.0	21.3-31.8	41.9	33.9-51.8	42.3	33.9-52.9
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	98.0	93.0-99.8	100.00	96.3-100.0	99.0	94.6-100.0	99.0	94.5-100.0
Day 90	N	100		97		98		99	
	GMT	278.6	231.0-336.0	308.8	254.4-374.8	348.4	285.5-425.0	363.0	306.5-429.9
	GMFR	11.9	9.4-15.0	14.0	11.1-17.7	15.7	12.4-19.8	16.6	13.0-21.1
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	93.0	86.1-97.1	92.8	85.7-97.0	91.8	84.5-96.4	94.9	88.6-98.3
Delta (B.1.617.2)									
Baseline	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	12.1	11.0-13.4	13.0	11.5-14.8	12.9	11.4-14.7	11.7	10.6-12.8
Day 28	N	100		97		100		99	
	GMT	172.7	142.3-209.5	196.8	163.2-237.4	331.3	274.5-399.8	311.2	265.7-364.4
	GMFR	14.2	11.7-17.3	15.1	12.2-18.7	25.6	20.9-31.5	26.7	22.1-32.2
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	95.0	88.7-98.4	92.8	85.7-97.1	96.0	90.1-98.9	100.0	96.3-100.0
Day 90	N	100		97		98		99	
	GMT	79.5	65.6-96.2	84.1	69.0-102.5	103.9	84.9-127.2	104.4	87.5-124.5
	GMFR	6.5	5.4-8.0	6.5	5.1-8.1	8.0	6.5-9.9	9.0	7.4-10.9
	≥4-fold GMFR (%)	81.0	71.9-88.2	79.4	70.0-86.9	81.6	72.5-88.7	88.9	81.0-94.3

Table 4b. Summary of geometric mean titer ratios (GMT Ratio) of Micro Neutralization Antibody Titers (MicroNT) by vaccine group. Overall geometric mean titer ratios of MicroNT was stratified by vaccine group and interval after booster (third) vaccination in the per protocol analysis group. Abbreviations: AZHD, ChAdOx1-S half-dose; AZFD, ChAdOx1-S full-dose; PFHD, BNT162b2 half-dose; PFFD, BNT162b2 full-dose

Timepoint of MicroNT Measurement Against SARS-CoV-2	Interval Duration (Days)	GMT Ratio (95% CI)			
		Ancestral SARS-CoV-2		Delta (B.1.617.2) SARS-CoV-2	
		AZHD/AZFD	PFHD/PFFD	AZHD/AZFD	PFHD/PFFD
Baseline (D1)	Overall	1.06 (0.84-1.33)	1.01 (0.79-1.30)	0.93 (0.79-1.10)	1.11 (0.95-1.29)
	60 to <90	1.20 (0.79-1.81)	1.17 (0.76-1.79)	0.95 (0.67-1.34)	1.22 (0.92-1.62)
	90 to < 120	0.90 (0.60-1.34)	0.92 (0.54-1.55)	0.93 (0.72-1.20)	0.96 (0.68-1.35)
	120 to 180	1.11 (0.77-1.60)	0.96 (0.71-1.29)	0.92 (0.73-1.16)	1.16 (0.99-1.36)
28 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.90 (0.71-1.15)	1.00 (0.79-1.27)	0.88 (0.67-1.15)	1.06 (0.83-1.36)
	60 to <90	1.25 (0.78-2.02)	0.97 (0.63-1.51)	1.27 (0.75-2.12)	1.11 (0.69-1.80)
	90 to < 120	0.75 (0.50-1.13)	1.21 (0.83-1.77)	0.68 (0.43-1.07)	1.02 (0.69-1.50)
	120 to 180	0.79 (0.56-1.12)	0.86 (0.59-1.27)	0.79 (0.52-1.21)	1.07 (0.71-1.59)
90 days after the third vaccination	Overall	0.90 (0.69-1.18)	0.96 (0.74-1.24)	0.94 (0.72-1.24)	1.00 (0.76-1.30)
	60 to <90	1.12 (0.66-1.91)	0.99 (0.61-1.62)	1.41 (0.86-2.31)	1.05 (0.66-1.66)
	90 to < 120	0.69 (0.44-1.08)	1.18 (0.74-1.88)	0.76 (0.46-1.23)	1.13 (0.71-1.82)
	120 to 180	0.96 (0.65-1.42)	0.75 (0.53-1.05)	0.79 (0.51-1.24)	0.83 (0.53-1.28)

Table 5. SARS-CoV-2 Reactive T-cell Concentration IFN-gamma Assay. Results are presented in units of mIU/mL. Q1, 1st Quartile, Q3, 3rd Quartile

Analysis Visit	AZHD N=222		AZFD N=231		PFHD N=223		PFFD N=224	
	Median	Q1-Q3	Median	Q1-Q3	Median	Q1-Q3	Median	Q1-Q3
Baseline	257.5	111.1-623.5	228.0	110.4-486.0	238.1	98.7-553.1	250.6	114.7-572.7
Day 28	1722.4	838.3-3245.2	1620.0	968.6-3305.1	2866.9	1391.6-6398.1	3487.7	1853.1-6835.7

Figure 1. CONSORT diagram depicting trial design and vaccine administration groups.




Figure 2. Solicited treatment-emergent adverse events. Abbreviations: AZHD (ChAdOx1-S half-dose) and AZFD (ChAdOx1-S full-dose): AZhalf/AZfull; PFHD (BNT162b2 half-dose) and PFFD (BNT162b2 full-dose): PFhalf/PFfull.






Figure 3. Non-inferiority comparisons for all immunogenicity assays by vaccine group. All comparisons were between either AZHD and AZFD; or between PFHD and PFFD and stratified by interval after booster (third) vaccination in the per protocol analysis group for (A) anti-SARS-Cov-2 Spike RBD antibody (shown as GMC Ratio), (B) pseudovirus neutralization antibody titre (shown as GMT Ratio) against Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 (left) or Delta (B.1.617.2) variant (right), and (C) micro-neutralization (shown as GMT Ratio) against Ancestral SARS-CoV-2 (left) or Delta (B.1.617.2) (right). Abbreviations: AZHD, ChAdOx1-S half-dose; AZFD, ChAdOx1-S full-dose; PFHD, BNT162b2 half-dose; PFFD, BNT162b2 full-dose; GMC Ratio, geometric mean concentration ratio; GMT Ratio, geometric mean titre ratio; RBD, receptor-binding domain.

(A) Anti-Spike RBD IgG



(B) Pseudo Neutralizing Antibody (PVNT50)



(C) Micro Neutralizing Antibody





Figure 4. Vaccine-induced immune responses. Geometric mean titres (GMT) of (A) pseudo and (B) micro-neutralization antibody assays are stratified by variant after participant completed primary CoronaVac vaccinations and before administration of boosters.

A) Pseudo Neutralization Antibody (PVNT50)



B) Micro Neutralization Antibody

