

## HUMORAL IMMUNOGENICITY TO THIRD DOSE SARS-COV-2 mRNA VACCINE IN PEOPLE LIVING WITH HIV (PLWH) BY CURRENT CD4 COUNT AND CD4/CD8 RATIO

Vergori A<sup>1</sup>, Cozzi Lepri A<sup>2</sup>, <u>Tavelli A<sup>3</sup></u>, Giannella M<sup>4</sup>, Cicalini S<sup>1</sup>, Marconi L<sup>5</sup>, Yellenki V<sup>3</sup>, Meschi S<sup>6</sup>, Pellicanò GF<sup>5</sup>, Caroccia N<sup>4</sup>, Matusali G<sup>6</sup>, Latini A<sup>7</sup>, Lichtner M<sup>8</sup>, Lo Caputo S<sup>9</sup>, Fusco FM<sup>10</sup>, Marchetti G<sup>3</sup>, Tacconelli E<sup>4</sup>, Antinori A<sup>1</sup>, RCHESTRA D' Arminio Monforte A<sup>3</sup> on behalf of the VAX-ICONA ORCHESTRA Study group

1. National Institute for Infectious Diseases L.Spallanzani IRCCS, HIV/AIDS Unit, Rome, Italy; 2.Institute for Global Health, UCL, CREME, London, UK; 3. ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, University of Milan, Infectious Diseases Unit, Milan, Italy; 4. Alma Mater Studiorum University of Bologna, Department of Medical and Surgical Sciences, Bologna, Italy; 5. University of Messina, Department of Human Pathology, Messina, Italy; 6. National Institute for Infectious Diseases L.Spallanzani, IRCCS, Laboratory of Virology, Rome, Italy; 7. San Gallicano Institute IRCCS, Infectious Diseases Unit, Rome, Italy; 8. Santa M. Goretti Hospital, Sapienza University, Infectious Diseases Unit, Iatina, Italy; 9. University of Foggia, Department of Clinical and Experimental Medicine,Foggia, Italy; 10. AORN Ospedali Delli Colli, PO D Cotugno, Infectious Diseases Unit, Napoli, Italy



## BACKGROUND

Persons living with HIV (PLWH) might have an increased risk of adverse outcomes following COVID-19 and represent a priority group in vaccination programs.

COVID-19 vaccines stimulate strong antibody responses in people with HIV and CD4 counts >500/mm3, by obtaining humoral response rates comparable to those of the HIV negative population. However, immunogenicity of vaccines is strongly related to CD4 cell count at the time of vaccination, indeed, CD4 <200/mm3 cell count significantly and independently predicts a poorer immune response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccine, placing this category as susceptible to booster doses. There is some evidence that the magnitude of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses to natural infection relates to the size of the naive CD4 T cell pool and the CD4/CD8 ratio in PLWH In the era of ART, CD4:CD8 ratio might be considered as an accessible biomarker for assessing individual risks in PLWH, a proportion of whom may require tailored vaccine strategies to achieve long-term protective immunity

## AIM

Aim was to investigate humoral response elicited after the third dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccination, according to CD4 count and CD4/CD8 ratio, in a large cohort of PLWH.

# **METHODS**

## **STUDY PARTICIPANTS:**

PLWH of the VAXICONA-ORCHESTRA cohort who previously received a complete primary cycle of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine (3 doses) and for whom anti-S serology was available.

At the time of 3° dose vaccination participants were stratified by CD4 count

Low CD4 count (LCD4)=CD4 count <200 cell/mm<sup>3</sup>;

>Intermediate CD4 count (ICD4)=CD4 count 201-500 cell/mm<sup>3</sup>; High CD4count (HCD4) =CD4 count >500 cell/mm<sup>3</sup>

- And by CD4/CD8 ratio:
- ➤Low ratio LR: 0.0-0.59
- Intermediate ratio IR: 0.60-0.99
- High ratio HR: 1.0+

#### **DEFINITION:**

Humoral response: the immune marker IgG anti RBD value associated with a 80% Vaccine Efficacy (VE) against symptomatic infections => 506 BAU/mL (Feng et al. Nat Med. 2021)

### LAB PROCEDURES:

-All values were measured with either DiaSorin, Abbott or Roche assays and standardized in BAU/mL. Abbott values were converted from AU/mL to BAU/mL using a factor of 0.142. Roche values were converted from U/mL to BAU/mL using a factor of 1.029 (Lukaszuk, K et al. Vaccines 2021, 9)

## **ENDPOINTS**

No response if IgG anti-RBD/S  $\leq$  506 BAU/mL 1 month after the 3° dose

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

ANOVA was used to compare anti-S titres (in log2 scale); Association between CD4 groups and risk of undetectable/low level anti-S was evaluated by means of ANOVA and logistic regression all adjusted for age, VL< copies/ml and n. of comorbidities

### **Acknowledgements**

Orchestra Project coordination: Evelina Tacconelli, Maddalena Giannella Vax-Icona Orchestra Scientific coordinators: Antonella d'Arminio Monforte, Andrea Antinori Data coordinators and statistics: Alessandro Tavelli, Alessandra Rodanò, Francesco Vinci, Alessandro Cozzi-Lepri cipating Cer

Andrea Costantini (Ospedali Riuniti, <u>Ancona);</u> Pierluigi Viale, Maddalena Giannella, Lorenzo Marconi, Leonardo Calza, Natascia Carroccia (Policlinico S.Orsola, <u>Bologna);</u> Sergio Lo Caputo, Sergio Ferrara (Ospedali Riuniti,

<u>Foggia</u>); Miriam Lichtner, Giulia Mancaralla, Laura Fondaco, Anna Carraro (Ospedale SM Goretti, <u>Latina</u>); Stefania Piconi, Silvia Pontiggia, Chiara Molteni (ASST Lecco, <u>Lecco</u>); Giuseppe Nunnari, Giovanni Pellicanò (AOU Gaetano Martino,

Slivia Pontiggia, Ciniara Molteriii (ASST Letcot, Lettor), Giospie Kunnan, Gostama Carlo, Balancia Participa (Messina): Giuliano Rizzardini, Maria Vittoria Cossu (ASST FBF-Sacco, <u>Milano</u>); Giulia Marchetti, Nicole Gemignani, Diletta Barbanotti, Vaibhav Yellenki, Walter De Francesco, Luigi Pantaleo (ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, <u>Milano</u>); Sangiovanni, Francesco M Fusco, Nadia Sangiovanni (AORN Ospedali dei Colli, <u>Napoli</u>); Antonio Cascio, Marcello Trizzino (Policinico P. Giaccone, <u>Palermo</u>); Stefania Cicalini, Alessandra Vergori, Chiara Salia, Jessica Paulicelli, Valentina Mazzotta, Simone Lanini, Giuseppina Giannico, Angela D'Urso, Marisa Fusto (INMI L. Spallanzani IRCCS, <u>Roma</u>); Alessandra Latini, Aldo Morrone, Fulvia Pimpinelli, Anna Pacifici (IFO-Regina Elena-San Gallicano, <u>Roma</u>); Giordano Madeddu, Andrea De Vito (AOU di Sassari, <u>Sassari</u>); Evelina Tacconelli, Anna Azzini, Elda Righi, Assunta Sartor, Giulia Belli, Concetta Sciammarella (AOUI di Verona, <u>Verona</u>); *Arcentina*:

<u>Argentina:</u> Gabriel Levy-Hara (Universidad de Buenos Aires, <u>Buenos Aires</u>);

<u>Spain:</u> Jesus Rodriguez Baño, Zaira Palacios,Giulia Caponcello (Hospital Virgen Macarena, <u>Seville</u>)

RESULTS

General characteristics of participants by CD4 count and by CD4/CD8 ratio at the time of receiving 3° dose vaccination are shown in table 1 and 2, respectively. Proportions of responses 1 month after the 3° dose in CD4 and CD4/CD8 ratio groups are shown in Figure 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1 – Main characteristics of target population by CD4 count at 3rd dose vaccination	CD4 count at 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose				
Characteristics	LCDR N= 56	ICDR N= 229	HCDR N= 547	p-value*	Total N= 832
Female, n(%)	14 (25.0)	39 (17.0)	104 (19.0)	0.390	157 (18.9)
Age, years, median (IQR)	57 (53, 61)	55 (47, 61)	52 (43, 58)		54 (45, 59)
Caucasian, n(%)	41 (73.2)	183 (79.9)	492 (89.9)	<.001	716 (86.1)
BMI, median (IQR)	23 (22, 26)	24 (22, 26)	24 (22, 27)		24 (22, 27)
>=1 comorbidity, n(%)	22 (39.3)	86 (37.6)	152 (27.8)	0.011	260 (31.3)
Time from AIDS diagnosis, years, median (IQR)	5 (5, 5)	8 (7, 8)	9 (4, 13)		7 (4, 11)
Nadir CD4 count, cells/mm <sup>3,</sup> median (IQR)	37 (11, 57)	77 (28, 155)	256 (103, 405)		164 (48, 333)
CD4 count at 3 <sup>rd</sup> dose, cells/mm3, median (IQR)	138 (106, 165)	374 (296, 439)	787 (635, 992)		631 (414, 877)
HIV RNA<=50, n(%)	44 (78.6)	212 (93.0)	526 (96.5)	<.001	782 (94.3)
Vaccination times (days), Medians (IQR) From 3rd dose to response	17 (15.0, 20.0)	16 (14.0, 20.0)	16 (14.0, 17.0)	0.083	16 (14.0, 18.0)
<sup>8</sup> In those with at least one: "Chi-square or Kruskal-Wallis test as appropriate					

IR

N= 264 45 (17.0%)

55 (47, 60)

212 (80.3%) 24 (22, 26)

99 (37.5%)

5 (3, 7)

57 (26, 154)

Figure 1 -VE>=80% after 3rd dose in PLWH by CD4 count at the time of booster



Figure 2 -VE>=80% after 3rd dose in PLWH by CD4/CD8 ratio at the time of booster



vaccination

p-value Odds ratio (95% p-value

CI)

<sup>&</sup>Type III p

value

From 3rd dose to response 16 (14.0, 18.0) 15 (14.0, 18.0) 16 (14.0, 19.0) 0.337 16 (14.0, 18.0) <sup>8</sup>In those with at least one; \*Chi-square or Kruskal-Wallis test as appropriate

aOR from fitting a logistic regression for vaccine doses responses according with CD4 count and CD4/CD8 ratio are reported in Table 3. Logistic regression of the probability of 80% VE at 1 month after 3rd dose

CD4/CD8 ratio at 3rd dose

N= 200 29 (14.5%)

53 (43, 58)

178 (89.0%

24 (22, 27)

64 (32.0%)

9 (7, 15)

0.4 (0.2, 0.5) 0.7 (0.7, 0.8) 1.3 (1.1, 1.5)

Panel A

dose

CD4 count at time of 3rd

195 (60, 330) 281 (122, 429)

237 (89.8%) 187 (94.9%) 351 (97.2%) <.001 775 (94.3%)

HR

N= 361 80 (22.2%)

53 (44, 60)

319 (88.4%)

24 (22, 27)

92 (25.5%)

11 (10, 15)

0.060

0.006

0.005

Total

N= 825 154 (18.7%)

54 (45, 59)

709 (85.9%)

24 (22, 27)

255 (30.9%)

7 (4, 11)

164 (48, 333)

0.8 (0.5, 1.2)

Odds ratio (95% CI)

Table 3 -OR of non-response after 3rd dose according to CD4 count (Panel A) and to CD4/CD8 ratio (Panel B) at the time of vaccination from fitting a logistic regression analysis. CD4>500/mm3; LR. CD4/CD8 ratio 0-0.59; IR, CD4/CD8 ratio 0.60-0.99; HR, CD4/CD8 ratio >1Abbreviations: LCD4. CD4<200/mm3,ICD4, CD4 500/mm3, HCD4, 201-

Table 2 – Main characteristics of target

vaccination

emale, n(%)

(IQR)

Age, years, median (IQR) Caucasian, n(%) BMI, median (IQR)

>=1 comorbidity, n(%)

median (IQR) HIV RNA <=50, n(%)

population by CD4/CD8 ratio at 3rd dose

Characteristics

Time from AIDS diagnosis, years, median

Nadir CD4 count, cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, median (IQR)

Vaccination times (days), Medians (IQR)

CD4/CD8 ratio at 3rd dose, cells/mm<sup>3</sup>

## **LIMITATIONS**

 Study period mainly covering alpha&delta circulating VOCs ✓The cut off used for 80%VE may be not valid in an epidemiological scenario dominated by Omicron ✓No data on waning post 3° dose here presented

✓No assessment of

neutralizing activity

#### Fail to achieve 80% VE 1 month after 3<sup>rd</sup> dose 500+ 201-500 0.047 2.50 (0.58, 10.70) 0.217 2.57 (0.59, 11.17) 0.207 21.56 (5.62, 82.77) 23.59 (5.68, 98.02) 0-200 <.001 <.001 per 1 SD lower (log2 3.26 (2.06, 5.16) <.001 2.07 (1.16, 3.67) 0.013 . scale) Panel B CD4/CD8 ratio at time of 3rd dose Fail to achieve 80% VE 1 month after 3rd dose 1.00+ 0.140 1.49 (0.09, 24.37) 0.780 14.02 (1.81, 108.5) 0.011 0.60-0.99 1.42 (0.09, 23.18) 0.804 0.00-0.59 14.53 (1.90, 111.2) 0.010 4.48 (2.56, 7.81) 3.06 (1.49, 6.28) per 1 SD lower (log2 <.001 0.002 scale)

\*adjusted for age, VL<=50 copies/mL at time of 3rd dose and no. of comorbidities &from the adjusted model

# CONCLUSIONS

The 3rd dose vaccination elicited a strong humoral immune response in all the groups identified, although was lower in those with severe immunodeficiency.

Both CD4 count and CD4/CD8 ratio at time of 3<sup>rd</sup> dose are predictors of failing to achieve a 80% VE, but, when directly compared, CD4/CD8 ratio appeared to be more strongly associated. This finding is consistent with previous data on response to natural SARS-CoV-2 infection

CD4/CD8 ratio should be considered as a factor to guide future vaccination booster strategy in PLWH.

Further studies are needed to update the estimated correlates of protection from infection with currently circulating Omicron VoCs

#### Funding

The ORCHESTRA project received grants from: European Union's Horizon 2020 research and from Innovation programme with GA No. 101016167

Contact Information

alessandra.vergori@inmi.it alessandro.tavelli@fondazioneicona.org