



Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active.

Real-time data are necessary to plan effective control measures should this outbreak grow further. The work builds on infrastructure developed for epidemic control and pandemic preparedness and was used for the COVID-19 pandemic.⁷ Global efforts are needed to ensure similar efforts to rapidly harmonise and publish detailed epidemiological data are supported during future outbreaks of emerging and re-emerging pathogens. This example will be a learning pathway to build better surveillance systems globally.

MUGK and JSB report funding from The Rockefeller Foundation and Google.org. TdO received fees from Illumina as a member of the Infectious Disease Testing Advisory Board and received partial travel support to attend the Nobel Symposium of Medicine in May, 2022. IB received consulting fees from BlueDot and NHL Players' Association. All other authors declare no competing interests.



Published Online
June 8, 2022

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(22\)00365-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00365-6)

*Moritz U G Kraemer, Houriiyah Tegally, David M Pigott, Abhishek Dasgupta, James Sheldon, Eduan Wilkinson, Marinanicole Schultheiss, Aimee Han, Mark Ogilia, Spencer Marks, Joshua Kanner, Katelynn O'Brien, Sudheer Dandamudi, Benjamin Rader, Kara Sewalk, Ana I Bento, Samuel V Scarpino, Tulio de Oliveira, Isaac I Bogoch, Rebecca Katz, *John S Brownstein

moritz.kraemer@zoo.ox.ac.uk; john.brownstein@childrens.harvard.edu

Department of Biology (MUGK, AD), Pandemic Sciences Institute (MUGK), and Department of Computer Science (AD), University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3SY, UK; Centre for Epidemic Response and Innovation, School of Data Science and Computational Thinking, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa (HT, EW, TdO); Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, University of Washington, DC, USA (DMP); The Roux Institute, Northeastern University, Portland, ME, USA (JS, SVS); Boston Children's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02215, USA (MS, AH, MO, SM, JK, KO'B, SD, BR, KS, JSB); School of Public Health, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA (AIB); Pandemic Prevention Institute, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York, NY, USA (AIB, SVS); Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM, USA (SVS); Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada (IB); Georgetown University, Washington, DC, USA (RK)

1 Rimoin AW, Mulembakani PM, Johnston SC, et al. Major increase in human monkeypox incidence 30 years after smallpox vaccination campaigns cease in the Democratic Republic of Congo. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2010; **107**: 16 262–67.

- UK Health Security Agency. Monkeypox cases confirmed in England—latest updates. May 14, 2022. <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/monkeypox-cases-confirmed-in-england-latest-updates> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Nakoune E, Olliaro P. Waking up to monkeypox. *BMJ* 2022; **377**: o1321.
- WHO. WHO working closely with countries responding to monkeypox. May 20, 2022. <https://www.who.int/news/item/20-05-2022-who-working-closely-with-countries-responding-to-monkeypox> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- WHO. Surveillance, case investigation and contact tracing for monkeypox. May 22, 2022. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-MPX-surveillance-2022.1> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Bunge EM, Hoet B, Chen L, et al. The changing epidemiology of human monkeypox—a potential threat? A systematic review. *PLoS Negl Trop Dis* 2022; **16**: e0010141.
- Kraemer MUG, Scarpino SV, Marivate V, et al. Data curation during a pandemic and lessons learned from COVID-19. *Nat Comput Sci* 2021; **1**: 9–10.

Neutralisation sensitivity of SARS-CoV-2 omicron subvariants to therapeutic monoclonal antibodies

During the current pandemic, SARS-CoV-2 has considerably diversified. The omicron variant (B.1.1.529) was identified at the end of November, 2021, and rapidly spread worldwide. As of May, 2022, the omicron BA.2 subvariant is the most dominant variant in the world. Other omicron subvariants have since emerged and some of them have begun to outcompete BA.2 in multiple countries. For instance, omicron BA.2.11 subvariant is spreading in France, and the BA.2.12.1 and BA.4/5 subvariants are becoming dominant in the USA and South Africa, respectively (appendix pp 4–5).

Newly emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants need to be carefully monitored for a potential increase in transmission rate, pathogenicity, and resistance to immune responses. The resistance of variants to vaccines

and therapeutic antibodies can be attributed to a variety of mutations in the viral spike protein. Although the spike proteins of new omicron subvariants (BA.2.11, BA.2.12.1, and BA.4/5) are derived from the BA.2 spike protein, the majority of them additionally bear the following mutations in the spike: BA.2.11, L452R; BA.2.12.1, L452Q and S704L; and BA.4/5, L452R, HV69-70del, F486V, and R493Q (appendix pp 4–5). In particular, the L452R and L452Q substitutions were detected in the delta (B.1.617.2) and lambda (C.37) variants, respectively, and we demonstrated that the L452R/Q substitution affects sensitivity to vaccine-induced neutralising antibodies.^{1,2} Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that these new omicron subvariants have reduced sensitivity to therapeutic monoclonal antibodies. To address this possibility, we generated pseudoviruses harbouring the spike proteins of these omicron subvariants and derivatives and prepared eight therapeutic monoclonal antibodies (appendix pp 2–3). Consistent with previous studies,^{3–5} bamlanivimab, casirivimab, etesevimab, imdevimab, and tixagevimab were less functional against BA.2 than the parental virus (table). These five antibodies were also less functional against new omicron subvariants, whereas the BA.2 spike bearing the R493Q substitution was partially sensitive to casirivimab and tixagevimab (table; appendix pp 4–5). Bebtelovimab was approximately 2-fold more effective against BA.2 and all omicron subvariants tested than the parental virus (table). Although sotrovimab was roughly 20-fold less effective against BA.2 than the parental virus, the omicron subvariants bearing the L452R substitution, including BA.2.11 and BA.4/5, were more sensitive to sotrovimab than BA.2 (table). Evusheld (cilgavimab and tixagevimab), particularly cilgavimab, was effective against BA.2, whereas

See Online for appendix

	Bamlanivimab	Bebtelovimab	Casirivimab	Cilgavimab	Etesevimab	Imdevimab	Sotrovimab	Tixagevimab	Casirivimab plus imdevimab (Ronapreve)	Etesevimab plus bamlanivimab	Cilgavimab plus tixagevimab (Evusheld)
B.1.1 (parental)	12.8	8.1	9.9	21	12	79	94	6.7	6.2	6.7	4.1
BA.2	>3700	3.8	>50 417	19	>6050	>50 000	2190	>2750	>2400	>3700	33
BA.2.11	>3700	2.3	>50 417	71	>6050	>50 000	540	>2750	>2400	>3700	154
BA.2.12.1	>3700	5.5	>50 417	75	>6050	>50 000	629	>2750	>2400	>3700	135
BA.4/5	>3700	6.3	>50 417	443	>6050	>50 000	1261	>2750	>2400	>3700	609
BA.2 L452Q	>3700	5.0	>50 417	26	>6050	>50 000	2443	>2750	>2400	>3700	82
BA.2 S704L	>3700	1.1	>50 417	28	>6050	>50 000	1213	>2750	>2400	>3700	27
BA.2 HV69-70del	>3700	2.2	>50 417	19	>6050	>50 000	774	>2750	>2400	>3700	34
BA.2 F486V	>3700	1.1	>50 417	18	>6050	>50 000	1575	>2750	>2400	>3700	23
BA.2 R493Q	>3700	4.2	3697	22	>6050	>50 000	1791	101	431	>3700	31

Representative neutralisation curves are shown in appendix pp 4-5.

Table: 50% neutralisation concentration (ng/mL)

the L452R/Q substitution rendered approximately 2–5-fold resistance. Notably, BA.4/5 exhibited about 20-fold more resistance to cilgavimab and Evusheld than BA.2 (table). Recently, Cao and colleagues showed that the neutralising activity of cilgavimab against BA.4/5 is approximately 4-fold lower than that against BA.2.⁶ Here, we used lentivirus-based pseudoviruses, whereas Cao and colleagues used vesicular stomatitis virus-based pseudoviruses.⁶ Therefore, the disparity between our results and those of Cao and colleagues might be due to the difference in the type of pseudoviruses used in the neutralisation assay.

Since mutations are accumulated in the spike proteins of newly emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants, we suggest the importance of rapid evaluation of the efficiency of therapeutic monoclonal antibodies against novel SARS-CoV-2 variants.

We declare no competing interests. DY, YK, and IK contributed equally. This work was supported in part by the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED) Research Program on Emerging and Re-emerging Infectious Diseases (JP22fk0108146 to KS, JP20fk0108413 to KS, and JP20fk0108451 to G2P-Japan Consortium and KS), the AMED Research Program on HIV/AIDS (JP22fk0410039 to KS), the Japan Science and Technology Agency CREST programme (JPMJCR20H4 to KS), the Japan Society for the

Promotion of Science (JSPS) Fund for the Promotion of Joint International Research (Fostering Joint International Research; 18KK0447 to KS), the JSPS Core-to-Core Program JJPSCCA20190008 (A. Advanced Research Networks; to KS), the JSPS Research Fellow DC2 22J11578 (to KU), and The Tokyo Biochemical Research Foundation (to KS).

Daichi Yamasoba, Yusuke Kosugi, Izumi Kimura, Shigeru Fujita, Keiya Uriu, Jumpei Ito, Kei Sato, for the Genotype to Phenotype Japan (G2P-Japan) Consortium keisato@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Division of Systems Virology, Department of Microbiology and Immunology (DY, YK, IK, SF, KU, JI, KS), International Research Center for Infectious Diseases (KS), and International Vaccine Design Center (KS), The Institute of Medical Science, The University of Tokyo, Minato-ku, Tokyo, Japan; School of Medicine, Kobe University, Kobe, Hyogo, Japan (DY); CREST, Kawaguchi, Saitama, Japan (KS)

- 1 Ferreira I, Kemp SA, Datt R, et al. SARS-CoV-2 B.1.617 mutations L452R and E484Q are not synergistic for antibody evasion. *J Infect Dis* 2021; **224**: 989–94.
- 2 Kimura I, Kosugi Y, Wu J, et al. The SARS-CoV-2 lambda variant exhibits enhanced infectivity and immune resistance. *Cell Rep* 2022; **38**: 110218.
- 3 Bruel T, Hadjadj J, Maes P, et al. Serum neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 omicron sublineages BA.1 and BA.2 in patients receiving monoclonal antibodies. *Nat Med* 2022; published online March 23. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-022-01792-5>.
- 4 Takashita E, Kinoshita N, Yamayoshi S, et al. Efficacy of antiviral agents against the SARS-CoV-2 omicron subvariant BA.2. *N Engl J Med* 2022; **386**: 1475–77.
- 5 Case JB, Mackin S, Errico J, et al. Resilience of S309 and AZD7442 monoclonal antibody treatments against infection by SARS-CoV-2 omicron lineage strains. *bioRxiv* 2022; published online March 18. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.17.484787> (preprint).

- 6 Cao Y, Yisimayi A, Jian F, et al. BA.2.12.1, BA.4 and BA.5 escape antibodies elicited by omicron infection. *bioRxiv* 2022; published online May 2. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.30.489997> (preprint).

Immune responses after omicron infection in triple-vaccinated health-care workers with and without previous SARS-CoV-2 infection



Published Online
June 9, 2022
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099\(22\)00362-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1473-3099(22)00362-0)

The SARS-CoV-2 omicron variant (B.1.1.529) is less sensitive to neutralising antibody responses induced by vaccination and prior infection than previous variants.^{1,2} Less is known regarding omicron-induced serological and T-cell responses after breakthrough infection of vaccinated individuals with and without prior infection.

In this prospective cohort study, we analysed serological and T-cell responses following omicron infection in 56 triple-vaccinated health-care workers in Sweden with and without prior SARS-CoV-2 infection. A surrogate virus neutralisation test (sVNT) was used to assess neutralisation of SARS-CoV-2 variants. Immune responses of all participants had been