

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Weak immunogenicity after a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 mRNA vaccine in treated cancer patients

Active cancer and ongoing antineoplastic treatments are major factors for severe coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) and death; reasons why the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) vaccination remains a priority in cancer patients (CPs).¹ However, immunocompromised patients were excluded from major studies on mRNA vaccines,^{2,3} and could have a decreased response to vaccination, as recently demonstrated in solid organ transplant recipients.⁴ Herein, we aimed to assess the proportion of antibody response 4 weeks after the first injection of the BNT162b2 (Pfizer-BioNTech) vaccine in CPs and health care workers (HCWs) as the control population.

All consecutive patients with cancer on active treatment or with treatment in the last 2 years and HCWs who underwent SARS-CoV-2 vaccination between 17 February 2021 and 18 March 2021 at the Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, Paris, France, were selected for analysis. The titration of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies was proposed just before the second injection of BNT162b2 vaccine. Serum anti-nucleoprotein (N) immunoglobulin G (IgG) and anti-spike protein (S) IgG against the receptor binding domain (RBD) of the S1 domain were detected using the Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA), according to the manufacturer's instructions. The presence of anti-N IgG was used as a surrogate marker of prior COVID-19.

Statistical analysis consisted of univariable analysis (Chi-square tests) and then multivariable analysis (binary logistic regression, including all variables with *P* value < 0.1 in univariable analysis) to determine the factors associated with the lack of seroconversion in CPs. Median titers of anti-S IgG were compared between CPs and HCWs, using a Mood's test. This study was approved by the Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertés (MR004, registration number: 2221945).

SARS-CoV-2 antibodies were measured in 110 CPs and 25 HCWs (Table 1). In CPs who did not have COVID-19 before vaccination, the seroconversion rate was only 55%, while it reached 100% in HCWs. Titers of anti-S IgG were significantly higher in HCWs in comparison with seropositive CPs (680 versus 315 UA/ml, *P* = 0.04). Sex, cancer locations and metastatic status were similar in seroconverters and non-seroconverter CPs (Supplementary Table S1, available at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2021.04.020>). After adjustment for potential confounders, two factors were strongly associated with no seroconversion: age >65 years [odds ratio 3.58, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.40-9.15, *P* = 0.008] and treatment by chemotherapy (odds ratio 4.34, 95% CI 1.67-11.30, *P* = 0.003).

Table 1. Characteristics of cancer patients and health care workers with SARS-CoV-2 serological outcome

Cancer patients (N = 110)	
Sex, n (%)	
Women	66 (60)
Men	44 (40)
Age, years, median (IQR)	66 (54-74)
Cancer location, n (%) ^a	
Breast	37 (34)
Lung	15 (14)
Gynecological	15 (14)
Prostate	11 (10)
Digestive	8 (7.3)
Kidney	7 (6.4)
Bladder	5 (4.5)
Upper aero-digestive tract	6 (5.5)
Thyroid	5 (4.5)
Others	3 (2.7)
Cancer staging, n (%)	
Local	47 (43)
Metastatic	63 (57)
Cancer treatment, n (%) ^b	
Chemotherapy	38 (35)
Targeted therapy	26 (24)
Immunotherapy	17 (16)
Hormonotherapy	16 (15)
Radiotherapy	6 (5.5)
Clinical surveillance	18 (16)
Time between first vaccine injection and SARS-CoV-2 serology, days, median (IQR)	27 (26-28)
Positive anti-N IgG, n (%) ^c	15 (14)
Positive anti-S IgG, n (%) ^c	
In all patients	64 (58)
Among patients with positive anti-N IgG (N = 15)	12 (80)
Among patients with negative anti-N IgG (N = 95)	52 (55)
Titer of anti-S IgG, UA/mL, median (IQR)	
In all anti-S positive patients (N = 64)	359 (178-998)
Among patients with positive anti-N IgG (N = 12)	657 (366-14, 112)
Among patients with negative anti-N IgG (N = 52)	315 (140-748)
Health care workers (N = 25)	
Sex, n (%)	
Women	18 (72)
Men	7 (28)
Age, years, median (IQR)	55 (38-62)
Time between first vaccine injection and SARS-CoV-2 serology, days, median (IQR)	23 (21-27)
Positive anti-N IgG, n (%) ^c	0 (0)
Positive anti-S IgG, n (%) ^c	25 (100)
Titer of anti-S IgG, UA/ml, median (IQR)	680 (360-930)

IQR, interquartile range; N, nucleoprotein; S, spike protein; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2.

^a Two patients had synchronous cancers (prostate + lung and prostate + colon).

^b Non-exclusive categories.

^c Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA), with detection threshold: 0.8 UA/ml for anti-N IgG, and detection threshold: 50 UA/ml for anti-S IgG.

No symptomatic COVID-19 occurred between the two injections of vaccine in CPs and HCWs.

In summary, almost half of CPs showed no anti-spike antibody response after the first injection of BNT 162b2 vaccine, and this low seroconversion rate could be much worse in elderly patients and in patients under chemotherapy. In comparison, 100% of the HCWs had anti-spike seroconversion. Moreover, even in CPs with

seroconversion, the level of antibody response could be lower than expected.

In conclusion, our findings argue for not extending the 21-day period between the two SARS-CoV-2 vaccine injections in CPs, and for performing serological monitoring to assess antibody response in this particular population, which could lead to adapting this vaccine strategy. We would also recommend a vaccine strategy including family and friendship circles.

R. Palich^{1,2,†*}, M. Veyri^{3,†}, S. Marot⁴, A. Vozy³, J. Gligorov⁵, P. Maingon⁶, A.-G. Marcelin⁴ & J.-P. Spano³

Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health (iPLESP), Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Departments of ¹Medical Oncology and ²Infectious Diseases, Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, Paris;
³*Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health (iPLESP), Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, Department of Medical Oncology, Institut Universitaire de Cancérologie (IUC), CLIP² Galilée, Paris;*
⁴*Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health (iPLESP), Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Department of Virology, Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, Paris;*
⁵*Sorbonne Université, Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP), Department of Medical Oncology, Tenon Hospital, Institut Universitaire de Cancérologie (IUC), CLIP² Galilée, Paris;*
⁶*Sorbonne Université, INSERM, Pierre Louis Institute of Epidemiology and Public Health (iPLESP), Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris (AP-HP),*

Pitié Salpêtrière Hospital, Department of Oncology Radiotherapy, Institut Universitaire de Cancérologie (IUC), CLIP² Galilée, Paris, France
 (*E-mail: romain.palich@aphp.fr).

†These authors have contributed equally to this work.

Available online xxx

© 2021 European Society for Medical Oncology. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annonc.2021.04.020>

FUNDING

None declared.

DISCLOSURE

J-PS declares having received advisory fees and meeting invitations from Roche, Bristol Myers Squibb, Merck Sharp & Dohme, Pfizer, Lilly, PFO, Leo Pharma, Myriads, Biogaran, Astra Zeneca and Gilead. All other authors have declared no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Gosain R, Abdou Y, Singh A, et al. COVID-19 and cancer: a comprehensive review. *Curr Oncol Rep*. 2020;22(5):53.
2. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, et al. Efficacy and safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(5):403-416.
3. Polack FP, Thomas SJ, Kitchin N, et al. Safety and efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA covid-19 vaccine. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;383(27):2603-2615.
4. Boyarsky BJ, Werbel WA, Avery RK, et al. Immunogenicity of a single dose of SARS-CoV-2 messenger RNA vaccine in solid organ transplant recipients. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2021;325(17):1784-1786.