

# Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine in a hemodialysis cohort

*Luc FRANTZEN, Service de Néphrologie, Hôpital Saint Joseph Marseille, France*

*Guilhem CAVAILLE, Service de Néphrologie, Hôpital Saint Joseph Marseille, France*

*Sandrine THIBEAUT, Laboratoire de Biologie Médicale, Hôpital Saint Joseph Marseille, France*

*Yohan EL-HAIK, Pharmacie, Centre de Dialyse DIAVERUM Marseille Hôpital Saint Joseph, France*

Correspondence to: Luc FRANTZEN; E-mail: [lfrantzen@mac.com](mailto:lfrantzen@mac.com)

## Introduction

Nephrologists call for priority access to COVID-19 vaccination in patients receiving in-center hemodialysis <sup>1</sup> for two main reasons: a very high risk of SARS-CoV-2 infection compared with the general population (5-16 times more likely <sup>2</sup> because they travel to their dialysis center 3 times a week and are surrounded by other patients and caregivers) and also a particular high mortality rate (close to 20%) when infected by SARS-CoV-2 <sup>3</sup>.

Our team is taking care of 470 in-center hemodialysis patients in Marseille and its surroundings, a region severely affected by COVID-19. As soon as vaccination has been prioritized for our patients, we proceeded to a large-scale campaign as of January 18<sup>th</sup> 2021, when the first injections were administered.

Nevertheless, a major downside is the vaccine hyporesponsiveness among such immune-compromised patients often showing disappointing seroconversion rates (for example a 44% rate following a double-dose vaccination schedule for hepatitis B <sup>4</sup>).

In this context and given the lack of data on COVID-19 vaccination in dialysis, we decided to evaluate the vaccine response of our patients by serology testing in order to optimize their future management.

## Methods

We proposed the COVID-19 vaccination - two injections three weeks apart of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine - to all our in-center hemodialysis patients. The exclusion criteria were a lack of consent or a SARS-CoV-2 infection less than three months old. The patients were vaccinated in their dialysis center (the vast majority during their dialysis session).

Vaccination efficacy was assessed 1 month after the second injection by quantifying antibodies directed against the Spike protein using the Elecsys<sup>®</sup> Anti SARS-CoV-2 S enzyme immunoassay (which presents a high correlation with neutralizing antibodies).

## Results

As of early March, 70% of our cohort (326 patients) had received the two injections (three weeks apart) of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. Vaccine tolerability was excellent with no serious adverse event on the overall cohort.

The first results, regarding 244 patients, show a very high response rate: 91% present a positive antibody titer (with a cut-off fixed at 15 U/mL for the Elecsys<sup>®</sup> Anti SARS-CoV-2 S test). The baseline characteristics of the patients and their immune response are shown in Table 1 and 2.

Older patients were less likely to present an antibody response. There was also no response to vaccination among all the patients undergoing chemotherapy (3/3) or under immunosuppression (1/1).

## Discussion

The results go far beyond what is usually seen with other vaccines in this hyporesponsive population with a 91% antibody positivity rate, with 60% of the patients presenting an antibody level above 200 U/ml correlating with maximal neutralizing capacity in the neutralization assays for the Elecsys<sup>®</sup> Anti SARS-CoV-2 S test.

However, some of our patients show a rather weak response and a recent study <sup>5</sup> reported lower antibody levels in dialysis patients compared to the general population. The

consequences may be a lower vaccine efficacy and a shorter period of immunoprotection. It is therefore necessary to consider reinforced vaccination schedules.

Nevertheless, in parallel to these biological results, we have witnessed a spectacular decrease in new case occurrences as of mid-February (three weeks after the first injections) in our dialysis centers.

This clinical and biological response to a mRNA Covid-19 vaccination among a highly vulnerable population is extremely promising. Studies to assess vaccine efficacy in this population in the real-world setting are needed.

#### **CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT**

The authors declare that the results presented in this paper have not been published previously in whole or part. None of the authors does present a conflict of interest.

## REFERENCES

1. Francis A, Baigent C, Ikizler T et al. The urgent need to vaccinate dialysis patients against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2: a call to action. *Kidney International* 2021;99:791–793
2. De Meester J, De Bacquer D, Naesens M, et al. Incidence, characteristics, and outcome of COVID-19 in adults on kidney replacement therapy: a regionwide registry study. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2021;32:385–396.
3. Savino M, Casula A, Santhakumaran S, et al. Sociodemographic features and mortality of individuals on haemodialysis treatment who test positive for SARS- CoV-2: a UK Renal Registry data analysis. *PLoS One*. 2020;15:e0241263.
4. Krueger KM, Ison MG, and Ghossein C. Practical Guide to Vaccination in All Stages of CKD, Including Patients Treated by Dialysis or Kidney Transplantation. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2020 ;3 : 417-425.
5. Grupper A, Sharon N, Finn T et al. Humoral Response to the Pfizer BNT162b2 Vaccine in Patients Undergoing Maintenance Hemodialysis. *CJASN* 16: ccc–ccc, 2021. (ePress)

**Table 1 - Patient characteristics and immune response after 2 doses of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine**

<b>Patient Characteristics</b>	<b>Total (n = 244)</b>
Age, mean (SD), years	76 (13)
Male - n (%)	170 (70)
Obesity (IMC > 30) - n (%)	55 (23)
Comorbidity - n (%)	
Diabetes mellitus	90 (37)
Hypertension	212 (87)
Heart Disease	86 (35)
Cancer/hemopathy <sup>a</sup>	3 (1)
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	16 (6)
Immunosuppression therapy - n	1 <sup>b</sup>
Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection - n (%)	32 (13)
<b>Immune response (n = 244)</b>	
<b>Positive antibody response - n (%)</b>	
Antibody level > 15 U/ml	<b>221 (91)</b>
> 250 U/ml	142 (58)
200 - 249 U/ml	4 (2)
150 - 199 U/ml	8 (3)
100 - 149 U/ml	20 (8)
50 - 99 U/ml	24 (10)
15 - 49 U/ml	23 (9)
<b>Negative antibody response - n (%)</b>	
Antibody level < 15 U/ml	<b>23 (9)</b>

<sup>a</sup> With ongoing treatment

<sup>b</sup> Pancreatic graft

**Table 2 - Demographic and clinical characteristics of patients stratified by immune response**

	<b>Antibody level</b>		<b>p value <sup>a</sup></b>
	<b>&gt; 15 U/ml (n = 221)</b>	<b>&lt; 15 U/ml (n = 23)</b>	
Age, mean (SD), years	70 (13)	77 (10)	<b>0.005</b>
Male - n (%)	158 (71)	12 (52)	0.25
Obesity (IMC > 30) - n (%)	51 (23)	4 (17)	0.53
<b>Comorbidity - n (%)</b>			
Diabetes mellitus	85 (38)	5 (22)	0.11
Hypertension	192 (87)	20 (87)	0.99
Heart Disease	81 (37)	5 (22)	0.15
Cancer/hemopathy	0	3 (13)	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	15 (7)	1 (4)	0.65
<b>Immunosuppression therapy - n</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.002</b>
Previous SARS-CoV-2 infection - n (%)	31 (14)	1 (4)	0.19

<sup>a</sup> Descriptive statistics included the percentages for categorical variables and the mean ( $\pm$  standard deviation) or median [interquartile ranges] for continuous variables according to the distribution. Comparisons between the two groups according to the presence or absence of a significant antibody level for continuous variables were made using the Student's t-test or the Mann-Whitney test, according to the variable distribution. Comparisons between the two groups for categorical variables were made using the Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test. A p-value < 0.05 was considered significant. The statistical analysis was conducted using R version 3.6.0 R development Core team (2019).