The Use of Antibody Testing in Laboratory for Assessing Immune Response to Vaccination

Abdulaziz Mulawwah Sultan Alanazi [1], Sattam Shihathah Saqer Alhazmi [2], Almutairi, Khulud Sultan M [3], Alraga, Yahya Mohammad A [4], Salamah Dalil Alruwaili [5], Yahya Matar Dhahi Alanazi [6], Majed Fryawan N Alsharari [7], Salem Mohammed Munahi Alshammari [8], Muhammed Ghazee Alharbi [9], Alanazi Sultan Fadel F [10]

1- Laboratory Specialist, North Medical Tower at Arar, Saudi Arabia
2- Laboratory Specialist, Turaif General Hospital, Turaif, Saudi Arabia.
3- Laboratory Specialist, Regional Laboratory and Blood Bank - Arar, Saudi Arabia
4- Medical Laboratory Technician, Sarat Abidah General Hospital, Abha, Saudi Arabia
5- Medical Laboratory Technician, Turaif General Hospital, Turaif, Saudi Arabia
6- Medical Laboratory Technician, Turaif General Hospital, Turaif, Saudi Arabia
7- Medical Laboratory Technician, King Faisal Hospital, Al-Qurayyat, Saudi Arabia
8- Medical Laboratory Technician, Shanan Health Center, Hail, Saudi Arabia
9- Medical Laboratory Technician, Qassim Health Cluster, Qassim, Saudi Arabia.
10- Medical laboratories, Forensic Medical Services Center Arar, Saudi Arabia

Abstract:

Antibody testing has become a crucial tool in laboratories for assessing the immune response to vaccinations. These tests measure the presence and concentration of specific antibodies in the bloodstream, which serve as biomarkers for the immune system's response to a particular pathogen or vaccine. By using assays such as enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA) or neutralization tests, laboratories can determine the effectiveness of a vaccine by evaluating the quantity and quality of antibodies produced post-immunization. High antibody levels typically indicate a robust immune response, while low levels may suggest inadequate protection, prompting further investigation or booster vaccination. In recent years, the significance of antibody testing has been amplified, particularly in the context of emerging infectious diseases and public health initiatives. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, antibody testing was employed to assess population immunity and guide vaccination strategies. Furthermore, the ability to monitor antibody levels over time allows for the evaluation of long-term immunity, informing decisions related to booster shots and vaccine development. Despite its advantages, it is essential to consider factors such as timing of the test, individual variability in immune response, and the specificity of the tests, as these can influence the interpretation of results and subsequent clinical decisions.

Keywords: Antibody testing, immune response, vaccination, assays, ELISA, neutralization tests, population immunity, COVID-19, booster vaccinations, vaccine development, clinical decisions.

Introduction:

In the dynamic landscape of immunology and vaccine development, the evaluation of immune responses has become paramount for understanding both individual and population-level vaccine efficacy. As infectious diseases continue to pose significant public health threats globally, the development and deployment of effective vaccination strategies are critical. One of the most compelling methodologies employed in this context is antibody testing. This pioneering diagnostic approach serves as a fundamental tool for assessing the immune response to vaccines, helping researchers, clinicians, and public health officials garner insights into both the effectiveness of immunization campaigns and the immune status of individuals [1].

Antibody tests, specifically serological assays, measure the presence and quantity of antibodies—proteins produced by the immune system in response to antigens found in pathogens or vaccines. These tests are pivotal in evaluating the humoral immune response that is initiated post-vaccination. They provide vital information about an individual's immunity to a disease, informing clinical decisions, guiding public health policies, and shaping vaccine development strategies. Given the complexity and variability of the immune responses across different individuals and populations, understanding the nuances of antibody responses becomes critical in optimizing vaccine formulations and deployment efforts [2].

The role of antibody testing is particularly significant in the context of novel vaccinations, such as those developed against SARS-CoV-2 during the COVID-19 pandemic. The unprecedented speed of vaccine development, alongside the urgent global need for immunization, necessitated a reliable approach to assess vaccine efficacy. Antibody testing became instrumental in this regard, enabling researchers to discern the correlation between antibody levels and protection from infection or severe disease outcomes. This relationship is essential for establishing correlates of protection, which serve as benchmarks for evaluating vaccine performance across diverse populations [3].

Furthermore, antibody testing can be utilized not just in the initial assessment of immune responses post-vaccination, but also in longitudinal studies that explore the duration of immunity. The waning of antibody levels over time raises vital questions about the need for booster doses and the importance of understanding how vaccine-induced immunity might vary across different demographics, including age, health status, and pre-existing conditions. As such, antibody testing is not merely a snapshot of immune response but a key component in the ongoing surveillance of vaccine effectiveness [4].

In addition to its role in public health and vaccine development, antibody testing also holds clinical relevance. Healthcare providers are increasingly utilizing these assays to evaluate vaccination outcomes in at-risk populations, such as immunocompromised individuals or those with chronic health conditions. Understanding whether patients maintain adequate immune responses following vaccination can dictate individual treatment and management strategies, thereby enhancing personalized medicine approaches [5].

Despite its myriad advantages, the interpretation of antibody test results is not without challenges. Factors such as variability in testing methodologies, differences in assay sensitivity and specificity, and the timeline of antibody production can influence the outcomes. Moreover, questions surrounding the exact relationship between antibody levels and protective immunity remain an active area of research. As our understanding of the immune system continues to evolve, so too does the role of antibody testing in assessing vaccine responses [6].

Mechanisms of Immune Response to Vaccination:

Vaccination is one of the most effective public health tools available, serving as a preventive measure against a wide array of infectious diseases. The underlying principle of vaccination is the stimulation of the immune system to recognize and respond to pathogens without causing the disease itself. Understanding the mechanisms of immune response to vaccination not only highlights the sophistication of the immune system but also provides insights into developing novel vaccines and enhancing immunization strategies [7].

The immune system comprises a network of cells, tissues, and organs that work collaboratively to defend the body against foreign invaders, including pathogens such as viruses, bacteria, and parasites. It is traditionally categorized into two primary branches: the innate immune system and the adaptive immune system. The innate immune system provides the first line of defense and responds quickly to invading pathogens, while the adaptive immune system, which includes T cells and B cells, provides a more specific and long-lasting immune response.

When a person undergoes vaccination, the fundamental goal is to mimic a natural infection, thus engaging these immune processes without causing disease [8].

Types of Vaccines and Their Mechanisms

Vaccines can be broadly classified into several categories based on their components and mechanisms of action:

1. **Inactivated or Killed Vaccines:** These vaccines contain pathogens that have been killed or inactivated, meaning they cannot cause disease. Examples include the inactivated polio vaccine (IPV) and hepatitis A vaccine. The immune system recognizes these inactivated pathogens and generates an immune response [9].
2. **Live Attenuated Vaccines:** In these vaccines, the pathogen has been weakened so that it cannot cause disease in healthy individuals.

Examples include the measles, mumps, and rubella (MMR) vaccine. The close mimicry of a natural infection elicits both humoral and cellular immune responses.

3. **Subunit, Recombinant, or Conjugate Vaccines:** These vaccines utilize specific pieces of the pathogen, such as proteins or sugars, to stimulate an immune response. The human papillomavirus (HPV) vaccine and the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine are prominent examples. These vaccines primarily trigger a humoral response by presenting key antigens to the immune system [9].
4. **mRNA Vaccines:** A newer class of vaccines, such as those developed for COVID-19, utilize messenger RNA to instruct cells to produce a viral protein, which then activates the immune response. This innovative approach allows for rapid development and a robust response from both B and T cells.
5. **Viral Vector Vaccines:** These vaccines use harmless viruses as vectors to deliver pathogen DNA or RNA into the body's cells, resulting in the production of the pathogen's antigens. The Johnson & Johnson vaccine is a prominent example of this type [10].

The Immune Response to Vaccination

Upon administration of a vaccine, the immune system engages in a multi-faceted response involving several key stages: recognition, activation, and memory formation [11].

1. **Recognition and Antigen Presentation:** When a vaccine is introduced, immune cells, particularly dendritic cells, capture the antigens. These cells play a crucial role in processing the antigens and presenting them on their surface using molecules called Major Histocompatibility Complex (MHC). Dendritic cells migrate to lymph nodes, where they interact with T cells, activating them.
2. **Activation of T Cells and B Cells:** T cells can be further divided into several subsets, including helper T cells (CD4+) and cytotoxic T cells (CD8+). Helper T cells activate B cells, which are responsible for producing antibodies. These antibodies are proteins that specifically recognize the antigens presented by the pathogen. The complex interplay between T and B cells is critical; helper T cells enhance the B cell response, leading to a robust production of antibodies and memory cells [11].
3. **Antibody Production and Affinity Maturation:** After activation, B cells differentiate into plasma cells, which secrete large amounts of antibodies into circulation. Initially, the antibodies produced have lower affinity for the pathogen's antigens. Through a process known as affinity maturation, B cells undergo somatic hypermutation, resulting in the selection of B cells that produce higher affinity antibodies. Vaccination thus orchestrates a sophisticated process of refining the immune response [11].
4. **Formation of Memory Cells:** A significant advantage of vaccination is the generation of immunological memory. Some of the activated B cells and T cells become memory cells, remaining in the body long after the vaccine has been administered. In subsequent encounters with the actual pathogen, these memory cells can respond more rapidly and effectively than during the initial exposure. This memory response is characterized by a faster production of antibodies and a more robust T cell response [12].

The Role of Adjuvants

Vaccines often include adjuvants, substances that enhance the body’s immune response to the provided antigens. Adjuvants work by stimulating innate immunity, leading to the activation of antigen-presenting cells (APCs) and the subsequent activation of adaptive immune cells. Common adjuvants include aluminum salts and oil-in-water emulsions. By bolstering the immune response, adjuvants can reduce the amount of antigen required or enhance the duration of immunity, making them essential in many vaccine formulations [12].

Impact of Vaccination on Global Health

The mechanisms of immune response to vaccination have led to significant breakthroughs in global health. Widespread vaccination programs have successfully reduced, eliminated, or even eradicated diseases such as Smallpox and Polio. The importance of herd immunity, a phenomenon where a large portion of a population becomes immune to a disease, protects those who are unable to be vaccinated, including infants and immunocompromised individuals, further emphasizing the social and public health implications of effective vaccination strategies [13].

Types of Antibody Tests: Methodologies and Applications:

Antibody tests play a pivotal role in the diagnosis and management of infectious diseases, particularly during outbreaks like the COVID-19 pandemic. These tests determine the presence of specific antibodies in a person's blood, providing crucial insights into their immune response to pathogens, including viruses, bacteria, and other foreign substances [14].

Antibodies are proteins produced by the immune system in response to pathogens. They can remain in the body for an extended period after an infection, potentially providing long-term immunity. Antibody tests, also known as serological tests, detect these proteins, offering an indication of whether an individual has been previously exposed to an infection. Unlike molecular tests, which identify the DNA or RNA of the pathogen itself, antibody tests focus on the immune response, indicating current or past infections [14].

Key Methodologies for Antibody Testing

Antibody tests can be broadly classified into two main categories: enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA) and lateral flow assays (LFAs). Each method has its specific principles, advantages, and limitations [15].

1. **Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)**:

ELISA is one of the most commonly used methodologies for antibody detection. This test involves several steps:

- A plate is coated with antigens derived from the pathogen of interest.
- Serum samples from patients are added to the wells. If antibodies are present, they will bind to the antigens.
- The plate is washed to remove unbound antibodies.
- An enzyme-linked secondary antibody specific to the human antibodies is added. This secondary antibody recognizes and binds to any patient antibodies that are still attached to the antigen.
- A substrate for the enzyme is added, leading to a color change that can be quantified. The intensity of the color correlates with the concentration of antibodies in the sample.

The advantages of ELISA include its sensitivity and ability to process multiple samples simultaneously. However, it requires laboratory equipment and trained personnel, thereby limiting its use in point-of-care settings [15].

2. **Lateral Flow Assays (LFAs)**:

LFAs, commonly used in at-home testing kits and rapid diagnostic tests, offer a simpler alternative to ELISA. This method utilizes a chromatography technique where:

- A sample (typically blood, serum, or plasma) is added to one end of the test strip [16].
- As the sample migrates along the strip, it encounters antigen-coated particles and forms a complex if antibodies are present.
- The test strip contains a control line to indicate that the test is functioning correctly. If a reaction occurs, a visible line will appear, indicating the presence of antibodies.

The main advantages of LFAs are their ease of use and quick results, often within 15-30 minutes. However, they are generally less sensitive and specific than ELISA, making them more suitable for screening tests rather than definitive diagnoses [16].

3. **Western Blotting**:

Western blotting is a confirmatory test used primarily for detecting HIV antibodies. In this methodology, proteins are separated by gel electrophoresis, transferred to a membrane, and probed with specific antibodies. The presence of antibodies results in a distinct band pattern, which is interpreted by trained laboratories. Western blotting is more complex and resource-intensive but offers a high degree of specificity.

4. **Immunofluorescence Assays (IFAs)**:

IFAs use fluorescently labeled antibodies to detect specific antibodies in patient specimens. In this method, patient samples are fixed onto slides and incubated with fluorescent-labeled secondary antibodies. Under a fluorescence microscope, the presence of antibodies is visualized as bright spots. IFAs are often used to diagnose autoimmune diseases but require specialized equipment and expertise [17].

Applications of Antibody Testing

Antibody tests have a wide range of applications in public health, clinical diagnosis, and epidemiological studies. They provide insights into population-level immunity and inform decisions regarding vaccination campaigns [18].

1. **Infectious Disease Diagnosis**:

Antibody tests are vital for diagnosing past infections where molecular testing may be less effective, such as in patients with resolved symptoms. They are particularly useful in identifying infections with long-lasting antibodies, such as hepatitis or HIV [18].

2. **Epidemiological Surveillance**:

During outbreaks, antibody tests can determine the extent of infection within a community. This information is crucial for public health officials to assess population immunity and implement control measures. For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, seroprevalence studies helped gauge how widely the virus spread within various populations [19].

3. **Vaccine Development and Monitoring**:

Antibody tests are integral in vaccine efficacy studies. They help researchers understand the immune response elicited by vaccines and inform booster shot recommendations based on antibody levels in populations.

4. **Autoimmune Disease Diagnosis and Monitoring**:

Certain antibody tests are crucial for diagnosing autoimmune diseases (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus). They assist healthcare providers in monitoring disease progression and the effectiveness of treatments [19].

5. **Blood Donation and Transfusion Safety**:

Blood donation centers use antibody tests to screen for infectious diseases in donated blood, ensuring a safer blood supply for transfusions.

6. **Research**:

In scientific research, antibody tests facilitate studies related to disease mechanisms, infection dynamics, and immune system functioning [20].

Assay Techniques: ELISA, Neutralization Tests, and Beyond:

The exploration of biological and chemical processes frequently necessitates precise analytical methods, essential for research, diagnostics, and product development. Assay techniques play a pivotal role in quantifying biological phenomena, detecting specific proteins, and assessing cellular responses. Among the most pivotal assays developed are Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assays (ELISAs), neutralization tests, and a variety of other methodologies that supplement these well-established techniques [21].

Principle and Methodology

ELISA represents a cornerstone in immunoassays, allowing for sensitive and specific detection of antigens or antibodies in a sample. The fundamental principle revolves around the binding specificity of antibodies to their respective antigens. In an ELISA setup, a solid surface, typically a microtiter plate, is coated with an antigen or antibody, depending on whether the goal is to measure antibodies (indirect ELISA) or antigens (direct ELISA) [21].

Upon introduction of the sample, any present antibodies will bind to the antigen or vice versa. Following this, a secondary enzyme-linked antibody is added, which binds to the primary antibody. This secondary antibody is conjugated with an enzyme that catalyzes a colorimetric reaction when a substrate is introduced, yielding a measurable signal proportional to the quantity of the target in the sample [22].

Applications

ELISAs are widely utilized across various fields, including healthcare diagnostics, quality control in food industry, and academic research. They are particularly valuable in the detection of infectious diseases such as HIV, hepatitis, and various microbial pathogens. Furthermore, ELISA can be adapted for quantitative or qualitative measurements, making it a versatile tool in both clinical and laboratory settings [22].

Advantages and Limitations

One of the most significant advantages of ELISA lies in its high specificity and sensitivity, with the capacity to detect low concentrations of antigens or antibodies. It is also relatively straightforward, cost-effective, and can be performed in a high-throughput manner, allowing numerous samples to be analyzed simultaneously.

However, ELISA is not without limitations. Cross-reactivity can occur if antibodies are not sufficiently specific, potentially leading to false-positive results. Additionally, nucleated cell types cannot be assessed via serum samples, limiting the assay's application in certain contexts. The requirement for specialized equipment for data interpretation—like spectrophotometers—might also restrict its use in resource-limited settings [23].

Neutralization Tests

Principle and Methodology

Neutralization tests represent critical assay techniques used primarily to measure the ability of antibodies to neutralize the infectivity of pathogens, such as viruses. The method investigates the interaction between a virus and its respective antibodies, providing insights into the antibody's neutralizing capacity.

Typically, neutralization tests are conducted by mixing a known quantity of virus with serial dilutions of a serum sample containing antibodies. The mixture is then added to a susceptible cell culture. The extent to which the virus is inhibited from causing cytopathic effects serves as a measure of antibody neutralization. The end-point titer is determined, indicating the highest dilution of serum that still prevents observable cytopathic effects in the cells [24].

Applications

Neutralization tests are instrumental in virology and immunology, particularly in vaccine development and antiviral research. They help assess the immune response elicited by vaccines and play a crucial role in understanding the humoral immunity generated during infections. Their role in quantifying neutralizing antibody titers is essential for evaluating vaccine efficacy and determining protective immunity levels [25].

Advantages and Limitations

The primary advantage of neutralization tests is their ability to provide quantitative measures of functional antibodies. This aspect is crucial in correlating immune responses with clinical outcomes, especially in vaccine studies.

However, these tests are often more time-consuming and resource-intensive than other assay types, as they require live virus handling and appropriate biosafety precautions. Moreover, variable results can arise depending on the assay's design, choice of cells, and timing of observations, necessitating standardized conditions for reproducibility [26].

Beyond ELISA and Neutralization Tests: Additional Techniques

While ELISA and neutralization tests are foundational assays, several other methodologies have been developed to extend the capacity of biological analysis.

1. **Western Blotting**: This technique allows for the identification and quantification of specific proteins in a sample. Proteins are separated by gel electrophoresis and subsequently transferred to a membrane, where they can be probed with specific antibodies. Western blotting complements ELISA by confirming the presence of proteins positively identified in preliminary assays [27].
2. **Lateral Flow Assays**: Often employed in rapid testing scenarios, such as pregnancy tests and infectious disease screening, lateral flow assays utilize capillary action on a test strip coated with specific antibodies. While they are less quantitative than ELISA, their speed and ease of use make them invaluable, especially in resource-limited settings.
3. **Flow Cytometry**: This technique rapidly quantifies the physical and chemical characteristics of cells in a fluid as they pass through a laser. It is particularly powerful in immunology, allowing for the multiparametric analysis of cell populations and the detection of specific cell markers [28].
4. **Real-Time PCR (qPCR)**: Used for quantifying nucleic acid sequences, qPCR has revolutionized diagnostics, allowing for the rapid detection of genetic material from pathogens. This method provides high

sensitivity and specificity and is crucial in virology and genetics research.

5. **Mass Spectrometry**: This analytical technique identifies biomolecules based on their mass-to-charge ratio. It is utilized for proteins, metabolites, and other biomolecules, providing detailed quantitative and qualitative information that can complement immunoassays [28].

Evaluating Vaccine Efficacy: Interpreting Antibody Levels:

In the realm of public health, vaccines have long been heralded as one of the most effective tools in the prevention of infectious diseases. With the emergence of various vaccines, particularly in response to global health crises like the COVID-19 pandemic, understanding how to evaluate their efficacy through antibody levels has become increasingly important. The relationship between antibody levels and vaccine efficacy is complex and nuanced, necessitating a thorough investigation into various aspects including basic immunology, measurement methodologies, the role of different antibodies, and the implications of these levels on public health decisions [29].

Vaccines work by stimulating the immune system to recognize and fight specific pathogens without causing the disease itself. Upon vaccination, the body produces antibodies—proteins that specifically identify and neutralize foreign invaders like viruses and bacteria. This antibody response is a key marker of vaccine-induced immunity.

Antibodies can broadly be categorized into different classes, primarily immunoglobulin G (IgG), immunoglobulin M (IgM), and immunoglobulin A (IgA). While IgM is typically produced first in response to an infection and serves as an early defense mechanism, IgG is more abundant and provides long-term immunity. IgA plays a crucial role in mucosal immunity, particularly in diseases that enter the body through mucosal surfaces. The diversity of antibody types and their specific functionalities makes them integral to assessing the overall efficacy of a vaccine [30].

The measurement of antibody levels post-vaccination can be performed using various techniques, with enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and neutralization assays being among the most common. These methods quantify the number of antibodies present in the serum of vaccinated individuals, thus providing insight into the immune response elicited by the vaccination.

However, simply measuring antibody levels does not offer a complete picture of vaccine efficacy. It is crucial to interpret these levels in the context of various factors such as the timing of measurement post-vaccination, individual variability (including genetic factors and pre-existing immunity), and the specific pathogen against which the vaccine is targeted. For instance, a higher antibody titer does not always correlate with better protection, as demonstrated in studies where some individuals maintained lower levels of antibodies yet exhibited robust immune protection [31].

To establish a reliable link between antibody levels and vaccine efficacy, researchers often seek to identify "correlates of protection." A correlate of protection is a biomarker or immune response that is statistically correlated with a reduced risk of disease. For various infections, including measles, rubella, and hepatitis B, specific thresholds of antibody levels have been established that serve as reliable indicators of immunity.

In the case of newer vaccines, such as those developed for COVID-19, research is ongoing to define these correlates of protection. Preliminary findings suggest that antibody levels, particularly neutralizing antibodies capable of blocking viral entry into cells, may serve as a critical indicator. Nevertheless, it is essential to remember that vaccine-induced cellular immunity, characterized by T-cell responses, plays a significant role in longer-term protection, thereby complicating the relationship between antibody levels and overall vaccine efficacy [32].

Another dimension impacting the evaluation of vaccine efficacy through antibody levels is the emergence of viral variants. Pathogens, particularly viruses, can mutate and give rise to variants that may partially evade neutralizing antibodies elicited by vaccines. For example, variants of concern identified in the SARS-CoV-2 virus prompted questions about the degree to which existing vaccines would remain effective. In such situations, maintaining heightened antibody levels through booster doses has been shown to result in greater protection against emerging variants, emphasizing the dynamic nature of vaccine efficacy evaluation [33].

Moreover, studies have demonstrated that antibody levels can decline over time—a phenomenon known as waning immunity. This decline necessitates regular monitoring of antibody levels in vaccinated populations and can inform public health strategies, such as booster vaccination campaigns targeting specific groups or communities. Understanding the temporal aspects of antibody responses to vaccines is critical for maintaining the efficacy of immunization programs and protecting public health.

The implications for public health are profound. Assessing vaccine efficacy through antibody levels can guide vaccination policies, including decisions about the necessity of booster shots and the prioritization of vaccination for at-risk populations. Furthermore, as vaccine technologies advance and new vaccines emerge, a robust understanding of antibody dynamics will enhance our ability to respond to infectious disease outbreaks [34].

Challenges remain, however, including disparities in access to laboratory testing for antibody levels and the need for standardized measurements across different geographic regions and populations. Additionally, educational initiatives aimed at providing the public with accurate information about vaccine efficacy and antibody levels can help dispel misinformation and build trust in vaccination efforts [35].

Long-term Immunity: Monitoring Antibody Persistence:

In the ongoing fight against infectious diseases, understanding long-term immunity is crucial for public health policy, vaccine development, and individual health management. Central to this understanding is the monitoring of antibody persistence, which refers to the duration over which antibodies remain detectable and functionally effective following infection or vaccination [36].

When the body encounters a pathogen, such as a virus or bacterium, the immune system initiates a complex defense mechanism involving innate and adaptive responses. The innate immune system acts as the first line of defense, utilizing barriers such as the skin and mucosal membranes, as well as the action of innate immune cells like macrophages and dendritic cells. However, it is the adaptive immune response that is responsible for the more specific recognition of pathogens and the generation of a lasting immune memory.

This adaptive response involves the activation of B-lymphocytes (B cells). Upon exposure to an antigen, B cells differentiate into plasma cells, which are responsible for producing antibodies. These antibodies specific to the pathogen facilitate its neutralization and help in its eradication. Following the resolution of the infection, a subset of these B cells persists as memory B cells, ready to mount a faster and more robust response upon subsequent exposures to the same pathogen [37].

Mechanisms of Antibody Persistence

Antibody persistence is not a straightforward process; it is influenced by various factors, including the type of pathogen, the nature of the immune response elicited, and the host's individual characteristics. Studies have shown that the longevity of antibodies can vary widely based on:

1. **Type of Antigen:** Different antigens can elicit varying levels and durations of antibody responses. For example, live attenuated vaccines often lead to longer-lasting immunity compared to inactivated or subunit vaccines, possibly due to stronger and more sustained activation of immune responses [38].
2. **Affinity Maturation:** As B cells encounter their specific antigens, a process called affinity maturation occurs. This process enhances the binding strength of antibodies to their target antigens over time, leading to more effective neutralization. Higher affinity antibodies may persist longer, contributing to prolonged immunity.
3. **Cytokine Influence:** Cytokines, which are signaling molecules released by immune cells, play a pivotal role in regulating the immune response. Specific cytokines can promote the survival of memory B cells and the long-term maintenance of antibody-producing plasma cells in the bone marrow [39].
4. **Genetic Factors:** Individual genetic differences can influence how long antibodies persist in a person. Genetic

polymorphisms in immune system genes may affect the efficacy of antibody responses and the longevity of memory B cells.

5. **Environmental and Physiological Factors:** Factors such as age, nutrition, and overall health can significantly impact the immune response. For instance, elderly individuals often exhibit reduced immunological memory, leading to diminished persistence of antibodies compared to younger populations [40].

Monitoring Antibody Persistence

Monitoring antibody persistence is crucial for assessing individual and population immunity levels. Various methods are employed to quantify antibody levels over time, including enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISA), western blotting, and neutralization assays. These quantitative techniques assess the concentration and functionality of antibodies in serum or plasma samples [41].

Regular monitoring can particularly inform vaccine strategies. For example, some vaccines may require booster doses to sustain adequate immunity against specific diseases. Understanding when antibody levels fall below protective thresholds allows public health officials to design effective booster vaccination campaigns, ensuring that communities remain safeguarded against outbreaks [42].

The persistence of antibodies has substantial implications for vaccine development. As researchers work to create vaccines against a multitude of diseases, the goal is not only to achieve a strong initial immune response but also to ensure that the immunity conferred can be long-lasting. The emergence of new vaccine platforms, such as mRNA vaccines, has shown promise in eliciting durable immune responses, raising hopes for longer-lasting immunity against for infectious diseases like COVID-19 [43].

Moreover, as we improve our understanding of antibody persistence, we can leverage this knowledge to enhance vaccine formulations. For instance, adjuvants, which are substances added to vaccines to enhance immune responses, can be tailored based on findings related to antibody longevity. Additionally, the use of novel delivery systems could potentially improve the stability and bioavailability of vaccine antigens, contributing to longer-lasting immunity.

Beyond individual health, monitoring antibody persistence is essential for understanding population immunity, often referred to as herd immunity. This concept relates to the level of immunity within a community and its capacity to prevent the spread of infectious diseases. High levels of population immunity can protect those who are unvaccinated or who cannot receive vaccinations due to medical reasons [44].

As pathogens evolve and adapt, the need for continuous monitoring of antibody levels and population immunity becomes increasingly vital. Continued surveillance can aid in identifying waning immunity trends and trigger timely responses, such as public health recommendations for booster vaccinations in specific demographics or the general population [45].

Challenges and Limitations of Antibody Testing in Clinical Settings:

In the realm of modern medicine, antibody testing has emerged as a crucial tool for diagnosing and monitoring various diseases, including infectious diseases, autoimmune conditions, and even certain cancers. The ability to determine the presence and levels of specific antibodies in patients' blood samples can provide significant insights into immune responses and disease progression. However, despite its advantages, antibody testing also presents a series of challenges and limitations that impact its utility in clinical settings [46].

One of the primary challenges associated with antibody testing lies in the sensitivity and specificity of the tests available. Sensitivity refers to the test's ability to correctly identify those with the disease (true positive rate), while specificity pertains to the test's ability to correctly identify those without the disease (true negative rate). Many antibody tests, particularly those that are rapid or point-of-care tests, may lack the rigor of laboratory-validated tests, leading to a higher rate of false positives and false negatives. A high rate of false negatives can be particularly critical, as it may lead to misdiagnosis or underdiagnosis of an ongoing infection, especially in cases where timely intervention is essential [47].

Additionally, the overlap of antibodies between different pathogens can result in cross-reactivity, further clouding the accuracy of the results. For instance, assays that detect antibodies for one virus may inadvertently react with antibodies from related viruses, such as those in the same viral family. This can complicate both diagnosis and treatment decisions and complicate epidemiological studies aimed at understanding viral infections [48].

Antibody response is not instantaneous; it typically takes time for antibodies to develop following exposure to a pathogen. This phenomenon leads to a critical challenge related to the timing of testing. For many infectious diseases, antibodies may not be detectable until days or even weeks after infection, creating a "window of detection" that can affect diagnosis [49].

For instance, in the context of diseases like COVID-19, an individual may be infectious and test negative for antibodies, leading to potential public health implications. Furthermore, variations in antibody response individual to individual mean that some patients may never develop detectable levels of antibodies, resulting in a missed diagnosis. This lag in detectability can impair clinical decision-making and epidemiological tracking of infectious diseases, making it a fundamental limitation in the broader scope of patient care [50].

The market for antibody testing has become saturated with a variety of testing methodologies, including enzyme-linked immunosorbent assays (ELISAs), Western blotting, and rapid lateral flow tests, each with distinct levels of reliability, complexity, and cost. The availability of numerous types of tests can lead to variability in results between different laboratories and settings, which in turn complicates the standardization of diagnostic protocols [51].

Moreover, the quality control measures employed by laboratories can vary widely, resulting in inconsistent testing outcomes. In a clinical setting, such variability can challenge healthcare providers' ability to interpret results accurately and may ultimately affect patient outcomes. In addition to the methodological differences, ascertaining the appropriate threshold for positivity may differ from one test to another, further introducing complexity in clinical decision-making.

Interpreting the results of antibody tests poses another significant challenge. Even when tests demonstrate adequate sensitivity and specificity, interpreting the results in the context of patient history, clinical presentation, and potential exposure can be complicated. The presence of antibodies does not always equate to immunity or protection against re-infection; indeed, the duration and robustness of antibody responses can vary greatly among individuals [52].

This issue of interpretation also extends to seroprevalence studies used in public health to assess community-level exposure to pathogens. If antibody tests are not accurately calibrated or if the population baseline is not well understood, the results may lead to misleading conclusions about the extent of exposure or immunity within a community. Such misconceptions can influence public health policies and decisions, possibly affecting vaccination strategies and infection control measures [53].

The limitations of antibody testing extend beyond individual patient care, featuring prominently in the context of public health. During pandemics, inaccurate or misunderstood antibody testing can result in misguided policy decisions, affecting vaccination drives, reopening strategies, and resource allocation. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, widespread reliance on antibody testing for assessing immunity sometimes led to false assumptions about population-wide immunity levels, impacting policies like mask mandates, social distancing protocols, and travel restrictions [54].

Moreover, the accessibility of antibody testing can create discrepancies in healthcare equity. Regions with limited access to accurate testing may be disproportionately affected by the consequences of misdiagnosis or delayed diagnosis. The reliance on varying testing modalities and inconsistent methodologies can also bring to light disparities not only in access to care but also in quality of care [55].

Future Directions: Innovations in Antibody Testing and Vaccine Assessment:

As innovations in vaccine development accelerate, an evolving framework for vaccine assessment is equally crucial. Traditional methods of evaluation focus on randomized controlled trials (RCTs) before approval, but the future of vaccine assessment includes more adaptable and rapid methodologies [56].

1. **Adaptive Trial Designs**: The utilization of adaptive trial designs allows researchers to modify trial protocols based on interim results. This flexibility can lead to quicker evaluations of vaccine efficacy and safety and optimize processes based on emerging data. The COVID-19 vaccine rollout has highlighted the potential of such adaptive approaches that can operate under emergency contexts [57].
2. **Real-World Evidence (RWE)**: Integrating real-world evidence into vaccine evaluation frameworks is gaining traction, as it examines the performance of vaccines in actual population settings post-approval. By leveraging electronic health records, patient registries, and ongoing surveillance, we can better understand the long-term effects and efficacy of vaccines in diverse populations [58].
3. **Neutralization Assays**: Innovations in neutralization assays, including the development of standardized protocols and reference materials, are critical in assessing vaccine performance. These assays measure the capacity of antibodies to prevent pathogen entry into host cells, providing a robust correlate of protection for vaccines [59].
4. **Immunological Mapping**: Advances in immunological mapping involve more sophisticated characterization of immune responses, including the identification of T cell responses alongside antibody production. Understanding this multifaceted immunity can yield more comprehensive insights into vaccine effectiveness and inform booster dose strategies and mixed-dose regimens [60].
5. **Vaccine Platforms**: The development of novel vaccine platforms, including mRNA and vector-based technologies, is reshaping how vaccines are formulated and assessed. These platforms allow for rapid adaptation to emerging pathogens and can be assessed using standardized methods that prioritize speed without compromising safety and efficacy [61].

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the study on "The Use of Antibody Testing in Laboratory for Assessing Immune Response to Vaccination" highlights the critical role of antibody testing as a valuable tool in evaluating the effectiveness of vaccinations. Our findings indicate that antibody levels correlate with protective immunity, making them essential for understanding individual and population responses to vaccines.

The research underscores that different vaccines may elicit varying immune responses, necessitating tailored approaches in antibody testing protocols. Furthermore, implementing standardized testing methods can enhance the reliability of results across different populations and settings.

Public health strategies can benefit significantly from routine antibody assessments, facilitating timely interventions, better vaccine administration campaigns, and informed decisions regarding booster shots. Overall, this study advocates for integrating antibody testing in vaccination programs to optimize immunity assessment and disease prevention strategies effectively.

Future studies should focus on long-term immunity assessments and the role of various factors, such as age, comorbidities, and genetic predispositions, in shaping immune responses to vaccination.

References:

1. Widge AT, Rouphael NG, Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Roberts PC, Makhene M, et al. Durability of Responses after SARS-CoV-2 mRNA-1273 Vaccination. N Engl J Med. 2021 doi: 10.1056/nejmc2032195.
2. Favresse J, Gillot C, Di Chiaro L, Eucher C, Elsen M, Van Eeckhoudt S, et al. Neutralizing antibodies in COVID-19 patients and vaccine recipients after two doses of BNT162b2. Viruses. 2021;13 doi: 10.3390/v13071364.
3. Polack F. Safety and Efficacy of the BNT162b2 mRNA Covid-19 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2021 doi: 10.1056/nejmc2036242.
4. Jabal KA, Ben-Amram H, Beiruti K, Batheesh Y, Sussan C, Zarka S, et al. Real-world

evidence from healthcare workers; Israel: 2020. Impact of age, ethnicity, sex and prior infection status on immunogenicity following a single dose of the BNT162b2 mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. Eurosurveillance 2021.

5. Tan CW, Chia WN, Qin X, Liu P, Chen MIC, Tiu C, et al. A SARS-CoV-2 surrogate virus neutralization test based on antibody-mediated blockage of ACE2–spike protein–protein interaction. Nat Biotechnol. 2020;38 doi: 10.1038/s41587-020-0631-z.

6. U.S. Food & Drug Administration F . 2021. EUA, RightSign COVID-19 IgG/IgM Rapid Test Cassette 2020.

7. Angyal A, Longet S, Moore S, Payne RP, Harding A, Tipton T, et al. T-Cell and Antibody Responses to First BNT162b2 Vaccine Dose in Previously SARS-CoV-2-Infected and Infection-Naive UK Healthcare Workers: A Multicentre, Prospective, Observational Cohort Study. SSRN Electron J. 2021 doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3812375.

8. Baden LR, El Sahly HM, Essink B, Kotloff K, Frey S, Novak R, et al. Efficacy and Safety of the mRNA-1273 SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine. N Engl J Med. 2021 doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2035389.

9. Der Li Y, WY Chi, Su JH, Ferrall L, Hung CF, Wu TC. Coronavirus vaccine development: from SARS and MERS to COVID-19. J Biomed Sci. 2020 doi: 10.1186/s12929-020-00695-2.

10. Walsh EE, Frenck RW, Falsey AR, Kitchin N, Absalon J, Gurtman A, et al. Safety and Immunogenicity of Two RNA-Based Covid-19 Vaccine Candidates. N Engl J Med. 2020 doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2027906.

11. Ng KW, Faulkner N, Cornish GH, Rosa A, Harvey R, Hussain S, et al. Preexisting and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in humans. Science. 2020;(80-) doi: 10.1126/science.abe1107.

12. Wang Z, Schmidt F, Finkin S, Schaefer-Babajew D, Cipolla M, Gaebler C, et al. mRNA vaccine-elicited antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 and circulating variants. Nature. 2021 doi: 10.1038/s41586-021-03324-6.

13. Addetia A, Crawford KHD, Dingens A, Zhu H, Roychoudhury P, Huang ML, et al. Neutralizing antibodies correlate with protection from SARS-CoV-2 in humans during a fishery vessel outbreak with a high attack rate. J Clin Microbiol. 2020;58 doi: 10.1128/JCM.02107-20.

14. California Department of Public Health. Track Var 2021.

15. Sahin U, Muik A, Derhovanessian E, Vogler I, Kranz LM, Vormehr M, et al. COVID-19 vaccine BNT162b1 elicits human antibody and TH1 T cell responses. Nature. 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2814-7.

16. Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, Yang B, Katzelnick LC, Rattigan SM, et al. A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses: kinetics, correlates of protection, and association with severity. Nat Commun. 2020;11 doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-18450-4.

17. Huang Y, Nguyen AW, Hsieh C-L, Silva R, Olaluwoye OS, Wilen RE, et al. Identification of a conserved neutralizing epitope present on spike proteins from all highly pathogenic coronaviruses. BioRxiv. 2021 doi: 10.7554/eLife.83710.

18. Valcourt EJ, Manguiat K, Robinson A, Chen JCY, Dimitrova K, Philipson C, et al. Evaluation of a commercially-available surrogate virus neutralization test for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) Diagn Microbiol Infect Dis. 2021;99 doi: 10.1016/j.diagmicrobio.2020.115294.

19. Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, Roberts PC, Makhene M, Coler RN, et al. An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 — Preliminary Report. N Engl J Med. 2020 doi: 10.1056/nejmoa2022483.

20. Seidel MG, Kindle G, Gathmann B, Quinti I, Buckland M, van Montfrans J, et al. The European Society for Immunodeficiencies (ESID) Registry Working Definitions for the Clinical Diagnosis of Inborn Errors of Immunity. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract (2019) 7(6):1763–70. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2019.02.004.

21. Bousfiha A, Jeddane L, Picard C, Al-Herz W, Ailal F, Chatila T, et al. Human Inborn Errors of Immunity: 2019 Update of the IUIS Phenotypical Classification. J Clin Immunol (2020) 40(1):66–81. doi: 10.1007/s10875-020-00758-x.

22. Bonilla FA, Khan DA, Ballas ZK, Chinen J, Frank MM, Hsu JT, et al. Practice Parameter for the Diagnosis and Management of Primary Immunodeficiency. J Allergy Clin Immunol (2015) 136(5):1186–205.e1-78. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2015.04.049.

23. Oksenhendler E, Gerard L, Fieschi C, Malphettes M, Mouillot G, Jaussaud R, et al. Infections in 252 Patients With Common Variable Immunodeficiency. Clin Infect Diseases: an Off Publ Infect Dis Soc America (2008) 46(10):1547–54. doi: 10.1086/587669.

24. Pollard AJ, Perrett KP, Beverley PC. Maintaining Protection Against Invasive Bacteria With Protein-Polysaccharide Conjugate Vaccines. Nat Rev Immunol (2009) 9(3):213–20. doi: 10.1038/nri2494.

25. Sorensen RU. A Critical View of Specific Antibody Deficiencies. Front Immunol (2019) 10:986. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2019.00986.

26. Lal G, Balmer P, Stanford E, Martin S, Warrington R, Borrow R. Development and Validation of a Nonaplex Assay for the Simultaneous Quantitation of Antibodies to Nine Streptococcus Pneumoniae Serotypes. J Immunol Methods (2005) 296(1-2):135–47. doi: 10.1016/j.jim.2004.11.006.

27. Daly TM, Hill HR. Use and Clinical Interpretation of Pneumococcal Antibody Measurements in the Evaluation of Humoral Immune Function. Clin Vaccine Immunol (2015) 22(2):148–52. doi: 10.1128/CVI.00735-14.

28. Winkelstein JA, Marino MC, Lederman HM, Jones SM, Sullivan K, Burks AW, et al. X-Linked Agammaglobulinemia: Report on a United States Registry of 201 Patients. Medicine (2006) 85(4):193–202. doi: 10.1097/01.md.0000229482.27398.ad.

29. Orange JS, Ballow M, Stiehm ER, Ballas ZK, Chinen J, de la Morena M, et al. Use and Interpretation of Diagnostic Vaccination in Primary Immunodeficiency: A Working Group Report of the Basic and Clinical Immunology Interest Section of the American Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology. Immunology (2021) 162(4):434–51. doi: 10.1111/imm.13297.

30. Sorensen RU, Edgar D. Specific Antibody Deficiencies in Clinical Practice. J Allergy Clin Immunol Pract (2019) 7(3):801–8. doi: 10.1016/j.jaip.2019.01.024.

31. Bernth Jensen JM, Skeldal S, Petersen MS, Møller BK, Hoffmann S, Jensenius JC, et al. The Human Natural Anti-αgal Antibody Targets Common Pathogens by Broad-Spectrum Polyreactivity. Immunology (2020) 162(4):434–51. doi: 10.1111/imm.13297.

32. Paris K, Sorensen RU. Assessment and Clinical Interpretation of Polysaccharide Antibody Responses. Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol (2007) 99(5):462–4. doi: 10.1016/S1081-1206(10)60572-8.

33. Bernth-Jensen JM, Sogaard OS. Polysaccharide Responsiveness Is Not Biased by Prior Pneumococcal-Conjugate Vaccination. PloS One (2013) 8(10):e75944. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0075944.

34. Hoffman TW, van Kessel DA, Rijkers GT. Impact of Using Different Response Criteria for Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccination for Assessment of Humoral Immune Status. J Clin Immunol (2018) 38(2):149–52. doi: 10.1007/s10875-017-0470-y.

35. Woloshin S, Patel N, Kesselheim AS. False Negative Tests for SARS-CoV-2 Infection—Challenges and Implications. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(6):e38. doi: 10.1056/NEJMp2015897.

36. Saito K, Ai T, Kawai A, Matsui J, Fukushima Y, Kikukawa N, et al. Performance and usefulness of a novel automated immunoassay HISCL SARS-CoV-2 Antigen assay kit for the diagnosis of COVID-19. Scientific Reports. 2021;11(1):23196. doi: 10.1038/s41598-021-02636-x.

37. Cutler DM, Summers LH. The COVID-19 Pandemic and the $16 Trillion Virus. Jama.

2020;324(15):1495–6. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.19759.

38. Peeling RW, Wedderburn CJ, Garcia PJ, Boeras D, Fongwen N, Nkengasong J, et al. Serology testing in the COVID-19 pandemic response. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2020;20(9):e245–e9. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30517-X.

39. Nam M, Seo JD, Moon HW, Kim H, Hur M, Yun YM. Evaluation of Humoral Immune Response after SARS-CoV-2 Vaccination Using Two Binding Antibody Assays and a Neutralizing Antibody Assay. Microbiology Spectrum. 2021;9(3):e0120221. doi: 10.1128/Spectrum.01202-21.

40. Fukumoto T, Iwasaki S, Fujisawa S, Hayasaka K, Sato K, Oguri S, et al. Efficacy of a novel SARS-CoV-2 detection kit without RNA extraction and purification. Int J Infect Dis. 2020;98:16–7. doi: 10.1016/j.ijid.2020.06.074.

41. Wheatley AK, Juno JA, Wang JJ, Selva KJ, Reynaldi A, Tan HX, et al. Evolution of immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 in mild-moderate COVID-19. Nat Commun. 2021;12(1):1162. doi: 10.1038/s41467-021-21444-5.

42. Varnaitė R, García M, Glans H, Maleki KT, Sandberg JT, Tynell J, et al. Expansion of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Antibody-Secreting Cells and Generation of Neutralizing Antibodies in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. J Immunol. 2020;205(9):2437–46. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.2000717.

43. Wang Y, Zhang L, Sang L, Ye F, Ruan S, Zhong B, et al. Kinetics of viral load and antibody response in relation to COVID-19 severity. The Journal of Clinical Investigation. 2020;130(10):5235–44. doi: 10.1172/JCI138759.

44. Satarker S, Nampoothiri M. Structural Proteins in Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus-2. Arch Med Res. 2020;51(6):482–91. doi: 10.1016/j.arcmed.2020.05.012.

45. Sethuraman N, Jeremiah SS, Ryo A. Interpreting Diagnostic Tests for SARS-CoV-2. Jama. 2020;323(22):2249–51. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.8259.

46. Wölfel R, Corman VM, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Zange S, Müller MA, et al. Virological assessment of hospitalized patients with COVID-19. Nature. 2020;581(7809):465–9. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2196-x.

47. Piccoli L, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Czudnochowski N, Walls AC, Beltramello M, et al. Mapping Neutralizing and Immunodominant Sites on the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Receptor-Binding Domain by Structure-Guided High-Resolution Serology. Cell. 2020;183(4):1024–42.e21. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2020.09.037.

48. Hajjar J, Al-Kaabi A, Kutac C, Dunn J, Shearer WT, Orange JS. Questioning the Accuracy of Currently Available Pneumococcal Antibody Testing. J Allergy Clin Immunol (2018) 142(4):1358–60. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2018.06.013.

49. Kralickova P, Kuhnova J, Soucek O, Vodarek P, Zak P, Simkovic M, et al. Antibodies Against Pneumococcal Capsular Polysaccharides and Natural Anti-Galactosyl (Alpha-Gal) in Patients With Humoral Immunodeficiencies. J Immunol Res (2017) 2017:7304658. doi: 10.1155/2017/7304658.

50. Janssen LMA, Heron M, Murk JL, Leenders A, Rijkers GT, de Vries E. Focusing on Good Responders to Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Vaccination in General Hospital Patients Suspected for Immunodeficiency. A Decision Tree Based on the 23-Valent Pneumococcal IgG Assay. Front Immunol (2019) 10:2496. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2019.02496.

51. Bernth Jensen JM, Petersen MS, Ellerman-Eriksen S, Moller BK, Jensenius JC, Sorensen UBS, et al. Abundant Human Anti-Galalpha3Gal Antibodies Display Broad Pathogen Reactivity. Sci Rep (2020) 10(1):4611. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-61632-9.

52. LaFon DC, Nahm MH. Interlaboratory Variability in Multiplexed Pneumococcal Antibody Testing. J Allergy Clin Immunol

(2019) 143(3):1255–7. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2018.10.057.

53. Bernth Jensen JM, Laursen NS, Jensen RK, Andersen GR, Jensenius JC, Sørensen UBS, et al. Complement Activation by Human IgG Antibodies to Galactose-α-1,3-Galactose. Immunology (2020) 161(1):66–79. doi: 10.1111/imm.13229.

54. Bucciol G, Schaballie H, Schrijvers R, Bosch B, Proesmans M, De Boeck K, et al. Defining Polysaccharide Antibody Deficiency: Measurement of Anti-Pneumococcal Antibodies and Anti-Salmonella Typhi Antibodies in a Cohort of Patients With Recurrent Infections. J Clin Immunol (2020) 40(1):105–13. doi: 10.1007/s10875-019-00691-8.

55. Ekdahl K, Braconier JH, Svanborg C. Immunoglobulin Deficiencies and Impaired Immune Response to Polysaccharide Antigens in Adult Patients With Recurrent Community-Acquired Pneumonia. Scand J Infect Dis (1997) 29(4):401–7. doi: 10.3109/00365549709011838.

56. Daly TM, Pickering JW, Zhang X, Prince HE, Hill HR. Multilaboratory Assessment of Threshold Versus Fold-Change Algorithms for Minimizing Analytical Variability in Multiplexed Pneumococcal IgG Measurements. Clin Vaccine Immunol (2014) 21(7):982–8. doi: 10.1128/CVI.00235-14.

57. Balloch A, Licciardi PV, Tang ML. Serotype-Specific Anti-Pneumococcal IgG and Immune Competence: Critical Differences in Interpretation Criteria When Different Methods Are Used. J Clin Immunol (2013) 33(2):335–41. doi: 10.1007/s10875-012-9806-9.

58. Bernth Jensen JM, Søgaard OS, Thiel S. The Level of Naturally Occurring Anti-αgal Antibody Predicts Antibody Response to Polysaccharide Vaccination in HIV-Infected Adults. Scand J Immunol (2021) 93(5):e13008. doi: 10.1111/sji.13008.

59. Jandus P, Boligan KF, Smith DF, de Graauw E, Grimbacher B, Jandus C, et al. The Architecture of the IgG Anti-Carbohydrate Repertoire in Primary Antibody Deficiencies. Blood (2019) 134(22):1941–50. doi: 10.1182/blood.2019001705.

60. Adler H, Ferreira DM, Gordon SB, Rylance J. Pneumococcal Capsular Polysaccharide Immunity in the Elderly. Clin Vaccine Immunol (2017) 24(6):1–18. doi: 10.1128/CVI.00004-17.

61. Lopez B, Bahuaud M, Fieschi C, Mehlal S, Jeljeli M, Rogeau S, et al. Value of the Overall Pneumococcal Polysaccharide Response in the Diagnosis of Primary Humoral Immunodeficiencies. Front Immunol (2017) 8:1862. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2017.01862.