

To: "(10)(2e) [REDACTED] /FR" <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@sanofi.com>, "(10)(2e) [REDACTED]" <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@umcutrecht.nl>, "(10)(2e) [REDACTED]" <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@rivm.nl>, "(10)(2e) [REDACTED]" <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@imperial.ac.uk> <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@imperial.ac.uk>, "(10)(2e) [REDACTED]" <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@gsk.com> <(10)(2e) [REDACTED]@gsk.com>

Cc: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@ed.ac.uk>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>

Subject: Re: PROMISE serology proposal and funding for RIVM

Dear all,

Thank you for sharing this proposal with me.

Our main interest is in section D of your proposal and I think it is the piece that fits the most our mandate to expand on RESCEU findings. I think pentaplex testing of samples from infants with known RSV infection status will allow to confirm your previous work and I'm glad you are interested in continuing the work.

On this point, I think the relevance of T4.3.1 hinges on the possibility of generating additional data (i.e., neutralizing Ab titers). Are sera samples still available for this purpose? Otherwise I would propose removing the modeling of Pienter data as I'm not convinced of the added value to the work you already did under RESCEU (JID paper in press). If you could get back to me on this by Monday so we can finalize the T4.3 piece, I would greatly appreciate it.

I understand section C may be of importance in the context of the PROMISE WP3 study but I think the interest for biomarker discovery/confirmation may be limited due to some specificities of the study design (i.e., sampling timepoints). I would suggest fitting it under WP3 activities – (10)(2e) does that make sense to you?

Finally, regarding sections A & B, while I fully agree the subject is relevant and the PiCo study even though not optimally designed for this purpose could start answering some questions, it would not fit under T4.3 objectives, but maybe would be better suited to an additional T4.4, budget permitting.

A few more technical comments:

(A) & (B) I'm not sure whether you are planning on testing ARI episodes for RSV, but I would strongly caution against relying on RSV serology alone to identify RSV (re)infections, especially in certain subpopulations. Indeed, we observed in the RESCEU older adult study that out of the 59 cases identified by PCR/POCT or serology (4 fold rise in preF and/or postF and/or neut titers), about one third (20) were identified solely by PCR following an ARI and didn't meet the serology criteria.

I agree with the risk you identified of COVID-19 protective measures impacting RSV incidence in the upcoming season, and we should keep in mind that this may make it impossible to collect enough observations to draw meaningful conclusions.

(C) Could you help me understand how you plan on contrasting the 2 timepoints? Would the acute sample be used as "pre" and convalescent as "post"? There are many potential caveats to this, some of which may be addressed by protocol design.

Apologies for the long email, but it is a rich proposal and I wanted to make sure I gave relevant feedback.

Let me know how you would like to proceed,

(10)(2e)

From: " (10)(2e) /FR" <(10)(2e)@sanofi.com>

Date: Thursday, September 10, 2020 at 11:41 AM

To: " (10)(2e) " <(10)(2e)@umcutrecht.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, " (10)(2e) @imperial.ac.uk" <(10)(2e)@imperial.ac.uk>, " (10)(2e) @gsk.com" <(10)(2e)@gsk.com>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@sanofi.com>

Cc: (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@ed.ac.uk>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>, (10)(2e) <(10)(2e)@rivm.nl>

Subject: RE: PROMISE serology proposal and funding for RIVM

Dear all,

Thank you very much for this information.

I copy here (10)(2e) as she is our expert on this field.

Now I had to find my way in RSV and PROMISE. From (10)(2e) I got insight into the WP1/WP2 workpackages, but this is another trajectory than the one for RSV biomarkers and serology (WP3/4). Now Louis Bont previously gave me some guidance here, yet it is not clear whether we can become a true partner again in PROMISE. I understand that we cannot obtain budget from the WP1/2 programme as this has already been planned and cannot be downscaled anymore.

Now Charlotte Vernhes from Sanofi has shown great interest in our pentaplex assay, and wrote a proposal with a request to support their study. Louis Bont showed similar interest with respect to mucosal versus serum response. Now I understand the limitations of the PROMISE budget, but we need a basic project and funding to be able to also carry out investigations for PROMISE partners.

Therefore, I would like to discuss with you the concept of the project proposal, and see where we can meet. In case of conflicts of interest or scientific overlap, please let me know.

Also, I have changed the previous concept and budget request a little less ambitious, as we do feel there are risks involved in engaging a very large Pienter/Pico cohort for the study as outlined under A and B, as we cannot predict serodynamics of RSV infections on beforehand across different age groups, and possible changes in the RSV epidemiology related to COVID-19 distancing measures.

That's why we have restricted the survey to an analysis of the first 1000, as to provide serological proof of RSV (re-) infection first. I hope this is sufficient basis to discuss the opportunities within your team as to support our research initiatives.

Hope to hear from you,

(10)(2e)

Center for Immunology and Infectious Diseases and Vaccines (IIV)
PO Box 102
3720 BA Bilthoven
The Netherlands
T+ 31 (10)(2e)

Dit bericht kan informatie bevatten die niet voor u is bestemd. Indien u niet de geadresseerde bent of dit bericht abusievelijk aan u is verzonden, wordt u verzocht dat aan de afzender te melden en het bericht te verwijderen. Het RIVM aanvaardt geen aansprakelijkheid voor schade, van welke aard ook, die verband houdt met risico's verbonden aan het elektronisch verzenden van berichten.
www.rivm.nl De zorg voor morgen begint vandaag.

This message may contain information that is not intended for you. If you are not the addressee or if this message was sent to you by mistake, you are requested to inform the sender and delete the message. RIVM accepts no liability for damage of any kind resulting from the risks inherent in the electronic transmission of messages.
www.rivm.nl/en Committed to health and sustainability

De informatie opgenomen in dit bericht kan vertrouwelijk zijn en is uitsluitend bestemd voor de geadresseerde. Indien u dit bericht onterecht ontvangt, wordt u verzocht de inhoud niet te gebruiken en de afzender direct te informeren door het bericht te retourneren. Het Universitair Medisch Centrum Utrecht is een publiekrechtelijke rechtspersoon in de zin van de W.H.W. (Wet Hoger Onderwijs en Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek) en staat geregistreerd bij de Kamer van Koophandel voor Midden-Nederland onder nr. 30244197.

Denk s.v.p. aan het milieu voor u deze e-mail afdrukt.

This message may contain confidential information and is intended exclusively for the addressee. If you receive this message unintentionally, please do not use the contents but notify the sender immediately by return e-mail. University Medical Center Utrecht is a legal person by public law and is registered at the Chamber of Commerce for Midden-Nederland under no. 30244197.

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.