

Stable IgG-antibody levels in patients with mild SARS-CoV-2 infection

Thomas Åkerlund^{1*}, Katherina Zakikhany¹, Charlotta Löfström², Evelina Lindmark², Henrik Källberg¹, Ulla Elofsson², Karin Cederbrant², Erik Nygren², Anders Kallin², Nina Lagerqvist¹, Peter Nilsson³, Sophia Hober³, Anna Ridderstad Wollberg², Åsa Szekely Björndal¹

¹Public Health Agency of Sweden, Solna, Sweden

²RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, Borås, Sweden

³KTH Royal Institute of Technology, SciLifeLab, Stockholm, Sweden

*Corresponding author: Thomas Åkerlund, Department of Microbiology, Public Health Agency of Sweden, Solna Sweden; email: thomas.akerlund@folkhalsomyndigheten.se; telephone; +46102052467

Abstract

More knowledge regarding persistence of antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infections in the general population with mild symptoms is needed. We measured and compared levels of SARS-CoV-2 spike- and nucleocapsid-specific IgG-antibodies in serum samples from 145 laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 cases and 324 non-cases. The IgG-antibody levels against the spike protein in cases were stable over the time-period studied (14 to 256 days), while antibody levels against the nucleocapsid protein decreased over time.

Introduction

The ongoing pandemic of the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and its associated respiratory disease, coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19), poses a major and unprecedented threat to global public health (1).

To date, serological tests are widely used to screen for antibodies made in response to a SARS-CoV-2 infection. The antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection are directed against multiple viral antigens including the spike and the nucleocapsid protein (2). Antibodies against the spike-S1 protein, more specifically, the receptor-binding domain, have shown virus-neutralizing activity (3).

Understanding the antibody kinetics over prolonged periods is of crucial importance especially with the ongoing roll out of general vaccination and immunity passports being discussed. Recent reports describe detectable IgG levels in approximately 80-90% of infected COVID-19 patients 4-8 months post infection (4-8). Several studies have included health-care workers with confirmed COVID-19 (9, 10), whose immune response may differ from that of the general population. In this context, there is a need for better understanding of antibody responses in the general population with largely mild symptoms.

Here, we characterize 469 serum samples collected from the general population in Sweden during October to December 2020. The samples were collected to establish a well-characterized national serum panel consisting of SARS-CoV-2 antibody-positive and negative samples for performance evaluation and quality assurance of serological tests. We assessed the antibody levels against SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid and spike proteins in sera from 145 COVID-19 patients 14 to 256 days after diagnosis.

43 **Materials and methods**

44 *Recruitment of study participants*

45 Study participants were recruited from three Swedish Counties via internet-based
 46 advertisement. The advertisement was specifically directed towards persons who either had or had
 47 not contracted COVID-19 during 2020. A web-based questionnaire was used to collect information
 48 on basic demographics and anamnesis concerning COVID-19 (Figure S1). The purpose of the
 49 questionnaire was to pre-screen for candidates likely to donate either antibody-positive or negative
 50 serum samples, as well as to allow for weighing of samples regarding gender, age, county of
 51 residence (county 1-3) and symptoms of respiratory tract infection (RTI) other than COVID-19.
 52 Of 5444 persons completing the questionnaires, 780 individuals were selected for serum sampling
 53 according to the criteria mentioned above. Of these, 484 donated serum for the study (Table S1).
 54 Written consent was obtained from all study-participants. At the time of serum sampling,
 55 vaccination campaigns had not yet started in Sweden.

56 *Serum sampling*

57 Venous blood (5-40 mL) was collected into Serum Sampling Tubes (SST BD Vacutainer)
 58 on county level and transported at ambient temperature to regional laboratories for centrifugation
 59 and isolation of serum. Serum sample aliquots were subsequently shipped to RISE Research
 60 Institutes of Sweden for further analysis.

61 *Case definitions*

62 Patient-cases were defined as study participants with a laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-
 63 2 infection, i.e. with positive real-time reverse transcription PCR test (rRT-PCR), as reported in

the national Swedish SmiNet database (electronic monitoring system for notifications received in accordance with the Communicable Diseases Act). For data analysis, dates for rRT-PCR-diagnostics were primarily used, and if missing, disease notification dates were used.

Non-cases were defined as study participants with no reported laboratory-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection (i.e. rRT-PCR test) as per recording in the SmiNet database up to the serum sampling date.

Of 484 participants, 15 were excluded due to incomplete personal identification number, missing serum samples, or if serum sampling had occurred within 14 days of disease onset.

One follow-up search in the SmiNet database for possible reinfections and/or new infections for the cohort was performed on April 12, 2021.

Antibody testing

Sera were tested for the presence of IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 at the Science for Life Laboratory (SciLifeLab) in Solna, Sweden. Testing was performed using a semi-quantitative multiplex bead-based serologic assay for detection of antibodies to two different SARS-CoV-2 viral proteins, the C-terminal part of the nucleocapsid protein (NCP-C) and the soluble spike glycoprotein (spike-foldon) (11). The sensitivity and specificity of the method was specified as 99.7% (95% CI: 98.3-100%) and 100% (95% CI: 99.8-100%), respectively. Results were obtained as fluorescence intensity in a FlexMap3D instrument (Luminex) and are here given as arbitrary units (AU). Each run included twelve negative and four positive reference samples. Cut-off was determined as the “mean + 6 × SD” of the twelve negative reference samples. Seropositivity was defined as AU above the cut-off for both the nucleocapsid and spike protein. The median AU value of the four positive samples was used for normalization between assays.

Three separate runs were performed, and the values were normalized against the run with the largest number of samples. Testing was performed blinded, i.e. without disclosing any case information of the samples.

Statistical analysis

To compare groups, i.e. cases vs. non-cases and cases only regarding severity (hospital vs. ill at home) we performed pairwise t-test, Mann-Whitney U-test and ANCOVA. ANCOVA was used to allow for correction of variability of gender, age and time between diagnosis (positive rRT-PCR) and serum sampling. We only present P-values based on ANCOVA for group comparisons. Furthermore, we estimated Pearsons correlation coefficient for the log of nucleocapsid and spike antibody levels (AU) in cases. R version 3.6.2 was used for all analysis.

Ethical approval and financing

Ethical approval for this study was obtained from the Swedish Ethical Review Board: Dnr 2020-03584. This project was exclusively funded by the Public Health Agency of Sweden via an assignment (S2020_05026) from the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, Government of Sweden.

Results

Demographics and clinical characteristics

Serum samples from the 469 included study participants were collected between October 30 and December 8, 2020. Of all participants, 145 were found to be laboratory-confirmed COVID-19-patients in the national registry system (SmiNet) and subsequently classified as patient-cases. All patient-cases had sampling/diagnosis dates between March 6 and November 9, 2020 and had until April 21, 2021 only one record in SmiNet. Thus, there were no patient-cases with a recorded re-infection. The remaining 324 participants had no record in SmiNet and were subsequently denoted as non-cases (Table 1). Of note, 28/324 non-cases (8.6%) were registered with a COVID-19 diagnosis in the follow-up search on April 12, 2021.

Most patient-cases, 85%, self-reported severity of illness as mild (Table 1) and symptoms were dominated by influenza-like symptoms (Table S2). About 39% of non-cases reported symptoms of respiratory-tract infection during 2020 and furthermore, 17% of non-cases reported that they had or suspected to have had contracted COVID-19 during 2020 (Table 1).

IgG antibody levels in patient-cases and non-cases

About 95% of patient-cases (137/145) were classified as seropositive, i.e. serum samples showed IgG antibody levels above the threshold for both the nucleocapsid and spike proteins (Table 2). Of the eight seronegative samples, four had antibodies against either spike or nucleocapsid and another four had no detectable antibodies against any of the included antigens. The four non-reactive samples showed background levels in the same range as the majority of non-case samples for the spike protein (Figure 1) and the fluorescence intensity levels showed a discontinuous distribution (Figure 2). These four non-reactive samples were thus considered as

outliers and were excluded for the analyses. There were no significant differences in seropositivity or antibody levels between age groups (Figure S2) or gender (not shown).

Fourteen non-cases (4%) were classified as seropositive (Table 2). Among the 55 non-cases that self-reported to have contracted COVID-19 during 2020, 10 tested seropositive (18%) and 45 tested negative (82%). Geographically, County 1 had a higher proportion of seropositive samples among non-cases than the other two counties (Table S1).

IgG antibody levels and severity of disease

Among patient-cases, antibody levels against the spike protein were higher in patients with moderate to severe disease compared to patients with mild disease ($P = 0.004$, ANCOVA, Figure 3). A similar association was found for antibody levels against the nucleocapsid protein ($P = 0.007$, ANCOVA).

IgG antibody levels in patient-cases in relation to time after diagnosis

For 141 patient-cases (excluding the four outliers), disease notification dates were recorded between March 6 and November 9, 2020, with a majority (30%) recorded in June, followed by 17% in May and October, respectively. The median time between disease notification date and serum sampling was 156 days (range 15-256 days). Four samples were collected 15–20 days after disease notification and 137 samples between 21–256 days. For the 4/141 samples that were classified as seronegative, three samples tested positive for antibodies against the spike protein and one sample tested positive for antibodies against the nucleocapsid protein. These samples were collected at day 160, 176, 207, and 232 after diagnosis.

There were no significant differences in IgG antibody levels against the spike protein over time (Figure 4, $R = -0.059$, $P = 0.49$). Conversely, antibody levels against the nucleocapsid protein were lower for patients diagnosed earlier during spring compared to those in the autumn ($R = -0.19$; $P = 0.02$).

Discussion

We describe the IgG antibody levels in 145 serum samples from patients with a confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis between March and November 2020 in Sweden. The 145 patient samples were part of 469 serum samples, collected with the purpose to establish a national serum panel for validation and quality assessment of serological assays.

Our data showed that 95% of patient-cases seroconverted after a laboratory-confirmed infection with SARS-CoV-2, and there was no difference with respect to age group or gender. Early studies reported 15-90% seroconversion rate in COVID-19 patients, with lower rates among asymptomatic patients (12, 13). One explanation for the varying results are performance differences among serological methods (14-16). Despite the high performance of the method used in this study, eight samples were classified as seronegative. Whereas four patient-cases had detectable IgG levels against one of the two antigens, the remaining four were distinguished by having background fluorescence levels similar to those of the negative controls. Although not conclusive, these outliers most likely represent false positive rRT-PCR diagnostic results. Large scale diagnostic testing in low prevalence settings increases the risk for false positives (17), and highlights the need for careful interpretation of serological non-responders as well as adherence to the case definition of putative reinfections (18).

The levels of IgG antibodies against the spike and nucleocapsid proteins were higher in patients with moderate to severe disease than in patients with mild disease. Reports have shown various results regarding the antibody levels in patients with severe and mild disease (16, 19, 20), which may be due to timing of antibody response in relation to the phase of the infection (21).

One strength of this study is that samples were collected from the general population, covering patients with mostly mild disease. The results indicate that the antibody levels, particularly against the spike protein, remain at detectable levels for more than eight months. This is in agreement with other studies showing a sustained antibody response, e.g. 6-9 months after infection (4, 5, 7, 22-24). Neutralizing antibodies are evidently important for protection against disease (25), and protection over longer time-periods depends on the evolution of memory B cells (26). In this context, it is interesting to note that only one episode of COVID-19 per case was registered between March 6, 2020 and April 12, 2021, while 9% of the non-cases were diagnosed with COVID-19 during the 3.5 months that passed after serum sampling.

Due to the unknown number of undiagnosed SARS-CoV-2 infections in the population, one challenge of our approach was to collect true negative serum samples. Twelve of the 55 non-cases who self-reported a suspected COVID-19 infection also reported positive rRT-PCR-test results in the questionnaires, despite not being registered in the national registry system. Possible explanations for this discrepancy are that they had received their diagnoses abroad, or that there was a misinterpretation of the questionnaire. Nevertheless, excluding those who had reported being tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 with rRT-PCR among the non-cases, we found 7/312 seropositive samples among the non-cases. Six of these were from County 1 which had the highest surge of COVID-19 during the first months of the pandemic in Sweden. About 9% of non-cases in County 1 had detectable antibody levels against either the spike or nucleocapsid protein, compared to 2%

in the other two Counties (Table S3). Due to the non-random selection and bias in the sampling algorithm used here, the result is most likely an underestimate of the proportion of undiagnosed cases in the population.

The well-characterized panel of serum samples presented here will be valuable for diagnostic performance and quality assessments of current and new serological assays.

Acknowledgments

We thank all voluntary participants for donating blood. We also want to thank the health care centres and regional laboratories for blood sampling and serum preparation as well as the SciLifeLab Autoimmunity and Serology profiling facility for analysis of serum samples. Jenny Belin, Carolina Sandman, Jenny Lindahl and Ingela Persson, RISE Research Institutes of Sweden, are acknowledged for setting up the quality management system handling the serum samples, technical assistance and for providing valuable advice on sampling. We are grateful to Karin Tegmark-Wisell, Charlotta Nilsson and Jonas Klingström, Public Health Agency of Sweden, and Magnus Larsson, RISE Research Institute of Sweden, for reading and giving valuable input to the manuscript.

References

1. Cucinotta D, Vanelli M. WHO Declares COVID-19 a Pandemic. *Acta Biomed.* 2020 Mar 19;91(1):157-60.
2. Li D, Li J. Immunologic Testing for SARS-CoV-2 Infection from the Antigen Perspective. *J Clin Microbiol.* 2021 Apr 20;59(5).

- 208 3. Liu L, Wang P, Nair MS, Yu J, Rapp M, Wang Q, et al. Potent neutralizing antibodies
209 against multiple epitopes on SARS-CoV-2 spike. *Nature*. 2020 Aug;584(7821):450-6.
- 210 4. Sherina N, Piralla A, Du L, Wan H, Kumagai-Braesch M, Andrell J, et al. Persistence of
211 SARS-CoV-2-specific B and T cell responses in convalescent COVID-19 patients 6-8 months
212 after the infection. *Med (N Y)*. 2021 Mar 12;2(3):281-95 e4.
- 213 5. Anand SP, Prevost J, Nayrac M, Beaudoin-Bussieres G, Benlarbi M, Gasser R, et al.
214 Longitudinal analysis of humoral immunity against SARS-CoV-2 Spike in convalescent
215 individuals up to 8 months post-symptom onset. *bioRxiv*. 2021 Jan 25.
- 216 6. Abayasingam A, Balachandran H, Agapiou D, Hammoud M, Rodrigo C, Keoshkerian E,
217 et al. Long-term persistence of RBD(+) memory B cells encoding neutralizing antibodies in
218 SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Cell Rep Med*. 2021 Apr 20;2(4):100228.
- 219 7. den Hartog G, Vos ERA, van den Hoogen LL, van Boven M, Schepp RM, Smits G, et al.
220 Persistence of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2 in relation to symptoms in a nationwide prospective
221 study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Feb 24.
- 222 8. Gudbjartsson DF, Norddahl GL, Melsted P, Gunnarsdottir K, Holm H, Eythorsson E, et
223 al. Humoral Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 in Iceland. *N Engl J Med*. 2020 Oct
224 29;383(18):1724-34.
- 225 9. Lumley SF, Wei J, O'Donnell D, Stoesser NE, Matthews PC, Howarth A, et al. The
226 duration, dynamics and determinants of SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses in individual
227 healthcare workers. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2021 Jan 6.

- 228 10. Dan JM, Mateus J, Kato Y, Hastie KM, Yu ED, Faliti CE, et al. Immunological memory
229 to SARS-CoV-2 assessed for up to 8 months after infection. *Science*. 2021 Feb 5;371(6529).
- 230 11. Rudberg AS, Havervall S, Manberg A, Jernbom Falk A, Aguilera K, Ng H, et al. SARS-
231 CoV-2 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in healthcare workers in Sweden. *Nat Commun*.
232 2020 Oct 8;11(1):5064.
- 233 12. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, Li Q, Deng HJ, Yuan J, et al. Clinical and immunological
234 assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*. 2020 Aug;26(8):1200-4.
- 235 13. Wellinghausen N, Plonne D, Voss M, Ivanova R, Frodl R, Deininger S. SARS-CoV-2-
236 IgG response is different in COVID-19 outpatients and asymptomatic contact persons. *J Clin*
237 *Virol*. 2020 Sep;130:104542.
- 238 14. Harris RJ, Whitaker HJ, Andrews NJ, Aiano F, Amin-Chowdhury Z, Flood J, et al.
239 Serological surveillance of SARS-CoV-2: Six-month trends and antibody response in a cohort of
240 public health workers. *J Infect*. 2021 Mar 22.
- 241 15. Marklund E, Leach S, Axelsson H, Nystrom K, Norder H, Bemark M, et al. Serum-IgG
242 responses to SARS-CoV-2 after mild and severe COVID-19 infection and analysis of IgG non-
243 responders. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(10):e0241104.
- 244 16. Wolf J, Kaiser T, Pehnke S, Nickel O, Lubbert C, Kalbitz S, et al. Differences of SARS-
245 CoV-2 serological test performance between hospitalized and outpatient COVID-19 cases. *Clin*
246 *Chim Acta*. 2020 Dec;511:352-9.
- 247 17. Surkova E, Nikolayevskyy V, Drobniewski F. False-positive COVID-19 results: hidden
248 problems and costs. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020 Dec;8(12):1167-8.

- 249 18. Yahav D, Yelin D, Eckerle I, Eberhardt CS, Wang J, Cao B, et al. Definitions for
250 coronavirus disease 2019 reinfection, relapse and PCR re-positivity. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* 2021
251 Mar;27(3):315-8.
- 252 19. Wu F, Liu M, Wang A, Lu L, Wang Q, Gu C, et al. Evaluating the Association of
253 Clinical Characteristics With Neutralizing Antibody Levels in Patients Who Have Recovered
254 From Mild COVID-19 in Shanghai, China. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2020 Oct 1;180(10):1356-62.
- 255 20. Sun B, Feng Y, Mo X, Zheng P, Wang Q, Li P, et al. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 specific
256 IgM and IgG responses in COVID-19 patients. *Emerg Microbes Infect.* 2020 Dec;9(1):940-8.
- 257 21. Li K, Huang B, Wu M, Zhong A, Li L, Cai Y, et al. Dynamic changes in anti-SARS-
258 CoV-2 antibodies during SARS-CoV-2 infection and recovery from COVID-19. *Nat Commun.*
259 2020 Nov 27;11(1):6044.
- 260 22. Wu J, Liang B, Chen C, Wang H, Fang Y, Shen S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection induces
261 sustained humoral immune responses in convalescent patients following symptomatic COVID-
262 19. *Nat Commun.* 2021 Mar 22;12(1):1813.
- 263 23. Mahallawi W, Alzahrani M, Alahmadey Z. Durability of the humoral immune response
264 in recovered COVID-19 patients. *Saudi J Biol Sci.* 2021 Feb 16.
- 265 24. Schaffner A, Risch L, Weber M, Thiel S, Jungert K, Pichler M, et al. Sustained SARS-
266 CoV-2 nucleocapsid antibody levels in nonsevere COVID-19: a population-based study. *Clin*
267 *Chem Lab Med.* 2020 Nov 19;59(2):e49-e51.

25. Khoury DS, Cromer D, Reynaldi A, Schlub TE, Wheatley AK, Juno JA, et al. Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat Med.* 2021 May 17.
26. Gaebler C, Wang Z, Lorenzi JCC, Muecksch F, Finkin S, Tokuyama M, et al. Evolution of antibody immunity to SARS-CoV-2. *Nature.* 2021 Mar;591(7851):639-44.

Table 1. Age, gender and self-reported symptoms of patient-cases and non-cases.

	Patient-cases (%)	Non-cases (%)	Total (%)
N	145 (31)	324 (69)	469 (100)
Gender			
Female	89 (61)	181 (56)	270 (58)
Male	56 (39)	143 (44)	199 (42)
Age group			
18-29	14 (10)	45 (14)	59 (13)
30-44	39 (27)	78 (24)	117 (25)
45-59	70 (48)	114 (35)	184 (39)
≥60	22 (15)	87 (27)	109 (23)
Symptoms of respiratory-tract infections during 2020*			
Yes	115 (79)	127 (39)	242 (52)

No†	30 (21)	197 (61)	227 (48)
Severity of symptoms‡			
Mild	123 (85)	52 (16)	175 (37)
Moderate	16 (11)	3 (0.9)	19 (4.1)
Severe	5 (3.4)	0 (0)	5 (1.1)
No data	1 (0.7)	269 (83)	270 (58)

*Symptoms of respiratory tract infections and severity of disease were extracted from the questionnaires.

†Of those that reported no RTI-symptoms, 29/30 of patient-cases and 12/197 of non-cases, respectively, reported symptoms that they suspected were due to COVID-19.

‡The question of severity of symptoms applied only to those who answered “Yes” on the question “Did you have symptoms during 2020 that you know, or suspect were due to COVID-19” (n = 144 for cases, and n = 55 for non-cases). Mild disease was defined as staying at home while being ill, moderate as hospital admission and severe as ICU admission.

Table 2. IgG-antibodies detected in serum samples of patient-cases and non-cases.

Reactive IgG antibody against	Patient-cases (n=145)	% (95% CI)	Non-cases (n=324)	% (95% CI)
Spike	140	96.6 (92.2-98.5)	21	6.5 (4.3-9.7)
Nucleocapsid	138	95.2 (90.4-97.6)	18	5.6 (3.6-8.6)
Spike and Nucleocapsid	137	94.5 (89.5-97.2)	14	4.3 (2.6-7.1)
None	4	2.8 (1.1-6.9)	299	92.3 (88.9-94.7)

Figures

Figure 1. Antibody levels against viral spike and nucleocapsid proteins in patient-cases (n = 145) and non-cases (n = 324), respectively. Boxes include values between the first (Q1) and third (Q3) quartile, whiskers limits shows values within $Q1-IQR \times 1.5$ and $Q3+IQR \times 1.5$. Outliers are defined as values outside the whisker limits and median values are indicated by a line. IQR: Interquartile range.




Figure 2. Correlation of IgG antibody levels against nucleocapsid and spike proteins among patient-cases (n=145).




Figure 3. Antibody levels in patient-cases with mild vs. moderate-severe disease (n = 120 vs. n = 21, respectively, four outliers removed). For explanation of boxes, see legend to Figure 1.




Figure 4. Correlation of antibody levels among patient-cases and time between disease notification and serum sampling (n = 141, 4 outliers removed).

