

1 Evaluating the serological status of COVID-19 patients using an indirect
2 immunofluorescent assay, France.

3
4 Edouard, S., Colson, P., Melenotte, C., De Pinto, F., Thomas, L., La Scola, B.,
5 Million, M., Tissot-Dupont, H., Gautret, P., Stein, A., Brouqui, P., Parola, P., Lagier,
6 J.-C., Raoult, D., Drancourt, M.

7

8 **ABSTRACT**

9 An indirect immunofluorescent assay was developed in order to assess the
10 serological status of 888 RT-PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patients (1,302 serum
11 samples) and controls in Marseille, France. Incorporating an inactivated clinical
12 SARS CoV-2 isolate as the antigen, the specificity of the assay was measured as
13 100% for IgA titre \geq 1:200; 98.6% for IgM titre \geq 1:200; and 96.3% for IgG titre \geq
14 1:100 after testing a series of negative controls as well as 150 serums collected from
15 patients with non-SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus infection, non-Coronavirus pneumonia
16 and infections known to elicit false-positive serology. Seroprevalence was then
17 measured at 3% before a five-day evolution up to 47% after more than 15 days of
18 evolution. We observed that the seroprevalence as well as the titre of specific
19 antibodies were both significantly higher in patients with a poor clinical outcome than
20 in patients with a favourable evolution. These data, which have to be integrated into
21 the ongoing understanding of the immunological phase of the infection, suggest that
22 serotherapy may not be a therapeutic option in patients with severe COVID-19
23 infection. The IFA assay reported here is useful for monitoring SARS-CoV-2
24 exposure at the individual and population levels.

25

26

27 INTRODUCTION

28 The SARS-CoV-2 is a coronavirus belonging to the genus *Betacoronavirus* that
29 emerged in humans in December 2019 (1). It was first described in China before
30 spreading and being classified as a pandemic (2). It causes a respiratory disease
31 known as Covid-19 that is usually mild but can result in a severe and even life-
32 threatening pneumonia, particularly in elderly people (2, 3). On 24 April 2020,
33 2,699,338 SARS-CoV-2 infections and 188,437 associated deaths had been
34 reported worldwide [<https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html>].

35 To date, the virological diagnosis of infections by SARS-CoV-2 has been
36 essentially based on real-time reverse transcription PCR (4). This virus has been
37 shown to elicit specific antibodies during the course of infection (1, 5). This
38 serological response has mainly been analysed using enzyme-linked or
39 chemiluminescence immunoassays among exposed populations in China and
40 neighbouring countries. Previous studies showed that specific IgG, IgM and IgA were
41 produced in response to the infection (6). The kinetics of these three classes of
42 antibodies have been described, yet correlations with the clinical outcome of the
43 patients has been poorly reported (6).

44 In this study, we implemented an indirect immunofluorescent assay for the
45 detection of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies, and observed significant differences in the
46 seroprevalence and antibody titres between groups of patients depending on their
47 clinical outcome.

48

49 PATIENTS AND METHODS

50 **Study design.** A cohort of patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection was
51 studied at the Institut Hospitalo-Universitaire (IHU) Méditerranée Infection in

52 Marseille, France, as previously described (7). All patients presenting symptoms
53 compatible with COVID-19 and contacts of suspected and confirmed COVID-19
54 cases were tested using a SARS-CoV-2 specific qRT-PCR assay (7, 8). Treatment
55 with hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) associated with azithromycin (AZ) was proposed to
56 all qPCR-positive patients who enrolled on a voluntary basis if they did not present
57 contraindications (7). Patients were followed-up on an out-patient basis at our day
58 care hospital or were hospitalised in the infectious disease units of the IHU, in
59 intensive care units or in other medical departments of the Assistance Publique-
60 Hôpitaux de Marseille, depending on the severity of the disease. We included in the
61 present study all patients from the previous study by Million *et al.* for whom ≥ 1 serum
62 sample was available for serological testing as part of the routine care of these
63 patients. The serum samples were tested retrospectively using an indirect
64 immunofluorescence assay (IFA). The time of serum collection was determined
65 relative to the date of the onset of symptoms. The non-interventional nature of this
66 study was approved by the Ethical Committee of the IHU Méditerranée Infection
67 under no. 2020-13.

68

69 **Case definition.** SARS-CoV-2 infection was defined by clinical, radiological, and
70 microbiological criteria as previously reported (3, 7). Briefly, the national early
71 warning score (NEWS) for COVID-19 was used for the classification of clinical
72 presentation of patients. Virological evidence of the infection was based on a positive
73 qRT-PCR on a nasopharyngeal sample or another respiratory sample. Pulmonary
74 involvement was evaluated by chest low-dose computed tomography for all patients.
75 Five groups of patients were constituted according to the following criteria (7): (1)

76 Patients with mild disease and good clinical and virological outcome (GO; n= 681);
77 (2) Patients with poor virological outcome defined by persistence at day 10 or more
78 of viral detection in respiratory samples (PVirO; n= 100); (3) Patients who received
79 HCQ + AZ treatment for more than three days, with poor clinical outcome requiring
80 prolonged hospitalisation for 10 days or more despite three days or more of HCQ +
81 AZ treatment (PClinO1; n= 53); (4) Patients who received HCQ + AZ treatment for
82 fewer than three days, with poor clinical outcome requiring prolonged hospitalisation
83 for 10 days or more (PClinO2; n = 25); (5) Patients with poor clinical outcome
84 requiring prolonged hospitalisation for 10 days or more leading to death (PClinO3; n=
85 29). Main characteristics of the patients in each group are summarised in Table 1.

86 **Indirect immunofluorescence assay.** Anti-SARS-Cov 2 antibodies were detected
87 using an in house indirect immunofluorescence assay (IFA), as previously described
88 (9). Vero E6 cells (ATCC CRL-1586, Rockville, MD, USA) infected with the SARS-
89 CoV2 strain IHU-MI2 (full genome sequence of this strain was deposited under the
90 European Molecular Biology Laboratory EMBL project accession no. PRJEB38023)
91 (10) were harvested between 24 hours and 48 hours post-inoculation when
92 cytopathic effect begins to be observed before massive cell lyses begin, washed with
93 sterile phosphate buffered saline (PBS) (Oxoid, Dardilly, France) and inactivated
94 using 5% paraformaldehyde. This preparation was used as the antigen and 50 nL of
95 antigen were spotted on each well of 18-well microscope glass slides using Echo
96 525 Liquid Handler instruments (Labcytes, Cannock, United Kingdom) that uses
97 acoustic energy to transfer liquid from a 96-well plate containing the antigen to
98 slides. Fifty nanolitres of uninfected Vero cells were also spotted on each well as a
99 negative control and a clinical isolate of *Staphylococcus aureus* (identified by matrix-
100 assisted laser desorption ionization-time of flight mass spectrometry) (11) was

101 spotted on each well in order to ensure further serum deposition, as previously
102 described (12). Each slide was air dried, fixed in acetone for 10 minutes and
103 conserved at 4°C in the dark.

104 In a first step, each serum sample was screened for the presence of anti-
105 SARS CoV-2 antibodies using the IFA, as previously described (9). Serum samples
106 were heat-decomplemented for 30 minutes at 56°C, diluted in 3% PBS-milk and 25
107 µL of a 1:50 dilution and a 1:100 dilution were pipetted onto a 18-spot slide then
108 incubated for 30 minutes at 37°C in the dark to be screened for the detection of total
109 immunoglobulin (IgT). After washing thrice, the slides with sterile PBS for 10
110 minutes, 25 µL of total FITC-conjugated IgT anti-human immunoglobulin (Bio-Rad,
111 Marnes-la-Coquette, France) with 0.5% Evans blue (Bio-Rad) were incubated for 30
112 minutes at 37°C. After washing, slides were observed under a fluorescence
113 microscope (AxioSkop 40, Zeiss, Marly le Roi, France). In a second step, all the
114 serum samples screened positive at a 1:100 dilution were quantified for IgG, IgM and
115 IgA as reported above, except that serum samples were diluted up to 1:1,600 for IgA
116 and IgM and 1:3,200 for IgG; and anti-IgG, anti-IgM and anti-IgA conjugates were
117 used (bioRad). Serum samples exhibiting positivity at 1:3,200 were further tested up
118 to 1:6,400. A serum sample exhibiting a 1:400 titre collected from one patient who
119 was positive by SARS COV-2 RT-PCR, was anonymised and used as a positive
120 control on each slide for screening and on each run for antibody quantification. A
121 negative serum collected in December 2019 from a patient and PBS-milk 3% were
122 used as negative controls on each slide screened. In order to interpret the IFA, any
123 serum sample exhibiting IgG 1:100 was considered as positive; as well as any serum
124 sample exhibiting isolated IgM or IgA 1:200.

125 **Serum samples.** The specificity of the IFA was evaluated by testing four series of
126 serum samples. Negative control samples (n = 200) had been collected from patients
127 between November and December 2018 (before the COVID-19 epidemics in
128 France). Further, serum samples known to be associated with nonspecific
129 serological interference were collected from 14 patients diagnosed with Epstein-Barr
130 virus infection; eight patients diagnosed with Cytomegalovirus infection; seven
131 patients diagnosed with A hepatitis virus infection; 10 patients diagnosed with
132 toxoplasmosis and 25 patients diagnosed with E hepatitis virus infection. Serum
133 samples were also collected from 50 patients diagnosed with Coronavirus NL63,
134 OC43, 229E or HKU1; as well as 36 sera collected from patients diagnosed with
135 non-coronavirus pneumonia, including 14 *Mycoplasma pneumoniae* infections, 10
136 *Legionella pneumophila* infections, and 12 *Chlamydia pneumoniae* infections, in
137 order to assess for potential cross-reactivity.

138 **Statistical analysis.** To avoid bias in data analysis, we studied the serological
139 response according to the time of sampling of the sera related to the date of the
140 onset of symptoms. The analysis of sera was divided into different times (D0-D5, D6-
141 D10, D11-D15 and D16-D38). For the studied of seroprevalence and for the
142 comparison of IgG titre, we considered only the sera with the higher IgG titre or with
143 the higher IgM or IgA titre when several sera were available for a same patient. For
144 the data comparisons and statistical analyses, Fisher's exact test or the Chi-squared
145 test and standard statistical software (GraphPad Prism 5) were used. A p-value <
146 0.05 was considered statistically significant. ROC curves were calculated using
147 GraphPad Prism 5.

148

149 **RESULTS**

150 **IFI assay.** In the negative control group of 200 serum samples collected from
151 patients in November and December 2018 before the emergence of COVID-19 in
152 France, no IgG and no IgA were detected and three samples exhibited a IgM titre of
153 1:25 for two samples and 1:100 for one sample (Figure 1). In the group of serum
154 samples known to yield cross-reactivities, two samples collected from patients
155 diagnosed with Epstein-Barr virus infection (n = 14) exhibited IgG titre 1:200, one to
156 1:100 and two IgM titre \geq 1:100; two samples collected from patients diagnosed with
157 Cytomegalovirus infection (n = 08) exhibited IgM titre 1:100; one sample collected
158 from patients diagnosed with hepatitis A (n = 07) exhibited an IgM titre at 1:200 and
159 two at 1:100; and one sample collected from patients diagnosed with hepatitis E (n =
160 25) exhibited IgG titre at 1:400; and one serum exhibited IgM titre at 1:100. Of the 50
161 serum samples collected from patients diagnosed with another Coronavirus other
162 than COVID-19, none reacted in IgG, none reacted in IgA and six reacted at 1:100 in
163 IgM, two reacted at 1:200 and one reacted at 1:800 (Table 2). No positivity was
164 observed from 10 serum samples drawn from toxoplasmosis patients. Also, 36 sera
165 collected from patients diagnosed with non-Coronavirus pneumonia yielded an IgG
166 titre at 1:400 (n = 3) and an IgG titre at 1:100 (n = 6). Overall, 13/350 serum samples
167 yielded a false positivity of IgG \geq 1:100, yielding a 96.3% specificity for IgG; and
168 05/350 serum samples yielded a false positivity of IgM \geq 1:200, yielding a specificity
169 of 98.6% for IgM. Specificity of IgA titre of 1:200 was 100%.

170 We then evaluated the serological response in a collection of 1,302 serum
171 samples from 888 patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 between 12 March and 17
172 April 2020 (7). This cohort, which included 408 men (46%), had a median age of 45
173 years (range, 14–97 years). Median age of patients from PClinO1, PClinO2, PClinO3

174 group were significantly higher than the median age of patients from PVirO and GO
175 group ($p < 0.0001$). Serum samples had been collected at a median time of 15 days
176 (range, 0–38 days) after onset of symptoms. Seventy (5.4%) sera were collected
177 between D0-D5, 238 (18.3%) between D6-D10, 395 (30.3%) between D11-D15 and
178 599 (46%) between D15-D38. Multiple sera were available for 299 patients. At least
179 one positive serology was found in 330 patients, leading to a global seroprevalence
180 of 37.2%. The time distribution of positive serum samples was as follows: 3%
181 between D0-D5, 13% between D6–D10, 27% between day D11–D15 and 47% after
182 D16. We observed 88 (29%) seroconversions that occurred between D6–D10 in 6
183 (7%) cases, between D11–D15 in 25 (28%) cases and after D16 in 57 (65%) cases.
184 Only two patients were observed to be positive within five days after onset of the
185 illness, one patient exhibited IgG titre 1:100 and another patient with IgG titre at
186 1:1,600 and IgA at 1:100.

187 Detailing the results for each group of patients, the median time of serum
188 sampling was 8, 11, 11, 16 and 16 days after the onset of symptoms for PClinO3,
189 PClinO2, PClinO1, PVirO and GO, respectively. Global seroprevalence by group
190 was 29% in PClinO3, 56% in PClinO2, 49% in PClinO1, 44% in PVirO and 29% in
191 GO patients. Higher seroprevalence was observed in group of PClinO3, PClinO2,
192 PClinO1 compared to GO group between D6-D10 but this was not significant.
193 However, significant higher seroprevalence between patients with poor clinical
194 outcome compared to patients with good clinical outcome was observed after D10
195 (Figure 2). Higher seroprevalence was found in PClinO3 (70%), PClinO2 (71%),
196 PClinO1 (57%) compared to patients with good clinical outcome (GO) (37%),
197 $p = 0.046$, $p = 0.01$ and $p = 0.015$, respectively. In particular, the five deda patients had

198 exhibited positive serology after day 16. No significant difference was observed
199 between PVirO and GO group.

200 We also compared IgG titre between the five groups of patients on sera
201 collected at least 10 days after the onset of symptoms. We found significant higher
202 IgG titre in patients with a poor clinical outcome (died PCLinO3, PCLinO2, PCLinO1)
203 compared to patients with good outcome (GO) ($p=0.0007$) (Figure 3).

204

205 **DISCUSSION**

206 We developed an indirect immunofluorescence assay for the detection of IgG, IgM
207 and IgA anti-SARS CoV-2 antibodies and we used it to assess the serological status
208 of hundreds of COVID-19 patients and controls, as such an assay has been only
209 reported on a very small group of patients (13). In order to avoid false negative
210 results, the assay incorporated *S. aureus* as a control of deposition of tested sera, as
211 *S. aureus* protein A and protein M bind non-specifically to any serum antibody (12).
212 The assay also incorporated non-infected Vero cells on which the viral antigen has
213 been produced, in order to identify false positive reactivities. Reading of both
214 controls was incorporated into the interpretation algorithm. Accordingly, the
215 specificity of the assay was measured at 100% for IgA, 98.5% for IgM and 95.9% for
216 IgG.

217 Using this assay, we observed low values of seroprevalence, at 37% in RT-
218 PCR confirmed COVID-19 patients, ranging precisely from 3% before five days'
219 evolution to 47% after 15 days' evolution. However, seroconversions of specific IgM
220 and IgG antibodies were observed as early as day four after the onset of symptoms,
221 as previously described (2). This low seroprevalence is here observed in a

222 population of treated patients with a favourable clinical evolution and outcome in
223 most of these patients. In contrast, we identified that patients with severe disease
224 developed a serological response in most cases (and all patients who died) that was
225 characterised by high levels of IgG; in agreement with previous reports that antibody
226 levels were higher after a severe and critical infection than after a mild infection (14-
227 16). An immediate antibody response was observed in severe cases while it
228 appeared later in mild cases (15, 16). On the other hand, an analysis of patients with
229 mild symptoms of COVID-19 showed that SARS-CoV-2 can persist in patients who
230 developed specific IgG antibodies for a very long period of time, up to 35 days,
231 whereas a patient who did not develop an IgG response cleared the virus after 46
232 days (17).

233 Thus, high antibody titres were associated with severe disease regardless of
234 age, gender and comorbidities, and there was no correlation between an early
235 adaptive humoral response and improved clinical outcome (14). These results
236 therefore call into question the much hoped-for role for serotherapy in SARS-CoV-2
237 infection. The use of convalescent plasma with high levels of neutralising antibodies
238 planned at the onset of the pandemic for the treatment of severe COVID-19
239 infections may not be an effective treatment option (18-20).

240 Detecting anti-SARS CoV-2 antibodies is useful as a marker associated with
241 COVID-19 severity. Serology also assesses exposure to the virus, at the individual
242 level for middle-long term medical monitoring of the patients; and at the population
243 level for monitoring the circulation of the virus, as it is one of the markers contributing
244 to assessing the effectiveness of countermeasures.

245

246 **REFERENCES**

247

248 1. Zhu N, Zhang D, Wang W, Li X, Yang B, Song J, Zhao X, Huang B, Shi W, Lu R,
249 Niu P, Zhan F, Ma X, Wang D, Xu W, Wu G, Gao GF, Tan W, China Novel
250 Coronavirus Investigating and Research Team. 2020. A novel coronavirus from
251 patients with pneumonia in China, 2019. *N Engl J Med* 382:727-733.

252

253 2. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, Peng Z, Yang B, Zhang J, Zhou Q, Ye H, Ma Y, Li H,
254 Wei X, Cai P, Ma WL. Antibody detection and dynamic characteristics in patients
255 with COVID-19. 2020. *Clin Infect Dis pii: ciaa461. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciaa461*. [Epub
256 ahead of print].

257

258 3. Gautret P, Lagier JC, Parola P, Hoang VT, Meddeb L, Sevestre J, Mailhe M,
259 Doudier B, Aubry C, Amrane S, Seng P, Hocquart M, Eldin C, Finance J, Vieira VE,
260 Dupont HT, Honoré S, Stein A, Million M, Colson P, La Scola B, Veit V, Jacquier
261 A, Deharo JC, Drancourt M, Fournier PE, Rolain JM, Brouqui P, Raoult D. 2020.
262 Clinical and microbiological effect of a combination of hydroxychloroquine and
263 azithromycin in 80 COVID-19 patients with at least a six-day follow up: A pilot
264 observational study. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 101663. doi:
265 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101663.

266

267 4. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, Yip CC, Cai JP, Chan
268 JM, Chik TS, Lau DP, Choi CY, Chen LL, Chan WM, Chan KH, Ip JD, Ng AC, Poon

269 RW, Luo CT, Cheng VC, Chan JF, Hung IF, Chen Z, Chen H, Yuen KY. 2020.
270 Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum
271 antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study.
272 Lancet Infect Dis pii: S1473-3099(20)30196-1. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(20)30196-
273 1. [Epub ahead of print].

274

275 5. Bin Ju, Qi Zhang, Xiangyang Ge, Ruoke Wang, Jiazhen Yu, Sisi Shan, Bing Zhou,
276 Shuo Song, Xian Tang, Jinfang Yu, Jiwan Ge, Jun Lan, Jing Yuan, Haiyan Wang,
277 Juanjuan Zhao, Shuye Zhang, Youchun Wang, Xuanling Shi, Lei Liu, Xinquan Wang,
278 Zheng Zhang, Linqi Zhang. 2020. Potent human neutralizing antibodies elicited by
279 SARS-CoV-2 infection. MedRxiv 2020.03.17.20036640; doi:
280 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.03.17.20036640>.

281

282 6. Guo L, Ren L, Yang S, Xiao M, Chang, Yang F, Dela Cruz CS, Wang Y, Wu C,
283 Xiao Y, Zhang L, Han L, Dang S, Xu Y, Yang Q, Xu S, Zhu H, Xu Y, Jin Q, Sharma
284 L, Wang L, Wang J. 2020. Profiling early humoral response to diagnose novel
285 Coronavirus disease (COVID-19). Clin Infect Dis. 2020 pii: ciaa310. doi:
286 10.1093/cid/ciaa310.

287

288 7. Million M, Lagier JC, Gautret P, Colson P, Fournier PE, Amrane S, Hocquart M,
289 Mailhe M, Esteves-Vieira V, Doudier B, Aubry C, Correard F, Giraud-Gatineau A,
290 Yanis Roussel, Bellenger C, Cassir N, Seng P, Zandotti C, Dhiver C, Ravaux I,
291 Tomei C, Eldin C, Braunstein D, Tissot-Dupont H, Honoré S, Stein A, Jacquier A,

292 Deharo JC, Chabrière E, Levasseur A, Fenollar F, Rolain JM, Obadia Y, Brouqui P,
293 Drancourt M, La Scola B, Parola P, Raoult D. 2020. Early treatment of 1061 COVID-
294 19 patients with hydroxychloroquine and azithromycin, Marseille, France. Submitted.

295 8. Amrane S, Tissot-Dupont H, Doudier B, Eldin C, Hocquart M, Mailhe M, Dudouet
296 P, Ormières E, Ailhaud L, Parola P, Lagier JC, Brouqui P, Zandotti C, Ninove L,
297 Luciani L, Boschi C, La Scola B, Raoult D, Million M, Colson P, Gautret P. 2020.
298 Rapid viral diagnosis and ambulatory management of suspected COVID-19 cases
299 presenting at the infectious diseases referral hospital in Marseille, France, - January
300 31st to March 1st, 2020: A respiratory virus snapshot. *Travel Med Infect Dis* 101632.
301 doi: 10.1016/j.tmaid.2020.101632.

302

303 9. Dupont HT, Thirion X, Raoult D. 1994. Q fever serology: cutoff determination for
304 microimmunofluorescence. *Clin Diagn Lab Immunol* 1:189-196.

305

306 10. La Scola B, Le Bideau M, Andreani J, Van Thuan Hoang, Grimaldier C, Colson
307 P, Gautret P, Raoult D. 2020. Viral RNA load as determined by cell culture as a
308 management tool for discharge of SARS-CoV-2 patients from infectious disease
309 wards. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. In press.

310

311 11. Seng P, Drancourt M, Gouriet F, La Scola B, Fournier PE, Rolain JM, Raoult D.
312 2009. Ongoing revolution in bacteriology: routine identification of bacteria by
313 matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization time-of-flight mass spectrometry.

314 Clin Infect Dis 49:543-551. doi: 10.1086/600885.

315

316 12. Gouriet F, Levy PY, Samson L, Drancourt M, Raoult D. 2008. Comparison of the
317 new InoDiag automated fluorescence multiplexed antigen microarray to the
318 reference technique in the serodiagnosis of atypical bacterial pneumonia. Clin
319 Microbiol Infect 14:1119-1127.

320

321 13. Haveri A, Smura T, Kuivanen S, Österlund P, Hepojoki J, Ikonen N, Pitkäpaasi
322 M, Blomqvist S, Rönkkö E, Kantele A, Strandin T, Kallio-Kokko H, Mannonen L,
323 Lappalainen M, Broas M, Jiang M, Siira L, Salminen M, Puumalainen T, Sane J,
324 Melin M, Vapalahti O, Savolainen-Kopra C. 2020. Serological and molecular findings
325 during SARS-CoV-2 infection: the first case study in Finland, January to February
326 2020. Euro Surveill 25. doi: 10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.11.2000266.

327

328 14. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, Liu W, Liao X, Su Y, Wang X, Yuan J, Li T, Li J, Qian
329 S, Hong C, Wang F, Liu Y, Wang Z, He Q, Li Z, He B, Zhang T, Fu Y, Ge S, Liu L,
330 Zhang J, Xia N, Zhang Z. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel
331 Coronavirus disease 2019. 2020. Clin Infect Dis pii: ciaa344. doi:
332 10.1093/cid/ciaa344.

333

334 15. Okba NMA, Müller MA, Li W, Wang C, GeurtsvanKessel CH, Corman VM,
335 Lamers MM, Sikkema RS, de Bruin E, Chandler FD, Yazdanpanah Y, Le Hingrat Q,
336 Descamps D, Houhou-Fidouh N, Reusken CBEM, Bosch BJ, Drosten C, Koopmans
337 MPG, Haagmans BL. Severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus 2-specific

338 antibody responses in Coronavirus disease 2019 Patients. 2020. Emerg Infect Dis
339 26. doi: 10.3201/eid2607.200841.

340

341 16. Yongchen Z, Shen H, Wang X, Shi X, Li Y, Yan J, Chen Y, Gu B. Different
342 longitudinal patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease
343 severity of COVID-19 patients.2020. Emerg Microbes Infect 1-14. doi:
344 10.1080/22221751.2020.1756699.

345 17. Wang B, Wang L, Kong X, Geng J, Xiao D, Ma C, Jiang X, Wang P-H. 2020.
346 Long-term coexistence of severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-
347 CoV-2) with antibody response in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Patients.
348 medRxiv 04.13.20040980; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.13.20040980>

349

350 18. Bloch EM, Shoham S, Casadevall A, Sachais BS, Shaz B, Winters JL, van
351 Buskirk C, Grossman BJ, Joyner M, Henderson JP, Pekosz A, Lau B, Wesolowski A,
352 Katz L, Shan H, Auwaerter PG, Thomas D, Sullivan DJ, Paneth N, Gehrie E,
353 Spitalnik S, Hod E, Pollack L, Nicholson WT, Pirofski LA, Bailey JA, Tobian AA.
354 Deployment of convalescent plasma for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19.
355 2020. J Clin Invest pii: 138745. doi: 10.1172/JCI138745.

356

357 19. Duan K, Liu B, Li C, Zhang H, Yu T, Qu J, Zhou M, Chen L, Meng S, Hu Y, Peng
358 C, Yuan M, Huang J, Wang Z, Yu J, Gao X, Wang D, Yu X, Li L, Zhang J, Wu X, Li
359 B, Xu Y, Chen W, Peng Y, Hu Y, Lin L, Liu X, Huang S, Zhou Z, Zhang L, Wang Y,
360 Zhang Z, Deng K, Xia Z, Gong Q, Zhang W, Zheng X, Liu Y, Yang H, Zhou D, Yu D,
361 Hou J, Shi Z, Chen S, Chen Z, Zhang X, Yang X. 2020. Effectiveness of

362 convalescent plasma therapy in severe COVID-19 patients. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA

363 pii: 202004168. doi: 10.1073/pnas.2004168117.

364

365 20. Wang X, Guo X, Xin Q, Pan Y, Li J, Chu Y, Feng Y, Wang Q. Neutralizing

366 antibodies responses to SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 inpatients and convalescent

367 patients. medRxiv 2020.04.15.20065623; doi:

368 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.15.20065623>.

369

370

371 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.**

372 The authors acknowledge the contribution of the technical staff of the IHU
373 Méditerranée Infection Laboratory. This work was supported by IHU Méditerranée
374 Infection, Marseille, France.

375

376 **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

377 This study was funded by ANR-15-CE36-0004-01 and by ANR “Investissements
378 d’Avenir” Méditerranée Infection 10-IAHU-03.

379

380

381

382 **Figure Legends.**

383 **Figure 1. Picture of immunofluorescence assay of serum sample from a**
384 **COVID-19 Infected patient.** Each well of glass slides was spotted with SARS-Cov-2
385 antigen (A), non-infected VERO cells (B) and *S. aureus* antigen (C). Left panel,
386 patient's serum with anti-SARS-CoV-2 total immunoglobulins detectable at dilution
387 1:100. Patient presented IgG titer at 1:400, IgM titer at 1:50 and IgA titer at 1:100.
388 Right panel, negative control serum. Slides were observed using Zeiss microscope,
389 objective x40.

390 **Figure 2.** Comparison of seroprevalence among the five groups of patients (a)
391 Between days 6 and 10 (b) Between days 11 and 15 (c) between days 16 and 38 (d)
392 After day 38.

393 **Figure 3.** Comparison of IgG titre detected at least 10 days after the onset of
394 symptoms between the different group of patients infected with SARS-CoV-2. When
395 multiple sera were available for a same patient, only the sera with higher IgG titre
396 were considered for this analysis.

397

398





