

Antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans: a systematic review

AUTHORS

Nathan Post^{1†}, Danielle Eddy^{2†*}, Catherine Huntley^{1†}, May C. I. van Schalkwyk³, Madhumita Shrotri¹, David Leeman², Samuel Rigby¹, Sarah V. Williams¹, William H. Bermingham⁴, Paul Kellam⁵, John Maher^{6,7}, Adrian M. Shields⁸, Gayatri Amirthalingam², Sharon J. Peacock^{2,9}, Sharif A. Ismail^{2,10}

¹ Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

² National Infection Service, Public Health England, UK

³ Department of Public Health, Environments and Society, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

⁴ Department of Clinical Immunology, University Hospitals Birmingham, UK

⁵ Department of Infectious Disease, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, UK

⁶ School of Cancer and Pharmaceutical Studies, King's College London, UK

⁷ Department of Immunology, Eastbourne Hospital, UK

⁸ Clinical Immunology Service, Institute of Immunology and Immunotherapy, University of Birmingham, UK

⁹ Department of Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK

¹⁰ Department of Global Health and Development, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK

† Denotes joint first author.

* Denotes corresponding author.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Dr Danielle Eddy

National Infection Service

Public Health England

Colindale

London NW9 5EQ

danielle.eddy2@nhs.net

KEYWORDS

Immunity, antibody, IgG, IgM, neutralising antibody, cross-reactivity, SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Full term
ACE2	Angiotensin Converting Enzyme 2
COVID-19	Coronavirus disease (2019)
HCoV	Human coronavirus
ICU	Intensive Care Unit
MEDLINE	Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online
MERS	Middle East Respiratory Syndrome
N	Nucleocapsid
nAb	Neutralising antibody
NEQAS	National External Quality Assessment Service (UK)
PRISMA	Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses
RBD	Receptor Binding Domain
S	Spike
SARS-CoV-1	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome CoronaVirus-1
SARS-CoV-2	Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome CoronaVirus-2
WHO	World Health Organisation

ABSTRACT

Introduction

Progress in characterising the humoral immune response to Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome 2 (SARS-CoV-2) has been rapid but areas of uncertainty persist. This review comprehensively evaluated evidence describing the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 published from 01/01/2020-26/06/2020.

Methods

Systematic review. Keyword-structured searches were carried out in MEDLINE, Embase and COVID-19 Primer. Articles were independently screened on title, abstract and full text by two researchers, with arbitration of disagreements. Data were double-extracted into a pre-designed template, and studies critically appraised using a modified version of the MetaQAT tool, with resolution of disagreements by consensus. Findings were narratively synthesised.

Results

150 papers were included. Most studies (75%) were observational in design, and included papers were generally of moderate quality based on hospitalised patients. Few considered mild or asymptomatic infection. Antibody dynamics were well described in the acute phase, and up to around 3 months from disease onset, although inconsistencies remain concerning clinical correlates. Development of neutralising antibodies following SARS-CoV-2 infection is typical, although titres may be low. Specific and potent neutralising antibodies have been isolated from convalescent plasma. Cross reactivity but limited cross neutralisation occurs with other HCoVs. Evidence for protective immunity in vivo is limited to small, short-term animal studies, which show promising initial results in the immediate recovery phase.

Interpretation

Published literature on immune responses to SARS-CoV-2 is of variable quality with considerable heterogeneity with regard to methods, study participants, outcomes measured and assays used. Antibody dynamics have been evaluated thoroughly in the acute phase but longer follow up and a comprehensive assessment of the role of demographic characteristics and disease severity is needed. The role of protective neutralising antibodies is emerging, with implications for therapeutics and vaccines. Large, cross-national cohort studies using appropriate statistical analysis and standardised serological assays and clinical classifications should be prioritised.

INTRODUCTION

Severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2), the novel viral pathogen that causes coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) in humans, has spread worldwide since its identification in late 2019. At the time of writing, there have been around 22.3m confirmed cases and 782,456 deaths reported to the WHO.¹ Limited pre-existing immunity is assumed to account for the extraordinary rise in cases worldwide. Characterisation of the human antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection is vitally important to inform vaccine development and strategies, and to guide appropriate design, implementation, and interpretation of serological assays for surveillance purposes.

Transmission models used to predict the behaviour of the pandemic and plan non-pharmaceutical interventions assume a degree of protective immunity arising from infection with SARS-CoV-2.^{2,3} A range of clinical and policy interventions to tackle SARS-CoV-2 spread depend on better understanding of the dynamics and determinants of humoral immunity to this virus. These include the proposed use of 'immunity passports', a form of certification for individuals with positive detection of antibodies that can enable them to avoid isolation or quarantine on the assumption they are protected against re-infection;⁴ treatment options such as infusion of convalescent plasma or derived immunoglobulin;⁵ sero-surveillance to monitor progression of the epidemic in the population;⁶ and the nature of the likely response to vaccination and supporting decisions on prioritising use of vaccines.

Experience with other human coronavirus species (HCoV) suggests that partial immunity arises following infection with a variable but generally short (1 to 2 year) duration.⁷ Limited data available for the closely related SARS-CoV-1 indicate that antibodies able to block viral infection (neutralising antibodies) may persist for up to 17 years following infection.⁸

Early clinical studies suggest that the dynamics of antibody response following acute infection with SARS-CoV-2 is similar to other HCoVs. Antibody responses are generally detected against the nucleocapsid (N) or spike (S) proteins, the S1 subunit of which contains the receptor-binding domain (RBD): antibodies against different antigens may have differential dynamics and neutralising effect. The presence of neutralising antibodies has been demonstrated in studies of vaccine research and therapeutic use of convalescent plasma.^{7,9} Previous lessons from Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS-CoV-1), Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS-

CoV) epidemics and other seasonal human coronaviruses suggest that there is the potential for a decline in population level protection from reinfection over a short period of time, but this is somewhat dependent on initial disease severity.^{7,9} Neutralising antibodies (nAbs) are likely to be a key metric for protection against infection by viruses such as SARS-CoV-2. However, their dynamics and role in long-term population immunity are not well understood.⁷ Furthermore, understanding of the mechanistic correlates of protective immunity in humans remains limited, including the antibody titre and specificity required to confer protection.¹⁰

This is the first of two linked papers reporting results from a systematic review of peer-reviewed and pre-print literature on the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection.¹¹ This paper has three aims. Firstly, to characterise the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection over time and explore the effects of potential correlates of immune activity (including age, time since symptom onset, clinical severity and ethnicity) on the nature of this response. Secondly, to consider relationships between these variables and indirect or relative quantification of antibodies to SARS-CoV-2. Thirdly, to consider the duration of post-infection immunity conferred by the antibody response.

METHODS

This systematic review was carried out according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. The protocol was pre-registered with PROSPERO (CRD42020192528).

Identification of studies

Keyword-structured searches were performed in MEDLINE, Embase, COVID-19 Primer and the Public Health England library¹² for articles published from 01/01/2020-26/06/2020. A sample search strategy is in **Supplementary Appendix A**. Subject area experts were consulted to identify relevant papers not captured through the database searches.

Definitions, inclusion and exclusion criteria

We included studies in all human and animal populations, and in all settings (laboratory, community and clinical - encompassing primary, secondary and tertiary care centres) relevant to our research questions. We excluded the following study designs: case reports, commentaries,

correspondence pieces or letter responses, consensus statements or guidelines and study protocols.

We focused on studies reporting measured titres (total antibody, IgA, IgG and/or IgM) with follow-up duration of greater than 28 days (which we defined as the limit of the acute phase of illness). Shorter follow-up studies were included if they reported on protective immunity, or immune response correlates. We defined “correlates” as encompassing, among other factors: primary illness severity - proxied by the WHO’s distinction between “mild”, “moderate”, “severe” and “critical” illness;¹³ subject age; gender; the presence of intercurrent or co-morbid disease e.g. diabetes, cardiovascular and/or chronic respiratory disease; and ethnicity.

Selection of studies

Studies were independently screened for inclusion on title, abstract and full text by two members of the research team (working across 4 pairs), with arbitration of disagreements by one review lead.

Data extraction, assessment of study quality, and data synthesis

Data were extracted in duplicate from each included study. Extraction was performed directly into a dedicated Excel template (**Supplementary Appendix B**). Pre-prints of subsequently published peer reviewed papers were included and results extracted where substantial differences in reported data were identified; if little difference was observed only the peer-reviewed version was retained.

Critical appraisal for each included study was performed in duplicate using a version of the MetaQAT 1.0 tool, adapted for improved applicability to basic science and laboratory-based studies. MetaQAT was selected for its simplicity and versatility in application to studies of all design types.¹⁴ Principal adaptations to the MetaQAT tool are described in **Supplementary Appendix C**.

The adapted MetaQAT tool was used to gather both qualitative feedback on study quality, and scaled responses (yes/no/unclear) for answers to key questions around study reliability, internal and external validity, and applicability, among other fields. Scaled responses were converted into weighted scores for each paper. Accordingly, studies were assigned a “high”, “medium” or “low” quality grading.

Study heterogeneity precluded formal meta-analysis. Results were instead synthesised narratively.

RESULTS

The PRISMA flowchart for the review is given in **figure 1**.

General characteristics of included studies

150 studies were included, of which 108 (72%) contained data pertaining to antibody response, and 70 (47%) to protective immunity (descriptive statistics for included studies are given in **table 1**). The vast majority focused on hospitalised patients (i.e. higher severity disease). Eleven studies considered antibody responses in asymptomatic individuals in the community and only five investigated protective immunity in this group. Most studies were of moderate quality. Assays used to detect and quantify antibody response were diverse, with target antigens including spike (S), S1 and S2 subunits, receptor binding domain (RBD) and nucleocapsid (N). Details of assays used, and an overview of strengths and limitations of these is provided in **Supplementary Appendix D**.

Kinetics of the antibody response

Time to seroconversion

The majority of individuals in the included studies mounted a SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody response during the acute phase of illness, with many studies reporting 100% seroconversion. Overall seroconversion rates depended on the timepoint at which testing was conducted in the disease course, the populations under study, the serology assay platforms used and their specific target proteins. Studies considered time to seropositivity for total antibody and/or individual antibody classes (IgA/IgG/IgM) (**figure 2**), although this was often not clearly defined with respect to symptom onset or first positive PCR test. In addition, whilst some studies described specific target proteins of assays used, others were either non-specific or not described. This limited assessment of dynamics of antibodies against specific viral targets, in particular anti-N versus anti-S, the latter of which may be more closely related to protection.

A number of studies reported seroconversion for total antibody (combined IgG, IgM and/or IgA),¹⁵⁻²¹ however the focus of findings presented is for specific antibody isotypes. For IgG, mean or median time to seroconversion ranged from 12 - 15 days post symptom onset,^{7,9,15,22-26} with wide variation in first to last detection of IgG from 4 - 73 days post symptom onset although reporting methods varied by study.^{15,27-33} For IgM, mean or median time to seroconversion ranged from 4-14 days post symptom onset,^{7,9,15,22-24,26,31,34} again with variations in reporting methods, study quality, and sample size giving rise to uncertainty around findings. Time to seroconversion for IgA was measured in fewer studies, ranging from 4 - 24 days post symptom onset, although most were within 4-11 days,^{23,35,36} with some outliers, including two reports of 24 days to first detection.^{37,38}

Sequential antibody response

In line with the expected sequential appearance of antibody isotypes, the majority of studies reported detection of IgM followed by IgG.^{15,23,39,40} Nevertheless, this finding was not consistent across all studies. One study measured time to seroconversion for IgA, IgM, and IgG and demonstrated detection of IgA and IgM simultaneously, followed by IgG.²³ . One study detected IgG seroconversion in advance of IgM,²⁶ and a study involving African green monkeys reported simultaneous IgM and IgG responses.⁴¹ These disparities may reflect the use of differing antibody assays across a range of species and without standardisation.

Antibody dynamics over time

IgG dynamics appeared to follow a pattern of peak, plateau, and persistence at lower levels (**figure 3**). After appearance, IgG titres rose to a peak between three and seven weeks post symptom onset,^{7,23,30,42-48} with studies recording the presence of IgG in and beyond weeks four,^{40,49} five,⁵⁰ six,^{23,51} seven,^{52,53} and eight^{17,45,54-56} post symptom onset. Some studies reported a plateau in virus-specific IgG beyond week three but levels beyond the peak were not well described.^{32,57-59} A decrease in antibody levels was reported in the eighth week post symptom onset by two studies,^{17,38} while another reported a decline from the second month after symptom onset.⁵⁸ Evidence from a cohort of 40 UK patients suggests a decline in titres after eight weeks,⁵⁸ although persistence of virus-specific IgG has been described at varying levels up to 12 weeks post symptom onset,⁴³ the longest follow up period among included studies. Dates of last detection were limited by the length of the study follow-up period, rather than confirmation of disappearance of detectable antibody titres.

IgM dynamics follow a ‘rise and fall’ pattern, with a peak two to five weeks post symptom onset^{7,26,30,34,43,46,47,53,60,61} then decline over time to below the detection limit.^{38,43,62} Beyond the peak, IgM is consistently reported to decrease from as early as two to three weeks,^{53,61} to as late as eight weeks⁵⁵ post symptom onset, with the majority of studies reporting this decline to occur at between three to five weeks.^{40,43,62,63} Virus-specific IgM became undetectable in almost all cases by around six weeks after disease onset in two small but high quality cohort studies.^{53,64}

Fewer studies describe IgA dynamics compared to IgM or IgG. IgA levels are reported to peak between 16 - 22 days post symptom onset, although there is no consensus on trends over time.^{23,61}

Correlates of Antibody Response

Key findings regarding correlates of the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection are summarised in **table 2**. Included papers addressed clinical factors (disease severity, co-morbid disease status and symptom profile) and demographic factors (age, sex and ethnicity) although results for many of these factors were conflicting or inconclusive. Across all papers, the definitions of comparator groups were highly variable, including disease severity classifications (severe/mild), outcomes (deceased/mild), and treatment categories (ICU/Non-ICU). The lack of consistency in methods, comparison groups and study design means it is not possible to determine whether or how disease severity affects, or is affected by, the antibody response. Most studies showed no association between antibody response and age or sex, and, when taken together, studies that did show associations had inconclusive results and lacked statistical analysis to relate these findings to disease severity. There were virtually no data to describe the immune response according to ethnicity.

Protective immunity

Neutralising antibody kinetics

Across the included studies, the majority of subjects developed detectable neutralising antibodies in response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in both human^{7,18,22,29,65–88} and animal^{41,89–92} participants. However, neutralising antibody titres were low in a substantial minority of participants. A high

quality cohort study found almost all participants (94%, n=19) generated an antibody response capable of neutralising 42-99% of pseudovirus in a carefully validated assay 14 days after exposure.⁸³ Another high-quality cohort study also found most patients (91%, n=22) developed a neutralising antibody response by 21 days after disease onset.⁸⁴ However only three quarters developed titres over 1:80. A larger case-control study including a sample of largely non-hospitalised convalescent patients demonstrated most participants (79%, n=149) had low neutralising antibody titres (<1:1000) after an average of 39 days following disease onset, while only 3% showed titres >1:5000.⁸⁷ Notably, RBD-specific antibodies with potent antiviral activity were found in all individuals tested, suggesting specific neutralising antibodies are produced following infection despite low overall plasma neutralising ability.⁸⁷

Neutralising antibodies were generally detectable between 7 - 15 days following disease onset,^{7,18,75,84,85,88,93,94} increasing over days 14 - 22 before plateauing^{22,68,69,88,93,94} and declining over a period of six weeks.^{69,85,88,95} Evidence from one medium-quality pre-print study suggests neutralising antibody titres reduced significantly among 27 convalescent patients around six weeks following disease onset to a mean neutralisation half maximum inhibitory dilution (ID50) of 596.⁵¹ A second medium quality preprint found neutralising antibodies became undetectable in four of 11 previously detectable cases.⁸⁵ Further high-quality evidence is required to fully evaluate the apparent waning of the neutralising antibody response over time. There were no high-quality studies investigating the dynamics of protective immunity over time in a cohort identified in this review. To date no studies have determined neutralising titres in upper respiratory tract samples.

Correlates of neutralising antibody production

Clinical and demographic correlates of the neutralising antibody response are described in **table 3**. Neutralising antibody responses correlated with disease severity in all studies in which this association was tested.^{7,43,49,66,76,85,87,96-98} Importantly, the few studies that investigated asymptomatic cases found those individuals were considerably less likely to develop detectable serum neutralising antibody responses than cases with symptoms. With regard to age and sex, evidence was mixed and a limitation across all papers was a lack of statistical adjustment for severity.

Correlation of neutralisation with specific antibodies

The level of neutralisation was found to correlate with a wide range of specific antibodies. Most studies, including all those considered high quality, suggested that neutralisation ability broadly

correlated with total virus-specific IgG.^{29,49,67,74,87,99–101} Specifically, high quality studies found that neutralisation ability correlated positively with anti-S IgG^{49,72,87,99} or anti-RBD IgG.^{72,74,87,102} There was more limited evidence for correlation with anti-RBD IgM, including one high quality study,^{51,84} and IgA.^{93,99}

A number of basic science studies also identified specific neutralising antibodies. The majority of these studies were medium quality, and heterogeneity between assays limits comparability of findings. A high quality study by Rogers et al highlighted the important role of RBD binding antibodies in neutralisation in a pseudovirus assay, with findings supported by an effective animal re-challenge model.¹⁰³ This study also reported that SARS-CoV-2 infection elicited a strong response against the S protein. However, few of these antibodies were neutralising, in agreement with other results.^{104,105} RBD-specific antibodies were also shown to have potent neutralising activity in a range of other small studies,^{70,104,106–112} including one using an IgA isotype.¹¹³ Neutralising ability correlated in particular with competition for the angiotensin converting enzyme - 2 (ACE2) receptor.^{70,72,106} Two studies demonstrated a lack of association with affinity,^{73,106} although a moderate correlation with binding affinity was reported in one study.¹⁰⁷ Potently neutralising N specific antibodies were isolated in other studies,^{73,109} and the potential for antibodies binding to protease cleavage sites as alternatives to RBD isolated from convalescent plasma has also been identified,¹¹⁴ suggesting an important role in preventing antibody dependent enhancement of viral entry.

Few studies investigated B cell responses in detail. A study by Galson et al of 19 hospitalised patients demonstrated clonal expansion and induction of a B cell memory response (possibly to other circulating coronaviridae) but that the predominant expansion was in the naïve B cell population.¹¹⁵ Strong convergence of response emerged across different participants, which was judged to be associated with disease severity, and these findings were consistent with another high quality study.⁸⁷

Correlation of antibodies with viral load

Several studies investigated the relationship between SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG and viral load^{116,117} or the co-existence of antibodies and viral RNA.^{15,24,25,38,42,46,62,64} In a large cohort study, the presence of SARS-CoV-2 anti-N IgG was significantly correlated with reduced viral load (measured as cycle threshold (Ct) >22, which was also associated with lower mortality).¹¹⁶ This was consistent with a study by To et al which correlated increasing anti-N IgG titres with

decreasing median viral load from 6.7 to 4.9 log₁₀ copies per mL between weeks one to three.¹¹⁷ Another high-quality cohort study had similar findings but did not quantify viral load.²⁴ Together these findings suggest the persistence of detectable RNA despite clinical recovery, and although viral loads generally reduced in the convalescent phase, co-existence of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG and detectable SARS-CoV-2 RNA could be identified in a small number of patients for up to 50 days following seroconversion.²⁵ Other studies were mixed, with one finding higher levels of specific antibodies correlated with viral clearance within 22 days,³⁸ and another finding weaker IgG response correlated with viral clearance within seven days after antibodies become detectable,⁴² although both of these findings are subject to a number of limitations. Importantly, one included study attempted to associate re-detection of viral RNA with the presence of specific antibodies, finding that IgG titres began to decrease immediately following recovery although this was not associated with whether RNA was re-detected. Across all included studies, high quality evidence for re-infection or lasting immunity was lacking.

Re-exposure to SARS-CoV-2

Studies exploring re-exposure to SARS-CoV-2 virus were limited to seven animal studies of variable quality. Broadly, two areas were explored; exposure following a primary infection with SARS-CoV-2^{89-91,118} and re-exposure following passive transfer of neutralising antibodies.^{92,103}

Following primary infection, timing of re-challenge varied between 20-43 days post inoculation. All studies but one⁹⁰ demonstrated some level of protection from reinfection with a high-quality study in nine macaques showing a significant reduction in viral titres ($p < 0.00001$) and reduced clinical symptoms.⁸⁹ Similar findings were reported in a hamster model.^{92,118} In a smaller ferret study, clinical findings following reinfection were mixed with the re-challenged group demonstrating increased weight loss compared to naive ferrets. However, the authors acknowledged that the sample size ($n=4$) was too small to draw wider inference.⁹⁰

Two studies examined protection from SARS-CoV-2 infection following the passive transfer of neutralising antibodies in Syrian hamster models.^{92,103} Following transfer of highly potent neutralising antibodies 12 hours prior to infection, hamsters showed lower viral titres and fewer clinical symptoms of COVID-19. However, following transfer of less potent neutralising antibodies, 1-2 days prior to infectious challenge, results were mixed demonstrating their inability to fully neutralise the virus.¹⁰³ Data on protection from re-infection in humans was not identified in the included papers, therefore conclusions on protective immunity are limited.

Cross-reactivity with other coronaviruses

There is limited evidence on the cross-reactivity of antibodies specific to other coronaviruses.^{49,51,94,119–121} Using a variety of assays, several in-vitro studies explored both cross-reactive antibody-binding responses and cross-neutralisation between SARS-CoV-2 and seasonal coronaviruses, MERS-CoV and SARS-CoV-1. Cross-reactive antibody-binding responses appear to be highest between SARS-CoV-1 and SARS-CoV-2, however cross-neutralisation is rare and where reported is weak.^{49,94,119} Whilst seasonal HCoV-229E are more common in the population, only 10% of sera exposed to HCoV-229E demonstrated cross-reactivity again with very little neutralisation activity.¹²⁰ A study comparing cross reactivity in children and older participants found children had elevated CoV-specific IgM compared to more mature class-switched specific IgA and IgG.¹²² All studies were performed in-vitro and recognised the need for in-vivo investigation.

DISCUSSION

Summary of findings

Most people who experience symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection undergo seroconversion to produce a detectable, specific antibody response in the acute phase (≤ 28 days). The kinetics of the antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 follow typical immunological paradigms: virus-specific IgM rises in the acute phase to a peak around two to five weeks following disease onset, then declines over a further three to five weeks before becoming undetectable in many cases; IgG peaks later (three to seven weeks following disease onset), then plateaus, persisting for at least eight weeks with some evidence suggesting a moderate decline over that period. However, understanding of IgG dynamics over time is limited by the understandably short duration of follow up in studies published to date.

Evidence suggests the majority of those infected with SARS-CoV-2 develop nAbs – a finding that is consistent with previous findings for SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV.⁷ The size of this response appears to correlate with disease severity. Neutralising antibodies are initially detectable from around seven to ten days, peaking at around three weeks and then declining. Further evidence is required to evaluate comprehensively the apparent waning of the nAb response over time. Although nAb may be detectable, high quality studies suggest that titres are generally low, and

the response is short lived. This is supported by recently published data (beyond the date cut off for inclusion in this study) from a UK cohort of healthcare professionals.¹²³

A number of potent, specific nAbs have been identified – in line with findings for other HCoVs. This is particularly the case for neutralising anti-RBD antibodies,¹²⁴ and is consistent with data emerging from vaccine development studies showing that protective antibodies can be induced.^{125–127} Ongoing vaccine research has, however, highlighted a need for evidence of longer-term protection due to nAbs, and the titres at which these effects are achieved – neither of which were fully addressed by studies included in this review. This is a significant gap in the evidence base on the immune response to SARS-CoV-2.

Data on correlates of the antibody response is incomplete, inconsistent or contradictory. It is not possible to draw robust conclusions on the associations of antibody response with age, sex, ethnicity or comorbidities, and although disease severity positively correlated with higher IgG antibody titres in a number of studies, distinguishing causation from correlation is not possible. The size of the detectable nAb response appears to be associated with male sex (although the effect of disease severity was not controlled for); this is a surprising finding given the now well-recognised association between male sex and poor COVID-19 outcomes.¹²⁸

Available data on protection following primary infection are limited to small scale animal models which consider re-exposure rather than reinfection. Primary infection appears to provide a degree of protection to reinfection up to day 43 post primary inoculation but no further data are available at later time points. The success of passive transfer of nAbs for protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection appears to be dose dependent, although no data exist around the importance of affinity, isotype or immunoglobulin subclass. Given the probable reduction in nAb titre over time, the protection they provide is likely to be limited. Limited cross reactivity is evident between SARS-CoV-2 and other HCoVs, but cross-neutralisation is rare and when it does occur, fails to fully neutralise the SARS-CoV-2 virus.

Strengths and limitations

Our review is the first to provide an overview and critical appraisal of literature published since the beginning of 2020 on the immune response in the round. Our findings are nevertheless limited both by aspects of the review methodology and by shortcomings in the included literature. The comprehensiveness of systematic reviews is always dependent on search strategy, and some

results relevant to the research question may have been missed. As with all systematic reviews, our findings cannot account for unpublished negative results.

Limitations of the underlying evidence base were considerable. A majority of included studies were of moderate quality. Study populations were highly variable, as were the assays used, along with the rigour with which they were described, verified and validated against their target populations. There are efforts in the UK to standardise laboratory SARS-CoV-2 assays use through the National External Quality Assessment Service (NEQAS), but these are early stage and no comparable international initiatives yet exist to support comparability of research findings. Longitudinal follow-up for durations greater than 50-60 days was rare. Many studies did not perform statistical analysis of findings; in particular, studies of putative correlates of immune response usually failed to control for the effects of potential confounders. Small sample sizes were common, as were study populations selected by convenience which, although common for clinical cohort studies, are prone to bias. Additionally, a large body of the evidence drew from pre-print publications which have not been subject to peer-review. While efforts were made to account for this during synthesis and reporting, reporting standards in these publications were highly variable and there is no validated system at this time for weighting evidence from pre-print publications relative to peer-reviewed papers. Finally, reporting of ethical approval was limited or absent in many studies.

Implications for policy

We identify two main policy implications arising from this work. At individual level, continuing uncertainty concerning the nature of the humoral response to SARS-CoV-2 makes it difficult to determine what the practical meaning of serologically-detected antibody response is with respect to sterilising immunity. Short follow-up periods, as well as the use of binary (positive/negative) serological tests in many studies continue to limit what can be said about the granularity of the immune response over time – and by implication, how best to interpret the results of serological testing with respect to individual susceptibility to infection.¹²⁹ We did not identify any studies considering risk of re-infection with SARS-CoV-2, which might provide an alternative perspective on susceptibility to infection.

At population-level, important policy implications arising from these data on antibody response relate to both surveillance and control. Reliance in the published literature on serological tests that have been evaluated predominantly in acutely unwell, hospitalised patients (without

appropriate validation against mild disease or in people with asymptomatic infection) means that seroprevalence estimates from this work should be treated with caution. A recent Cochrane review emphasises the risk of false-positive and false-negative results under different population prevalence scenarios.¹³⁰ However, in the UK, nationally validated assays have been evaluated with convalescent samples from community participants and a number of large-scale sero-surveys now use these.^{131–133} Clear understanding of the kinetics of the response, particularly for the specific N and S antigens, is important for the interpretation of seroprevalence studies.

With regard to control, the evidence here for lasting protective immunity, or lack thereof, may suggest it is too early to recommend the use of ‘immunity passports’. A range of promising data have been identified to support further investigation of treatment with convalescent plasma or immunoglobulin, and the basic science underlying the antibody/virus/host cell interaction is starting to be described, with promising findings related to vaccine development. For vaccines, beyond development, strategies for implementation will also require a thorough understanding of the likely impact in different population groups.

Onward research questions

Investigating the relationship between antibody response and correlates including age, sex, ethnicity and disease severity through high-quality, large-sample studies using well validated assays and incorporating appropriate statistical testing of results should be prioritised. The limited amount of data on antibody dynamics for mild and asymptomatic cases, which are likely to make up a significant proportion of infections, is a particularly important gap in the literature that will need to be addressed to improve understanding and definition of the varied clinical phenotypes associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection.

Evidence on immunity beyond three months following primary infection or vaccination is urgently needed. Evidence of immunity following vaccination is being explored through various vaccine trials (e.g. ChAdOx1 nCoV-19).¹²⁵ However, longitudinal studies of those already infected with SARS-CoV-2 is required to examine the degree of protection arising from prior infection.

Conclusions

Studies on the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 is of variable quality, and comparison of findings is difficult. A longer-term view and a more comprehensive assessment of the role of demographic characteristics and disease severity is required. Larger, high-quality, longitudinal studies, with

appropriate statistical analysis, consistent use of established and well-validated serological assays matched to clearly defined clinical phenotypes should be prioritised.

Author contributions (CRediT author statement)

NP – investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

DE – conceptualisation, investigation, project administration, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

CH – investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

MClvS – conceptualisation, investigation, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

MS – investigation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

DL – investigation, writing – review and editing

SR – investigation, writing – review and editing

SVW – investigation, writing – review and editing

WHB – validation, writing – review and editing

PK – conceptualisation, validation, writing – review and editing

JM – validation, writing – review and editing

AMS – validation, writing – review and editing

GA – conceptualisation, supervision, validation, writing – review and editing

SJP – conceptualisation, supervision, validation, writing – review and editing

SAI – conceptualisation, investigation, methodology, project administration, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing

Acknowledgements

We thank Professor Mike Ferguson from the School of Life Sciences, University of Dundee, for comments on the research questions and initial outputs from this work; and Professor Mark Petticrew from the Faculty of Public Health and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine for advice on methodological aspects of this study.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors. MClvS is funded by a NIHR Doctoral Fellowship (Ref NIHR300156). JM acknowledges the support of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre based at Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. SAI is supported by a Wellcome Trust Clinical Research Training Fellowship (Ref No 215654/Z/19/Z). The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, PHE or the Department of Health.

Competing interests

JM is chief scientific officer, shareholder and scientific founder of Leucid Bio, a spinout company focused on development of cellular therapeutic agents. The authors report no other competing financial interests or conflicts of interest.

Ethics

This was a systematic review based on analysis of openly published secondary data. No ethical approval was required.

REFERENCES

1. WHO. WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard. <https://covid19.who.int/>. Published 2020. Accessed August 20, 2020.
2. Ferguson NM, Laydon D, Nedjati-Gilani G, et al. *Impact of Non-Pharmaceutical Interventions (NPIs) to Reduce COVID-19 Mortality and Healthcare Demand*. Imperial College London 2020. doi:10.25561/77482
3. Davies NG, Kucharski AJ, Eggo RM, Gimma A, Group CC-19 W, Edmunds WJ. The effect of non-pharmaceutical interventions on COVID-19 cases, deaths and demand for hospital services in the UK: a modelling study. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.01.20049908. doi:10.1101/2020.04.01.20049908
4. World Health Organization. "Immunity passports" in the context of COVID-19. *WHO - Sci Br*. 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa344
5. Tiberghien P, de Lambalerie X, Morel P, Gallian P, Lacombe K, Yazdanpanah Y. Collecting and evaluating convalescent plasma for COVID-19 treatment: why and how. *Vox Sang*. 2020;02:2. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1111/vox.12926>
6. Theel ES, Slev P, Wheeler S, Couturier MR, Wong SJ, Kadkhoda K. The Role of Antibody Testing for SARS-CoV-2: Is There One? *J Clin Microbiol / Comment*. 2020. doi:10.1128/jcm.00797-20
7. Huang AT, Garcia-Carreras B, Hitchings MDT, et al. A systematic review of antibody mediated immunity to coronaviruses: antibody kinetics, correlates of protection, and association of antibody responses with severity of disease. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20065771
8. Anderson DE, Tan CW, Chia WN, et al. Lack of cross-neutralization by SARS patient sera towards SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1761267
9. Kellam P, Barclay W. The Dynamics of Humoral Immune Responses Following SARS-CoV-2 Infection and the Potential for Reinfection. *J Gen Virol*. 2020. doi:10.20944/PREPRINTS202004.0377.V1
10. Tay MZ, Poh CM, Rénia L, MacAry PA, Ng LFP. The trinity of COVID-19: immunity, inflammation and intervention. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2020;20(6):363-374. doi:10.1038/s41577-020-0311-8
11. Shrotri M, van Schalkwyk MCI, Post N, et al. Cellular immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection in humans: a systematic review (paper in preparation). 2020.
12. De Brun C, Farrow E, Gledhill R, et al. Covid-19 Daily Digest Endnote Library. 2020.
13. WHO. *Clinical Management of COVID-19: Interim Guidance*. Geneva; 2020.
14. Rosella L, Bowman C, Pach B, Morgan S, Fitzpatrick T, Goel V. The development and validation of a meta-tool for quality appraisal of public health evidence: Meta Quality Appraisal Tool (MetaQAT). *Public Health*. 2016. doi:10.1016/j.puhe.2015.10.027
15. Lou B, Li T-D, Zheng S-F, et al. Serology characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infection since exposure and post symptom onset. *Eur Respir J*. 2020. doi:10.1183/13993003.00763-2020
16. Kohmer N, Westhaus S, Rühl C, Ciesek S, Rabenau HF. Clinical performance of different SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody tests. *J Med Virol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.26145
17. Vabret N, Britton GJ, Gruber C, et al. Immunology of COVID-19: current state of the science. *Immunity*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2020.05.002
18. Grzelak L, Temmam S, Planchais C, et al. SARS-CoV-2 serological analysis of COVID-19 hospitalized patients, pauci-symptomatic individuals and blood donors. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.21.20068858
19. den Hartog G, Schepp RM, Kuijper M, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific antibody detection for

- sero-epidemiology: a multiplex analysis approach accounting for accurate seroprevalence. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.18.20133660
20. Edouard S, Colson P, Melenotte C, et al. *Evaluating the Serological Status of COVID-19 Patients Using an Indirect Immunofluorescent Assay, France*. *medRxiv* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.05.20092064
 21. Buntinx F, Claes P, Gulikers M, et al. Early experiences with antibody testing in a Flemish nursing home during an acute COVID-19 outbreak a retrospective cohort study. *medrxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.18.20105874
 22. Borremans B, Gamble A, Prager K, et al. Quantifying antibody kinetics and RNA shedding during early-phase SARS-CoV-2 infection. 2020:1-20. doi:10.1101/2020.05.15.20103275
 23. Ma H, Zeng W, He H, et al. Serum IgA, IgM, and IgG responses in COVID-19. *Cell Mol Immunol*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41423-020-0474-z
 24. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;28. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa344>
 25. Wang B, Wang L, Kong X, et al. Long-term coexistence of SARS-CoV-2 with antibody response in COVID-19 patients. *J Med Virol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.25946
 26. Qu J, Wu C, Li X, et al. Profile of IgG and IgM antibodies against severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020. doi:10.1093/cid/ciaa489
 27. Agarwal V, Venkatakrishnan AJ, Puranik A, et al. Quantifying the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 long-term shedding among non-hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.02.20120774
 28. Fung M, Chiu CY, DeVoe C, et al. Clinical Outcomes and Serologic Response in Solid Organ Transplant Recipients with COVID-19: A Case Series from the United States. *Am J Transplant*. 2020. doi:10.1111/ajt.16079
 29. Gniffke EP, Harrington WE, Dambrauskas N, et al. Plasma from recovered COVID19 subjects inhibits spike protein binding to ACE2 in a microsphere-based inhibition assay. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.09.20127050
 30. Zhang B, Zhou X, Zhu C, et al. Immune phenotyping based on neutrophil-to-lymphocyte ratio and IgG predicts disease severity and outcome for patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.12.20035048 %J medRxiv
 31. Lee YL, Liao CH, Liu PY, et al. Dynamics of anti-SARS-Cov-2 IgM and IgG antibodies among COVID-19 patients. *J Infect / Artic Press*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.04.019
 32. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, et al. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in Patients with COVID-19. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;19:19. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa461>
 33. Zhang L, Pang R, Xue X, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 virus antibody levels in convalescent plasma of six donors who have recovered from COVID-19. *Aging*. 2020;12:22. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.18632/aging.103102>
 34. Ou J, Tan M, He H, et al. Study on the expression levels of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 at different period of disease and its related factors in 192 cases of COVID-19 patients. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.22.20102525
 35. Jääskeläinen AJ, Kekäläinen E, Kallio-Kokko H, et al. Evaluation of commercial and automated SARS-CoV-2 IgG and IgA ELISAs using coronavirus disease (COVID-19) patient samples. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(18):2000603. doi:<https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.18.2000603>
 36. Herroelen PH, Martens GA, Smet D De, Swaerts K, Decavele A-S. Kinetics of the humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2: comparative analytical performance of seven commercial serology tests. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.09.20124719
 37. Solbach W, Schiffner J, Backhaus I, et al. Antibody profiling of COVID-19 patients in an

- urban low-incidence region in Northern Germany. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.30.20111393
38. Huang J, Mao T, Li S, et al. *Long Period Dynamics of Viral Load and Antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 Infection: An Observational Cohort Study*. *medRxiv* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.22.20071258
 39. Lynch KL, Whitman JD, Lacanienta NP, et al. Magnitude and kinetics of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses and their relationship to disease severity. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.03.20121525
 40. Xiao AT, Gao C, Zhang S. Profile of specific antibodies to SARS-CoV-2: The first report. *J Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.03.012
 41. Hartman AL, Nambulli S, McMillen CM, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection of African green monkeys results in mild respiratory disease discernible by PET/CT imaging and prolonged shedding of infectious virus from both respiratory and gastrointestinal tracts. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.20.137687
 42. Tan W, Lu Y, Zhang J, et al. Viral Kinetics and Antibody Responses in Patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.24.20042382
 43. Li K, Wu M, Huang B, et al. The Dynamic Changes of Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 during the Infection and Recovery of COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.18.20105155
 44. Sun B, Feng Y, Mo X, et al. Kinetics of SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM and IgG responses in COVID-19 patients. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1762515
 45. Wang Z, Li H, Li J, et al. Elevated Serum IgM Levels Indicate Poor Outcome in Patients with Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pneumonia: A Retrospective Case-Control Study. *SSRN Electron J*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.22.20041285
 46. Jin Y, Wang M, Zuo Z, et al. Diagnostic value and dynamic variance of serum antibody in coronavirus disease 2019. *Int J Infect Dis*. 2020;94:49-52. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijid.2020.03.065>
 47. Du Z, Zhu F, Guo F, Yang B, Wang T. Detection of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *J Med Virol*. 2020. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25820>
 48. Zhang Y, Xu J, Jia R, et al. Protective humoral immunity in SARS-CoV-2 infected pediatric patients. *Cell Mol Immunol*. 2020;(April):2-4. doi:10.1038/s41423-020-0438-3
 49. Zhang J, Qu X. Cross-reactivity of neutralizing antibody and its correlation with circulating T follicular cells in recovered COVID-19 individuals. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.12.20129460
 50. He J, Hu P, Gao Y, et al. Comparison and Application of Different Immunoassay Methods for the Detection of SARS-CoV-2. *J Med Virol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.26187
 51. Prévost J, Gasser R, Beaudoin-Bussi eres G, et al. Cross-sectional evaluation of humoral responses against SARS-CoV-2 Spike. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.140244
 52. Minervina AA, Komech EA, Titov A, et al. Longitudinal high-throughput TCR repertoire profiling reveals the dynamics of T cell memory formation after mild COVID-19 infection. *bioRxiv*. 2020. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.08290>.
 53. Hou H, Wang T, Zhang B, et al. Detection of IgM and IgG antibodies in patients with coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Transl Immunol*. 2020;9(5):e01136. doi:10.1002/cti2.1136
 54. Vogelzang EH, Loeff FC, Derksen NIL, et al. Development of a SARS-CoV-2 total antibody assay and the dynamics of antibody response over time in hospitalized and non-hospitalized patients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.17.20133793
 55. Jin CC, Zhu L, Gao C, Zhang S. Correlation between viral RNA shedding and serum antibodies in individuals with coronavirus disease 2019. *Clin Microbiol Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.05.022
 56. Benotmane I, Gautier-Vargas G, Wendling M-J, et al. In-depth virological assessment of kidney transplant recipients with COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020.

- doi:10.1101/2020.06.17.20132076
57. De Vriese AS, Reynders M. IgG Antibody Response to SARS-CoV-2 Infection and Viral RNA Persistence in Patients on Maintenance Hemodialysis. *J Clean Prod.* 2020. doi:10.1053/j.ajkd.2020.05.009
 58. Adams ER, Anand R, Andersson MI, et al. Evaluation of antibody testing for SARS-Cov-2 using ELISA and lateral flow immunoassays. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.15.20066407
 59. Yang HS, Racine-Brzostek SE, Lee WT, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody characterization in emergency department, hospitalized and convalescent patients by two semi-quantitative immunoassays. *Clin Chim Acta.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.06.004
 60. Zhang T, Cui X, Zhao X, et al. Detectable SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA in Feces of Three Children during Recovery Period of COVID-19 Pneumonia. *J Med Virol.* 2020;29. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jmv.25795>
 61. Padoan A, Sciacovelli L, Basso D, et al. IgA-Ab response to spike glycoprotein of SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19: A longitudinal study. *Clin Chim acta.* 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.04.026
 62. Zhang G, Nie S, Zhang Z, Zhang Z. Longitudinal Change of SARS-Cov2 Antibodies in Patients with COVID-19. *J Infect Dis.* 2020:1-6. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiaa229
 63. Xie J, Ding C, Li J, et al. Characteristics of Patients with Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Confirmed using an IgM-IgG Antibody Test. *J Med Virol.* 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.25930
 64. Hu Q, Cui X, Liu X, et al. The production of antibodies for SARS-CoV-2 and its clinical implication. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.20.20065953
 65. Payne DC, Smith-Jeffcoat SE, Nowak G, et al. SARS-CoV-2 Infections and Serologic Responses from a Sample of U.S. Navy Service Members - USS Theodore Roosevelt, April 2020. *MMWR* 2020;69(23);714–721.
 66. Fafi-Kremer S, Bruel T, Madec Y, et al. Serologic responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection among hospital staff with mild disease in eastern France. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.19.20101832
 67. Harvala H, Robb M, Watkins N, et al. Convalescent plasma therapy for the treatment of patients with COVID-19: Assessment of methods available for antibody detection and their correlation with neutralising antibody levels. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.20.20091694
 68. Luchsinger LL, Ransegnola B, Jin D, et al. Serological Analysis of New York City COVID19 Convalescent Plasma Donors. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20124792
 69. Ng D, Goldgof G, Shy B, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence and neutralizing activity in donor and patient blood from the San Francisco Bay Area. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.19.20107482
 70. Brouwer PJM, Caniels TG, van der Straten K, et al. Potent neutralizing antibodies from COVID-19 patients define multiple targets of vulnerability. *Science (80-).* 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abc5902
 71. Hu J, He CL, Gao Q, et al. The D614G mutation of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein enhances viral infectivity and decreases neutralization sensitivity to individual convalescent sera. *bioRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.20.161323
 72. Juno JA, Tan H-X, Lee WS, et al. Immunogenic profile of SARS-CoV-2 spike in individuals recovered from COVID-19. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.17.20104869
 73. Chi X, Yan R, Zhang J, et al. A neutralizing human antibody binds to the N-terminal domain of the Spike protein of SARS-CoV-2. *Science (80-).* 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abc6952
 74. Suthar MS, Zimmerman MG, Kauffman RC, Mantus G. Rapid generation of neutralizing

- antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.03.20084442
75. Perera RAPM, Mok CKP, Tsang OTY, et al. Serological assays for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), March 2020. *Eurosurveillance*. 2020;25(16):2000421. doi:doi:<https://doi.org/10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.16.2000421>
 76. Choe PG, Kang CK, Suh HJ, et al. Antibody Responses to SARS-CoV-2 at 8 Weeks Postinfection in Asymptomatic Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2020. doi:10.3201/eid2610.202211
 77. Klimstra WB, Tilston-Lunel NL, Nambulli S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 growth, furin-cleavage-site adaptation and neutralization using serum from acutely infected, hospitalized COVID-19 patients. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.19.154930
 78. Liu P, Cai J, Jia R, et al. Dynamic surveillance of SARS-CoV-2 shedding and neutralizing antibody in children with COVID-19. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1772677
 79. Lou Y, Zhao W, Wei H, et al. Cross-neutralization antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and RBD mutations from convalescent patient antibody libraries. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.06.137513
 80. Lu J, Peng J, Xiong Q, et al. Clinical immunological and virological characterization of COVID-19 patients that test re-positive for SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.20131748
 81. Mueller L, Ostermann PN, Walker A, et al. Sensitivity of commercial Anti-SARS-CoV-2 serological assays in a high-prevalence setting. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.11.20128686
 82. Siracusano G, Pastori C, Lopalco L. Humoral Immune Responses in COVID-19 Patients: A Window on the State of the Art. *Front Immunol*. 2020. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2020.01049
 83. Chen Y, Tong X, Wang J, et al. High SARS-CoV-2 antibody prevalence among healthcare workers exposed to COVID-19 patients. *J Infect*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2020.05.067
 84. Premkumar L, Segovia-Chumbez B, Jadi R, et al. The receptor binding domain of the viral spike protein is an immunodominant and highly specific target of antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020. doi:10.1126/sciimmunol.abc8413
 85. Brochot E, Demey B, Touze A, et al. Anti-Spike anti-Nucleocapsid and neutralizing antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 hospitalized patients and asymptomatic carriers. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.12.20098236
 86. Dingens AS, Crawford KH, Adler A, et al. Seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 among children visiting a hospital during the initial Seattle outbreak. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.26.20114124
 87. Robbani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2456-9
 88. Danh K, Karp DG, Robinson P V, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies with a cell-free PCR assay. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.28.20105692
 89. Chandrashekar A, Liu J, Martinot AJ, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection protects against rechallenge in rhesus macaques. *Science (80-)*. 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abc4776
 90. Ryan KA, Bewley KR, Fotheringham SA, et al. Dose-dependent response to infection with SARS-CoV-2 in the ferret model: evidence of protection to re-challenge. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.29.123810
 91. Bao L, Deng W, Gao H, et al. Lack of reinfection in rhesus macaques infected with SARS-CoV-2. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.13.990226
 92. Imai M, Iwatsuki-Horimoto K, Hatta M, et al. Syrian hamsters as a small animal model for SARS-CoV-2 infection and countermeasure development. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2020. doi:10.1073/pnas.2009799117

93. Espejo AP, Akgun Y, Al Mana AF, et al. Review of Current Advances in Serologic Testing for COVID-19. *Am J Clin Pathol*. 2020. doi:10.1093/ajcp/aqaa112
94. Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, et al. Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their implications. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.30.20047365
95. Wang X, Guo X, Xin Q, et al. Neutralizing Antibodies Responses to SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 Inpatients and Convalescent Patients. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.04.15.20065623. doi:10.1101/2020.04.15.20065623
96. Jungbauer C, Weseslindtner L, Weidner L, et al. Characterization of 100 sequential SARS-CoV-2 convalescent plasma donations. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.21.163444
97. Percivalle E, Cambiè G, Cassaniti I, et al. Prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 specific neutralising antibodies in blood donors from the Lodi Red Zone in Lombardy, Italy, as at 06 April 2020. *Euro Surveill*. 2020. doi:10.2807/1560-7917.ES.2020.25.24.2001031
98. Wang P, Liu L, Nair MS, et al. SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody responses are more robust in patients with severe disease. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.13.150250
99. Varnaitè R, García M, Glans H, et al. Expansion of SARS-CoV-2-specific Antibody-secreting Cells and Generation of Neutralizing Antibodies in Hospitalized COVID-19 Patients. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.28.118729
100. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, al. et. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific humoral and cellular immunity in COVID-19 convalescent individuals. *Immun* 2020:52(6):971-977.e3. doi: 10.1016/j.immuni.2020.04.023.
101. Thompson C, Grayson N, Paton R, et al. Neutralising antibodies to SARS coronavirus 2 in Scottish blood donors - a pilot study of the value of serology to determine population exposure. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.13.20060467 %J medRxiv
102. Laing AG, Lorenc A, Barrio IDM Del, et al. A consensus Covid-19 immune signature combines immuno-protection with discrete sepsis-like traits associated with poor prognosis. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20125112
103. Rogers TF, Zhao F, Huang D, et al. Rapid isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection in a small animal model. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
104. Cao Y, Su B, Guo X, et al. Potent Neutralizing Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 Identified by High-Throughput Single-Cell Sequencing of Convalescent Patients' B Cells. *Cell*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.025
105. Chen X, Li R, Pan Z, et al. Human monoclonal antibodies block the binding of SARS-CoV-2 spike protein to angiotensin converting enzyme 2 receptor. *Cell Mol Immunol*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41423-020-0426-7
106. Ju B, Zhang Q, Ge J, et al. Human neutralizing antibodies elicited by SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2380-z
107. Kreer C, Zehner M, Weber T, et al. Longitudinal isolation of potent near-germline SARS-CoV-2-neutralizing antibodies from COVID-19 patients. *bioRx*. 2020.
108. Wu Y, Wang F, Shen C, et al. A noncompeting pair of human neutralizing antibodies block COVID-19 virus binding to its receptor ACE2. *Science (80-)*. 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abc2241
109. Wec AZ, Wrapp D, Herbert AS, et al. Broad sarbecovirus neutralizing antibodies define a key site of vulnerability on the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.15.096511
110. Hansen J, Baum A, Pascal KE, et al. Studies in humanized mice and convalescent humans yield a SARS-CoV-2 antibody cocktail. *Science (80-)*. 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abd0827
111. Hurlburt NK, Wan Y-H, Stuart AB, et al. Structural basis for potent neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 and role of antibody affinity maturation. *bioRxiv*. 2020.

- doi:10.1101/2020.06.12.148692
112. Wang H, Hou X, Wu X, et al. SARS-CoV-2 proteome microarray for mapping COVID-19 antibody interactions at amino acid resolution. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.03.26.994756
 113. Ejemel M, Li Q, Hou S, et al. IgA MAb blocks SARS-CoV-2 Spike-ACE2 interaction providing mucosal immunity. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.15.096719
 114. Farrera L, Daguer J-P, Barluenga S, et al. Identification of immunodominant linear epitopes from SARS-CoV-2 patient plasma. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.20131391
 115. Galson JD, Schaetzle S, Bashford-Rogers RJM, et al. Deep sequencing of B cell receptor repertoires from COVID-19 patients reveals strong convergent immune signatures. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.20.106294
 116. Bryan A, Fink SL, Gattuso MA, et al. Anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibodies are associated with reduced viral load. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.22.20110551
 117. To KKW, Tsang OTY, Leung WS, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099%2820%2930196-1
 118. Brocato RL, Principe LM, Kim RK, et al. Disruption of Adaptive Immunity Enhances Disease in SARS-CoV-2 Infected Syrian Hamsters. *bioRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.19.161612
 119. Lv H, Wu NC, Tsang OTY, et al. Cross-reactive Antibody Response between SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV Infections. *Cell Rep*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2020.107725
 120. Ng K, Faulkner N, Cornish G, et al. Pre-existing and de novo humoral immunity to SARS-CoV-2 in humans. *bioRxiv* 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.14.095414.
 121. Anderson DE, Tan CW, Chia WN, et al. Lack of cross-neutralization by SARS patient sera towards SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020;9(1):900-902. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1761267>
 122. Selva KJ, Sandt CE van de, Lemke MM, et al. Distinct systems serology features in children, elderly and COVID patients. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.11.20098459
 123. Seow J, Graham C, Merrick B, et al. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.07.09.20148429
 124. Jiang S, Hillyer C, Du L. Neutralizing Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and Other Human Coronaviruses. *Trends Immunol*. 2020. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.it.2020.03.007>
 125. Folegatti PM, Ewer KJ, Aley PK, et al. Safety and immunogenicity of the ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 vaccine against SARS-CoV-2: a preliminary report of a phase 1/2, single-blind, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2020. doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(20)31604-4
 126. Jackson LA, Anderson EJ, Rouphael NG, et al. An mRNA Vaccine against SARS-CoV-2 — Preliminary Report. *N Engl J Med*. 2020. doi:10.1056/nejmoa2022483
 127. Sahin U, Muik A, Derhovanessian E, et al. Concurrent human antibody and TH1 type T-cell responses elicited by a COVID-19 RNA vaccine. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.07.17.20140533
 128. Klein SL, Morgan R. The impact of sex and gender on immunotherapy outcomes. *Biol Sex Differ*. 2020;11(1):1-13. doi:10.1186/s13293-020-00301-y
 129. Bermingham WH, Wilding T, Beck S, Huissoon A. SARS-CoV-2 serology: Test, test, test, but interpret with caution! *Clin Med*. 2020. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2020-0170
 130. Deeks JJ, Dinnes J, Takwoingi Y, et al. Antibody tests for identification of current and past infection with SARS-CoV-2. *Cochrane database Syst Rev*. 2020;6:CD013652. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013652
 131. Flower B, Brown JC, Simmons B, et al. Clinical and laboratory evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 lateral flow assays for use in a national COVID-19 seroprevalence survey. *Thorax*.

- 2020:thoraxjnl-2020-215732. doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2020-215732
132. Ward H, Atchison C, Whitaker M, et al. *Antibody Prevalence for SARS CoV-2 Following the Peak of the Pandemic in England: REACT2 Study in 100,000 Adults*. Imperial College London 2020. doi:10.1088/1757-899x/724/1/011001
 133. Office for National Statistics. *Coronavirus (COVID-19) Infection Survey Pilot: England and Wales, 14 August 2020*. ONS 2020. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/conditionsanddiseases/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19infectionsurveypilot/englandandwales14august2020>.
 134. Yongchen Z, Shen H, Wang X, et al. Different longitudinal patterns of nucleic acid and serology testing results based on disease severity of COVID-19 patients. *Emerg Microbes Infect.* 2020;1-14. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/22221751.2020.1756699>
 135. Okba NMA, Muller MA, Li W, et al. Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients. *Emerg Infect Dis.* 2020;26(7). doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.3201/eid2607.200841>
 136. Liu Z-L, Liu Y, Wan L-G, et al. Antibody Profiles in Mild and Severe Cases of COVID-19. *Clin Chem.* 2020. doi:10.1093/clinchem/hvaa137
 137. Dahlke C, Heidepriem J, Kobbe R, et al. Distinct early IgA profile may determine severity of COVID-19 symptoms: an immunological case series. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.14.20059733
 138. Ozturk T, Howell C, Benameur K, et al. Cross-sectional IgM and IgG profiles in SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.10.20097535
 139. Candel González FJ, Viñuela-Prieto JM, Del Castillo JG, et al. Utility of lateral flow tests in SARS-CoV-2 infection monitoring. *Rev Esp Quimioter.* 2020. doi:10.37201/req/052.2020
 140. Carsetti R, Zaffina S, Mortari EP, et al. Spectrum of innate and adaptive immune response to SARS CoV 2 infection across asymptomatic, mild and severe cases; a longitudinal cohort study. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20137141
 141. Shen L, Wang C, Zhao J, et al. Delayed specific IgM antibody responses observed among COVID-19 patients with severe progression. *Emerg Microbes Infect.* 2020. doi:10.1080/22221751.2020.1766382
 142. Marcos-Jimenez A, Sanchez-Alonso S, Alcaraz-Serna A, et al. Deregulated cellular circuits driving immunoglobulins and complement consumption associate with the severity of COVID-19. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.15.20131706
 143. Zhang Z, Xiao T, Wang Y, et al. Early viral clearance and antibody kinetics of COVID-19 among asymptomatic carriers. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.28.20083139
 144. Dobi A, Frumence E, RAKOTO ML, et al. Serological surveys in Reunion Island of the first hospitalized patients revealed that long-lived immunoglobulin G antibodies specific against SARS-CoV2 virus are rapidly vanishing in severe cases. *medrxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.25.20112623
 145. Duan L, Zhang S, Guo M, et al. Epidemiological and clinical characteristics in patients with SARS-CoV-2 antibody negative probable COVID-19 in Wuhan. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.18.20134619
 146. Rijkers G, Murk J-L, Wintermans B, et al. Differences in antibody kinetics and functionality between severe and mild SARS-CoV-2 infections. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.09.20122036
 147. Hu Q, Cui X, Liu X, Peng B, Jiang J. The production and clinical implications of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies. *medRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.20.20065953
 148. Cervia C, Nilsson J, Zurbuchen Y, et al. Systemic and mucosal antibody secretion specific to SARS-CoV-2 during mild versus severe COVID-19. *bioRxiv.* 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.21.108308

149. Reifer J, Hayum N, Heszkel B, Klagsbald I, Streva VA. SARS-CoV-2 IgG Antibody Responses in New York City. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.23.20111427
150. He R, Lu Z, Zhang L, et al. The clinical course and its correlated immune status in COVID-19 pneumonia. *J Clin Virol*. 2020;127:104361. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104361
151. Qin C, Zhou L, Hu Z, et al. Dysregulation of immune response in patients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;12. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa248
152. Bao J, Li C, Zhang K, Kang H, Chen W, Gu B. Comparative analysis of laboratory indexes of severe and non-severe patients infected with COVID-19. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2020. doi:10.1016/j.cca.2020.06.009
153. Staines HM, Kirwan DE, Clark DJ, et al. Dynamics of IgG seroconversion and pathophysiology of COVID-19 infections. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.07.20124636
154. Burbelo PD, Riedo FX, Morishima C, et al. Detection of Nucleocapsid Antibody to SARS-CoV-2 is More Sensitive than Antibody to Spike Protein in COVID-19 Patients. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.20.20071423
155. Solodky ML, Galvez C, Russias B, et al. Lower detection rates of SARS-COV2 antibodies in cancer patients vs healthcare workers after symptomatic COVID-19. *Ann Oncol*. 2020:19-21. doi:10.1016/j.annonc.2020.04.475
156. Brotons C, Serrano J, Fernandez D, et al. Seroprevalence against COVID-19 and follow-up of suspected cases in primary health care in Spain. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.13.20130575
157. Favara DM, Cooke A, Doffinger R, et al. First results from the UK COVID-19 Serology in Oncology Staff Study (CSOS). *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20136838
158. Rudberg A-S, Havervall S, Manberg A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 exposure, symptoms and seroprevalence in health care workers. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.22.20137646
159. Long QX, Tang XJ, Shi QL, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nat Med*. 2020. doi:10.1038/s41591-020-0965-6
160. Madariaga MLL, Guthmiller J, Schrantz S, et al. Clinical predictors of donor antibody titer and correlation with recipient antibody response in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma clinical trial. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.21.20132944
161. Houlihan C, Vora N, Byrne T, et al. SARS-CoV-2 virus and antibodies in front-line Health Care Workers in an acute hospital in London: preliminary results from a longitudinal study. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.08.20120584
162. Schmidt SB, Grüter L, Boltzmann M, Rollnik JD. Prevalence of serum IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among clinic staff. *PLoS One*. 2020. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0235417
163. Garcia-Basteiro AL, Moncunill G, Tortajada M, et al. Seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among health care workers in a large Spanish reference hospital. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.04.27.20082289
164. Sandri MT, Azzolini E, Torri V, et al. IgG serology in health care and administrative staff populations from 7 hospital representative of different exposures to SARS-CoV-2 in Lombardy, Italy. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.05.24.20111245
165. Giagulli VA, Guastamacchia E, Magrone T, et al. Worse progression of COVID-19 in men: Is testosterone a key factor? *Andrology*. 2020. doi:10.1111/andr.12836
166. Zeng F, Dai C, Cai P, et al. A comparison study of SARS-CoV-2 IgG antibody between male and female COVID-19 patients: A possible reason underlying different outcome between sex. *J Med Virol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/jmv.25989
167. Chen J, Zhang ZZ, Chen YK, et al. The clinical and immunological features of pediatric COVID-19 patients in China. *Genes Dis*. 2020. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gendis.2020.03.008

168. Cohen R, Jung C, Ouldali N, et al. Assessment of spread of SARS-CoV-2 by RT-PCR and concomitant serology in children in a region heavily affected by COVID-19 pandemic. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.12.20129221
169. Du W, Yu J, Wang H, et al. Clinical characteristics of COVID-19 in children compared with adults in Shandong Province, China. *Infection*. 2020;16:16. doi:<https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s15010-020-01427-2>
170. Li Y, Deng W, Xiong H, et al. Immune-related factors associated with pneumonia in 127 children with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2020. doi:10.1002/ppul.24907
171. Zeng H, Xu C, Fan J, et al. Antibodies in Infants Born to Mothers with COVID-19 Pneumonia. *JAMA*. 2020:E1-E2. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.4861>
172. Bwire GM, Njiro BJ. A systematic review on the levels of antibodies in COVID-19 virus exposed but negative newborns: a possible vertical transmission of IgG/ IgM. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi:10.1101/2020.06.09.20127118
173. Fox A, Marino J, Amanat F, et al. Evidence of a significant secretory-IgA-dominant SARS-CoV-2 immune response in human milk following recovery from COVID-19. *medRxiv*. 2020. doi: 10.1101/2020.05.04.20089995
174. Du H, Dong X, Zhang J, et al. Clinical characteristics of 182 pediatric COVID-19 patients with different severities and allergic status. *Allergy*. 2020. doi:10.1111/all.14452
175. Rogers TF, Zhao F, Huang D, et al. Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. *Science (80-)*. 2020. doi:10.1126/science.abc7520




Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart describing the process of screening and selection of included studies.

	Antibody response	Protective Immunity
<i>Article type</i>		
Pre-print	57	43
Peer reviewed paper	51	26
Report	0	1
<i>Study designs</i>		
Cohort	58	18
Case control	20	14
Case series	15	8
Basic science	4	22
Narrative review	4	2
Systematic review with meta-analysis	5	2
Systematic review without meta-analysis	1	1
Non-randomised trial	1	2
<i>Subjects</i>		
Human	104	58
Animal	1	6
Both	3	6
<i>Country of origin</i>		
China	41	20
USA	15	14
Europe excl UK	29	9
UK	7	5
Other countries	5	4
Multiple populations	10	6
Lab or animal based*	1	12
<i>Study setting</i>		
Hospital patients	70	33
Mixed hospital and community	18	11
Community	13	5
Unclear	6	12
Animal only study	1	9
<i>Overall MetaQAT quality assessment</i>		
High	25	9
Moderate	74	51
Low	9	10

Table 1. Summary of characteristics of included studies.




Figure 2. Forest plot showing median time to seroconversion by severity across included studies. Central points in the forest plot represent the median reported by each study overall; the range across participants in each individual study is represented by whiskers either side.




Figure 3. Schematic showing scale of IgG/IgM/IgA/Neutralising Ab response over time from disease onset (note that the y axis is illustrative – no scale is given).

Table 2. Evidence on correlates of antibody response

Category	Correlate	Dimension or sub-population	Findings
Clinical	Disease severity	Longitudinal trends in Ab production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most studies report no relationship between time to seroconversion for IgG or IgM and disease severity.^{22,35,53,56} • A number of studies report earlier antibody response to more severe disease^{134,135}, including specifically for IgG;⁷ a shorter time to peak antibody titre,^{19,26,136–138} including specifically for IgA,³⁰ and that IgG persists for longer in severe disease compared to milder cases.^{139,140} • Three studies report an earlier antibody response to milder disease,^{19,43} including specifically IgM¹⁴¹ and IgA,¹⁴⁰ shorter time to peak for IgG,¹⁴⁰ and IgG persists for longer compared to severe cases.¹⁴² • One study reports lower seroconversion rate amongst asymptomatic compared to symptomatic cases.¹⁴³ • Two other studies on this association were limited by low quality.^{144,145}
		Antibody titre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ten studies reported that more severe cases have higher IgG titres,^{23,34,39,42,75,146–150} three studies reported no difference between mild and severe cases,^{45,53,63} and two studies report severe cases have lower IgG titres.^{53,63} • Five studies reported severe cases have higher IgM titres,^{23,34,39,45,53} two studies reported no difference in between mild and severe cases,^{64,102} and three studies reported severe cases have lower IgM titres.^{150–152} • Three studies report severe cases have higher IgA titres,^{23,140,148} one study reports no difference between mild and severe cases.¹⁵¹
	Co-morbid disease		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three studies report an association between co-morbidities and seroconversion or antibody positivity,^{64,153} with one finding immunocompromised individuals developed a lower response.¹⁵⁴ • One study reports antibody responses to be independent of co-morbidities, for both IgA and IgG.¹⁴⁸ • One study on this association was limited by low quality.¹⁵⁵
	Symptom profile		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three studies report an association between COVID-19 symptoms and seropositivity,^{156–158} and with higher titres of IgG,^{29,159} IgA,¹⁵⁹ and anti-RBD and anti-S antibodies.¹⁶⁰ • Two study reported that asymptomatic healthcare workers did develop antibodies.^{161,162} • Fever appears to have a consistent relationship with seropositivity and antibody titres,^{29,158,160} although other symptoms such as ageusia have also been associated.^{156,158}
Demographic	Sex		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four studies report no association between antibody titres (either IgG or IgM) and sex.^{21,148,163,164} • Two studies report a higher IgG titre in women,^{165,166} although one found this association in severe patients only.¹⁶⁶ • Two studies report a higher proportion of women tested positive for antibodies.^{156,164} • One study found higher anti-RBD and anti-S antibodies in male plasma donors.¹⁶⁰
	Age	Older adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five studies found no association between antibody response and age, for both antibody positivity¹⁴⁷ or IgM/IgG titre.^{21,58,148,167} • One study found that 'older' patients were more likely to seroconvert,¹⁵³ and concentration of IgG was related to age.³⁴ • Three studies reported that older people had higher titres of IgA and IgG,²³ IgM,¹⁶³ and anti-S and anti-RBD IgG.¹⁶⁰
		Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two studies found children generally developed a detectable antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 infection^{86,168}

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two studies found children with pneumonia generally mounted lower IgG¹⁶⁹ and IgA responses¹⁷⁰ and one study reported no differences.¹⁶⁷ Two studies reported most neonates born to COVID-19 positive mothers had raised IgM,^{171,172} and COVID-19 recovered donor breast milk was found to have reactive IgA in one study.¹⁷³
	Ethnicity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One study reported non-white ethnicity was associated with higher antibody levels than white ethnicity.¹⁵³

Table 3. Evidence on correlates of neutralising antibody response

Category	Correlate	Dimension or sub-population	Findings
Clinical	Disease severity	Longitudinal trends in Ab production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One study reported asymptomatic cases with neutralising antibodies were more likely to lose detectable neutralising antibodies in the convalescent phase.¹⁵⁹
		Antibody titre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ten studies reported a higher titre of neutralising antibodies in more clinically severe cases.^{7,43,49,66,85,87,95–98} One study reported undetectable neutralising activity in plasma from a majority of asymptomatic cases.⁸⁵
Demographic	Sex	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Five studies reported neutralising antibody response was positively correlated with male sex,^{66,68,87,96} although it is unclear how this is related to disease severity.⁴⁹ One study reported a positive correlation between neutralising antibody formation and female sex.⁸⁵
		Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Older adults Two studies reported increasing neutralising antibody response with increasing age.^{20,94} Two studies reported no association between neutralising antibodies and age.^{68,85}
		Children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two studies reported children can develop a neutralising antibody response.^{48,86}
	Ethnicity	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One study reported that individuals with Hispanic/Latino ethnicity were more likely to have detectable neutralising antibody responses (although this study was based on a convenience sample in an atypical cohort – US service personnel on a warship).⁶⁵

[BLANK PAGE]