Perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

1 Rapid, simplified whole blood-based multiparameter assay to quantify and phenotype

- 2 SARS-CoV-2 specific T cells
- 3
- 4 Catherine Riou^{1,2,*}, Georgia Schäfer^{1,3,4}, Elsa du Bruyn^{1,5}, Rene T. Goliath¹, Cari Stek^{1,5,6}, Huihui
- 5 Mou⁷, Deli Hung⁸, Katalin A. Wilkinson^{1,5,9}, Robert J. Wilkinson^{1,5,6,9}
- 6

7	¹ Wellcome Centre for Infectious Disease Research in Africa and Institute of Infectious Disease
8	and Molecular Medicine, University of Cape Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa
9	² Division of Immunology, Department of Pathology, University of Cape Town, Observatory
10	7925, South Africa
11	³ International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology (ICGEB) Cape Town,
12	Observatory 7925, South Africa
13	⁴ Division of Medical Biochemistry and Structural Biology, Department of Integrative
14	Biomedical Sciences, University of Cape Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa
15	⁵ Department of Medicine, University of Cape Town, Observatory 7925, South Africa
16	⁶ Department of Infectious Diseases, Imperial College London, W12 0NN, UK
17	⁷ Department of Immunology and Microbiology, The Scripps Research Institute, Jupiter, FL
18	33458, USA
19	⁸ Department of Immunology and Microbiology, The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, CA
20	92037, USA

- ⁹ The Francis Crick Institute, London, NW1 1AT, UK
- 22
- 23 * Corresponding Author: Catherine Riou, University of Cape Town, IDM, Anzio Road,
- 24 Observatory, 7925, Cape Town, South Africa. E-mail: cr.riou@uct.ac.za
- 25

26 Key words: COVID-19, T cells, Whole blood Assay

27

28 **Running title**: SARS-CoV-2-specific whole blood T cell assay.

- 29 30 **40-word su**
- **40-word summary:** In this proof of concept study, we show that SARS-CoV-2 T cell responses
- 31 are easily detectable using a rapid whole blood assay requiring minimal blood volume. Such
- 32 assay could represent a suitable tool to monitor adaptive immunity in vaccine trials.

33 ABSTRACT

35	Rapid tests to evaluate SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses are urgently needed to decipher
36	protective immunity and aid monitoring vaccine-induced immunity. Using a rapid whole blood
37	assay requiring minimal amount of blood, we measured qualitatively and quantitatively SARS-
38	CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell responses in 31 healthcare workers, using flow cytometry. 100% of
39	COVID-19 convalescent participants displayed a detectable SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell
40	response. SARS-CoV-2-responding cells were also detected in 40.9% of participants with no
41	COVID-19-associated symptoms or who tested PCR negative. Phenotypic assessment indicated
42	that, in COVID-19 convalescent participants, SARS-CoV-2 CD4 responses displayed an early
43	differentiated memory phenotype with limited capacity to produce IFNy. Conversely, in
44	participants with no reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 CD4 responses were enriched in late
45	differentiated cells, co-expressing IFN γ and TNF α and also Granzyme B. This proof of concept
46	study presents a scalable alternative to PBMC-based assays to enumerate and phenotype SARS-
47	CoV-2-responding T cells, thus representing a practical tool to monitor adaptive immunity in
48	vaccine trials.

49 INTRODUCTION

50

51	The outbreak of SARS-CoV-2 infection (causing the disease known as COVID-19) that first
52	emerged in Wuhan, China in December 2019, was declared a global pandemic on 12 th March
53	2020, and is affecting all countries of the world, including those of Africa (Margolin et al., 2020).
54	There is an urgent need to understand better the clinical manifestations and the pathogenesis of
55	SARS-CoV-2 in order to develop relevant tools, including diagnostic tests, treatments and
56	vaccines, to stop the spread of disease as well as strategies to best manage this disease in all
57	population groups.
58	
59	The clinical spectrum of COVID-19 is very wide, from asymptomatic through mild flu-like
60	symptoms to severe pneumonia and death. Understanding what constitutes immune protection
61	against SARS-CoV-2 is key to predicting long-term immunity and to inform vaccine design.
62	While much emphasis has been placed on the B cell and antibody response, it is not yet clear
63	what type of immune response confers protection to SARS-CoV-2 (Cox and Brokstad, 2020).
64	Several studies suggest that the T cell response may play an important role in SARS-CoV-2
65	pathogenesis and reports indicating that patients lacking B cells can recover from SARS-CoV-2
66	infection further highlight the likely importance of T cell immunity (Altmann and Boyton, 2020);
67	(Quinti et al., 2020). Additionally, accumulating evidence indicates that the presence of pre-
68	existing, cross-reactive memory T cells specific for common cold coronaviruses may affect
69	susceptibility to SARS-CoV-2 infection and partially explain the markedly divergent clinical
70	manifestations of COVID-19 (Braun et al., 2020; Canete and Vinuesa, 2020; Lipsitch et al., 2020;
71	Sette and Crotty, 2020).
72	

Efficient, sensitive and simple assessment of human T-cell immunity remains a challenge. Most
 commonly used T cell assays necessitate the isolation of peripheral blood mononuclear cells

- 75 (PBMC), requiring significant amount of blood. Therefore, whole blood assays could be more 76 advantageous than PBMC-based methods, by significantly reducing blood volume (~ 1 ml), 77 making them more applicable to paediatric populations. Moreover, such assays are rapid, as they 78 don't require cell separation, and preserve the physiologic cellular and soluble environments, 79 mimicking better human blood condition. Here we report a rapid (~ 7 hrs) whole blood-based 80 detection method of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses with simple steps that could be 81 adapted to settings of limited resources. This rapidly applicable assay could represent an easily 82 standardizable tool to assess SARS-CoV-2-specific adaptive immunity to monitor T cell 83 responses in vaccine trials, gain insight into what constitutes a protective response, or define the
- 84 prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 T cell responders population wide.

85 METHODS

86

87 Study population

88 The population studied consisted of healthcare workers (HCW, n=31, 29% male) recruited 89 between July and September 2020, from Groot Schuur Hospital in Cape Town, the hardest hit 90 region of the initial COVID-19 epidemic in South Africa (Mendelson et al., 2020). Participants 91 were classified according to i) reporting of COVID-19-associated symptoms, ii) whether a 92 SARS-CoV-2 RNA PCR from a nasal or pharyngeal swab was performed and iii) SARS-CoV-2 93 PCR results. Based on these criteria, participants were subdivided into three groups: 1) persons 94 with no COVID-19-associated symptoms (n=15); 2) persons who reported symptoms but tested 95 SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative (n = 7); and 3) persons who had COVID-19-associated symptoms 96 and tested SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive (n = 9) (Table 1). In all groups, the exposure to COVID-97 19 patients was comparable (86.8 to 100%). All participants with PCR confirmed COVID-19 had 98 mild symptoms and did not require hospitalization. Blood samples were obtained a median of 7.3 99 weeks post-SARS-CoV-2 testing in persons with a negative test results and 4.7 weeks in those 100 with a confirmed positive result (p=0.09). All participants were symptom-free at the time of 101 sampling. In four SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive participants, a second sample was obtained 1 102 month later. The University of Cape Town's Faculty of Health Sciences Human Research Ethics 103 Committee approved the study (HREC: 207/2020) and written informed consent was obtained 104 from all participants.

105

106 Measurement of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG in plasma

107 The measurement of SARS-CoV-2 specific antibodies was performed using the Roche Elecsys®

- 108 Anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay (Roche Diagnostics, Basel, Switzerland). This semi-
- 109 quantitative electro-chemiluminescent immunoassay measures SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-
- 110 specific IgG. The assay was performed by the South African National Health Laboratory Service

111 (NHLS) and interpreted according to manufacturers' instructions (Roche: V 1.0 2020-05).

112 Results are reported as numeric values in form of a cut-off index (COI; signal sample/cut-off),

113 where a COI < 1.0 corresponds to non-reactive plasma and COI \ge 1.0 to reactive plasma. At 14

114 days post-SARS-CoV-2 PCR confirmation, the sensitivity and specificity of the Elecsys® Anti-

115 SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay is reported as 99.5% (95% CI, 97.0 to 100.0%) and 99.80% (95%

116 CI, 99.69 to 99.88%), respectively (Favresse et al., 2020; Muench et al., 2020; National, 2020).

117

118 SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus neutralisation assay

119 Patient plasma was evaluated for SARS-CoV-2 neutralisation activity using a SARS-CoV-2

120 pseudovirus infection assay. Single-cycle infectious SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirions based on the

121 HIV backbone expressing the SARS-CoV-2 Spike (S) protein and a firefly luciferase reporter

122 were produced in HEK-293TT cells (Buck et al., 2004; Buck et al., 2005) by co-transfection of

123 plasmids pNL4-3.Luc.R-.E- (NIH AIDS Reagent Program (#3418), Germantown, MD, USA) and

124 pcDNA3.3-SARS-CoV-2-spike Δ 18 (Rogers et al., 2020). HEK-293TT cell culture supernatants

125 containing the virions were harvested 3 days post transfection and incubated with heat-inactivated

126 patient plasma at 5-fold serial dilutions for 60 min at 37°C. Plasma/pseudovirus mixtures were

127 then used for transfection of HEK-293T cells stably expressing the ACE2 receptor (Mou et al.,

128 2020). Cells were lysed 3 days post infection using the Promega cell culture lysis reagent

129 (Promega Biosciences Inc., San Luis Obispo, CA, USA) and assessed for luciferase activity using

130 a GloMax[®] Explorer Multimode Microplate Reader (Promega Biosciences) together with the

131 Luciferase assay system (Promega Biosciences).

132

133 Whole blood-based T cell detection assay

134 Blood was collected in sodium heparin tubes and processed within 3 h of collection. The whole

135 blood-based SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell detection assay was adapted from a previously reported

136 whole blood intracellular cytokine detection assay designed to quantitate Mycobacterium

137 tuberculosis specific T cells in small volumes of blood (Hanekom et al., 2004). However, 138 significant modifications have been made, including a reduced incubation time, the usage of a 139 fixation buffer allowing the simultaneous lysis of red blood cells to streamline processing time, 140 leading to faster acquisition of results (Riou et al., 2020). Here, we adapted this assay to detect 141 SARS-CoV-2 specific T cells using synthetic SARS-CoV-2 PepTivator peptides (Miltenyi 142 Biotec, Surrey, UK), consisting of 15-mer sequences with 11 amino acid overlap covering the 143 immunodominant parts of the spike (S) protein, and the complete sequence of the nucleocapsid 144 (N) and membrane (M) proteins. All peptides were combined in a single pool and used at a final 145 concentration of 1 µg/ml. The workflow of the assay is presented in Figure 1. Briefly, 400 µl 146 whole blood was stimulated with the SARS-CoV-2 S, N and M protein peptide pool at 37°C for 5 hrs in the presence of the co-stimulatory antibodies against CD28 and CD49d (1µg/ml each; BD 147 148 Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA) and Brefeldin-A (10µg/ml, Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO, 149 USA). Unstimulated blood was incubated with co-stimulatory antibodies, Brefeldin-A and an 150 equimolar amount of DMSO. Red blood cell lysis and white cell fixation was then performed as a 151 single step using a Transcription Factor Fixation buffer (eBioscience, San Diego, CA, USA) for 152 20 minutes. At this stage cells were cryopreserved in freezing media (50% foetal bovine serum, 153 40% RPMI and 10% dimethyl sulfoxide) and stored in liquid nitrogen until batched analysis. 154

Cell staining was performed on cryopreserved cells that were thawed, washed and permeabilised
with a Transcription Factor perm/wash buffer (eBioscience). Cells were then stained at room

157 temperature for 30 min with antibodies for CD3 BV650, CD4 BV785, CD8 BV510, CD45RA

158 Alexa 488, CD27 PE-Cy5, CD38 APC, HLA-DR BV605, Ki67 PerCP-cy5.5, PD-1 PE,

159 Granzyme B (GrB) BV421, IFNγ BV711, TNFα PE-Cy7 and IL-2 PE/Dazzle 594, as detailed in

160 Supplementary Table 1. Samples were acquired on a BD LSR-II and analysed using FlowJo

161 (v9.9.6, FlowJo LCC, Ashland, OR, USA). A positive response was defined as any cytokine

162 response that was at least twice the background of unstimulated cells. To define the phenotype of

- 163 SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells, a cut-off of 30 events was used. The gating strategy is
- 164 provided in **Supplementary Figure 1**.
- 165

166 Statistical analyses

- 167 Graphical representations were performed in Prism (v8.4.3; GraphPad Software Inc, San Diego,
- 168 CA, USA) and JMP (v14.0.0; SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA). Statistical tests were performed in
- 169 Prism. Non-parametric tests were used for all comparisons. The Kruskal-Wallis test with Dunn's
- 170 multiple comparison test was used for multiple comparisons and the Mann-Whitney and
- 171 Wilcoxon matched pairs test for unmatched and paired samples, respectively.

172 **RESULTS**

173

174 Serological assessment of SARS-CoV-2 sensitization.

175 Even though RT-PCR is the most specific technique to detect acute SARS-CoV-2 infection, the

- 176 positivity rate drops rapidly as soon as 10 days post-symptom onset, particularly in individuals
- 177 with mild forms of COVID-19 (Liu et al., 2020a; Liu et al., 2020b). Hence, serology assays
- 178 provide an important complement to RNA testing to identify individuals who have been
- 179 sensitized by SARS-CoV-2. Thus, to assess potential SARS-CoV-2 sensitization in participants
- 180 who did not have a SARS-CoV-2 PCR test performed or tested PCR negative, the presence of
- 181 SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies (e.g. SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG) was measured
- and a SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus neutralisation assay was also performed in all participants.
- 183 While all participants with a positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR test exhibited *in vitro* anti-SARS-CoV-2
- 184 neutralizing activity and 8/9 (88.8%) had detectable SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG,
- 185 none of the participants who tested negative or did not undergo PCR testing were positive for
- 186 SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG (Figure 2A) or displayed robust *in vitro* anti-SARS-
- 187 CoV-2 activity (Figure 2B). Overall, these results confirmed that PCR positive participants had
- 188 been infected with SARS-CoV-2 and mounted an immune response to the virus and suggested
- 189 that none of the participants who did not have a PCR test performed or tested PCR negative,

190 despite experiencing COVID-19-like symptoms, have been SARS-CoV-2 infected.

191

192 Magnitude and functional profile of SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells.

Amongst the 31 participants tested, 58% (n=18) had a detectable SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T
cell response (producing any of the measured cytokines, IFNγ, TNFα or IL-2) using the described
whole blood assay (Figure 3A). We then defined the magnitude and phenotype of SARS-CoV-2
-specific CD4 responses according to participants' clinical characteristics (Figure 3B&C). All

197 HCW with self-reported symptoms and a SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive test (n=9) were found to

have SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells (median frequency: 0.47%, IQR: 0.28-0.65) (Figure

199	3 C). Of note, the frequency of SARS-CoV-2 specific CD4 T cells did not associate with the
200	magnitude of SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG ($p = 0.64$, $r = -0.18$) or plasma
201	neutralizing activity ($p = 0.46$, $r = 0.28$) (data not shown). Interestingly, in participants with no
202	detectable SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG or neutralizing antibody activity, of those
203	with self-reported symptoms, 3/7 (43%) had detectable SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells
204	(median of responders: 0.02%, IQR: 0.019-0.03) and 6/15 (40%) of those with no self-reported
205	symptoms had detectable SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells (median of responders: 0.15%,
206	IQR: 0.05-1.47), suggesting that these responses correspond to SARS-CoV-2 cross-reactive
207	memory CD4 T cells.
208	Next, we defined the polyfunctional profile of SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, based on
209	their capacity to co-express IL-2, IFN γ or TNF α (Figure 3D). The overall functional profile of
210	SARS-CoV-2-specific cells in PCR positive participants was distinct from participants with no
211	reported symptoms (p=0.0002). Indeed, the SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 response in PCR+
212	participants was characterized by limited expression of IFNy and was enriched in cells co-
213	expressing IL-2 and TNFα. On the contrary, in participants reporting no symptom, most SARS-
214	responding CD4 cells were distributed between triple functional cells (IL-2+IFN γ +TNF α +) and
215	cells co-producing IFN γ and TNF α . Overall, in this assay TNF α was the predominant cytokine
216	produced, with its production being significantly higher compared to IL-2 ($p = 0.0026$) and IFN γ
217	(p < 0.0001) (Supplementary Figure 2).

218

198

219 Phenotypic assessment of SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells

220 While the proposed assay can be performed using a limited antibody panel to identify the

221 frequency of SARS-CoV-2-responding T cells, by solely measuring cytokine production, the use

- of a more extensive antibody panel also permits definition of the phenotypic profile of these cells.
- 223 To this end, we included additional markers to assess the memory differentiation (CD27,

224 CD45RA), cytotoxic potential (GrB) and activation profile (HLA-DR, CD38, Ki67, PD-1) of

225 SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells.

- 226 Figure 4A&B shows that in all individuals with symptoms, SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells
- displayed almost exclusively (median: 97.7%) an early differentiated memory phenotype (ED:
- 228 CD45RA-CD27+). On the contrary, in 4/6 HCW with no symptoms, SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4
- 229 T cells exhibited a predominant late differentiated phenotype (LD: CD45RA-CD27-).
- 230 While the role of cytotoxic CD4 T cells is still unclear, the presence of these cells has been
- described in several viral infections (Juno et al., 2017). We thus measured GrB expression in
- 232 SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells. While GrB was barely detectable in SARS-CoV-2-
- 233 specific CD4 T cells in PCR positive participants, elevated GrB expression was observed in 4 out
- of 6 participants without symptoms (Figure 4C&D). Moreover, the proportion of ED SARS-
- 235 CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells inversely associated with GrB expression (p = 0.002, r = -0.71)
- and the proportion of IFN γ and TNF α dual producing cells (p < 0.0001, r = -0.84) (Figure 4E).
- 237 The phenotypic characteristics of GrB expressing SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells (i.e.
- 238 highly differentiated and producing IFNγ and TNFα) are in agreement with a recent report
- 239 describing CMV-specific CD4 CTL T cells (Pachnio et al., 2016).
- 240
- 241 To determine if the overall phenotypic profile of SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells allowed
- 242 discrimination of participants based on their clinical characteristics, we performed a hierarchical
- 243 clustering analysis (Figure 5A) and a principal component analysis (PCA) (Figure 5B),
- including four parameters (e.g. proportion of IFN γ +TNF α +IL2+ and IFN γ -TNF α +IL2+ cells,
- 245 proportion of ED, and GrB expression). Both analyses show that participants who reported no
- 246 symptoms and were negative for SARS-CoV-2 Abs separated clearly from PCR positive
- 247 participants. Conversely, PCR and SARS-CoV-2 antibody negative HCWs reporting symptoms
- 248 could not be separated from PCR positive participants. The loading plot shows that GrB
- 249 expression and the proportion of triple positive cells were the main drivers permitting the

250 segregation of participants who reported no symptoms and were negative for SARS-CoV-2 Abs

251 (**Figure 5C**)

Lastly, as the expression of activation markers (HLA-DR, CD38, PD-1 or Ki67) on an specific T cells are indicative of active infection (Chen and Wherry, 2020; Mathew et we defined the expression of these markers on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells. significant difference was observed in any of the measured markers amongst the differ notwithstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing ($p < 0.0001$, $r = -0.91$), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	
specific T cells are indicative of active infection (Chen and Wherry, 2020; Mathew et we defined the expression of these markers on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells. significant difference was observed in any of the measured markers amongst the differ notwithstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	as the expression of activation markers (HLA-DR, CD38, PD-1 or Ki67) on antigen-
we defined the expression of these markers on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells. significant difference was observed in any of the measured markers amongst the differ notwithstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	c T cells are indicative of active infection (Chen and Wherry, 2020; Mathew et al., 2020),
significant difference was observed in any of the measured markers amongst the differ notwithstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	ined the expression of these markers on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells. No
257 notwithstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure 258 Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w 259 expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia 260 dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 261 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee 262 activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te 263 Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated 264 with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas 265 in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim 266 associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression si 267 strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	cant difference was observed in any of the measured markers amongst the different groups,
Interestingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression w expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potentia dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	nstanding a few outliers observed in the PCR positive participant group (Figure 6A).
expressed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potential dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202) and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betweed activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreass in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	tingly, regardless of the participants' clinical characteristics, PD-1 expression was highly
260 dysfunction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 202 261 and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betweed 262 activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te 263 Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated 264 with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas 265 in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim 266 associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s 267 strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	sed on SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells, raising the question of a potential intrinsic
and Kurachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship betwee activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing ($p < 0.0001$, $r = -0.91$), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	ction/exhaustion of coronavirus-specific memory CD4 T cells (Jubel et al., 2020; Wherry
activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR te Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing ($p < 0.0001$, $r = -0.91$), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression si strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	urachi, 2015; Wykes and Lewin, 2018). We then defined the relationship between the
Figure 6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated with the time post PCR testing ($p < 0.0001$, $r = -0.91$), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression st strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	ion profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and time post positive PCR test.
with the time post PCR testing (p <0.0001, r = -0.91), where CD38 expression decreas in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	6B shows that in PCR positive participants, the expression of CD38 associated strongly
 in the first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Sim associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C). 	e time post PCR testing (p < 0.0001 , r = - 0.91), where CD38 expression decreased sharply
 associations where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression s strongest correlation (Figure 6C). 	first 2 to 3 weeks post testing, suggesting a rapid clearance of the pathogen. Similar
267 strongest correlation (Figure 6C).	tions where observed for all tested activation markers, with CD38 expression showing the
	est correlation (Figure 6C).

268 **DISCUSSION**

269

270	In this proof of concept analysis assessing the use of a simple whole blood assay to
271	measure SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses in a small health care worker cohort, we show
272	that SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells (expressing IFN γ , TNF α or IL-2) were easily detectable
273	in all tested convalescent COVID-19 participants. However, in participants who did not
274	experience any COVID-19-related symptoms or tested SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative (despite
275	reporting symptoms), 9/22 (40.9%) also exhibited a detectable SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell
276	response. Nevertheless, the median frequency of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells in the latter
277	groups was ~ 5-fold lower compared to SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive participants. Importantly,
278	unlike convalescent COVID-19 participants, none of participants without symptoms or who
279	tested PCR negative had detectable SARS-CoV-2 nucleocapsid-specific IgG or displayed robust
280	neutralizing activity. This strongly suggests that in these participants, SARS-CoV-2-responding
281	CD4 T cells may correspond to a pre-existing cross-reactive memory CD4 T cell response. Thus,
282	the sole presence SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD4 T cells does not permit to infer SARS-CoV-2
283	infection or sensitization. These findings are in line with a number of studies demonstrating the
284	presence of SARS-CoV-2-reactive CD4 T cells in 40 to 60% of SARS-CoV-2-unexposed
285	individuals in different populations around the world (Grifoni et al., 2020; Le Bert et al., 2020;
286	Rydyznski Moderbacher et al., 2020; Sekine et al., 2020). Additionally, it is important to point
287	out that all these studies were performed using PBMC and it is encouraging to find that a whole
288	blood-based assay using limited amount of blood (< 1ml) yields comparable results.
289	Further analyses of the polyfunctional and phenotypical profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific
290	CD4 T cells revealed that regardless of the clinical characteristics of the participants, the most
291	prevalent cytokine detected in response to SARS-CoV-2 peptides was TNFa. These observations
292	are in accordance with other studies pointing out an impairment of SARS-CoV-2 adaptive
293	immune responses, characterized by low level of type I and type II interferon (Blanco-Melo et al.,

294 2020; Sattler et al., 2020). However, it is also possible that the limited IFNy production, we 295 observed in this study, is related to the short stimulation time (e.g. 5hrs) used in the assay. 296 Nevertheless, this suggests that TNF α could be a more reliable target than IFN γ , to detect SARS-297 CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell responses. Additionally, SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells in all 298 participants were characterized by elevated of PD-1 expression. Such profiles have been observed 299 in acute SARS-CoV-2 infection and is likely driven by ongoing viral replication (Schub et al., 300 2020; Sekine et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2020). However, PD-1 expression on antigen-specific T 301 cells has been shown to decrease upon pathogen clearance (Barber et al., 2006; Sester et al., 302 2008). Thus, elevated PD-1 expression in COVID-19 convalescent persons and uninfected 303 responders could reflect an intrinsic state of functional exhaustion of SARS-CoV-2-reactive 304 memory CD4 T cells. 305 Lastly, SARS-CoV-2-responding CD4 T cells were qualitatively different between 306 convalescent COVID-19 participants and participants who did not experience COVID-19-307 associated symptoms. In the former group, SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells displayed almost 308 exclusively an early differentiated memory phenotype; while in the latter group, SARS-CoV-2-309 responsive CD4 T cells exhibited a late differentiated memory phenotype and were enriched in 310 GrB. Differences in the attributes of SARS-CoV-2-reactive T cells distinguishing recent SARS-311 CoV-2 infection from pre-existing immunity have been recently reported: strong ex vivo Elispot 312 responses and enhanced proliferation capacity were frequently observed in confirmed COVID-19 313 patients but rare in pre-pandemic or unexposed seronegative persons (Ogbe et al., 2020). This is 314 consistent with the phenotypic features we observed in our study. It remains to be determined 315 whether the presence of pre-existing cross-reactive memory T cells offers any protection against 316 SARS-CoV-2. 317 Although our results rely on a small number of participants and need to be confirmed in

317 Annough our results rely on a small number of participants and need to be commined in 318 larger cohorts, this study suggests that a whole blood assay could represent a valuable tool to 319 assess SARS-CoV-2-specific adaptive immunity. The whole blood assay described here is rapid

- 320 and scalable for varying complexities depending on laboratory resources and questions to be
- 321 addressed. It can be adapted to a simple 4-colour flow cytometry assay to monitor the frequency
- 322 of T cell responses in epidemiological studies or vaccine trials. Alternatively, it can also be used
- 323 to characterize in more depth the specific attributes of SARS-CoV-2-specific T cells, as shown
- 324 here, to aid deciphering cellular features that may associate with immune correlates of protection.
- 325 Finally, as this standardizable assay requires a limited volume of blood, it can be easily used in
- 326 COVID-19 paediatric cases.

327 Acknowledgment: The authors thank all the participants.

328

329	Funding sources: This work was supported by Wellcome [grant number: 104803 and 203135]
330	and Crick idea to innovation (i2i) scheme in partnership with the Rosetrees Trust [grant number:
331	2020-0009]. CR is supported by the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials
332	Partnership EDCTP2 programme supported by the European Union (EU)'s Horizon 2020
333	programme [grant number: Training and Mobility Action TMA2017SF-1951-TB-SPEC to CR]
334	and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) [grant number:R21AI148027 to CR]. GS is supported
335	by the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership EDCTP2 programme
336	[grant number: Training and Mobility Action TMA2018SF-2446 to GS]. RJW and KAW receive
337	support from the Francis Crick institute, which is funded by the UK Medical Research Council
338	UKRI, Cancer Research UK and Wellcome [grant number: FC0010218].
339	
340	Author contributions: CR, KAW and RJW designed the study. CR performed the whole blood
341	assay and flow cytometry experiments and analysed and interpreted the data. GS performed the
342	neutralizing assay experiments. EdB, RTG and CS recruited the study participants. KAW, HM
343	and EL provided critical reagents. CR and KAW wrote the manuscript with all authors
344	contributing to providing critical feedback.
345	
216	

346 **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

347 FIGURE LEGENDS

348

Figure 1: Schematic showing methodology and workflow of the whole blood assay for the 349 350 detection of SARS-CoV-2-specific adaptive immune responses. Step 1: 400 µl of heparinized whole blood is incubated for 5 hours in the presence of a SARS-CoV-2-specific peptide pool in 351 352 the presence of co-stimulatory antibodies (i.e. CD28 and CD49d) and Brefeldin-A. Step 2: Cells 353 are incubated for 20 min in the presence of a transcription factor fixation buffer, leading to the 354 simultaneous lysis of red blood cells and cell fixation. Step 3: Cells are stained for 30 min with 355 an optimized panel of fluorophore labelled antibodies. Step 4: Samples are acquired on a flow 356 cytometer. Control samples are processed with a similar workflow in the absence of SARS-CoV-357 2-specific peptide pool. 358 Figure 2: SARS-CoV-2 serological assessment. A- Quantification of SARS-CoV-2 359 Nucleocapsid-specific antibodies using the Elecsys[®] Roche assay expressed as a cut-off index 360 361 (signal sample/cut-off). Participants were grouped according to their clinical characteristics 362 (Blue: no symptoms, no SARS-CoV-2 PCR performed; Orange: self-reported symptoms, SARS-363 CoV-2 PCR negative; and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive). Bars 364 represent the medians. The dotted line indicates the manufacturer's cut-off value for positivity. 365 Statistical comparisons were performed using a Mann-Whitney T- test. B- SARS-CoV-2 366 pseudovirus neutralization activity. SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirions pre-incubated with serially 367 diluted patient plasma were used to infect ACE2-expressing HEK-293T cells. Luciferase activity as a measure for infection was assessed 3 days post-infection, and results are expressed as 368 369 infection compared to control (untreated virions, grey shaded area) which was set 100%. 370 371 Figure 3: Magnitude and functional profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells. A-

372 Proportion of participants exhibiting a detectable SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell response. B-

373 Representative examples of TNF α and IFNy production in CD4 T cells in response to SARS-374 CoV-2 peptide pool. NS: no stimulation. C- Magnitude of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell 375 response (expressed as a percentage of total CD4 T cells) in participants grouped according to 376 their clinical characteristics (Blue: no symptoms, no SARS-CoV-2 PCR performed; Orange: self-377 reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative; and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-378 2 PCR positive). The number of participants and % of responders in each group is presented at 379 the bottom of the graph. Statistical comparisons were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. D-380 Polyfunctional profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells in each group. The x-axis displays 381 the composition of each combination which is denoted with a dot for the presence of IL-2, IFNy 382 and TNF α . The medians (black bar) are shown. Each combination is color-coded, and data are 383 summarized in the pie charts, where each pie slice represents the median contribution of each 384 combination to the total SARS-CoV-2 response. The arcs identify the contribution of TNFa (light 385 grey), IL-2 (grey) and IFNy (black) to SARS-CoV-2 response. The Wilcoxon Rank Sum Test was 386 used to compare response patterns between groups. Statistical differences between pie charts 387 were defined using a permutation test.

388

389 Figure 4: Memory differentiation profile and Granzyme B (GrB) expression in SARS-CoV-

390 **2-specific CD4 T cells. A-** Representative examples of the memory differentiation profile of

391 SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells based on the expression of CD45RA and CD27. The flow

392 plot on the right shows the distribution of Naïve (CD45RA+CD27+), Early differentiated (ED:

393 CD45RA-CD27+), Late differentiated (LD: CD45RA-CD27-) and Effector (Eff:

394 CD45RA+CD27-) in total CD4 T cells. **B-** Summary graph of the proportion of ED and LD in

395 SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells in each group (Blue: no symptoms, no SARS-CoV-2 PCR

396 performed; Orange: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative and Red: self-reported

- 397 symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive). Statistical comparisons were performed using the
- 398 Kruskal-Wallis test. C- Representative examples of GrB expression in total and SARS-CoV-2-

399	specific CD4 T cells. D- Summary graph of GrB expression in SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T
400	cells in each group. Statistical comparisons were performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. E-
401	Relationship between the proportion of ED within SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and GrB
402	expression or the proportion of IFN γ +TNF α +IL2- SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells.
403	Correlations were tested by a two-tailed non-parametric Spearman rank test.
404	
405	Figure 5: Phenotypic signature of SARS-CoV-2-specific IFNγ+ CD4+ T cells according to
406	clinical characteristics. A- Non-supervised two-way hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA, Ward
407	method) using three phenotypic parameters (i.e. GrB expression and the proportion of ED and
408	IFNy+TNFa+IL2-) from SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells. Each column represents a
409	participant and is color-coded according to their clinical characteristics indicated by a dot at the
410	top of the dendrogram (Blue: no symptoms, no SARS-CoV-2 PCR performed; Orange: self-
411	reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative; and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-
412	2 PCR positive). Participants with a positive SARS-CoV-2 serology test are indicated by a black
413	box and a white box identifies SARS-CoV-2 antibody-negative subjects. Data are depicted as a
414	heatmap coloured from minimum to maximum values for each parameter. B- Principal
415	component analysis on correlations, derived from the three studied parameters. Each dot
416	represents a participant. The two axes represent principal components 1 (PC1) and 2 (PC2). Their
417	contribution to the total data variance is shown as a percentage. C- Loading plot showing how
418	each parameter influences PC1 and PC2 values.
419	
100	

Figure 6: Activation profile of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells. A- CD38, HLA-DR, Ki67
and PD-1 expression in SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells in each group (Blue: no symptoms,
no SARS-CoV-2 PCR performed; Orange: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative
and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive). No significant differences were
observed between groups for any markers, using the Kruskal-Wallis test. B- Association between

- 425 CD38 expression in SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells and the time post SARS-CoV-2 PCR
- 426 positive test (weeks). Each symbol represents a participant (n=9). Dotted red lines identify
- 427 participant with longitudinal samples. Correlations were tested by a two-tailed non-parametric
- 428 Spearman rank test. C- Comparison of the correlation between the time post SARS-CoV-2 PCR
- 429 positive test (weeks) and the expression of different activation profile markers, ranked according
- 430 to the strength of the association. Spearman correlation r values are plotted on the x-axis and
- 431 corresponding *P*-values are shown within each bar.

perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Altmann, D.M., and R.J. Boyton. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 T cell immunity: Specificity, function,

durability, and role in protection. Sci Immunol 5. DOI: 10.1126/sciimmunol.abd6160:

Ahmed. 2006. Restoring function in exhausted CD8 T cells during chronic viral infection.

Barber, D.L., E.J. Wherry, D. Masopust, B. Zhu, J.P. Allison, A.H. Sharpe, G.J. Freeman, and R.

432 **REFERENCES**

Nature 439:682-687.

433

434

435

436

437

438

439 Blanco-Melo, D., B.E. Nilsson-Payant, W.C. Liu, S. Uhl, D. Hoagland, R. Moller, T.X. Jordan, K. Oishi, M. Panis, D. Sachs, T.T. Wang, R.E. Schwartz, J.K. Lim, R.A. Albrecht, and 440 441 B.R. tenOever. 2020. Imbalanced host response to SARS-CoV-2 drives development of 442 COVID-19. Cell 181:1036-1045 e1039. 443 Braun, J., L. Loyal, M. Frentsch, D. Wendisch, P. Georg, F. Kurth, S. Hippenstiel, M. Dingeldey, 444 B. Kruse, F. Fauchere, E. Baysal, M. Mangold, L. Henze, R. Lauster, M.A. Mall, K. 445 Bever, J. Rohmel, S. Voigt, J. Schmitz, S. Miltenvi, I. Demuth, M.A. Muller, A. Hocke, 446 M. Witzenrath, N. Suttorp, F. Kern, U. Reimer, H. Wenschuh, C. Drosten, V.M. Corman, 447 C. Giesecke-Thiel, L.E. Sander, and A. Thiel. 2020. SARS-CoV-2-reactive T cells in 448 healthy donors and patients with COVID-19. Nature Doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2598-9: 449 Buck, C.B., D.V. Pastrana, D.R. Lowy, and J.T. Schiller. 2004. Efficient intracellular assembly of 450 papillomaviral vectors. J Virol 78:751-757. 451 Buck, C.B., D.V. Pastrana, D.R. Lowy, and J.T. Schiller. 2005. Generation of HPV pseudovirions 452 using transfection and their use in neutralization assays. Methods Mol Med 119:445-462. 453 Canete, P.F., and C.G. Vinuesa. 2020. COVID-19 makes B cells forget, but T cells remember. 454 *Cell* 183:13-15. 455 Chen, Z., and E.J. Wherry. 2020. T cell responses in patients with COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol 456 20:529-536. 457 Cox, R.J., and K.A. Brokstad. 2020. Not just antibodies: B cells and T cells mediate immunity to 458 COVID-19. Nat Rev Immunol 20:581-582. 459 Favresse, J., C. Eucher, M. Elsen, M. Tre-Hardy, J.M. Dogne, and J. Douxfils. 2020. Clinical 460 performance of the Elecsys electrochemiluminescent immunoassay for the detection of 461 SARS-CoV-2 total antibodies. Clin Chem 66:1104-1106. 462 Grifoni, A., D. Weiskopf, S.I. Ramirez, J. Mateus, J.M. Dan, C.R. Moderbacher, S.A. Rawlings, 463 A. Sutherland, L. Premkumar, R.S. Jadi, D. Marrama, A.M. de Silva, A. Frazier, A.F. 464 Carlin, J.A. Greenbaum, B. Peters, F. Krammer, D.M. Smith, S. Crotty, and A. Sette. 465 2020. Targets of T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in humans with COVID-466 19 disease and unexposed individuals. Cell 181:1489-1501 e1415. 467 Hanekom, W.A., J. Hughes, M. Mavinkurve, M. Mendillo, M. Watkins, H. Gamieldien, S.J. 468 Gelderbloem, M. Sidibana, N. Mansoor, V. Davids, R.A. Murray, A. Hawkridge, P.A. 469 Haslett, S. Ress, G.D. Hussey, and G. Kaplan. 2004. Novel application of a whole blood intracellular cytokine detection assay to quantitate specific T-cell frequency in field 470 471 studies. J Immunol Methods 291:185-195. Jubel, J.M., Z.R. Barbati, C. Burger, D.C. Wirtz, and F.A. Schildberg. 2020. The role of PD-1 in 472 473 acute and chronic infection. Front Immunol 11:487. 474 Juno, J.A., D. van Bockel, S.J. Kent, A.D. Kelleher, J.J. Zaunders, and C.M. Munier. 2017. 475 Cytotoxic CD4 T cells - Friend or foe during viral infection? Front Immunol 8:19. 476 Le Bert, N., A.T. Tan, K. Kunasegaran, C.Y.L. Tham, M. Hafezi, A. Chia, M.H.Y. Chng, M. Lin, N. Tan, M. Linster, W.N. Chia, M.I. Chen, L.F. Wang, E.E. Ooi, S. Kalimuddin, P.A. 477 478 Tambyah, J.G. Low, Y.J. Tan, and A. Bertoletti. 2020. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell 479 immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS, and uninfected controls. Nature 584:457-480 462.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.30.20223099; this version posted November 3, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in

perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

- 481 Lipsitch, M., Y.H. Grad, A. Sette, and S. Crotty. 2020. Cross-reactive memory T cells and herd 482 immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Nat Rev Immunol 20:709-713.
- 483 Liu, L., W. Liu, Y. Zheng, X. Jiang, G. Kou, J. Ding, Q. Wang, Q. Huang, Y. Ding, W. Ni, W. 484 Wu, S. Tang, L. Tan, Z. Hu, W. Xu, Y. Zhang, B. Zhang, Z. Tang, X. Zhang, H. Li, Z. 485 Rao, H. Jiang, X. Ren, S. Wang, and S. Zheng. 2020a. A preliminary study on serological 486 assay for severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) in 238 487 admitted hospital patients. Microbes Infect 22:206-211.
- 488 Liu, Y., L.M. Yan, L. Wan, T.X. Xiang, A. Le, J.M. Liu, M. Peiris, L.L.M. Poon, and W. Zhang. 489 2020b. Viral dynamics in mild and severe cases of COVID-19. Lancet Infect Dis 20:656-490 657.
- 491 Margolin, E., W.A. Burgers, E.D. Sturrock, M. Mendelson, R. Chapman, N. Douglass, A.L. 492 Williamson, and E.P. Rybicki. 2020. Prospects for SARS-CoV-2 diagnostics, therapeutics 493 and vaccines in Africa. Nat Rev Microbiol DOI: 10.1038/s41579-020-00441-3:
- 494 Mathew, D., J.R. Giles, A.E. Baxter, D.A. Oldridge, A.R. Greenplate, J.E. Wu, C. Alanio, L. 495 Kuri-Cervantes, M.B. Pampena, K. D'Andrea, S. Manne, Z. Chen, Y.J. Huang, J.P. Reilly, 496 A.R. Weisman, C.A.G. Ittner, O. Kuthuru, J. Dougherty, K. Nzingha, N. Han, J. Kim, A. 497 Pattekar, E.C. Goodwin, E.M. Anderson, M.E. Weirick, S. Gouma, C.P. Arevalo, M.J. 498 Bolton, F. Chen, S.F. Lacey, H. Ramage, S. Cherry, S.E. Hensley, S.A. Apostolidis, A.C. 499 Huang, L.A. Vella, U.P.C.P. Unit, M.R. Betts, N.J. Meyer, and E.J. Wherry. 2020. Deep 500 immune profiling of COVID-19 patients reveals distinct immunotypes with therapeutic 501 implications. Science 369. DOI: 10.1126/science.abc8511:
- 502 Mendelson, M., L. Boloko, A. Boutall, L. Cairncross, G. Calligaro, C. Coccia, J.A. Dave, M. de 503 Villiers, S. Dlamini, P. Frankenfeld, P. Gina, M.V. Gule, J. Hoare, R. Hofmeyr, M. Hsiao, 504 I. Joubert, T. Kahn, R. Krause, A. Kroopman, D. Levin, D. Maughan, S. Mazondwa, G. 505 Meintjes, R. Nordien, N. Ntusi, N. Papavarnavas, J. Peter, H. Pickard, P. Raubenheimer, 506 Q. Said-Hartley, P. Singh, S. Wasserman, and o.b.o.t.G.S.H.C.-R. Team. 2020. Clinical 507 management of COVID-19: Experiences of the COVID-19 epidemic from Groote Schuur 508 Hospital, Cape Town, South Africa. South African Medical Journal 110:973-981.
- 509 Mou, H., B.D. Quinlan, H. Peng, Y. Guo, S. Peng, L. Zhang, M.E. Davis-Gardner, M.R. Gardner, 510 G. Crynen, Z.X. Voo, C.C. Bailey, M.D. Alpert, C. Rader, H. Choe, and M. Farzan. 2020. 511 Mutations from bat ACE2 orthologs markedly enhance ACE2-Fc neutralization of SARS-512 CoV-2. BioRxiv DOI: 10.1101/2020.06.29.178459:
- 513 Muench, P., S. Jochum, V. Wenderoth, B. Ofenloch-Haehnle, M. Hombach, M. Strobl, H. 514 Sadlowski, C. Sachse, G. Torriani, I. Eckerle, and A. Riedel. 2020. Development and 515 validation of the Elecsys anti-SARS-CoV-2 immunoassay as a highly specific tool for 516 determining past exposure to SARS-CoV-2. J Clin Microbiol 58. DOI: 517 10.1128/JCM.01694-20:
- 518 National, S.-C.-S.A.E.G. 2020. Performance characteristics of five immunoassays for SARS-519 CoV-2: a head-to-head benchmark comparison. Lancet Infect Dis. DOI: 10.1016/S1473-520 3099(20)30634-4:
- 521 Ogbe, A., B. Kronsteiner, D.T. Donal T. Skelly, M. Pace, and A. Brown. 2020. T cell assays 522 differentiate clinical and subclinical SARS-CoV-2 infections from cross-reactive antiviral 523 responses. MedRxiv DOI: 10.1101/2020.1109.1128.20202929.
- 524 Pachnio, A., M. Ciaurriz, J. Begum, N. Lal, J. Zuo, A. Beggs, and P. Moss. 2016. 525 Cytomegalovirus infection leads to development of high frequencies of cytotoxic virus-526 specific CD4+ T cells targeted to vascular endothelium. PLoS Pathog 12:e1005832.
- 527 Quinti, I., V. Lougaris, C. Milito, F. Cinetto, A. Pecoraro, I. Mezzaroma, C.M. Mastroianni, O.
- 528 Turriziani, M.P. Bondioni, M. Filippini, A. Soresina, G. Spadaro, C. Agostini, R. Carsetti, 529 and A. Plebani. 2020. A possible role for B cells in COVID-19? Lesson from patients 530 with agammaglobulinemia. J Allergy Clin Immunol 146:211-213 e214.
- 531 Riou, C., E. Du Bruyn, S. Ruzive, R.T. Goliath, C.S. Lindestam Arlehamn, A. Sette, A. Sher, 532 D.L. Barber, and R.J. Wilkinson. 2020. Disease extent and anti-tubercular treatment

533	response correlates with Mycobacterium tuberculosis-specific CD4 T-cell phenotype
534	regardless of HIV-1 status. Clin Transl Immunology 9:e1176.
535	Rogers, T.F., F. Zhao, D. Huang, N. Beutler, A. Burns, W.T. He, O. Limbo, C. Smith, G. Song, J.
536	Woehl, L. Yang, R.K. Abbott, S. Callaghan, E. Garcia, J. Hurtado, M. Parren, L. Peng, S.
537	Ramirez, J. Ricketts, M.J. Ricciardi, S.A. Rawlings, N.C. Wu, M. Yuan, D.M. Smith, D.
538	Nemazee, J.R. Teijaro, J.E. Voss, I.A. Wilson, R. Andrabi, B. Briney, E. Landais, D. Sok,
539	J.G. Jardine, and D.R. Burton. 2020. Isolation of potent SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing
540	antibodies and protection from disease in a small animal model. Science 369:956-963.
541	Rydyznski Moderbacher, C., S.I. Ramirez, J.M. Dan, A. Grifoni, K.M. Hastie, D. Weiskopf, S.
542	Belanger, R.K. Abbott, C. Kim, J. Choi, Y. Kato, E.G. Crotty, C. Kim, S.A. Rawlings, J.
543	Mateus, L.P.V. Tse, A. Frazier, R. Baric, B. Peters, J. Greenbaum, E. Ollmann Saphire,
544	D.M. Smith, A. Sette, and S. Crotty. 2020. Antigen-specific adaptive immunity to SARS-
545	CoV-2 in acute COVID-19 and associations with age and disease severity. Cell. DOI:
546	10.1016/j.cell.2020.09.038:
547	Sattler, A., S. Angermair, H. Stockmann, K.M. Heim, D. Khadzhynov, S. Treskatsch, F. Halleck,
548	M.E. Kreis, and K. Kotsch. 2020. SARS-CoV-2 specific T-cell responses and correlations
549	with COVID-19 patient predisposition. J Clin Invest. DOI: 10.1172/JCI140965:
550	Schub, D., V. Klemis, S. Schneitler, J. Mihm, P.M. Lepper, H. Wilkens, R. Bals, H. Eichler, B.C.
551	Gartner, S.L. Becker, U. Sester, M. Sester, and T. Schmidt. 2020. High levels of SARS-
552	CoV-2-specific T cells with restricted functionality in severe courses of COVID-19. JCI
553	Insight 5:e142167.
554	Sekine, T., A. Perez-Potti, O. Rivera-Ballesteros, K. Stralin, J.B. Gorin, A. Olsson, S. Llewellyn-
555	Lacey, H. Kamal, G. Bogdanovic, S. Muschiol, D.J. Wullimann, T. Kammann, J. Emgard,
556	T. Parrot, E. Folkesson, CS.G. Karolinska, O. Rooyackers, L.I. Eriksson, J.I. Henter, A.
557	Sonnerborg, T. Allander, J. Albert, M. Nielsen, J. Klingstrom, S. Gredmark-Russ, N.K.
558	Bjorkstrom, J.K. Sandberg, D.A. Price, H.G. Ljunggren, S. Aleman, and M. Buggert.
559	2020. Robust T cell immunity in convalescent individuals with asymptomatic or mild
560	COVID-19. <i>Cell</i> 183:158-168 e114.
561	Sester, U., D. Presser, J. Dirks, B.C. Gartner, H. Kohler, and M. Sester. 2008. PD-1 expression
562	and IL-2 loss of cytomegalovirus- specific T cells correlates with viremia and reversible
563	functional anergy. Am J Transplant 8:1486-1497.
564	Sette, A., and S. Crotty. 2020. Pre-existing immunity to SARS-CoV-2: the knowns and
565	unknowns. Nat Rev Immunol 20:457-458.
566	Wherry, E.J., and M. Kurachi. 2015. Molecular and cellular insights into T cell exhaustion. Nat

- 567 Rev Immunol 15:486-499. 568 Wykes, M.N., and S.R. Lewin. 2018. Immune checkpoint blockade in infectious diseases. Nat
- 569 Rev Immunol 18:91-104.
- Zheng, H.Y., M. Zhang, C.X. Yang, N. Zhang, X.C. Wang, X.P. Yang, X.Q. Dong, and Y.T. 570 Zheng. 2020. Elevated exhaustion levels and reduced functional diversity of T cells in 571 peripheral blood may predict severe progression in COVID-19 patients. Cell Mol 572 *Immunol* 17:541-543. 573
- 574

	Healthcare Workers (n=31)			
n	15	7	9	P-value
Self-reported symptoms	No	Yes	Yes	-
Tested for COVID	No	Yes	Yes	-
Positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR	na	No	Yes	-
Positive SARS-CoV-2 N-spe IgG (%) ^a	0%	0%	88.9% (8/9)	-
Presence of SARS nAbs (%) ^b	0%	0%	100%	-
Contact with COVID patients (%)	86.6%	100%	88.9%	ns
Time post PCR test (weeks) ^c	na	7.3 [6.3-8.4]	4.7 [2.6-7.2]	0.09

Table 1: Clinical characteristics of study participants

^a Measured using the Elecsys[®] Roche system

^b Measured using a SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus neutralisation assay

^c Median and Interquartile range (IQR)

Figure 1



Figure 2



Figure 3











Supp Table 1

Markers	Fluorochrome	Clone	Company	Cat. Number	Role	
CD3	BV650	OKT3	BioLegend	317323		
CD4	BV785	OKT4	BioLegend	317428	Lineage	
CD8	BV510	RPA-T8	BioLegend	301048		
CD45RA	Alexa 488	HI100	BioLegend	304114	Memory	
CD27	PE-Cy5	1A4CD27	Beckman	6607107	differentiation	
CD38	APC	HIT2	BD Bioscience	555462		
HLA-DR	BV605	L243	BioLegend	307640		
Ki67	PerCP-Cy5.5	B56	BD Bioscience	561284	Activation	
PD-1	PE	EH12.2H7	BioLegend	329906		
GrB	BV421	GB11	BD Bioscience	563388	Cytotoxic potential	
IFNɣ	BV711	4S.B3	BioLegend	502540		
ΤΝFα	PE-Cy7	MAB11	BioLegend	502930	Functions	
IL-2	PE/Dazzle™ 594	MQ1-17H12	BioLegend	500344		

Supp table 1: Description of the antibody panel used in the study.



Supp Figure 1: Gating strategy used to identify SARS-CoV-2 specific CD4 T cells and defined their phenotypic characteristics. **A-** Cell lineage. **B-** Phenotyping of total CD4 T cell and cytokine production in response to SARS-CoV-2 peptides. **C-** Phenotype of SARS-CoV-2 responding CD4 T cells in one participant with no symptom (left) and one COVID-19 confirmed participant (right). SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cells (expressing any measured cytokine) are depicted in red.



Supp Figure 2: Comparison of magnitude of SARS-CoV-2-specific CD4 T cell response expressing TNFα, IL-2 or IFNy in participants exhibiting a detectable response to SARS-CoV-2 peptide pool. Each dot represent a participant and is color-coded according to clinical characteristics (Blue represents no symptoms, no SARS-CoV-2 PCR performed; Orange: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR negative and Red: self-reported symptoms, SARS-CoV-2 PCR positive). Black bars indicate medians. Statistical comparisons were performed using a nonparametric paired Friedman test.