#### 1 Characterization of antibody response in asymptomatic and symptomatic SARS-CoV-2

#### infection 2

- Marchi S<sup>1#</sup>, Viviani S<sup>#1</sup>, Remarque EJ<sup>2</sup>, Ruello A<sup>3</sup>, Bombardieri E<sup>3</sup>°, Bollati V<sup>4</sup>, Milani GP<sup>4,5</sup>, 3
- Manenti A<sup>6,7</sup>, Lapini G<sup>7</sup>, Rebuffat A<sup>8</sup>, Montomoli E<sup>1,6,7</sup> and Trombetta CM<sup>1\*</sup> 4
- 5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Molecular and Developmental Medicine, University of Siena, Via Aldo Moro, 2, 53100, Siena, Italy.
- <sup>2</sup>Department of Virology, Biomedical Primate Research Centre, Lange Kleiweg, 161, 2288 GJ Rijswijk, The Netherlands. 6
- 7 <sup>3</sup> Medical Analysis Laboratory, Humanitas Gavazzeni, Via Mauro Gavazzeni, 21, 24125, Bergamo, Italy.
- 8 <sup>3°</sup>Scientific Director, Humanitas Gavazzeni, Via Mauro Gavazzeni, 21, 24125, Bergamo, Italy.
- 9 <sup>4</sup> EPIGET Lab, Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, University of Milan, Via San Barnaba, 8, 20122, 10 Milan. Italy.
- 11 <sup>5</sup>Pediatric Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Via della Commedia, 10, 20122, Milan, 12 Italy.
- 13 <sup>6</sup>VisMederi srl, Strada del Petriccio e Belriguardo, 35, 53100, Siena, Italy.
- 14 <sup>7</sup> VisMederi Research srl, Strada del Petriccio e Belriguardo, 35, 53100, Siena, Italy.
- 15 <sup>8</sup> Presidio Ospedaliero di Campostaggia, Località Campostaggia, 53036, Poggibonsi, Italy.
- 16
- 17 <sup>#</sup>These authors contributed equally to this article.
- \*trombetta@unisi.it 18

#### ABSTRACT 19

- SARS-CoV-2 pandemic is causing high morbidity and mortality burden worldwide with 20
- 21 unprecedented strain on health care systems.
- To elucidate the mechanism of infection, protection, or rapid evolution until fatal outcome of the 22
- 23 disease we performed a study in hospitalized COVID-19 patients to investigate the time course of the
- 24 antibody response in relation to the outcome. In comparison we investigated the time course of the
- antibody response in SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic subjects. 25
- Study results show that patients produce a strong antibody response to SARS-CoV-2 with high 26
- 27 correlation between different viral antigens (spike protein and nucleoprotein) and among antibody
- classes (IgA, IgG, and IgM and neutralizing antibodies). The peak is reached by 3 weeks from hospital 28
- admission followed by a sharp decrease. No difference was observed in any parameter of the antibody 29
- classes, including neutralizing antibodies, between subjects who recovered or with fatal outcome. 30
- Only few asymptomatic subjects developed antibodies at detectable levels. 31

#### 32 **KEYWORDS**

SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, COVID-19 patients, SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic subjects, antibody 33 NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice. 34 response.

### 35 INTRODUCTION

On March 11, 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) Director General declared a pandemic 36 situation due to a novel coronavirus causing a Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) rapidly 37 spreading worldwide [1]. The novel coronavirus (CoV) SARS-CoV-2 has been firstly identified in 38 Wuhan, the capital city of Hubei Province, China, at the end of 2019 when a cluster of atypical 39 40 pneumonia was identified [1, 2]. In January 2020, SARS-CoV-2 was isolated and sequenced as a CoV genetically related to the highly pathogenic CoV (SARS-CoV-1) responsible for the 2003 SARS 41 outbreak. CoV s are known to cause disease in humans. There are four CoVs responsible for the 42 43 common cold and another one highly pathogenic known as Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS)-CoV [2-6]. SARS-CoV-1 caused a global pandemic with approximately 10% case fatality 44 rate (CFR) [7]. However, SARS-CoV-1 has stopped circulating in humans since 2004. MERS-CoV 45 was first reported from Saudi Arabia in 2012 and has continued to infect humans in 27 countries with 46 limited human-to-human transmission, and a CFR of approximately 34.4%, according to the most 47 48 recent WHO report [7]. As SARS-CoV-1 and MERS-CoV, the SARS-CoV-2 virus is an enveloped, single-stranded, and positive-sense RNA virus belonging to the Betacoronavirus Genus, 49 50 *Coronaviridae* family. The genome of SARS-CoV-2, as the other emerging pathogenic human CoVs, 51 encodes four major structural proteins: spike (S), envelope (E), membrane (M), nucleocapsid (N); approximately 16 nonstructural proteins (nsp1-16), and five to eight accessory proteins. Among 52 them, the S protein plays an essential role in viral attachment, fusion, entry, and transmission. The S 53 54 protein is the common target antigen for neutralizing antibodies and vaccine development [8-11]. SARS-CoV-2 predominant transmission way was identified early to be a human-to-human mode 55 occurring through respiratory droplets, however, close contact with infected surfaces or objects may 56 also be an occasional way of transmission. The virus is excreted and detectable in saliva and stool [5, 57 9, 12]. SARS-CoV-2 disease, or COVID-19, ranges from a mild upper/lower respiratory tract 58 59 infection that resolves in a few days without sequelae to more serious disease with fever, cough, shortness of breath, myalgias, fatigue, confusion, headache, sore throat, acute respiratory distress 60 syndrome, leading to respiratory or multiorgan failure [5, 9, 12]. The fatality rate is high in people 61

62 with underlying comorbidities, particularly in the elderly, such as diabetes, hypertension, chronic respiratory disease or cardiovascular disease [9, 12]. After almost one year after the first cases were 63 reported in Wuhan, as of 13 December 2020, there have been over 70 million cases and over 1.5 64 million deaths reported to WHO of confirmed COVID-19 [13] with Europe being one of the most 65 affected areas, second only to the Americas. COVID-19 pandemic is causing high morbidity and 66 mortality burden worldwide, an unprecedented strain on health care systems, with social and 67 economic disruption as the only effective prevention is social distancing leading entire countries in 68 quarantine for weeks or months with dramatic impact on day-to-day human, social and economic life 69 70 [14].

Italy has been one of the earliest and most affected countries by COVID-19. Although the first SARS-71 CoV-2 case identified in Codogno at the end of February 2020 is considered the Italian index case, 72 some evidence has later arisen that the virus had circulated in Italy and Europe since autumn 2019 73 [15-18]. Italy suffered the first wave from February until June 2020 when the whole country was 74 75 under strict lockdown. During this period the most affected areas were located in Northern and to a less extent in Central Italy, while the Southern part of the country was relatively unaffected [19, 20]. 76 77 During the summer period until the end of September 2020 COVID-19 remained endemic, with a 78 second epidemic wave starting in October 2020 that led to a second national lockdown in November 2020. As of the 13<sup>th</sup> of December 2020, more than 1.8 million confirmed cases and more than 64.000 79 deaths due to SARS-CoV-2 were reported to ISS (Istituto Superiore di Sanità), Rome [21]. The mean 80 81 age of fatalities in COVID-19 infected people was 80 years, 42,4% were women and more than 90% had one or more co-morbidity as ischemic heart disease, diabetes, active cancer, atrial fibrillation, 82 dementia, and a history of stroke [19]. 83

The emerging and rapid diffusion of COVID-19 has risen the calls for more targeted research in the field [22] helping to elucidate the mechanism of infection, protection, or rapid evolution until fatal outcome of the disease. We present here a study performed in hospitalized infected COVID-19 patients to investigate the time course of the antibody response in relation to the outcome, and as

### It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International licensi

explorative comparison, we also investigated the time course of the antibody response in SARS-CoV-

89 2 asymptomatic subjects.

## 90 MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 91 Study population

92 This was a retrospective study on COVID-19 patients and SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic subjects
93 during the first epidemic wave occurred in Italy between March and May 2020.

A total of 42 COVID-19 patients, hospitalized at Humanitas Gavazzeni (Bergamo, Italy), were 94 retrospectively selected for this study, of whom 35 (22 males and 13 females) recovered and 7 (3 95 96 males and 4 females) had a fatal outcome. All subjects were admitted to hospital with a diagnosis of interstitial pneumonia confirmed by chest radiograph or a CAT (computerized axial tomography) and 97 had rhino-pharyngeal swab positive to SARS-CoV-2 (Real-Time PCR Thermo Fisher Scientific). Six 98 patients required care in the intensive care unit (ICU), the others were hospitalized in the general 99 medicine unit. Out of 7 deceased patients, 3 were hospitalized in ICU and 4 in the general medicine 100 101 unit.

Serum samples were collected at different time points from March to April 2020 for diagnostic/therapeutic purposes. We selected patients who had available at least 5 blood samples during the period of hospital admission (baseline, day 2, day 6, day 12-14, day 18-20, day 27-30).Demographic and clinical variables reported in this study were those collected at hospital admission.For the purpose of this study patients were categorized according to the outcome: recovered or deceased.

During the first phase of the COVID-19 epidemic, little was known about this novel CoV and there was no standard therapy, so the management changed over the time. The Italian Society of Infectious and Tropical Diseases recommended as therapy hydroxychloroquine, antiviral agents, steroids, low molecular weight heparin and oxygen support in different combinations according to the clinician's evaluation. The antibiotic therapy was adopted only in case of suspected or confirmed bacterial superinfection.

114 Serum samples from 25 asymptomatic subjects who presented a positive nasal swab for SARS-CoV-

115 2 were collected as part of the UNICORN project and were analysed in the present study [23].

This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Siena (approval number 177 17373, approval date June 1, 2020), by the Ethics Committee of Humanitas Gavazzeni (approval 118 number 236, approval date September 22, 2020 Protocol 670/20). The UNICORN study was 119 approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Milan (approval number 17/20, approval date 120 March 6, 2020).

- 121 Serological assay
- 122 ELISA

All serum samples were tested by commercial ELISA for the detection of IgA, IgG, and IgM against
 the S1 of SARS-CoV-2 (Aeskulisa<sup>®</sup> SARS-CoV-2 S1 IgA, IgM, IgG, Aesku.Diagnostics,
 Wendelsheim, Germany) and for the detection of IgG against the nucleoprotein (NP) of SARS-CoV-

126 2 (Aeskulisa<sup>®</sup> SARS-CoV-2 NP IgG, Aesku.Diagnostics, Wendelsheim, Germany).

According to the manufacturer's instructions, quantitative analysis was performed by use of a 4parameter logistic standard curve obtained by plotting the optical density (OD) values measured for 4 calibrators against their antibody activity (U/ml) using logarithmic/linear coordinates. Antibody activities of the samples were evaluated from OD values using the generated curve and considered positive if >12 U/ml.

### 132 Virus Neutralization assay

The virus neutralization (VN) assay has been performed as previously reported [24]. Briefly, serum samples were heat-inactivated for 30 minutes at 56°C and, starting from 1:10 dilution, were mixed with an equal volume of SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCov/Italy-INMI1 strain) viral solution containing 100 Tissue Culture Infective Dose 50% (TCID50). After 1 hour of incubation at room temperature, 100µl of virus-serum mixture were added to a 96-well plate containing an 80% confluent Vero E6 cell monolayer. Plates were incubated for 3 days at 37°C, 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in humidified atmosphere, then inspected for presence/absence of cytopathic effect (CPE) by means of an inverted optical

microscope. A CPE higher than 50% indicated infection. The VN titer was expressed as the reciprocalof the highest serum dilution showing protection from viral infection and CPE.

## 142 Statistical analysis

143 All statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft R-Open version 3.5.0 (R Core Team (2018).

144 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,

145 Vienna, Austria. URL <u>https://www.R-project.org/</u>). For patient baseline characteristics continuous

146 variables were evaluated using Mann-Whitney tests and for categorical variables Chi-square tests

147 were used. Seroconversion rates were compared using Fisher's exact test. Antibody levels were

statistically evaluated using t-tests. Statistical significance was set at p<0.05, two tailed.

### 149 **RESULTS**

### 150 COVID-19 patients

Between March and April 2020, a total of 42 subjects were retrospectively selected for this study, of 151 whom 35 recovered and 7 had a fatal outcome. The median age at admission was 64.0 years 152 153 (interquartile range (IQR) 56.0-71.5) for those who recovered and 69.0 years (IQR 64.5-72.0) for deceased patients. The median length of stay in the hospital was similar in both groups with 11.0 days 154 155 (IQR 9.0-24.5) and 10.0 (IQR 6.0-15.59) for recovered and deceased patients, respectively. The mean 156 number of pre-existing conditions in recovered and deceased was 1.53 (standard deviation (SD) 1.25) and 2.0 (SD 1.41), respectively, and comorbidities were indicated in 1.88 (SD 1.36) and 3.5 (SD 3.54) 157 of recovered and deceased patients, respectively. No differences were found between recovered and 158 159 deceased patients when compared for symptoms at admission (fever, cough, diarrhea, dyspnea) or presence/absence of comorbidities and/or preexisting conditions. The other demographic, clinical, 160 and blood chemistry variables collected at baseline were similar between the two groups, with 161 exception of ALT that showed to be statistically significantly higher (p-value 0.021) in subjects who 162 recovered (Table 1a). 163

At hospital admission, 15 subjects (35.7%) were negative for S1 IgM, 11 (26.2%) for S1 IgA, 13 (30.9%) for S1 IgG, 15 (35.7%) for NP IgG, and 10 (23.8%) for neutralizing antibodies. Five subjects (11.9%) were negative to any antibody assay at the time of admission; of these, 2 died and 3

167 recovered. Two days after admission, 6 subjects (14.3%) were still negative for S1 IgM, 7 (16.7%) for S1 IgA, 4 (9.5%) for S1 IgG, 3 (7.1%) for NP IgG, and 5 (11.9%) for neutralizing antibodies. 168 Two subjects (4.8%) were still negative to any antibody assay: of these, 1 died and 1 recovered. At 6 169 days of sample collection, all subjects except one (97.6%) were positive to all assays (Figures 1-5). 170 The exception was represented by a 40-year-old male subject, showing neither S1 IgM nor S1 IgA 171 positivity in any sample, NP IgG with a borderline result at admission and at day 2, and negative at 172 day 6, and neutralizing antibody titers less or equal than 40. This subject presented fever and dyspnea 173 at admission with no comorbidities or preexisting conditions and recovered in 12 days. 174

175 Two subjects, one recovered and one deceased both within 6 days after admission, were both negative

to NP IgG at admission and at day 2. Two subjects, both recovered, were positive only for neutralizing

antibodies at admission, with titers less or equal to 40. Both showed positivity to all antibodies tested

at day 2 and later (Figures 1-5).

179 Neutralizing antibodies were found in all patients, with a range from 10 to 5120.

180 Antibody titers for patients are presented in table 2. S1 and NP antibodies started increasing at day 2 and again at day 6. A decrease for all antibodies was observed in recovered patients at day 27-30. S1 181 182 antibody increase was similar in both recovered and deceased patients, while NP IgG titers were 183 significantly higher in deceased patients at day 6 (p-value 0.044). At baseline neutralizing antibody titers in recovered patients were 40.8 (95%CI 1.3 -1296.4) and 24.4 (95%CI 0.2- 3093.8) in those 184 deceased. Already at day 6, neutralizing antibody titers had increased steadily with 427.9 (95% CI 185 186 29.0 - 6321.5) in recovered patients and 226.3 (95% CI 12.1 -4228.2) in those deceased and showed a plateau in recovered patients until day 18-20. At day 27-30, neutralizing antibody titers had declined 187 in recovered. No significant difference between the two groups, however comparison for the last days 188 collection was not possible for few subjects in the deceased group. 189

Considering seroconversion rates in comparison to baseline (Table 3), IgM seroconversion rateappeared higher in the deceased (p-value 0.043).

No statistically significant difference in antibody titers at baseline and by peak antibody level (all 5
assays combined) was found between those survivors and deceased by using the Cox proportional

194	hazard model. A good correlation was found among all assays (Figure 6). Overall, the level of S1
195	specific response was well correlated among antibody types (r=0.781 and r=0.794, S1 IgG correlating
196	with S1 IgA and S1 IgM, respectively; r=0.760 S1 IgA correlating with S1 IgM). S1 IgG response
197	was highly correlated with NP IgG (r=0.834). Neutralizing antibodies well correlated with all ELISA
198	antibodies tested (r=0.722 with S1 IgA, r=0.798 with S1 IgM, r=0.739 with S1 IgG, and r=0.730 with

NP IgG). 199

#### 200 Table 1a. Baseline characteristics of COVID-19 patients according to outcome. Median (IOR)

Parameter	Recovered	Deceased	P-value
Sex	22 M / 13 F	3 M / 4 F	0.574
Age	64.0 (56.0 to 71.5)	69.0 (64.5 to 72.0)	0.279
Length of stay	11.0 (9.0 to 24.5)	10.0 (6.0 to 15.5)	0.498
ICU	3 yes / 32 no	3 yes / 4 no	0.076
WBC	7.1 (5.8 to 9.7)	8.8 (5.5 to 11.6)	0.800
RBC	4.2 (3.9 to 4.6)	4.6 (4.1 to 4.9)	0.273
Hb	13.2 (12.2 to 14.3)	13.9 (13.2 to 14.0)	0.649
PLT	202.0 (152.5 to 298.0)	165.0 (134.0 to 283.0)	0.673
Neutrophils	6.2 (4.2 to 8.1)	6.9 (4.5 to 10.2)	0.673
Lymphocytes	0.9 (0.7 to 1.3)	0.4 (0.4 to 0.7)	0.075
AST	52.0 (31.5 to 80.0)	46.0 (35.0 to 52.0)	0.418
ALT	40.0 (25.5 to 64.5)	23.0 (22.5 to 29.0)	0.021
LDH	382.0 (279.0 to 527.5)	602.0 (400.5 to 680.5)	0.147
GGT	46.0 (34.0 to 96.5)	60.0 (23.0 to 73.0)	0.566
Creatinine	0.9 (0.8 to 1.0)	1.0 (0.9 to 1.1)	0.380
CRP	12.6 (7.9 to 16.1)	10.6 (7.9 to 13.5)	0.716
Ferritin	544.0 (315.5 to 1310.0)	1079.0 (967.5 to 1301.0)	0.224
Fibrinogen	591.0 (446.0 to 650.5)	577.0 (447.0 to 602.0)	0.500
D-Dimer	1383.0 (669.0 to 2261.5)	1137.0 (962.5 to 1733.5)	1.000
Fever*	33 yes / 2 no	7 yes / 0 no	1.000
Cough*	7 yes / 28 no	3 yes / 4 no	0.418
Diarrhea*	5 yes / 30 no	1 yes / 6 no	1.000
Dyspnea*	26 yes / 9 no	6 yes / 1 no	0.871
Comorbidities	17 yes / 18 no	2 yes / 5 no	0.579
Preexisting conditions	15 yes / 20 no	2 yes / 5 no	0.779

<sup>201</sup> 

202 ICU, Intensive care unit; WBC, white blood cells (103/mmc); RBC, red blood cells (106/mmc); Hb, haemoglobin (gr/dl); 203 PLT, platelets (103/mmc); AST, Aspartate aminotransferase (UI/l); ALT, Alanine aminotransferase (UI/l); LDH, lactate 204 dehydrogenase (U/l); GGT, Gamma Glutamyl Transferase (UI/l); CRP, C reactive protein (mg/l).

205

206 Neutrophilis (103/mmc); Lymphocytes (103/mmc); Creatinine (mg/dl); Ferritin (ug/l); Fibrinogen (g/l); D-Dimer 207 (mcg/ml).

208 \*Fever: a measured temperature of 100.4° F (38° C) or greater, or with a history of feeling feverish.; Cough: continuous 209 cough for more than an hour, or 3 or more coughing episodes in 24 hours; Diarrhea: loose, watery stools that occur more 210 frequently than usual (at least 3 episodes within a 24-hour period); Dyspnea: difficult or labored breathing; shortness of

211 breath.

212

# 213 Asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infected subjects

Asymptomatic infected subjects serum was made available as part of the UNICORN project [23]. The median age of asymptomatic subjects was 45.0 years (IQR 36.0-60.0), 8 were males and 17 females (Table 1b). Twenty-one subjects had the swab positive to SARS-CoV-2 in March 2020 and a blood draw, of whom 19 subjects had a blood draw in May and 14 another blood draw in September. Four subjects had the swab positive to SARS-CoV-2 in May and a blood draw, of whom 1 had a second blood draw in September.

Out of 25 asymptomatic subjects, 16 (64.0%) were negative to any antibody at any time point. Nine 220 221 subjects (36.0%) had at least one detectable antibody type at least at one of the time points. At the 222 first time point 6 subjects (24.0%) had positive S1 IgG, of whom 2 also had S1 IgA and NP IgG, 1 also S1 IgM, S1 IgA and NP IgG and 1 had S1 IgA, NP IgG and positive neutralizing antibodies. 223 Three subjects negative at any antibody at the first time points had antibodies at one of the subsequent 224 time points. One of these subjects was positive at any antibody assay at the second time point 225 226 including neutralizing antibodies. The other 2 subjects had S1 IgA, S1 IgG and NP IgG at the third time point. One subject was positive to all ELISA antibodies (S1 IgM, S1 IgA, S1 IgG, and NP IgG) 227 at the first time point, negative at the second time point, and positive again only to S1 IgG at the third 228 229 time point. Detectable neutralizing antibodies were found only in 2 subjects (8.0%), one at the first 230 and only time point available and in the other one at the second time point, the third time point wasn't available. Both subjects were also positive to S1 IgA, S1 IgG, and NP IgG; only the first one was also 231 232 positive to S1 IgM.

Asymptomatic subjects with positive antibody levels in any of the assays had titers well below the level found in symptomatic subjects as shown in figures 1-5 (table 4).

- 235
- 236
- 237
- 238
- 239

#### Table 2. Comparison of immune responses in recovered versus deceased COVID-19 patients. ELISA titres are expressed as **Ú**/ml

			Recovered		Deceased		
Antibody	Day	N	GMT (95% CI)	N	GMT (95% CI)	Ratio D/R	P-value
	Baseline	35	19.6 (0.5 to 718.5)	7	5.0 (0.0 to 12159.3)	0.25 (0.01 to 4.89)	0.308
	Day 2	35	46.9 (3.0 to 732.2)	7	17.4 (0.0 to 9381.0)	0.37 (0.03 to 4.03)	0.356
S1 IgM	Day 6	31	126.7 (16.9 to 951.6)	6	146.4 (34.5 to 621.4)	1.16 (0.61 to 2.17)	0.627
	Day 12-14	18	111.5 (9.7 to 1284.4)	3	177.7 (29.9 to 1057.1)	1.59 (0.70 to 3.63)	0.232
	Day 18-20	12	107.3 (15.6 to 737.9)	2	119.4 (1.7 to 8251.2)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
_	Day 27-30	8	64.4 (5.3 to 788.3)	1	79.2 (0.0 to 0.0)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Baseline	35	17.8 (0.6 to 497.5)	7	6.8 (0.0 to 21390.7)	0.38 (0.02 to 8.03)	0.473
	Day 2	35	42.9 (3.2 to 571.6)	7	34.6 (0.5 to 2510.1)	0.81 (0.16 to 4.13)	0.768
S1 IgA	Day 6	31	96.4 (14.1 to 659.6)	6	118.3 (16.4 to 854.9)	1.23 (0.54 to 2.78)	0.581
-	Day 12-14	18	100.2 (15.5 to 646.2)	3	187.0 (10.0 to 3493.1)	1.87 (0.48 to 7.23)	0.249
	Day 18-20	12	108.0 (38.2 to 305.2)	2	95.8 (0.0 to 10573636.2)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Day 27-30	8	79.7 (13.6 to 465.8)	1	206.7 (0.0 to 0.0)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Baseline	35	16.8 (0.1 to 1966.3)	7	6.2 (0.0 to 21044.6)	0.37 (0.02 to 8.18)	0.476
	Day 2	35	66.3 (2.2 to 1956.6)	7	33.5 (0.0 to 147927.2)	0.50 (0.02 to 12.13)	0.623
S1 IgG	Day 6	31	355.8 (90.2 to 1403.1)	6	403.3 (212.0 to 767.1)	1.13 (0.82 to 1.57)	0.436
-	Day 12-14	18	397.6 (115.7 to 1366.9)	3	392.4 (65.8 to 2339.2)	0.99 (0.44 to 2.22)	0.964
	Day 18-20	12	408.9 (160.9 to 1038.9)	2	344.5 (0.4 to 335188.3)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Day 27-30	8	202.7 (151.6 to 271.0)	1	220.8 (0.0 to 0.0)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Baseline	35	18.1 (0.5 to 647.9)	7	10.8 (0.0 to 2898.3)	0.60 (0.07 to 5.03)	0.588
	Day 2	35	70.3 (2.0 to 2416.5)	7	71.7 (0.1 to 68291.3)	1.02 (0.08 to 13.77)	0.987
NP IgG	Day 6	31	411.9 (32.3 to 5248.2)	6	756.0 (246.1 to 2323.1)	1.84 (1.02 to 3.32)	0.044
C	Day 12-14	18	466.7 (30.1 to 7248.5)	3	725.4 (24.0 to 21884.1)	1.55 (0.34 to 7.06)	0.467
	Day 18-20	12	371.8 (59.2 to 2333.6)	2	550.5 (0.0 to 6914416.1)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Day 27-30	8	171.3 (43.6 to 672.3)	1	262.0 (0.0 to 0.0)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Baseline	35	40.8 (1.3 to 1296.4)	7	24.4 (0.2 to 3093.8)	0.60 (0.09 to 3.81)	0.539
	Day 2	35	75.4 (3.2 to 1754.7)	7	32.8 (0.6 to 1907.7)	0.44 (0.09 to 2.07)	0.255
NAb	Day 6	31	427.9 (29.0 to 6321.5)	6	226.3 (12.1 to 4228.2)	0.53 (0.16 to 1.77)	0.257
	Day 12-14	18	373.3 (27.5 to 5071.8)	3	285.1 (6.7 to 12155.4)	0.76 (0.14 to 4.21)	0.670
	Day 18-20	12	508.0 (79.9 to 3229.0)	2	113.1 (0.0 to 14707762061.6)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
	Day 27-30	8	190.3 (16.0 to 2267.5)	1	160.0 (0.0 to 0.0)	1.00 (1.00 to 1.00)	
NAb, neutralizing antibody.							

#### Table 3. Seroconversion in COVID-19 patients according to outcome. Seroconversion (SC) was calculated as 4-250 251 fold increase in titre compared to baseline

		Recovered		Dece		
Antibody	Day	SC Yes	SC No	SC Yes	SC No	P-value
		~	20		2	0.042
	Day 2	6	29	4	3	0.043
	Day 6	19	12	4	2	1.000
S1 IgM	Day 12-14	11	7	2	1	1.000
	Day 18-20	7	5	1	1	1.000
	Day 27-30	4	4	1	0	1.000
	Day 2	8	27	3	4	0.353
	Day 6	20	11	4	2	1.000
S1 IgA	Day 12-14	12	6	2	1	1.000
	Day 18-20	8	4	1	1	1.000
	Day 27-30	5	3	1	0	1.000
	Day 2	11	24	5	2	0.085
	Day 6	23	8	4	2	0.653
S1 IgG	Day 12-14	13	5	2	1	1.000
	Day 18-20	9	3	1	1	0.505
	Day 27-30	4	4	1	0	1.000
	Day 2	16	19	6	1	0.096
	Day 6	24	7	5	1	1.000
NP IgG	Day 12-14	14	4	2	1	1.000
	Day 18-20	9	3	1	1	0.505
	Day 27-30	7	1	1	0	1.000
	Day 2	5	30	1	6	1.000
	Day 6	22	9	4	2	1.000
NAb	Day 12-14	13	5	2	1	1.000
	Day 18-20	9	3	1	1	0.505
	Day 27-30	6	2	1	0	1.000

<sup>252</sup> NAb, neutralizing antibody.

#### 254 Table 1b. Baseline characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic subjects. Median (IQR)

Parameter	Statistics
Sex	8 M / 17 F
Smoke	14 never, 5 stopped, 5 active
Age	45.0 (36.0 to 60.0)
BMI	22.8 (21.5 to 24.6)

255 BMI, Body Mass Index.

#### 256 Table 4. Comparison of baseline immune responses for Recovered or Deceased versus asymptomatic controls

Antibody	Recovered/ Asymptomatic	P value	Deceased / Asymptomatic	P value
S1 IgM	286 (111 to 734)	1.42E-15	73 (4 to 1448)	0.0111
S1 IgA	172 (71 to 422)	6.05E-15	65 (3 to 1351)	0.0145
S1 IgG	96 (27 to 338)	4.86e- 9	36 (2 to 798)	0.0295
NP IgG	7.3 (3.7 to 14.3)	3.22e- 7	4.3 (0.5 to 36.3)	0.142
NAb	8.2 (4.6 to 14.6)	1.88e- 8	4.9 (0.8 to 30.5)	0.0785

<sup>253</sup> 

### 258 **DISCUSSION**

In this study we primarily evaluated the time course of the antibody response to different antigens of 259 SARS-CoV-2 (IgG, IgM, and IgA against S1, IgG against NP, and neutralizing antibodies) in 260 COVID-19 patients admitted to hospital for pneumonia during the first epidemic wave in March and 261 April 2020 in Italy. No significant difference in titers was observed in any of the S1 antibody class at 262 263 any time point between patients who survived and who did not survive. However, in deceased patients, a sharper increase of S1 antibodies has been observed suggesting a potential risk factor. 264 Notably, IgM seroconversion rate appeared somewhat higher in the deceased, which might indicate 265 266 that the deceased were admitted early after infection. In other similar studies early antibody response to S1 IgA or IgM or difference in the magnitude of the immune response to SARS-CoV-2 infection 267 was a predictor of disease severity or progression or outcome [25-28]. IgG antibody titers against NP 268 were significantly higher in the deceased at day 6 according to other studies in which an early 269 response to NP in the first 15 days post-disease onset was indicative of fatal outcomes [25, 27]. Our 270 271 results did not highlight any difference for neutralizing antibodies in contrast with other studies in which these antibodies were significantly higher in patients who required ICU or died [27]. One 272 273 explanation for the similar immune response between the two study groups can be that in our study 274 COVID-19 patients had, at admission, similar clinical and demographic characteristics. However, 275 other factors could be implicated in the specific immune response against SARS-CoV-2 that need to be further investigated, as other elements of cellular-mediated immunity may play a role in protection. 276 277 The kinetics of the antibody response showed an increase starting from day 2 and reaching the peak between days 6 and 18-20. At 27-30 day, a decline in titers was observed for any of the antibody 278 classes. In other studies, the antibody kinetic in COVID-19 patients showed the antibody peak 279 reaching up to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> week from disease onset followed by antibody decay starting at the 6<sup>th</sup> 280 week [28, 29]. This observation differs from our findings most likely as our study period of patients 281 started at hospital admission when the severity of the disease was already in an advanced stage. 282 In this study, a high correlation between S1 and NP protein-based ELISAs and the neutralization 283

assay was observed in COVID-19 patients. The reason for that is likely due to the fact that the S1

12

protein represents the immunodominant antigen of SARS-CoV-2 virus and functional neutralizing
antibodies are mainly targeting the Receptor-Binding Domain, a subunit of that protein [30].

In this study, only few asymptomatic subjects had detectable titers with almost two-thirds negative at 287 any time point. These findings support the observation that the use of serology testing for population 288 surveys might account of false negative results as asymptomatic or paucisymptomatic subjects might 289 290 have antibody concentration below the level of detection [31]. Only few asymptomatic subjects had 291 detectable titers to S1 IgG or more antibodies but with a low level of titers as compared to COVID-19 patients included in this study in accordance with another study [32]. Notably, in contrast to 292 293 COVID-19 patients, the majority of asymptomatic subjects do not have circulating neutralizing antibodies that are considered a surrogate of protection against COVID-19, thus vaccination is highly 294 recommended. Although further evidence should be provided to establish a correlate of protection, 295 based on these data it can be speculate that evidence of neutralizing antibodies might be used as 296 markers of protective immunity. 297

Asymptomatic subjects have a low viral load in the nasopharynges as assessed by RT-PCR and most likely a lack or a defective viral replication and/or mucosal invasion that induces a weak or any antibody response [33]. Although memory B and T cells may have been primed in SARS-CoV-2 swab positive subjects with undetectable antibodies in serum, with the ability to induce a rapid immune response to re-exposure, the question of whether these subjects should be vaccinated is critical now that effective vaccines are available against COVID-19.

One limitation of this study is its retrospective nature and the collection of COVID-19 samples was carried out only in a single center. Besides this, we limited the collection to those patients for whom it was possible to construct an antibody response curve over a period of at least one month. This, of course, represents a bias, however, the ratio between deceased and recovered patients (7 out of 42), 16.6% falls in the range from 5.7% to 30.4% as described in the literature [34, 35]. This value shows high variability because it can be influenced both by the characteristics of the series studied and the different treatments. The findings from this study do not allow us to predict the kinetics of the

antibody decay over time in patients who recovered from COVID-19, in particular, who will besusceptible to reinfection over time, since no follow-up samples after discharge were available.

313 Overall, our data highlight that COVID-19 patients produce a simultaneous antibody response to

SARS-CoV-2 with high correlation between different viral antigens (S1 and NP) and among antibody

classes (IgA, IgG, and IgM and neutralizing antibodies). The peak is reached by 3 weeks from hospital

admission followed by a sharp decrease. On the contrary, only few asymptomatic subjects developed

antibodies at detectable levels, though significantly lower compared to COVID-19 patients. Since

neutralizing antibodies were rarely produced, this finding raises the question about the protection of

319 these subjects against reinfection.

320

### 321 Author's contributions

S.M.: investigation, data curation, writing – review and editing; S.V.: conceptualization, funding acquisition,
writing – original draft preparation; E.J.R.: formal analysis, writing – review & editing; A.R.: resources, data
curation, writing – review & editing; E.B.: resources, data curation, writing – review & editing; V.B.:
resources, data curation, writing – review & editing; G.P.M: resources, data curation, writing – review &
editing; A.M.: methodology, writing – review and editing; G.L.: methodology, writing – review and editing;
A.R.; methodology, writing – review and editing; E.M.: methodology, writing – review and editing; C.M.T.:
conceptualization, funding acquisition, investigation, project administration, writing – review and editing.

### 329 Conflicts of interest statements

330 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### 331 Acknowledgements

332 This study was funded by a research grant (Pfizer Tracking Number 60353289).

This funding source did not have any role in the design of this study and during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

335 This study was supported by the European Virus Archive goes Global (EVAg) project, which has received

funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreementNo 653316.

337 No 653316.
338 The UNICORN population was recruited thanks to the Funding Action "Ricerche Emergenza coronavirus",

- University of Milan, 2020.
- 340 The authors thank Linda Benincasa for technical support.
- 341 342

### 343 **References**

- World Health Organization. WHO Director-General's opening remarks at the media briefing on COVID-19 - 11 March 2020. 2020; Available from: <u>https://www.who.int/dg/speeches/detail/who-</u> director-general-s-opening-remarks-at-the-media-briefing-on-covid-19---11-march-2020.
- Lu, R., X. Zhao, J. Li, P. Niu, B. Yang, H. Wu, W. Wang, H. Song, B. Huang, N. Zhu, Y. Bi, X. Ma,
   F. Zhan, L. Wang, T. Hu, H. Zhou, Z. Hu, W. Zhou, L. Zhao, J. Chen, Y. Meng, J. Wang, Y. Lin, J.
- 349 Yuan, Z. Xie, J. Ma, W.J. Liu, D. Wang, W. Xu, E.C. Holmes, G.F. Gao, G. Wu, W. Chen, W. Shi,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.03.29.21254534; this version posted March 31, 2021. 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 percetuity.

perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

- and W. Tan, *Genomic characterisation and epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor binding.* Lancet, 2020. **395**(10224): p. 565-574.
- Tay, M.Z., C.M. Poh, L. Renia, P.A. MacAry, and L.F.P. Ng, *The trinity of COVID-19: immunity, inflammation and intervention.* Nat Rev Immunol, 2020. 20(6): p. 363-374.
- Amanat, F. and F. Krammer, *SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines: Status Report.* Immunity, 2020. 52(4): p. 583-589.
- 5. Chan, J.F., S. Yuan, K.H. Kok, K.K. To, H. Chu, J. Yang, F. Xing, J. Liu, C.C. Yip, R.W. Poon, H.W.
  Tsoi, S.K. Lo, K.H. Chan, V.K. Poon, W.M. Chan, J.D. Ip, J.P. Cai, V.C. Cheng, H. Chen, C.K. Hui,
  and K.Y. Yuen, *A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster*. Lancet, 2020. **395**(10223): p. 514-523.
- Shu, N., D. Zhang, W. Wang, X. Li, B. Yang, J. Song, X. Zhao, B. Huang, W. Shi, R. Lu, P. Niu, F. Zhan, X. Ma, D. Wang, W. Xu, G. Wu, G.F. Gao, W. Tan, I. China Novel Coronavirus, and T. Research, *A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China*, 2019. N Engl J Med, 2020.
   **382**(8): p. 727-733.
- 364 7. World Health Organization. *MERS SITUATION UPDATE*. 2019 02/16/2021]; Available from: 365 <u>https://applications.emro.who.int/docs/EMRPUB-CSR-241-2019-EN.pdf?ua=1&ua=1&ua=1</u>.
- Bu, L.Y., Y.X. He, Y.S. Zhou, S.W. Liu, B.J. Zheng, and S.B. Jiang, *The spike protein of SARS-CoV a target for vaccine and therapeutic development*. Nature Reviews Microbiology, 2009. 7(3): p. 226 236.
- Huang, C., Y. Wang, X. Li, L. Ren, J. Zhao, Y. Hu, L. Zhang, G. Fan, J. Xu, X. Gu, Z. Cheng, T. Yu,
  J. Xia, Y. Wei, W. Wu, X. Xie, W. Yin, H. Li, M. Liu, Y. Xiao, H. Gao, L. Guo, J. Xie, G. Wang, R.
  Jiang, Z. Gao, Q. Jin, J. Wang, and B. Cao, *Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan, China.* Lancet, 2020. **395**(10223): p. 497-506.
- Jiang, S., C. Hillyer, and L. Du, *Neutralizing Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and Other Human Coronaviruses: (Trends in Immunology 41, 355-359; 2020).* Trends Immunol, 2020. 41(6): p. 545.
- 375 11. Du, L., Y. Yang, Y. Zhou, L. Lu, F. Li, and S. Jiang, *MERS-CoV spike protein: a key target for antivirals*. Expert Opin Ther Targets, 2017. 21(2): p. 131-143.
- Young, B.E., S.W.X. Ong, S. Kalimuddin, J.G. Low, S.Y. Tan, J. Loh, O.T. Ng, K. Marimuthu, L.W.
  Ang, T.M. Mak, S.K. Lau, D.E. Anderson, K.S. Chan, T.Y. Tan, T.Y. Ng, L. Cui, Z. Said, L.
  Kurupatham, M.I. Chen, M. Chan, S. Vasoo, L.F. Wang, B.H. Tan, R.T.P. Lin, V.J.M. Lee, Y.S. Leo,
  D.C. Lye, and T. Singapore Novel Coronavirus Outbreak Research, *Epidemiologic Features and Clinical Course of Patients Infected With SARS-CoV-2 in Singapore*. JAMA, 2020. 323(15): p. 14881494.
- World Health Organization. *WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard*. 2021 12/13/2020];
  Available from: <u>https://covid19.who.int/</u>.
- Nations, F.a.A.O.o.t.U. Impact of COVID-19 on people's livelihoods, their health and our food systems. 2020 02/1672021]; Available from: <u>http://www.fao.org/news/story/en/item/1313598/icode/</u>.
- Apolone, G., E. Montomoli, A. Manenti, M. Boeri, F. Sabia, I. Hyseni, L. Mazzini, D. Martinuzzi, L.
  Cantone, G. Milanese, S. Sestini, P. Suatoni, A. Marchiano, V. Bollati, G. Sozzi, and U. Pastorino, *Unexpected detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies in the prepandemic period in Italy.* Tumori, 2020: p.
  300891620974755.
- Beslandes, A., V. Berti, Y. Tandjaoui-Lambotte, C. Alloui, E. Carbonnelle, J.R. Zahar, S. Brichler, and Y. Cohen, *SARS-CoV-2 was already spreading in France in late December 2019*. Int J Antimicrob Agents, 2020. 55(6): p. 106006.
- Amendola, A., S. Bianchi, M. Gori, D. Colzani, M. Canuti, E. Borghi, M.C. Raviglione, G.V. Zuccotti,
  and E. Tanzi, *Evidence of SARS-CoV-2 RNA in an Oropharyngeal Swab Specimen, Milan, Italy, Early December 2019.* Emerg Infect Dis, 2021. 27(2): p. 648-650.
- 397 18. Gianotti, R., M. Barberis, G. Fellegara, C. Galvan-Casas, and E. Gianotti, *COVID-19-related* 398 *dermatosis in November 2019: could this case be Italy's patient zero?* Br J Dermatol, 2021.
- 19. Istituto Superiore di Sanità, EPIDEMIA COVID-19. Aggiornamento nazionale 2 Aprile 2020. 2020.
- 400 20. Onder, G., G. Rezza, and S. Brusaferro, *Case-Fatality Rate and Characteristics of Patients Dying in Relation to COVID-19 in Italy.* JAMA, 2020. **323**(18): p. 1775-1776.
- 402 21. Istituto Superiore di Sanità, *Caratteristiche dei pazienti deceduti positivi all'infezione da SARS-CoV-*403 2 *in Italia*. 2020.
- Lipsitch, M., D.L. Swerdlow, and L. Finelli, *Defining the Epidemiology of Covid-19 Studies Needed*.
  N Engl J Med, 2020. 382(13): p. 1194-1196.

- 406 23. Milani, G.P., L. Dioni, C. Favero, L. Cantone, C. Macchi, S. Delbue, M. Bonzini, E. Montomoli, V. 407 Bollati, and U. Consortium, Serological follow-up of SARS-CoV-2 asymptomatic subjects. Sci Rep, 408 2020. **10**(1): p. 20048.
- 409 24. Manenti, A., M. Maggetti, E. Casa, D. Martinuzzi, A. Torelli, C.M. Trombetta, S. Marchi, and E. 410 Montomoli, Evaluation of SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibodies using a CPE-based colorimetric live 411 virus micro-neutralization assay in human serum samples. J Med Virol, 2020. 92(10): p. 2096-2104.
- Atyeo, C., S. Fischinger, T. Zohar, M.D. Slein, J. Burke, C. Loos, D.J. McCulloch, K.L. Newman, C. 412 25. 413 Wolf, J.Y. Yu, K. Shuey, J. Feldman, B.M. Hauser, T. Caradonna, A.G. Schmidt, T.J. Suscovich, C. 414 Linde, Y.F. Cai, D. Barouch, E.T. Ryan, R.C. Charles, D. Lauffenburger, H. Chu, and G. Alter, 415 Distinct Early Serological Signatures Track with SARS-CoV-2 Survival. Immunity, 2020. 53(3): p. 524-+. 416
- 417 Wang, Y.Q., L. Zhang, L. Sang, F. Ye, S.C. Ruan, B. Zhong, T. Song, A.N. Alshukairi, R.C. Chen, 26. 418 Z.Y. Zhang, M. Gan, A.R. Zhu, Y.B. Huang, L. Luo, C.K.P. Mok, M.M. Al Gethamy, H.T. Tan, Z.T. 419 Li, X.F. Huang, F. Li, J. Sun, Y.J. Zhang, L.Y. Wen, Y.M. Li, Z. Chen, Z. Zhuang, J.F. Zhuo, C.K. 420 Chen, L.J. Kuang, J.X. Wang, H.B. Lv, Y.L. Jiang, M. Li, Y.M. Lin, Y. Deng, L. Tang, J.L. Liang, 421 J.C. Huang, S. Perlman, N.S. Zhong, J.X. Zhao, J.S.M. Peiris, Y.M. Li, and J.C. Zhao, Kinetics of viral 422 load and antibody response in relation to COVID-19 severity. Journal of Clinical Investigation, 2020. 423 **130**(10): p. 5235-5244.
- 424 27. Hashem, A.M., A. Algaissi, S.A. Almahboub, M.A. Alfaleh, T.S. Abujamel, S.S. Alamri, K.A. 425 Alluhaybi, H.I. Hobani, R.H. AlHarbi, R.M. Alsulaiman, M.Z. ElAssouli, S. Hala, N.K. Alharbi, R.Y. 426 Alhabbab, A.A. AlSaieedi, W.H. Abdulaal, A. Bukhari, A.A. Al-Somali, F.S. Alofi, A.A. Khogeer, 427 A. Pain, A.A. Alkayyal, N.A.M. Almontashiri, B.M. Ahmad, and X. Li, Early Humoral Response Correlates with Disease Severity and Outcomes in COVID-19 Patients. Viruses, 2020. 12(12). 428
- 429 Chen, Y., X. Tong, Y. Li, B. Gu, J. Yan, Y. Liu, H. Shen, R. Huang, and C. Wu, A comprehensive, 28. 430 longitudinal analysis of humoral responses specific to four recombinant antigens of SARS-CoV-2 in 431 severe and non-severe COVID-19 patients. PLoS Pathog, 2020. 16(9): p. e1008796.
- Okba, N.M.A., M.A. Muller, W. Li, C. Wang, C.H. GeurtsvanKessel, V.M. Corman, M.M. Lamers, 432 29. 433 R.S. Sikkema, E. de Bruin, F.D. Chandler, Y. Yazdanpanah, Q. Le Hingrat, D. Descamps, N. Houhou-Fidouh, C. Reusken, B.J. Bosch, C. Drosten, M.P.G. Koopmans, and B.L. Haagmans, Severe Acute 434 435 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease Patients. 436 Emerg Infect Dis, 2020. 26(7): p. 1478-1488.
- Algaissi, A., M.A. Alfaleh, S. Hala, T.S. Abujamel, S.S. Alamri, S.A. Almahboub, K.A. Alluhaybi, 437 30. 438 H.I. Hobani, R.M. Alsulaiman, R.H. AlHarbi, M.A. ElAssouli, R.Y. Alhabbab, A.A. AlSaieedi, W.H. Abdulaal, A.A. Al-Somali, F.S. Alofi, A.A. Khogeer, A.A. Alkayyal, A.B. Mahmoud, N.A.M. 439 440 Almontashiri, A. Pain, and A.M. Hashem, SARS-CoV-2 S1 and N-based serological assays reveal rapid seroconversion and induction of specific antibody response in COVID-19 patients. Sci Rep, 441 442 2020. 10(1): p. 16561.
- 443 31. Peeling, R.W., C.J. Wedderburn, P.J. Garcia, D. Boeras, N. Fongwen, J. Nkengasong, A. Sall, A. 444 Tanuri, and D.L. Heymann, Serology testing in the COVID-19 pandemic response. Lancet Infect Dis, 445 2020. 20(9): p. e245-e249.
- 446 32. Reynolds, C.J., L. Swadling, J.M. Gibbons, C. Pade, M.P. Jensen, M.O. Diniz, N.M. Schmidt, D.K. 447 Butler, O.E. Amin, S.N.L. Bailey, S.M. Murray, F.P. Pieper, S. Taylor, J. Jones, M. Jones, W.J. Lee, 448 J. Rosenheim, A. Chandran, G. Joy, C. Di Genova, N. Temperton, J. Lambourne, T. Cutino-Moguel, 449 M. Andiapen, M. Fontana, A. Smit, A. Semper, B. O'Brien, B. Chain, T. Brooks, C. Manisty, T. 450 Treibel, J.C. Moon, C.O. investigators, M. Noursadeghi, C.O.i.c. network, D.M. Altmann, M.K. 451 Maini, A. McKnight, and R.J. Boyton, Discordant neutralizing antibody and T cell responses in asymptomatic and mild SARS-CoV-2 infection. Sci Immunol, 2020. 5(54). 452
- 453 33. Roltgen, K., A.E. Powell, O.F. Wirz, B.A. Stevens, C.A. Hogan, J. Najeeb, M. Hunter, H. Wang, M.K. Sahoo, C. Huang, F. Yamamoto, M. Manohar, J. Manalac, A.R. Otrelo-Cardoso, T.D. Pham, A. 454 455 Rustagi, A.J. Rogers, N.H. Shah, C.A. Blish, J.R. Cochran, T.S. Jardetzky, J.L. Zehnder, T.T. Wang, 456 B. Narasimhan, S. Gombar, R. Tibshirani, K.C. Nadeau, P.S. Kim, B.A. Pinsky, and S.D. Boyd, 457 Defining the features and duration of antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection associated with disease severity and outcome. Sci Immunol. 2020. 5(54). 458
- 459 34. Yao, T., Y. Gao, Q. Cui, B. Peng, Y. Chen, J. Li, C. Huang, C. He, J. Pu, J. Wei, Y. Zhan, J. Yan, J. 460 Tian, Z. Zhang, and Z. Liu, Clinical characteristics of a group of deaths with COVID-19 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a retrospective case series. BMC Infect Dis, 2020. 20(1): p. 695. 461
- 35. 462 Di Domenico, S.L., D. Coen, M. Bergamaschi, V. Albertini, L. Ghezzi, M.M. Cazzaniga, V. Tombini, 463 R. Colombo, N. Capsoni, T. Coen, K.B. Cazzola, M. Di Fiore, L. Angaroni, and M.A. Strozzi, Clinical

- characteristics and respiratory support of 310 COVID-19 patients, diagnosed at the emergency room: a single-center retrospective study. Internal and Emergency Medicine, 2020.



Figure 1. S1 IgM titres in COVID-19 patients (recovered and deceased) and asymptomatic subjects. Black dashed line indicates positivity threshold at 12 U/ml.

Legends for figures:





Figure 2. S1 IgA titres in COVID-19 patients (recovered and deceased) and asymptomatic subjects. Black dashed line indicates positivity threshold at 12 U/ml.

Legends for figures:





Figure 3. S1 IgG titres in COVID-19 patients (recovered and deceased) and asymptomatic subjects. Black dashed line indicates positivity threshold at 12 U/ml.

Legends for figures:





Figure 4. NP IgG titres in COVID-19 patients (recovered and deceased) and asymptomatic subjects. Black dashed line indicates positivity threshold at 12 U/ml.

Legends for figures:





Figure 5. Neutralizing antibody (NAb) titres in COVID-19 patients (recovered and deceased) and asymptomatic subjects.

Legends for figures:





Figure 6. Correlations between antibody for COVID-19 patients. Titres are shown as log-2 transformed.