

1 **Modelling the association between neutralizing antibody levels and SARS-CoV-2 viral**
2 **dynamics : implications to define correlates of protection against infection**

3 Guillaume Lingas¹, Delphine Planas^{2,3}, H el ene P er e^{4,5}, Darragh Duffy⁶, Isabelle Staropoli⁷,
4 Fran oise Porrot^{2,3}, Florence Guivel-Benhassine^{2,3}, Nicolas Chapuis⁸, Camille Gobeaux⁹,
5 David Veyer^{4,5}, Constance Delaugerre^{10,11}, J er ome Le Goff^{10,12}, Prunelle Getten¹³, J er ome
6 Hadjadj¹⁴, Ad ele Bellino¹⁵, B eatrice Parfait¹⁶, Jean-Marc Treluyer¹⁷, Olivier Schwartz^{2,3},
7 J er emie Guedj^{1,‡}, Solen Kern eis^{1,18,#}, Benjamin Terrier^{19,20,#}

8 ¹ Universit e Paris Cit e, IAME, INSERM, F-75018, Paris ;

9 ²Virus and Immunity Unit, Institut Pasteur, Universit e Paris Cit e, CNRS UMR3569, Paris, France.

10 ³Vaccine Research Institute, Cr eteil, France.

11 ⁴Microbiology Department, Virology Unit, APHP, H opital Europ een Georges-Pompidou, F-75015, Paris, France

12 ⁵Universit e Paris Cit e, INSERM UMRS1138 Functional Genomics of Solid Tumors laboratory, F-75006, Paris, France

13 ⁶Translational Immunology Unit, Institut Pasteur, Universit e Paris Cit e, Paris, France

14 ⁷Virus and Immunity Unit, Institut Pasteur, Universit e Paris Cit e, CNRS UMR3569, Paris, France.

15 ⁸Assistance Publique-H opitaux de Paris. Centre-Universit e Paris Cit e, Service d'h ematologie biologique, H opital Cochin, Paris,
16 France

17 ⁹Department of automated biology, CHU de Cochin, AP-HP, Paris, France

18 ¹⁰Virology Department, AP-HP, H opital Saint-Louis, F-75010 Paris, France

19 ¹¹Universit e Paris Cit e, Inserm U944, Biology of emerging viruses, F-75010, Paris, France

20 ¹²Universit e Paris Cit e, Inserm U976, INSIGHT Team, F-75010, Paris, France

21 ¹³INSERM UMRS 970, Universit e Paris Descartes, Paris, France.

22 ¹⁴Department of Internal Medicine, National Reference Center for Rare Systemic Autoimmune Diseases, AP-HP, APHP.CUP,
23 H opital Cochin, Paris, France.

24 ¹⁵Unit e de Recherche Clinique Cochin-Necker, AP-HP, Paris, France.

25 ¹⁶F ed eration des Centres de Ressources Biologiques - Plateformes de Ressources Biologiques AP-HP.Centre-Universit e Paris
26 Cit e, Centre de Ressources Biologiques Cochin, H opital Cochin, F-75014, Paris, France

27 ¹⁷Unit e de Recherche clinique, H opital Cochin, AP-HP.Centre - Universit e de Paris, Paris, France.

28 ¹⁸Equipe de Pr evention du Risque Infectieux (EPRI), AP-HP, H opital Bichat, F-75018 Paris, France

29 ¹⁹Department of Internal Medicine, National Reference Center for Rare Systemic Autoimmune Diseases, AP-HP, APHP.CUP,
30 H opital Cochin, F-75014, Paris, France

31 ²⁰Universit e Paris Cit e, INSERM U970, Paris Cardiovascular Research Center, F-75015, Paris, France.

32

33 #These authors contributed equally to this work as co-senior authors.

34 ‡ Corresponding author: jeremie.guedj@inserm.fr

35

36 **Abstract**

37 **Background**

38 While anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody kinetics have been well described in large populations of
39 vaccinated individuals, we still poorly understand how they evolve during a natural infection
40 and how this impacts viral clearance.

41 **Methods**

42 For that purpose, we analyzed the kinetics of both viral load and neutralizing antibody levels
43 in a prospective cohort of individuals during acute infection by Alpha variant.

44 **Results**

45 Using a mathematical model, we show that the progressive increase in neutralizing
46 antibodies leads to a shortening of the half-life of both infected cells and infectious viral
47 particles. We estimated that the neutralizing activity reached 90% of its maximal level within
48 8 days after symptoms onset and could reduce the half-life of both infected cells and
49 infectious virus by a 6-fold factor, thus playing a key role to achieve rapid viral clearance.
50 Using this model, we conducted a simulation study to predict in a more general context the
51 protection conferred by the existence of pre-existing neutralization, due to either vaccination
52 or prior infection. We predicted that a neutralizing activity, as measured by $ED_{50} > 10^3$, could
53 reduce by 50% the risk of having viral load detectable by standard PCR assays and by 99%
54 the risk of having viral load above the threshold of cultivable virus.

55 **Conclusions**

56 This threshold value for the neutralizing activity could be used to identify individuals with
57 poor protection against disease acquisition.

58

59 **Introduction**

60 The analysis of viral and immunological kinetics during severe acute respiratory
61 coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infection has provided important insights on some patterns of
62 the virus, both at the individual (within-host) and population (between-host) levels. For
63 instance, we and others have found that SARS-CoV-2 peak viral load was close or even
64 coincided with the onset of symptoms, suggesting that identifying individuals before
65 symptoms onset was key to efficiently reduce transmission¹. Likewise, we and others
66 identified that dynamics of viral load after the peak was associated with the risk of severe
67 disease, and we used these predictions to quantify the clinical efficacy of antiviral
68 strategies^{1,2}. In addition, mathematical models of antibody kinetics after vaccination also
69 played a key role to identify correlates of protection against severe infection³.

70 A question that has remained largely unsolved is the impact of antibody kinetics on
71 viral clearance, and how the induction of antibodies modulates the time to viral clearance.
72 Because the virus constantly mutates, it has been shown in large observational studies that
73 the measurement of total anti-Spike (S) IgG antibodies was important⁴⁻⁶, but that their
74 neutralization capacity was also critical⁷. Neutralization titers (ED₅₀; half-maximal effective
75 dilution), provides a much more accurate description of the quantitative and qualitative level
76 of protection of patients' sera, against the different Variants of Concerns (VoC) that emerged
77 since 2021. This approach has been extensively used to analyze the magnitude and the
78 duration of the protection conferred by mRNA vaccines⁸, and has played an important role to
79 support booster dose strategies, or alert on the low level of protection of mRNA vaccine
80 against disease acquisition in the Omicron variant era^{9,10}.

81 However, the combined kinetic analysis of both viral dynamic and neutralizing activity
82 has never been studied in detail in the context of an acute infection. Here, we relied on the
83 AMBU COV cohort, a cohort of ambulatory individuals that took place in 2021 during the
84 Alpha variant wave in France, prior to the mass vaccination campaign. Individuals were

85 included early after symptoms onset, and both virological and immunological parameters
86 were followed prospectively. We provided a detailed picture of the kinetics of antibody
87 neutralization capacity against the Alpha variant, but also against the VoC that emerged
88 subsequently, including Delta and Omicron (BA.1) variants. Following previous studies in
89 hospitalized patients¹¹, we used mathematical modeling to characterize the impact of the
90 evolution of the neutralization activity on viral kinetics after a natural infection. Then we used
91 this model to predict how the presence of a pre-existing neutralization activity (such as
92 conferred by natural infection or vaccination) may reduce viral replication. We put these
93 results in perspective to discuss the efficacy of vaccines and more broadly the use of
94 neutralizing titers as a correlate of protection against disease acquisition.

95

96 **Patients and methods**

97 ***Study design***

98 The AMBU COV study (APHP201285, N° IDRCB /EUDRACT: 2020-A03102-37,
99 ClinicalTrial.gov: NCT04703114) is a non-interventional longitudinal study that included 63
100 individuals between 05 February 2021 and 20 May 2021 in Cochin Hospital (Paris, France).
101 The AMBU COV study was an ancillary study of the cross-sectional SALICOV study
102 (NCT04578509), that aimed to compare diagnostic accuracy of two alternate diagnosis
103 strategies (nasopharyngeal antigen test and saliva nucleic acid amplification testing) to the
104 current reference standard (nasopharyngeal nucleic acid amplification testing) for detection
105 of SARS-CoV-2 in community testing centers¹². The SALICOV study was conducted in the
106 network of community screening centers of the Assistance Publique-Hôpitaux de Paris
107 (APHP), France. Briefly, all individuals with symptoms (i.e., temperature > 37.8 °C or chills,
108 cough, rhinorrhea, muscle pain, loss of smell or taste, unusual persistent headaches, or
109 severe asthenia) were invited to be tested for SARS-CoV-2 in two community screening
110 centers located in Paris . Testing was also available to all asymptomatic individuals wishing

111 to be tested (i.e., contact of infected cases, before or after travel, after participation to a
112 gathering event). Once their participation to SALICOV was completed, participants tested
113 positive for SARS CoV-2 were contacted by phone by the principal investigator (BT) to
114 explain the study protocol and offered to participate in the AMBUCOV study. Home visits
115 were organized and written informed consent was obtained from all included participants (or
116 their legal representatives if unable to consent).

117 Exclusion criteria included patients with criteria for hospitalization at the time of diagnosis,
118 non-consent or inability to obtain consent, patients with dementia or not authorized, for
119 psychiatric reasons or intellectual failure, to receive information on the protocol and to give
120 informed consent, and patients under guardianship or curatorship.

121 ***Study population and procedures***

122 All adults included in the SALICOV study, with a positive nasopharyngeal PCR for SARS-
123 CoV-2 within 48 hours, either with or without symptoms were included in the AMBUCOV
124 study.

125 For each participant, four home visits were done by study nurses on day 0 (defined as the
126 first study visit), day 3, day 8 and day 15. Blood samples were collected at each home visit,
127 saliva on day 3, day 8 and day 15, nasal swab on day 8 and day 15 and stools on day 3 and
128 day 15.

129 A follow-up study was performed at Cochin Hospital (Paris, France) on day 90 to collect
130 outcome data and additional biological samples (blood, saliva and stools). Saliva samples
131 were self-collected under supervision of the nurse or the principal investigator. Blood
132 samples, saliva and stools samples were centralized, frozen in several aliquots at -80°C
133 within 24 hours and stored for analysis.

134 ***Data collection***

135 We collected data on sociodemographic, past medical history, presence of symptoms and
136 concomitant medications using a standardized data collection form. When missing, date of
137 symptom onset was imputed at the median observed in the population.

138 ***Role of the funding sources***

139 The AMBUCOV study was supported by the Fonds IMMUNOV, for Innovation in
140 Immunopathology. An additional grant was obtained for immunological and virological
141 experiments (COVID-19 grant number COV21039). The funding sources had no role in the
142 study's design, conduct, and reporting.

143 ***Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval***

144 The IRB C.P.P. Ile de France III approved the study protocol prior to data collection
145 (approval number Am8849-2-3853-RM) and all subsequent amendments.

146 ***Quantification of SARS-CoV2 RNA in saliva samples***

147 Viral RNA was extracted from saliva samples using the Cellfree200 V7 DSP 200 protocol
148 with the QIASymphony® DSP virus/pathogen mini kit (QIAGEN, UK). Samples loaded onto
149 the QIASymphony® SP as instructed by the manufacturer, with a 200 µl sample input
150 volume and 60 µl elution output volume of AVE buffer, unless stated (QIAGEN, UK). SARS-
151 CoV-2 RT-ddPCR assays were performed using the One-Step RT-ddPCR Advanced Kit for
152 90 Probes (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA, USA) and the QX200 ddPCR platform
153 (Biorad). A 2-plex RT-ddPCR assay was developed, which targets the Nucleocapside (N1)
154 gene of the SARS-CoV-2 positive-strand RNA genome with specific FAM- probe and primers
155 Cy5-labeled probe for the detection of a human housekeeping gene (RNaseP). RNaseP
156 positivity was necessary to validate the RT-PCR assay prior to any further analysis. We
157 considered 6 log₁₀ copies/mL as a proxy for positive viral culture¹¹.

158 **S-Flow Assay**

159 The S-Flow assay is based on the recognition of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein expressed
160 on the surface of 293T cells. It was used to quantify SARS-CoV-2-specific IgG and IgA
161 subtypes in sera as previously described^{13,14}. Briefly, 293T cells were obtained from ATCC
162 (ATCC Cat# CRL-3216, RRID:CVCL_0063) and tested negative for mycoplasma. 293T cells
163 stably expressing Spike (293T S) or control (293T Empty) were transferred into U-bottom 96-
164 well plates (10^5 cells/well). Cells were incubated at 4°C for 30 min with serum (1:300
165 dilution), saliva (1:5 dilution) or nasopharyngeal swabs (1:5 dilution) in PBS containing 0.5%
166 BSA and 2 mM EDTA. Then, cells were washed with PBS, and stained at 4°C for 30 min
167 using anti-IgG AlexaFluor647 (Jackson ImmunoResearch cat# 109-605-170) and Anti-IgA
168 AlexaFluor488 (Jackson ImmunoResearch cat# 109-545-011). Then, cells were washed with
169 PBS and fixed 10 min with 4% PFA. Data were acquired on an Attune Nxt instrument (Life
170 Technologies). Results were analyzed with FlowJo 10.7.1 (Becton Dickinson). The specific
171 binding was calculated as follow: $100 \times (\% \text{ binding } 293T \text{ Spike} - \% \text{ binding } 293T \text{ Empty}) /$
172 $(100 - \% \text{ binding } 293T \text{ Empty})$. For sera, the assay was standardized with WHO international
173 reference sera (20/136 and 20/130) and cross-validated with two commercially available
174 ELISA (Abbott and Beckmann) using a Passing-Bablok linear regression model to allow
175 calculation of BAU/mL¹⁵. SARS-CoV-2 neutralization was assessed using the S-fuse assay,
176 as previously described¹⁶.

177 **S-Fuse neutralization assay**

178 U2OS-ACE2 GFP1-10 or GFP 11 cells, also termed S-Fuse cells, become GFP+ when they
179 are productively infected by SARS-CoV-2¹⁷. Cells tested negative for mycoplasma. Cells
180 were mixed (ratio 1:1) and plated at 8×10^3 per well in a μ Clear 96-well plate (Greiner Bio-
181 One). The indicated SARS-CoV-2 strains were incubated with serially diluted sera for 15 min
182 at room temperature and added to S-Fuse cells. Sera were heat-inactivated for 30 min at
183 56 °C before use. 18 h later, cells were fixed with 2% PFA, washed and stained with Hoechst
184 (dilution of 1:1,000, Invitrogen). Images were acquired using an Opera Phenix high-content

185 confocal microscope (PerkinElmer). The GFP area and the number of nuclei were quantified
186 using the Harmony software (PerkinElmer). The percentage of neutralization was calculated
187 using the number of syncytia as value with the following formula: $100 \times (1 -$
188 $(\text{value with serum} - \text{value in 'non-infected'}) / (\text{value in 'no serum'} - \text{value in 'non-infected'}))$.
189 Neutralizing activity of each serum was expressed as the half maximal effective dilution
190 (ED₅₀).

191 **Viral strain**

192 B.1.1.7 (Alpha variant) was isolated from an individual in Tours (France) who had returned
193 from the UK (PMID: 33772244). B.1.617.2 (Delta variant) was isolated from a
194 nasopharyngeal swab of a hospitalized patient who had returned from India. The swab was
195 provided and sequenced by the Laboratoire de Virologie of the Hôpital Européen Georges
196 Pompidou (Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Paris) (PMID: 34237773). The Omicron
197 BA.1 strain was supplied and sequenced by the NRC UZ/KU Leuven (Leuven, Belgium)
198 (PMID: 35016199).

199 All individuals provided informed consent for the use of the biological materials. The variant
200 strains were isolated from nasal swabs on Vero cells and amplified by one or two passages
201 on Vero cells.

202 Titration of viral stocks was performed on Vero E6, with a limiting dilution technique allowing
203 a calculation of TCID₅₀, or on S-Fuse cells. Viruses were sequenced directly on nasal
204 swabs, and after one or two passages on Vero cells. Sequences were deposited in the
205 GISAID database immediately after their generation, with the following IDs: Alpha:
206 EPI_ISL_735391; Delta: ID: EPI_ISL_2029113; Omicron BA.1.

207 ***Model for antibody and ED₅₀ kinetics***

208 We modeled the evolution of IgG levels using a sigmoid Gompertz function to reflect the
209 progressive increase in IgG from 0 (before infection) to a plateau, noted IgG_{max}:

$$IgG(t) = IgG_{max} \times e^{-e^{(A-B \times t)}}$$

210 We next relate IgG to the evolution of the neutralizing activity (ED_{50}) against different strains,
211 namely Alpha (α), Delta (δ) and Omicron (BA.1, \omicron) using the following relationship:

$$ED_{50}^{\alpha}(t) = \zeta \times IgG(t)$$

$$ED_{50}^{\delta}(t) = f_{\delta} \times \zeta \times IgG(t)$$

212 $ED_{50}^{\omicron}(t) = f_{\omicron} \times \zeta \times IgG(t),$

213 such that ζ represents the scaling factor between IgG and ED_{50}^{α} , while f_{α} (resp f_{δ})
214 represent the fold change between the neutralization capacity against alpha and delta
215 variant (resp. omicron). Of note, in this model, the time to reach 90% of the maximal
216 protection is the same for all variants and is equal to $(A - \log(-\log(0.9)))/B$.

217 **Model for viral dynamics in saliva**

218 We used a target-cell limited model with an eclipse phase as described before¹¹
219 (**Supplementary Figure 1**) to characterize viral dynamics in saliva from infection ($t=0$) to
220 clearance. In brief, the model includes three types of cell populations: target cells (T),
221 infected cells in an eclipse phase (I_1) and productively infected cells (I_2). The model assumes
222 that target cells are infected at a constant infection rate β ($\text{mL.virion}^{-1}.\text{d}^{-1}$). Once infected,
223 cells enter an eclipse phase and become productively infected after a mean time $1/k$ (day).
224 We assume that productively infected cells have a constant loss rate, noted δ (d^{-1}). Infected
225 cells produce p viral particles per day ($\text{virus}.\text{d}^{-1}$), but only a fraction of them, μ , is infectious,
226 and the virus particles can either be infectious (V_i) or non-infectious (V_{ni}). We assumed that
227 viral load, as measured by RNA copies (V), is the sum of infectious and non-infectious viral
228 particles, both cleared at the same rate, c . The model can be written as :

$$\frac{dT}{dt} = -\beta V_i T$$

$$\frac{dI_1}{dt} = \beta V_i T - kI_1$$

229
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta I_2 \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$

$$\frac{dV_i}{dt} = p\mu I_2 - cV_I$$

$$\frac{dV_{NI}}{dt} = p(1 - \mu) - cV_{NI}$$

230 The basic reproductive number R_0 , defined by the number of secondary infected cells
231 resulting from one infected cell in a population of fully susceptible cells, T_0 , is defined by :

$$R_0 = \frac{\beta p T_0 \mu}{c \delta}$$

232 **Combined immunovirological model**

233 Finally, we aimed to characterize the impact of the neutralizing antibody level on viral load.
234 For that purpose, we tested several models, assuming no effect of neutralization antibody
235 levels (model M0, Eq. 1), or that the effect of neutralization could alternatively i) increase
236 infected cell clearance (model M1), ii) increase the loss of both infectious and non-infectious
237 virus (model M2), iii) or both (model M3) (**Supplementary Figure 1**).

238 Model M0:

239
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta I_2, \frac{dV_I}{dt} = p\mu I_2 - cV_I, \frac{dV_{NI}}{dt} = p(1 - \mu)I_2 - cV_{NI}$$

240 Model M1:

241
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta[I_2 + \varphi_\delta \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)], \frac{dV_I}{dt} = p\mu I_2 - cV_I, \frac{dV_{NI}}{dt} = p(1 - \mu)I_2 - cV_{NI}$$

242 Model M2

243
$$\frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta I_2, \frac{dV_I}{dt} = p\mu I_2 - c[V_I + \varphi_c \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)], \frac{dV_{NI}}{dt} = p(1 - \mu)I_2 - c[V_{NI} +$$

244
$$\varphi_c \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)]$$

245 Model M3:

$$246 \quad \frac{dI_2}{dt} = kI_1 - \delta[I_2 + \varphi_\delta \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)], \frac{dV_I}{dt} = p\mu I_2 - c[V_I + \varphi_c \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)], \frac{dV_{NI}}{dt} = p(1 - \\ 247 \quad \mu)I_2 - c[V_{NI} + \varphi_c \log_{10}(ED50_\alpha)]$$

248 ***Assumptions on parameter values***

249 We fixed c to 10 d^{-1} , k to 4 d^{-1} and μ to 10^{-4} as previously published¹¹. As only the product
250 $p \times T_0$ is identifiable, we also fixed the density of susceptible epithelial cells to the same value
251 found in the upper respiratory tract, i.e., $T_0 = 1.33 \times 10^5 \text{ cells.mL}^{-1}$. Further we assumed that
252 the duration of the incubation period was log-normally distributed, with a median value of 5
253 days a standard deviation of 0.125, such that 90% of individuals have an incubation period
254 between 3 and 7 days¹¹. Thus, only 3 viral parameters were estimated, namely p , δ and R_0 ,
255 along with their interindividual variabilities. Given the lack of data on the viral upslope, we
256 also fixed the standard deviation of the random effect associated to R_0 , denoted ω_{R_0} to 0.5,
257 as done previously¹⁸.

258 ***Inference & model selection***

259 Models M0, M1, M2, and M1+M2 (i.e., a dual effects on both infected cells and virus
260 clearance) were fitted to all data available, namely viral load, IgG and ED_{50} against all
261 strains, assuming an additive error on the log-quantities. Parameters were estimated using
262 non-linear mixed effect models and SAEM algorithm, using the same statistical methodology
263 as previously described^{11,18,19}. Only the results obtained with the best model are presented.

264 ***Impact of a pre-existing neutralization capacity on viral dynamics***

265 Next, we used the best model to anticipate the viral dynamics that could be observed in non-
266 naive individuals, i.e., in individuals having a pre-existing neutralization due either natural

267 infection or vaccination. For that purpose, we assumed that one virus was present at $t=0$
268 (infection time), and we assumed different levels of neutralizing capacity ranging from
269 $ED_{50}=0$ to $ED_{50}=10^5$. For each value of ED_{50} we generated a large population of 5,000
270 virological profiles using the final immuno-virological model, and we calculated different viral
271 metrics. Of note, we made the conservative assumption here that the neutralizing capacity
272 remained constant during the infection, i.e., we did not consider any increase over time due
273 to stimulated immune response. As a sensitivity analysis, we also calculated the protection
274 obtained with the alternative models.

275 **Materials availability statement**

276 All codes, datasets for the modelling analysis and datasets for the figures, supplementary
277 figures, tables and supplementary tables are available at
278 <https://datadryad.org/stash/share/oNDQyb2rNuSRXr8vjIZSHBtlIC6zp4h504gunxxjmbo>.

279 **Conflict of interest**

280 CCG received study materials and payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations,
281 speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events from Roche Diagnostics,
282 Nephrotek, Radiometer and Siemens Helthineers as well as study materials from
283 Hemcheck/Eurobio. CCG participated on a Data Safety Monitoring Board for Siemens
284 Helthineers and Gentian. CD received consulting fees from ViiV, Gilead and MSD. HP'
285 institution received grants or contracts from PHRC-K/INCA ; ANRS ; ARC Programme de
286 recherche clinique ; CRC – APHP. HP received payment or honoraria for lectures,
287 presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events from MSD ;
288 Janssen ; ViiV and Seegene as well as support for attending meetings/travels from MSD and
289 Seegene. HP has patents planned, issued or pending (PCT/EP2021/064575 &
290 PCT/EP2021/065863). SK' institution received a grant from BioMérieux.

291

292

293

294 **Results**

295 ***Baseline characteristics***

296 A total of 57 patients were included between February and September 2021 (**Table 1**).

297 Patients were mostly male ($N=40$, 63%), with a median age of 44 years (IQR: 35-57) and all

298 were infected with the Alpha variant. Fifty-five participants developed symptoms, and 2

299 remained asymptomatic throughout the study. Patients had very few comorbidities, and

300 hypertension (5%), chronic cardiac disease (5%), obesity (3%), and chronic kidney disease

301 (2%) were the most common comorbidities. One patient was fully vaccinated (2 doses) and

302 7 patients had received one dose of vaccination at the time of infection. The median time

303 between symptoms onset and inclusion in the AMBU COV study was 4 (IQR: 3-6) days and

304 the median saliva viral load at inclusion was 6.27 (IQR: 5.61-6.93) \log_{10} copies/mL.

305 ***Immuno-virological modeling***

306 All data used for the modeling exercise, namely viral load (in saliva), anti-S IgG and

307 neutralizing titers (in plasma or serum) are shown in **Figure 1** and **Supplementary Figure 2**.

308 The model best describing our data assumed that neutralizing antibodies acted on both

309 infected cell and infectious virus clearance ($M1+M2$), and the model could well fit all data

310 (**Figure 2**). Model parameters were in line with what we found in other studies^{1,18,19}, with a

311 within-host R_0 equal to 22.6, a viral production rate of 4×10^3 viruses/cell/day, and a loss rate

312 of infected cells in absence of antibodies equal to $\delta = 0.26 \text{ d}^{-1}$ (**Table 2**). The peak viral load

313 occurred at symptom onset with a median level of 6.8 \log_{10} RNA copies/mL.

314 The population average maximal level of anti-S IgG after acute infection, IgG_{max} , was equal

315 to 155 BAU/mL, corresponding to an antibody neutralization level against α variant, ζ^*

316 IgG_{max}, equal to 548 ED₅₀. After infection, antibodies rapidly increased, and we predicted that
317 90% of this maximal antibody protection was achieved as early as day 10 post-symptom
318 onset. This level of neutralization was achieved around day 6 after symptoms onset in
319 patients vaccinated with one dose, and the only patient that had received 2 doses at the time
320 of the infection reached this level only 4 days after symptoms onset, supporting that
321 vaccination considerably reduced the time to achieve high level of neutralization activity. At
322 antibody peak, we estimated that the half-lives of both infected cells and infectious virus
323 were shortened by respectively 6- and 7-fold (corresponding to loss rates for δ and c equals
324 to 1.56 d⁻¹ and 77 d⁻¹, respectively). Because antibody levels reached their maximal value
325 after peak viral load, we did not find a significant association between the cumulated levels
326 of neutralizing antibody levels and viral load (**Supplementary Figure 3**). As all individuals
327 were infected with Alpha variant, the population average maximal level of neutralization
328 against Delta and BA.1 variants were much lower and were diminished by respectively 6.7-
329 and 277.7-folds ($\zeta \cdot \text{IgG}_{\text{max}} \cdot f_{\text{Delta/Omicron}}$), leading to median ED₅₀ of 82 and 2, respectively, after
330 infection, reached around 19 days after symptom onset.

331 To address the impact of the temporal effect of antibody levels on viral clearance, we
332 simulated 5000 *in silico* virological profiles using the estimated parameter distributions and
333 considering that antibody could have either the two mechanisms of action (as found in our
334 model), only one of them or none of them (thus fixing alternatively φ_{δ} and/or φ_c to 0 in the
335 model). When considering the full model, the predicted median time to clearance after
336 symptoms onset was equal to 12 days, as compared to >50 in a model in which antibodies
337 had no effect ($\varphi_{\delta} = \varphi_c = 0$). We observed that the effectiveness of IgG was predominantly
338 driven by its action on the loss rate of infected cells, with a median time to viral clearance
339 equal to 14 days when only the effects on infected cell was assumed ($\varphi_c = 0$) as compared
340 to >50 days when only the effects on infected viral particles was assumed ($\varphi_{\delta} = 0$)
341 (**Supplementary Figure 4**). Consistent with this prediction, the post-hoc analysis showed
342 that the early appearance of detectable neutralizing antibodies was associated with lower

343 viral levels at day 4 post-symptom onset, which corresponds to the median time of inclusion
344 in the study ($r=0.47$, ($P<10^{-3}$, **Supplementary Figure 3**).

345

346

347 ***Impact of a pre-existing neutralization capacity on viral dynamics***

348 Next, we used the model to anticipate the viral dynamics that could be observed in non-
349 naive individuals after an encounter with the virus, i.e., in individuals having a pre-existing
350 neutralization due either natural infection or vaccination. For that purpose, we assumed that
351 infection is initiated at $t=0$ with only one infectious particle, and we assumed different levels
352 of neutralizing capacity ranging from $ED_{50}=1$ to $ED_{50}=10^5$ (see methods). This corresponds to
353 a within-host R_0 ranging from 22.5 (i.e., the value estimated in our population before
354 antibody secretion) to about 0.5. Using the model parameters, we simulated viral dynamics
355 of 5,000 individuals with each potential level of ED_{50} and we computed the following metrics:
356 peak viral load, probability of having detectable viral load at peak, probability of having viral
357 load $> 6 \log_{10}$ copies/mL. The simulations showed that $ED_{50}>1000$ would be sufficient to
358 maintain 45% of individuals with viral load below the limit of detection at all times, and only
359 1% being at risk of transmitting the infection (i.e. peak viral load above $> 6 \log_{10}$ copies/mL).

360 **Discussion**

361 In this work, we combined the kinetic analysis of saliva viral load and immune
362 response during an acute Covid-19, from infection to viral clearance in ambulatory patients
363 with non severe disease. We show that neutralizing antibodies on infected cells and, to
364 some extent, on circulating viral particles, played a key role to achieve viral clearance. The
365 neutralizing activity was largely variant-dependent, and ED₅₀ was estimated to be equal to
366 548 against Alpha variant but decreased by 7- and 300-fold against Delta and Omicron BA.1
367 variants, respectively. We next performed simulations to predict the level of protection
368 against infection conferred by various pre-existing levels of antibody neutralization, and
369 predicted that a level of ED₅₀ >10³ was sufficient to prevent 50% of infections from being
370 detectable and 99% from being above the threshold of viral culture, used as a proxy of
371 infectiousness.

372 The AMBUCOV study population included patients with mild COVID-19 during the
373 Alpha variant wave in France, prior to the mass vaccination campaign, to describe the
374 natural course of viral load and immune response in immunocompetent patients without any
375 strong comorbidities, as illustrated by patients characteristics. The decision was directly
376 related to our main objective, i.e. to analyze the relationship between the virus and the
377 immune response.

378 We have modeled the kinetics of both saliva viral load and immune response, mainly
379 the humoral response, during an acute COVID-19. We showed that the increase in
380 neutralizing antibodies leads to a shortening of the half-life of both infected cells and
381 infectious viral particles. We estimated that the neutralizing activity reached 90% of its
382 maximal level within 8 days after symptoms onset and could reduce the half-life of both
383 infected cells and infectious virus by a 6-fold factor, thus playing a key role to achieve rapid
384 viral clearance. To establish a correlate of protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection, we
385 predicted that a neutralizing activity defined by ED₅₀ >10³ could reduce by 50% the risk of

386 having viral load detectable in saliva by ultrasensitive ddPCR assays and by 99% the risk of
387 having viral load above the threshold of cultivable virus. Overall, this value of neutralizing
388 activity could be used to identify individuals with poor protection against disease acquisition.

389 Based on the data from a previous study⁸, we compared the level of neutralizing antibodies
390 in individuals hospitalized in a nursing home prior to an outbreak, and compared the levels
391 between individuals that experienced a breakthrough infection and those that remained
392 uninfected. While all individuals in this study were vaccinated, the median ED₅₀ before
393 infection was 1429 in individuals that subsequently experienced a breakthrough infection
394 (with Omicron BA.1 variant) as compared to 2528 in those who did not. Similarly, in two
395 studies, levels of neutralizing antibodies were lower 1770 against Alpha and BA.5 variants
396 just before the respective breakthrough infection^{20,21}. These data during the Omicron wave
397 support our findings and the threshold of neutralizing activity ED₅₀ >10³ as a potential
398 correlate of protection against SARS-CoV-2 infection regardless of the variants.

399 Finally, our study has some limitations. Viral loads and IgG were not quantified from
400 same site, the first being obtained in saliva and the second in serum. Unfortunately the
401 neutralizing assay was not adapted to measure the neutralizing activity in saliva. Further, as
402 frequently observed in acute infection^{1,18}, very few data could be measured before peak viral
403 load, which may cause a bias in the estimation of R₀ and, accordingly, their effects on loss
404 rates parameters. Finally, our identifiability analysis showed that the effect neutralization of
405 circulating viral particles φ_c was poorly identifiable (RSEE = 76%) and that the effect of
406 neutralization on infected cells clearance rate was barely identifiable as well (RSEE = 49%).
407 All identifiability metrics are available in Supplementary Table 4. As a consequence, we
408 conducted the same 5000 individual simulations as previously, this time using the estimates
409 of model M1, where only an effect on the clearance rate of infected cells was considered. In
410 these simulations, we observed that above 10³ ED50, the resulting protection conferred did
411 not improve (Supplementary table 5), with peak viral loads and proportion of detectable
412 individuals at peak viral load being >98% at all concentrations.

413 In conclusion, our data show that $ED_{50} > 10^3$ could be a clinically relevant threshold
414 value for the neutralizing activity to identify individuals with poor protection against disease
415 acquisition. The evaluation of this threshold on larger cohorts is now warranted to evaluate
416 whether it could be used to define a correlate of protection against disease acquisition.

417

418 **References**

- 419 1. Néant, N. *et al.* Modeling SARS-CoV-2 viral kinetics and association with mortality in
420 hospitalized patients from the French COVID cohort. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **118**,
421 e2017962118 (2021).
- 422 2. Ke, R., Zitzmann, C., Ho, D. D., Ribeiro, R. M. & Perelson, A. S. In vivo kinetics of
423 SARS-CoV-2 infection and its relationship with a person's infectiousness. *Proc. Natl.*
424 *Acad. Sci.* **118**, (2021).
- 425 3. Khoury, D. S. *et al.* Neutralizing antibody levels are highly predictive of immune
426 protection from symptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 1205–1211 (2021).
- 427 4. Chivu-Economescu, M. *et al.* Assessment of the Humoral Immune Response Following
428 COVID-19 Vaccination in Healthcare Workers: A One Year Longitudinal Study.
429 *Biomedicines* **10**, 1526 (2022).
- 430 5. Di Chiara, C. *et al.* Long-term Immune Response to SARS-CoV-2 Infection Among
431 Children and Adults After Mild Infection. *JAMA Netw. Open* **5**, e2221616 (2022).
- 432 6. Lo Sasso, B. *et al.* Longitudinal analysis of anti-SARS-CoV-2 S-RBD IgG antibodies
433 before and after the third dose of the BNT162b2 vaccine. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 8679 (2022).
- 434 7. Planas, D. *et al.* Considerable escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron to antibody
435 neutralization. *Nature* **602**, 671–675 (2022).
- 436 8. Bruel, T. *et al.* Neutralising antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 omicron among elderly
437 nursing home residents following a booster dose of BNT162b2 vaccine: A community-
438 based, prospective, longitudinal cohort study. *eClinicalMedicine* **51**, 101576 (2022).

- 439 9. Bruel, T. *et al.* Serum neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron sublineages BA.1 and
440 BA.2 in patients receiving monoclonal antibodies. *Nat. Med.* **28**, 1297–1302 (2022).
- 441 10. Planas, D. *et al.* Considerable escape of SARS-CoV-2 Omicron to antibody
442 neutralization. *Nature* **602**, 671–675 (2022).
- 443 11. Néant, N. *et al.* Modeling SARS-CoV-2 viral kinetics and association with mortality in
444 hospitalized patients from the French COVID cohort. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **118**,
445 e2017962118 (2021).
- 446 12. Kernéis, S. *et al.* Accuracy of saliva and nasopharyngeal sampling for detection of
447 SARS-CoV-2 in community screening: a multicentric cohort study. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol.*
448 *Infect. Dis. Off. Publ. Eur. Soc. Clin. Microbiol.* **40**, 2379–2388 (2021).
- 449 13. Grzelak, L. *et al.* Sex Differences in the Evolution of Neutralizing Antibodies to Severe
450 Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2. *J. Infect. Dis.* **224**, 983–988 (2021).
- 451 14. Grzelak, L. *et al.* A comparison of four serological assays for detecting anti-SARS-CoV-2
452 antibodies in human serum samples from different populations. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **12**,
453 eabc3103 (2020).
- 454 15. Hadjadj, J. *et al.* Immunogenicity of BNT162b2 vaccine against the Alpha and Delta
455 variants in immunocompromised patients with systemic inflammatory diseases. *Ann.*
456 *Rheum. Dis.* **81**, 720–728 (2022).
- 457 16. Planas, D. *et al.* Sensitivity of infectious SARS-CoV-2 B.1.1.7 and B.1.351 variants to
458 neutralizing antibodies. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 917–924 (2021).
- 459 17. Buchrieser, J. *et al.* Syncytia formation by SARS-CoV-2-infected cells. *EMBO J.* **39**,
460 e106267 (2020).
- 461 18. Lingas, G. *et al.* Effect of remdesivir on viral dynamics in COVID-19 hospitalized
462 patients: a modelling analysis of the randomized, controlled, open-label DisCoVeRy
463 trial. *J. Antimicrob. Chemother.* (2022) doi:10.1093/jac/dkac048.
- 464 19. Gonçalves, A. *et al.* Timing of Antiviral Treatment Initiation is Critical to Reduce SARS-
465 CoV-2 Viral Load. *CPT Pharmacomet. Syst. Pharmacol.* **9**, 509–514 (2020).
- 466 20. Boudhabhay, I. *et al.* COVID-19 outbreak in vaccinated patients from a haemodialysis

467 unit: antibody titres as a marker of protection from infection. *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.*

468 **37**, 1357–1365 (2022).

469 21. Planas, D. *et al.* Duration of BA.5 neutralization in sera and nasal swabs from SARS-

470 CoV-2 vaccinated individuals, with or without omicron breakthrough infection. *Med*

471 S2666634022004111 (2022) doi:10.1016/j.medj.2022.09.010.

472

473

474

475


476

477


478 **Tables and figures**

479

480



481




482

483 **Figure 1. Virological and immunological data analyzed in the AMBU COV cohort. A.**
484 **Saliva viral load. B. Serum concentration of IgG (BAU/mL). C-E. Neutralization activity of IgG**
485 **against strains C. Alpha D. Delta. E. Omicron (BA.1). All data expressed in time since**
486 **symptom onset. Triangles represent data below LOQ.**


487

488



489

490 **Figure 2. Median predictions of viral (A) and serological (B) kinetics.** Circles are the
491 observed data and lines represent the simulation-based median predictions of the model.
492 Triangles represent data below LOQ. Darkblue: Viral load. Lightblue: IgG. Brown: ED_{50α}.
493 Pink: ED_{50δ}. Yellow: ED_{50o}



494

495 **Figure 3. Prediction of peak viral load distribution depending on ED₅₀ levels at**
496 **initiation of infection. Values of ED₅₀ : Pink: 0 ; Yellow: 10 ; Green: 100 ; Blue : 1000 ;**
497 **Purple : 10000 ; Red : 100000**

498

499

	Median/N (IQR/%)
Age (years)	43 (33-54)
BMI (kg/m²)	23.9 (21.3-25.3)
Male Gender	36 (63%)
At least 1 comorbidity*	6 (11%)
Delay between symptom onset and inclusion	4 (3-6)
Vaccinated (1 dose)	7 (12%)
Vaccinated (2 doses)	1 (2%)
IgG (log₁₀ BAU/mL of serum)	0.5 (3-1.2)
Saliva viral load (log₁₀ copies/mL)	6.4 (5.74-6.93)
Log₁₀ ED₅₀^α	2.6 (2.1-3.5)
Log₁₀ ED₅₀^δ	2.1 (1.2-2.6)
Log₁₀ED₅₀^o	LOQ

500 *Hypertension, Obesity, Heart failure or Kidney failure

501

502 **Table 1. Clinical and biological characteristics at inclusion in the AMBU COV study.**

503

Antibody neutralization level at infection (ED₅₀)	Median peak viral load (log₁₀ copies/mL)	Probability of peak viral load above the limit of detection	Probability of peak viral load above the threshold of infectivity
0	7.2	100%	86%
10¹	6.0	99%	48%
10²	4.1	80%	12%
10³	1.9	55%	1%
10⁴	1.7	44%	0%
10⁵	1.6	38%	0%


504

505 **Table 2. Predicted impact of a pre-existing antibody neutralization on viral kinetics.**
506 **The limit of detection and the threshold of infectivity were set to 1.84 and 6 log₁₀**
507 **copies/mL, respectively.**

508


509

510 **Supplementary figure 1. Viro-immunological model.**



511

512 **Supplementary figure 2. Individual fits of the whole population studied.**




513


514

515 **Supplementary figure 3.** Correlations between predicted viral load 4 days post symptom
516 onset and time to ED₅₀ positivity (left) and AUCs of viral load and ED₅₀ between 4 and 18
517 days after symptom onset.
518


519



520 **Supplementary figure 4.** Sensitivity analysis of each mode of action of neutralization.
521 Green: median predicted viral load of model M1+M2. Yellow: Clearance rate of viral particles
522 not increased by neutralization. Red: Clearance rate of infected cells not increased by
523 neutralization.



524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533



534
535
536

537 **Supplementary Figure 5. Prediction of peak viral load distribution depending on ED₅₀**
538 **levels at initiation of infection using parameter estimates of model M1.**

539
540
541

Supplementary table 1. Parameter estimates of model M0.

	Parameter estimate (RSE, %)	
	Fixed effect	Random effect SD
R0	19.1 (58.3)	0.5
k (d⁻¹)	4	-
p (virus/cell/d)	17704 (68.8)	1.76 (46.7)
c (d⁻¹)	10	-
μ	0.0001	-
δ (d⁻¹)	0.88 (7.32)	0.28 (24.6)
IgG_{max}	161 (15)	0.94 (12.0)
A	4.63 (11.4)	0.15 (50.9)
B	0.36 (13.8)	0.19 (46.7)
ζ	3.58 (21)	1.36 (12.3)
f_{delta}	0.15 (22.5)	1.26 (17.2)
f_o	0.0037 (50.6)	1.11 (42.8)
φ_δ	0	-
φ_c	0	-
BIC	1173.09	

542
543

544
545
546

Supplementary table 2. Parameter estimates of model M1.

Parameter estimate (RSE, %)		
	Fixed effect	Random effect SD
R0	17.7 (58.3)	0.5
k (d⁻¹)	4	-
p (virus/cell/d)	1803 (68.2)	2.23 (33.5)
c (d⁻¹)	10	-
μ	0.0001	-
δ (d⁻¹)	0.35 (21.6)	0.45 (28.9)
IgG_{max}	153.07 (14.7)	12.5 (12)
A	5.1 (8.58)	0.19 (69.3)
B	0.41 (9.86)	0.12 (198)
ζ	3.58 (20.1)	1.35 (12.2)
f_{delta}	0.15 (23.2)	1.32 (18.2)
f_O	0.0031 (109)	1.27 (88.2)
Φ_δ	1.14 (10.8)	-
Φ_c	0	-
BIC	1158.54	

547
548

549 **Supplementary table 3.** Parameter estimates of model M2.
 550

Parameter estimate (RSE, %)		
	Fixed effect	Random effect SD
R0	17.9 (100)	0.5
k (d⁻¹)	4	-
p (virus/cell/d)	15609 (72.1)	2.03 (27.2)
c (d⁻¹)	10	-
μ	0.0001	-
δ (d⁻¹)	0.88 (7.77)	0.69 (16.8)
IgG_{max}	157.84 (14.7)	0.92 (12)
A	4.82 (9.56)	0.13 (46)
B	0.38 (11.6)	0.2 (31.2)
ζ	3.58 (21.2)	1.37 (12.4)
f_{delta}	0.15 (23.0)	1.3 (17.0)
f_o	0.0024 (85.5)	1.5 (53.8)
φ_δ	0	-
φ_c	<10 ⁻⁵ (>10 ³)	-
BIC	1176.88	

551
 552

553 **Supplementary table 4.** Parameter estimates of model M1+M2.

554

555

	Parameter estimate (RSE, %)	
	Fixed effect	Random effect SD
R0	22.57 (33.5)	0.5
k (d⁻¹)	4	-
p (virus/cell/d)	4275.38 (63.2)	2.03 (27.2)
c (d⁻¹)	10	-
μ	0.0001	-
δ (d⁻¹)	0.26 (14.7)	0.69 (16.8)
IgG_{max}	155 (14.5)	0.94 (12)
A	5.24 (11.3)	0.12 (52)
B	0.42 (14.2)	0.21 (29.5)
ζ	3.54 (20.9)	1.34 (12.5)
f_{delta}	0.15 (22.7)	1.27 (16.7)
f_o	0.0036 (81.6)	1.22 (63.7)
Φ_δ	1.51 (3.90)	-
Φ_c	1.81 (2.47)	-
BIC	1159.27	

556

557

558 **Supplementary table 5.** Identifiability metrics of model M1+M2.

559

	Parameter estimate (RSE, %)	Empirical SE	Empirical RSE	RBias
R0	22.57 (33.5)	14.8	65	25
p (virus/cell/d)	4275.38 (63.2)	4971	116	41
δ (d⁻¹)	0.26 (14.7)	0.08	30	-8.2
IgG_{max}	155 (14.5)	23	15	-2.6
A	5.24 (11.3)	0.6	11	2.3
B	0.42 (14.2)	0.06	13.6	3.3
ζ	3.54 (20.9)	0.77	22	5.1
f_{delta}	0.15 (22.7)	0.04	26	5.1
f_O	0.0036 (81.6)	0.0018	50.0	8.4
ϕ_δ	1.81 (3.90)	0.75	50	23.5
ϕ_c	1.51 (2.47)	1.37	76	23.1

560

561

562 **Supplementary table 6.** Predicted impact of a pre-existing antibody neutralization on viral
563 kinetics using model M1.
564

Antibody neutralization level at infection (ED₅₀)	Median peak viral load (log₁₀ copies/mL)	Probability of peak viral load above the limit of detection	Probability of peak viral load above the threshold of infectivity
0	6.6	100.0%	73%
10¹	6.4	100.0%	66%
10²	6.2	99.9%	59%
10³	6.1	99.9%	54%
10⁴	5.9	99.2%	46%
10⁵	5.7	98.6%	41%

565
566

