1 Beyond the Spike: identification of viral targets of the antibody responses to

2 SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 patients

- 3 Asmaa Hachim¹[^], Niloufar Kavian ^{1, 2, 3} *[^], Carolyn A Cohen¹, Alex WH Chin⁴, Daniel
- 4 KW Chu⁴, Chris KP Mok¹, Owen TY Tsang⁵, Yiu Cheong Yeung⁵, Ranawaka APM
- 5 Perera⁴, Leo LM Poon⁴, Malik JS Peiris^{1,4}, Sophie A Valkenburg¹*
- 6
- 7 ¹HKU-Pasteur Research Pole, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of
- 8 Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China.
- 9 ²Faculté de Médecine Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Assistance
- 10 Publique–Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Universitaire Paris Centre, Centre Hospitalier
- 11 Universitaire Cochin, Service d'Immunologie Biologique, Paris, France.
- ¹² ³Institut Cochin, INSERM U1016, Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité,
- 13 Paris, France.
- ⁴Division of Public Health Laboratory Sciences, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing
- 15 Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
- ¹⁶ ⁵Infectious Diseases Centre, Princess Margaret Hospital, Hospital Authority of Hong
- 17 Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China
- 18
- 19 [^] These authors contributed equally to this work
- 20 ^{*} Corresponding authors
- 21 Niloufar Kavian and Sophie A. Valkenburg
- 22 HKU Pasteur Research Pole
- 23 School of Public Health
- 24 The University of Hong Kong
- 25 Niloufar@hku.hk; sophiev@hku.hk

26 Abstract

Background: The SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged in December 2019 and caused a pandemic associated with a spectrum of COVID-19 disease ranging from asymptomatic to lethal infection. Serology testing is important for diagnosis of infection, determining infection attack rates and immunity in the population. It also informs vaccine development. Although several serology tests are in use, improving their specificity and sensitivity for early diagnosis on the one hand and for detecting past infection for population-based studies, are priorities.

Methods: We evaluated the anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody profiles to 15 SARS-CoV-2 antigens by cloning and expressing 15 open reading frames (ORFs) in mammalian cells and screened antibody responses to them in COVID-19 patients using the Luciferase Immunoprecipitation System (LIPS).

38 Results: The LIPS technique allowed us to detect antibody responses in COVID-19 39 patients to 11 of the 15 SARS-CoV-2 antigens tested, identifying novel immunogenic 40 targets. This technique shows that antigens ORF3b and ORF8 allow detection of 41 antibody early in infection in a specific manner and reveals the immuno-dominance of 42 the N antigen in COVID-19 patients.

Conclusion: Our report provides an unbiased characterization of antibody responses to a range of SARS-CoV-2 antigens. The combination of 3 SARS-CoV-2 antibody LIPS assays, i.e. N, ORF3b, and ORF8, is sufficient to identify all COVID-19 patients of our cohort even at early time-points of illness, whilst Spike alone fails to do so. Furthermore, our study highlights the importance of investigating new immunogens NSP1, ORF3b, ORF7a and ORF8 which may mediate immune functions other than neutralization which may be beneficial or harmful to the patient.

50 Introduction

51 The acute pandemic respiratory disease COVID-19 is caused by a novel coronavirus 52 that belongs to the species Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus 53 (SARS-CoV-2) (1, 2). There are at least 70 vaccine candidates against COVID-19 in 54 various stages of testing, development and human clinical trials (5). Urgency in 55 vaccine development and deployment to mitigate the pandemic has left some 56 fundamental immunological research questions outstanding, especially regarding the 57 range of virus immunogens that elicit antibody responses, their kinetics, specificity, 58 breadth, longevity and impact for long-term protection or immune-pathology.

59 Endemic human coronaviruses (HCoV) OC43, 229E, HKU1 and NL63 usually 60 cause a mild 'common cold'- like upper respiratory disease. SARS-CoV-2 belongs to 61 the β -coronavirus genus which includes SARS-CoV which emerged in 2002, and 62 Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) which emerged in 63 2012, which are severe human diseases of zoonotic origin (4). As of 20th of April 64 2020, the World Health Organization has reported a total of 2,241,778 cases of 65 COVID-19 worldwide and 152,551 deaths (5). Ongoing research has reported the full 66 genome sequence (1), transcriptome (6) and the immune response to infection (7).

67 SARS-CoV-2 has 12 putative functional open reading frames (ORF) and 68 shares 82% nucleotide homology with SARS-CoV (8). There are at least four 69 structural proteins in SARS-CoV-2: Spike (S), Envelope (E), Membrane (M), 70 Nucleocapsid (N). The trimer S protein is cleaved into S1, containing the receptor 71 binding domain, and S2 subunits (8, 9), and S2 is further cleaved into S2' to form the 72 viral fusion peptide (6). The S protein is critical for viral entry and is a neutralising 73 target, as it is with SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV and is a key target for diagnostic tests 74 and vaccine development (10). The S1 subunit of SARS-CoV-2 shares about 70%

identity with the SARS-CoV, whereas the identity of the S2 subunit is up to 99% with some evidence of cross-reactivity between the viruses (11). Apart from these structural proteins, the SARS-CoV-2 genome encodes for around 20 putative nonstructural proteins (8). ORF1a/b encodes for a large polyprotein that is proteolytically cleaved into 16 non-structural proteins (NSP1-16). Extra ORFs, such as ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10 may encode for proteins but their functions are unknown.

81 Encouragingly, reports have shown that SARS-CoV-2 patients develop 82 neutralising and high titer S1-specific antibody responses (11), and robust T and B 83 cellular responses (12). However, the magnitude of the antibody responses appears 84 related to the clinical severity of COVID-19 disease. In one recent report 10 of 175 85 confirmed patients did not develop a neutralising SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody 86 response (by pseudo particle assay), but binding antibodies were still detected (by 87 ELISA) (13). In patients with MERS (14) it has been shown that viral load and severe disease correlates with the magnitude of the antibody response, however mild 88 89 diseases (in 4 of 6 mild subjects) may not lead to detectable antibody responses. 90 Furthermore, MERS-CoV seropositive dromedary camels can still be re-infected in 91 the presence of high antibody titers (15). Similarly, there are reports of waning of S1-92 specific and neutralising antibodies in SARS-CoV infection (16). These instances of 93 low or no antibody responses by traditional serological approaches may lead to an 94 underestimation of asymptomatic and mild infection, and threaten the success of a 95 potential vaccine that targets the S1 alone. Therefore, a broader landscape of 96 antibody responses to a range of viral proteins needs to be assessed to better detect 97 the immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 infection to improve the understanding of 98 pathogenesis and immunity.

99 The Luciferase Immunoprecipitation system (LIPS) assay allows for a comprehensive 100 understanding of the antibody immune response against infectious agents (17) by the 101 expression of any protein or antigen as a recombinant Renilla luciferase (Ruc)-102 antigen fusion. The LIPS technique has previously been used to distinguish infected 103 versus vaccinated cases for influenza due to the presence of antibodies against non-104 structural proteins (18), and to characterize human infections by zoonotic spill over 105 from bat viruses (19). In this study, we used LIPS to assess the acute and 106 convalescent antibody responses to a panel of 15 potential SARS-CoV-2 antigens: 107 the 4 structural proteins (S, N, M and E), 3 S subunits (S1, S2, S2'), the 7 available 108 ORFs (ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10) and 1 relevant NSP within ORF1a/b (NSP1) 109 (20). Our data reports the most extensive landscape of antibody responses of 110 COVID-19 patients reported to date.

111 **RESULTS**

112 We made a panel of fifteen SARS-CoV-2 ORFs as Renilla luciferase-antigen fusion 113 proteins to assess the humoral immune responses in 15 COVID-19 infected patients 114 from Hong Kong compared with a panel of healthy negative controls using LIPS. The 115 four SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins show high amino-acid sequence homology with 116 SARS-CoV but not with other human coronaviruses responsible for common colds 117 (Supplementary Table 1). We detected significantly higher antibody responses to the 118 full Spike protein (S), the Nucleoprotein (N) and the Membrane protein (M) in COVID-119 19 patients compared to healthy negative controls (p <0.0001, p=0.023, and 120 p=0.0116 respectively, Figure 1bcd). COVID-19 patients did not show any increased 121 production of Envelope (E) antibodies (Figure 1e) compared to healthy negative 122 controls (p=0.0591, Figure 1d).

We confirmed our results by traditional IgG ELISA, which correlated well with LIPS LU responses (R2=0.5289) for full-S (Supplementary figure 1ab). N-specific IgG by ELISA is also elevated in COVID-19 patients (Supplementary figure 1c) but does not correlate strongly with LIPS results (Supplementary figure 1d).

127 The S1 subunit, a key virus immunogen, detected significantly higher 128 antibodies in COVID-19 patients than negative controls (5191+/-1469 LU versus 129 4003+/-1062 LU, p=0.0288, Figure 2a). Interestingly, there was no difference in the 130 antibodies to S2 in the LIPS assay between COVID-19 patients and negative controls 131 (p=0.5683). Antibodies to the S2' cleaved subunit were significantly higher in COVID-132 19 patients (p=0.0391 for S2', Figure 2) but the overall in antibody levels between the 133 groups was considerable. Patients with higher SARS-CoV-2 micro neutralization 134 (MN) titers (>160 reciprocal serum dilution) also had higher responses towards full-S

by LIPS, whilst there was no difference observed in LIPS responses to subunits S1,

136 S2 and S2' in high or low MN COVID-19 patients (Figure 2c, p=0.0049).

We next investigated the presence of antibodies specific to previously uncharacterized ORFS to the SARS-CoV-2. As we could not produce the full ORF1ab due to its extended length (>21,000 bp, (1)), we cloned and expressed a representative antigen, non-structural protein 1 (NSP1). Bioinformatic predictions have revealed a putative role for NSP1 in suppressing the antiviral host response (8).

142 We used LIPS to detect antibodies specific to NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF6, 143 ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF8 and ORF10 (Figure 3). COVID-19 patients had significantly 144 higher NSP1-antibody levels compared to negative controls (mean of 5301+/-854.7 145 LU versus 3683+/-726.4 LU, p<0.0001, Figure 3a). Furthermore, significantly higher antibody levels in COVID-19 patients were detected towards ORF3a, ORF3b, 146 147 ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF8 (p=0.0302, p<0.0001, p<0.0001, p=0.0019, p<0.0001, 148 Figure 3b, c, e, f, g). The largest difference between COVID-19 and negative controls 149 in mean antibody signals among the ORFs was observed for ORF3b (7712+/-2947 150 LU versus 3599+/-1029 LU) and ORF8 (16933+/-7489 LU versus 5440+/-1096 LU) 151 (Figure 3c and g). Meanwhile there was no significant difference between COVID-19 152 patients and negative controls for ORF6 and ORF10 antigens (Figure 3d and h).

Globally, among the antibody responses tested in our LIPS assay, we detected significant levels of antibodies specific to 11 antigens: N, M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF6 in the COVID-19 population (Table 1) at all time-points of infection from day 4 to day 22 (see below in Figure 4 for early timepoint detection). We did not detect a significant production of antibodies to 4 of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens tested: E, S2, ORF6 and ORF10 proteins.

Comparison of the global SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses from 15 COVID-19 patients reveals that anti-N antibodies dominate the humoral response detected by LIPS (Figure 3i), whilst other antigens make lower and similar contributions to the magnitude anti-SARS-Cov-2 antibody responses (Figure 5a).

163

164 Absence of sex- and age- effect in our cohort

Epidemiological data from many countries suggest that men develop more severe COVID-19 related symptoms than women (21). We therefore evaluated the effect of gender in our cohort of COVID-19 patients for antibody responses and found no difference across all antigenic targets tested (p=0.6289, Supplementary Figure 2a). Similarly, the SARS-CoV-2 antibody response was comparable between patients aged below and above 60 years old (p=0.9363, Supplementary Figure 2b).

171

172 Combined antigen test panels as a potential diagnostic tool for COVID-19

173 We found significantly higher levels of 11 of the 15 antigens tested in the COVID-19 174 populations. Next, their ability to correctly identify COVID-19 patients was 175 determined. Therefore, a cut-off value of LIPS antibody signals, based on the mean 176 plus three standard deviations of the healthy negative control group (22-24), was 177 calculated for each of these 11 antigens, along with the sensitivity and specificity of 178 each test (Table 3, and Figure 4). The cut-off value of all 11 tests showed a high 179 specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 LIPS assays with no samples from the negative 180 control group being above the cut-off. On the other hand, 8 antigens showed a low 181 sensitivity (below 75% for M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF7a, ORF7b, Figure 4b), 182 hence being insufficient to correctly identify all the COVID-19 patients with high rates 183 of false negatives (Table 3), limiting their use for LIPS diagnostics. On the other

hand, the N, ORF3b and ORF8 antigens showed good sensitivity levels of 93.3%, 86.6% and 100% respectively (Table 3). Of note, ORF8 is the only of the 11 tests to correctly identify all COVID-19 patients including at day 4 after onset of illness (Figure 4a).

188 As many LIPS tests showed low sensitivity, we then used an approach based on the 189 combination of LIPS antibody LU signals for the 11 separate SARS-CoV-2 antigen 190 tests to efficiently detect SARS-CoV-2 exposure in this population (22-24). This 191 approach of combining the LU values from the 11 LIPS tests increased the sensitivity 192 to 100% for the diagnosis of COVID-19 infections during acute infection (Figure 5a, 193 blue dots for <14 days). Furthermore, combination of only 3 LIPS tests, those for 194 anti-N, ORF3b and ORF8 antibodies, also has a 100% sensitivity and specificity 195 (Figure 5b and Table 3). As ORF3b and ORF8 show the lowest homology to previous 196 SARS-CoV among all the viral proteins (8), we also looked separately at the 197 combination of responses towards ORF3b and ORF8 (Figure 5c). We observed the 198 same trend as above with all COVID-19 patients having a combined score above the 199 cut-off and all negative controls having a combined score below, and all early time-200 points being correctly detected (Figure 4c). By combining only the 3 relevant Spike 201 protein LIPS tests (S, S1, S2'), the sensitivity of the LIPS test drastically decreased to 202 26.6% as only 4 of the 15 COVID-19 patients had a total combined LU above the cut-203 off (Figure 5d). Interestingly all samples from early time-points (day 4 to day 13) had 204 LU signals under the cut-off value for S+S1+S2' (blue dots, Figure 5d). The 205 magnitude of the 11 relevant antigens, N+ORF3b+ORF8, as well as ORF3b+ORF8 206 responses significantly increase the detection of patients with early time-points 207 samples (Figure 5e, f). Therefore, the combinational use of ORF3b and ORF8 tests

alone could be sufficient to detect COVID-19 exposed subjects at any time-point ofinfection.

210 Because endemic HCoVs are ubiquitous, the negative control plasma samples are 211 likely to have antibodies to a range of HCoVs. Sequence homology with other HCoV 212 could result in the detection of cross-reactive antibodies by LIPS and reduce 213 specificity of serological assays. Structural proteins of SARS-CoV-2 with other HCoV 214 structural proteins only share 18 to 40% homology (Supplementary table 1), making 215 potential cross-reactivity of existing antibodies unlikely and undetermined. Whilst 216 SARS-Cov-2 and SARS-CoV, N and S share 94% and 76% conservation 217 (Supplementary table 1), previous reports showed the lowest homology for ORF3b 218 and ORF8 at 32% and 40% amino acid homology respectively (8), making them the 219 most unique genes to SARS-CoV2.

220 To investigate specificity of the antibody responses to the panel of antigens, we 221 subtracted the mean LU levels of healthy negative controls from the mean LU of 222 COVID-19 infected patients and compared this difference across each antigen 223 (Figure 5b). We found that this difference was significantly higher for the N-specific 224 antibody response compared to all the other relevant antibody responses (M, S, S1, 225 S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b, and ORF8) (p<0.0001, Figure 5b), 226 highlighting a possible dominance and specificity of N across the SARS-CoV-2 227 humoral immune responses. Besides N, the ORF8 and ORF3b also appear to be 228 important antigenic targets (Figure 5h, i). Statistical analysis (ANOVA) revealed that 229 ORF8 was significantly increased compared to all other antigens (p<0.0001 versus 230 10 remaining antigens: M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, 7a, and 7b, Figure 5bc). 231 Whilst results for ORF3b were significant against the remaining 8 antigens (M, S, S1,

S2', NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, and 7b), excluding ORF7a (Figure 5c). Therefore, ORF3b
and ORF8 are newly identified as specific and unique antigenic targets.

234

235 **DISCUSSION**

236 SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing is an important component of the options for diagnosis 237 of recent and past COVID-19 infection. Antibody tests are crucial for determining 238 infection attack rates in the population, population immunity and inform vaccine 239 development. We report, for the first time, the detection of antibody responses 240 directed against an extensive spectrum of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens. Several 241 approaches have been developed to measure SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies, 242 including micro neutralization assays (virus or pseudo virus-based (25)), ELISA 243 assays (11,26). immunofluorescence (7),colloidal gold-based 244 immunochromatographic assays (27), and peptide/protein microarray (28) (29). 245 Using LIPS technology with crude lysates from transfected cells, we have screened 246 all the structural proteins along with all the ORFs of the SARS-CoV-2 virus (NSP1 247 only for ORF1ab) to identify new and unique antigenic targets of the humoral immune 248 response of COVID-19 patients.

Among the 15 proteins tested for antibody specificity, 11 antigens showed 249 250 significantly higher responses in the COVID-19 patients compared to healthy pre-251 pandemic negative controls. For the Spike subunits, only antibodies to S1 and S2' 252 were elevated in COVID-19 patients by our LIPS test, and S2 responses were not 253 significantly different from the control group. The trimer S conformation and 254 maturation of viral particles by the cleavage of S2 during virus endocytosis to form 255 the S2' fusion peptide may result in a difference in their antigenicity. Patients with 256 higher MN titer had correspondingly higher levels of full-Spike LIPS and ELISA

results, establishing consistency among assays for the full-S protein. N antibody
 responses detected were also elevated in patients, but the correlation between LIPS
 and ELISA N antibody assays was lower.

260 We next cloned all the available ORFs of the virus ORF1ab (as NSP1 only), ORF3a, 261 ORF3b, ORF6, ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF8 and ORF10, to acquire more extensive 262 information of the immunogenic targets of the virus. We found that 6 of these 8 ORFs 263 induced a humoral immune response in the patients (NSP1 (ORF1ab), ORF3a, 264 ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF8). Furthermore, by calculating a cut-off value 265 based on the mean of the negative population + 3 standard deviations, we could 266 ascertain that only 3 out of these 11 antigens were useful in diagnostic tests with high 267 performance: N, ORF3b, and ORF8. By using the combined results of several 268 antibody signals and calculating a cut-off value for these responses, we found that 269 the sum of the 11 relevant antibody tests was highly sensitive and specific. Moreover, 270 combining only the 3 of the most informative and sensitive antigens, N, ORF3b and 271 ORF8, we achieved a sensitivity and specificity of 100%, correctly identifying all the 272 COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. A larger data set from COVID-19 273 patients and negative controls is needed to further refine and confirm the 274 performance of our test (30).

The Spike protein is responsible for virus entry into host cells and is the main antigen that elicits neutralizing antibodies (10). Whilst we detected significant differences in the magnitude of responses by LIPS between patients and controls for S, S1 and S2', these antigens did not show high sensitivity levels, especially for sera collected early post disease onset. The Spike protein is a trimer on the surface of virions, and the conformation of our Ruc-S antigen should be assessed by conformation dependent monoclonal antibodies to confirm whether the conformation of S protein in

our assay is well retained for antibody binding and affinity (31). Further LIPS tests using the S RBD antigen alone are underway to assess the proportion of RBDspecific antibodies as an important target of neutralizing antibodies (31). The S protein also elicits non-neutralizing antibodies targeted to conserved epitopes (11), and among our cohort an absence of *in vitro* neutralization has been observed for some patients, especially at early time-points.

The combination of multiple antigens by LIPS beyond the Spike could be the basis for supplementary serological tests useful to determine SARS-CoV-2 exposure to overcome false negative results. We found that the single test detection of N, S or ORF3b antibodies at early time-points (day 4 to day 14) results in a high proportion of false negative results, whilst the minimal combination of N+ORF3b+ORF8 LIPS tests is highly sensitive and specific.

294 Importantly, ORF3b and ORF8 are the least identical proteins to SARS-CoV (8), and they do not exist in other strains of human coronaviruses. However very little is 295 296 known about their function and expression. Previous reports found the ORF3b of 297 SARS-CoV plays an important role in the interaction with the innate immune system 298 through inhibition of type 1 Interferon synthesis (33). In SARS-CoV, ORF8 has been 299 shown to accumulate in the Endoplasmic Reticulum and mediate cell death by 300 autophagy (32). In SARS-CoV-2, the functions of these ORFs have yet to be 301 determined. Importantly, ORF8 can only be found in human and bat SARS-like CoV 302 (35), and in our results we observed very low background detection in negative 303 control plasma resulting in highly specific results. However, there are recent reports 304 of the deletion of ORF8 in a few Singaporean COVID-19 patients (34) but this is not 305 reported elsewhere. Whilst ORF8-deletion SARS-CoV-2 viruses had reduced 306 replicative fitness, this issue may undermine the utility of ORF8 alone in serological

307 testing. In addition, NSP1 and ORF7a LIPS tests showed high significance for 308 COVID-19 patients. Though little is known about their function, bioinformatic 309 predictions reveal that both NSP1 and ORF7a could be involved in suppressing the 310 antiviral host response (6, 8). Therefore, the combined use of multiple antigens that 311 are sensitive and specific is needed for diagnostic serology.

312 Most commercially available or published serological tests use only the S antigen, 313 with a few using both the S and N antigens (11, 36, 37). Using extensive testing of 314 the virus antigens, we have shown that additional targets are important for early 315 detection of antibody responses and identification of COVID-19 patients. Potential 316 cross-reactivity of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with other coronaviruses antibodies 317 cannot be excluded, but several recent data report that this cross-reactivity is minimal 318 (26). Therefore, the approach of combining several relevant antigens that are unique 319 to SARS-CoV-2, and immunogenic boosting specific antibodies would overcome 320 issues of cross-reactivity and increase the sensitivity of serological assays. 321 Screening of additional negative pre-pandemic samples with our LIPS approach is 322 needed to refine issues of cross-reactivity with other HCoV. The high orders of 323 magnitude and range of antibody quantity measured by our SARS-CoV-2 LIPS assay 324 is an advantage compared to ELISA Optical Density measurements. These 325 advantages may help with the rapid screening of recovered COVID-19 patients for 326 elevated antibodies to donate serum for the treatment of other patients by passive 327 transfer (38).

Our study does not report on antibody functions and data on Fc mediated functions of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies are also still lacking (39). Therefore, Fc mediated functions of antibodies directed against internal proteins from ORF3b and ORF8 will be the focus of future studies. Furthermore, only IgG is bound to the protein A/G

used in the LIPS assays, therefore the use of protein L that binds the light chain of all
immunoglobulins could be of interest to detect IgM early responses in future
investigations. The E, S2, ORF6 and ORF10 antibodies did not show elevated levels
in COVID-19 patients in our assay, consistent with the findings of Wang H. *et al.* by
microarray (29). Further confirmation is needed using additional experimental
approaches before excluding their utility.

338 Our study is limited by small sample size and by the small number of sera collected 339 in the first few days after onset of symptoms. The absence of paired samples from 340 multiple time-points for the same patients is also a limitation. Longitudinal studies are 341 needed to further assess kinetics of antibody responses, especially to identify early 342 antibody responses for rapid diagnostic tests. The inclusion of additional time points, 343 greater sample size and asymptomatic cases are necessary to test the cut-off 344 sensitivity scores; and to confirm the diagnostic value of our LIPS assays and the 345 relevancy of ORF3b and ORF8 antibodies. Late-convalescent sera are needed to 346 assess antibody waning. We also need to investigate antibody profiles with disease 347 severity.

348 In conclusion, we found that COVID-19 patients not only produce antibodies to the 349 Spike protein, but also to other structural and non-structural proteins. The 350 nucleoprotein, and then ORF8, and ORF3 show an immunodominant and specific 351 humoral response compared with other SARS-CoV-2 antigenic targets tested. The 352 combined use of N+ORF3b+ORF8 provides a sensitive and specific method for the 353 detection of all COVID-19 patients in our cohort even at early time-points, whilst the 354 Spike protein does not. Our results provide insights into the overall spectrum of 355 antibody responses associated with COVID-19. We still need to investigate whether 356 antigens other than the virus spike confer protection. Such information will help

- 357 prioritize antigen targets for vaccine development, monoclonal antibody reagents and
- 358 detecting early responses to infection.

360 Methods

361 **Patients and samples collection**

362 Our study enrolled a total of 26 patients with RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19 infection 363 (Table 1). Fifteen patients were enrolled in Hong Kong (China, SAR) and all of them 364 provided informed consent. The study was approved by the institutional review board 365 of the Hong Kong West Cluster of the Hospital Authority of Hong Kong (approval 366 number: UW20-169). Plasma samples were collected from heparinized blood, and 367 heat-inactivated at 56°C, 30 mins. Gender- and age-matched plasma samples from 368 healthy subjects collected before the COVID-19 pandemic were used as negative 369 controls.

370

371 SARS-CoV-2 gene cloning

372 Based on previous studies describing the structure of the SARS-CoV-2 genome (1, 373 8), an extensive panel of 12 proteins (S, E, M, N, NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8, 10) 374 was chosen for antibody testing by LIPS. Primers for the amplification of SARS-CoV-375 2 proteins were designed (See protein ID in Table 1, and primers sequences in 376 Supplementary table 2). A RT-PCR was performed using extracted SARS-CoV-2 377 vRNA to amplify target genes corresponding to Structural and Non-structural proteins 378 of the virus (Table 1, (6)) using Platinum SuperScriptIII One Step RT-PCR system. 379 The bands were then extracted using Qiagen gel extraction kit (Qiagen, Germany) 380 and digested with BamHI and Notl or KpnI-HF and XhoI (New England Biolabs, 381 USA). Extracted products were ligated using T4 DNA ligase (New England Biolabs) 382 into the pREN2 plasmid (from Peter Burbelo NDICR, NIH). Plasmids were 383 transformed using DH10B competent cells and purified using PureYield Plasmid 384 midi-prep system (Promega).

385

386 SARS-CoV-2 (Ruc)-antigen expression

Constructs with pREN2-Renilla luciferase plasmid containing the SARS-CoV-2 antigen of interest were transfected into Cos1 cells using Fugene 6 (Promega) as per manufacturer's instructions. Cells were harvested 48 hours later, lysed and sonicated, and (Ruc)-antigen yields were measured using a Luminometer plate reader (PerkinElmer) according to the protocol of Burbelo *et al.* (20).

392

393 Measurement of antibody responses using Luciferase Immunoprecipitation

394 System (LIPS)

395 The LIPS assays were performed following the protocol of Burbelo et al., with the 396 following modifications (20). Briefly, (Ruc)-antigen (1e7 per well) and plasma (heat 397 inactivated and diluted 1:100) were incubated for 2 hours with shaking at 800rpm. 398 Ultralink protein A/G beads were added to the (Ruc)-antigen and serum mixture in a 399 96-deep-well polypropylene microtiter plate and incubated for 2 hours with shaking at 400 800rpm. The entire volume was then transferred into HTS plates and washed as 401 previously described. The plate was read using QUANTI-Luc Gold substrate 402 (Invivogen, rep-glcg5) as per manufacturer's instructions and a MicroBeta JET 403 luminometer (PerkinElmer). Experimental controls include blank wells with antigens 404 and negative control serum from age matched non-infected patient plasma collected 405 prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

406

407

408 Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay

409 ELISA assays were performed with the available SARS-CoV-2 proteins Spike 410 (S1+S2) and Nucleoprotein (N) proteins. Briefly, recombinant S and N proteins 411 (Sinobiological) were coated on 96-well flat-bottom immunosorbent plates (Nunc 412 Immuno MaxiSorp, Roskilde, Denmark) at a concentration of 100 ng/ml, in 100/µl 413 coating buffer (PBS with 53% Na₂CO₃ and 42% NaHCO₃, pH 9.6) at 4°C overnight. 414 An additional plate coated with a non-specific protein (blocking buffer, PBS with 5%) 415 FBS) was used to measure the background binding of each sample. Following FBS 416 blocking and thorough washing, diluted plasma samples (1:100) were bound for 417 2 hours, further washed and then detected by an anti-human Ig secondary antibody 418 labelled with HRP specific for IgG (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA).

419

420 Microneutralization assay

421 Plasma samples were diluted in serial two-fold dilutions commencing with a dilution 422 of 1:10, and mixed with equal volumes of SARS-CoV-2 at a dose of 200 tissue 423 culture infective doses 50% (TCID₅₀) determined by Vero E6 cells respectively. After 424 1 hour of incubation at 37°C, 35µl of the virus-serum mixture was added in 425 quadruplicate to Vero or Vero E6 cell monolayers in 96-well microtiter plates. After 1 426 hour of adsorption, the virus-serum mixture was removed and replaced with 150ul of 427 virus growth medium in each well. The plates were incubated for 3 days at 37°C in 428 5% CO₂ in a humidified incubator. Cytopathic effect was observed at day 3 post-429 inoculation. The highest plasma dilution protecting 50% of the replicate wells was 430 denoted as the neutralizing antibody titer. A virus back-titration of the input virus was 431 included in each batch of tests.

432

433 Multiple alignments of Coronaviruses

Multiple amino acid alignments of structural proteins from HKU1 (AY597011.2),
HCoV-229E (AF304460.1), HCoV-OC43 (AY391777.1) and HCoV-NL63
(AY567487.2) were compared versus SARS-CoV-2 (MN908947) using CLUSTAL
2.1.

438

439 Statistics

- 440 GraphPad Prism 6 software (San Diego, CA) was used for statistical analysis.
- 441 Antibody levels are presented as the geometric mean +/- standard deviation (stdev).
- 442 For the calculation of sensitivity and specificity, cut-off limits for each antigen were
- 443 derived from the mean value plus three standard deviations of the controls. Non-
- 444 parametric Mann-Whitney U tests were used to compare the antibody levels
- between COVID-19 and negative groups, using the GraphPad 8 Prism software.

446 **Competing interests**

- 447 A Hachim, N Kavian, LLM Poon, JSM Peiris and SA Valkenburg have filed a patent
- 448 application on the basis of the invention described in this study.
- 449

450 Acknowledgements

- 451 This study was partly supported by the Research Grants Scheme (GRF 17113718).
- 452 We thank Linfa Wang (Duke NUS, Singapore) for technical advice for establishing
- the LIPS assay.

454 **References**

455 1. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, et al. A new coronavirus 456 associated with human respiratory disease in China. Nature. 2020;579(7798):265-9. 457 Poon LLM, Peiris M. Emergence of a novel human coronavirus threatening 2. human health. Nat Med. 2020;26(3):317-9. 458 459 Amanat F, Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines: Status Report. Immunity. 3. 2020. 460 461 4. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, Xiang TX, Le A, Liu JM, et al. Viral dynamics in mild 462 and severe cases of COVID-19. Lancet Infect Dis. 2020. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation 463 5. 464 reports 2020 [Available from: https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-465 coronavirus-2019/situation-reports Zhang C, Zheng W, Huang X, Bell EW, Zhou X, Zhang Y. Protein Structure 466 6. 467 and Sequence Reanalysis of 2019-nCoV Genome Refutes Snakes as Its Intermediate Host and the Unique Similarity between Its Spike Protein Insertions and 468 469 HIV-1. J Proteome Res. 2020;19(4):1351-60. 470 7. Thevarajan I, Nguyen THO, Koutsakos M, Druce J, Caly L, van de Sandt CE, 471 et al. Breadth of concomitant immune responses prior to patient recovery: a case 472 report of non-severe COVID-19. Nat Med. 2020;26(4):453-5. 473 Chan JF, Kok KH, Zhu Z, Chu H, To KK, Yuan S, et al. Genomic 8. 474 characterization of the 2019 novel human-pathogenic coronavirus isolated from a 475 patient with atypical pneumonia after visiting Wuhan. Emerg Microbes Infect. 476 2020;9(1):221-36. 477 9. Walls AC, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Wall A, McGuire AT, Veesler D. Structure, 478 Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. Cell. 2020. 479 10. Paules CI, Marston HD, Fauci AS. Coronavirus Infections-More Than Just the 480 Common Cold. JAMA. 2020. 481 Huibin Lv NCW, Owen Tak-Yin Tsang, Meng Yuan, Ranawaka A. P. M. 11. 482 Perera, Wai Shing Leung, Ray T. Y. So, Jacky Man Chun Chan, Garrick K. Yip, 483 Thomas Shiu Hong Chik, Yiquan Wang, Chris Yau Chung Choi, Yihan Lin, Wilson W. 484 Ng, Jincun Zhao, Leo L. M. Poon, J. S. Malik Peiris, Ian A. Wilson, Chris K. P. Mok. 485 Cross-reactive antibody response between SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV infections. 486 bioRxiv. 2020. 487 12. Thevarajan I, Nguyen THO, Koutsakos M, Druce J, Caly L, van de Sandt CE, 488 et al. Breadth of concomitant immune responses prior to patient recovery: a case 489 report of non-severe COVID-19. Nature Medicine. 2020. 490 13. Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, Wang Q, Chen J, Xia S, et al. Neutralizing antibody 491 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their 492 implications. medRxiv. 2020:2020.03.30.20047365. 493 14. Choe PG, Perera R, Park WB, Song KH, Bang JH, Kim ES, et al. MERS-CoV 494 Antibody Responses 1 Year after Symptom Onset, South Korea, 2015. Emerg Infect 495 Dis. 2017;23(7):1079-84. 496 Hemida MG, Chu DK, Poon LL, Perera RA, Alhammadi MA, Ng HY, et al. 15. 497 MERS coronavirus in dromedary camel herd, Saudi Arabia. Emerg Infect Dis. 498 2014;20(7):1231-4. 499 Channappanavar R, Zhao J, Perlman S. T cell-mediated immune response to 16. 500 respiratory coronaviruses. Immunol Res. 2014;59(1-3):118-28. 501 17. Burbelo PD, Goldman R, Mattson TL. A simplified immunoprecipitation method 502 for quantitatively measuring antibody responses in clinical sera samples by using

503 mammalian-produced Renilla luciferase-antigen fusion proteins. BMC Biotechnol. 504 2005;5:22. 505 18. Robertson AH, Mahic M, Savic M, Tunheim G, Hungnes O, Trogstad L, et al. 506 Detection of anti-NS1 antibodies after pandemic influenza exposure: Evaluation of a 507 serological method for distinguishing H1N1pdm09 infected from vaccinated cases. 508 Influenza Other Respir Viruses, 2020. 509 19. Uehara A, Tan CW, Mani S, Chua KB, Leo YS, Anderson DE, et al. 510 Serological evidence of human infection by bat orthoreovirus in Singapore. J Med 511 Virol. 2019;91(4):707-10. 512 20. Burbelo PD, Ching KH, Klimavicz CM, ladarola MJ. Antibody profiling by 513 Luciferase Immunoprecipitation Systems (LIPS). J Vis Exp. 2009(32). 514 21. Conti P, Younes A. Coronavirus COV-19/SARS-CoV-2 affects women less 515 than men: clinical response to viral infection. J Biol Regul Homeost Agents. 516 2020;34(2). 517 Burbelo PD, Keller J, Wagner J, Klimavicz JS, Bayat A, Rhodes CS, et al. 22. 518 Serological diagnosis of pulmonary Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection by LIPS 519 using a multiple antigen mixture. BMC Microbiol. 2015;15:205. 520 Frey A, Di Canzio J, Zurakowski D. A statistically defined endpoint titer 23. 521 determination method for immunoassays. J Immunol Methods. 1998;221(1-2):35-41. 522 24. Burbelo PD, Chaturvedi A, Notkins AL, Gunti S. Luciferase-Based Detection of 523 Antibodies for the Diagnosis of HPV-Associated Head and Neck Squamous Cell 524 Carcinoma. Diagnostics (Basel). 2019;9(3). 525 25. Nie J, Li Q, Wu J, Zhao C, Hao H, Liu H, et al. Establishment and validation of 526 a pseudovirus neutralization assay for SARS-CoV-2. Emerg Microbes Infect. 527 2020;9(1):680-6. 528 26. Fatima Amanat DS, Shirin Strohmeier, Thi Nguyen, Veronika Chromikova, 529 Meagan McMahon, Kaijun Jiang, Guha Asthagiri-Arunkumar, Denise Jurczyszak, 530 Jose Polanco, Maria Bermudez-Gonzalez, Giulio Kleiner, Teresa Aydillo, Lisa Miorin, 531 Daniel Fierer, Luz Amarilis Lugo, Erna Milunka Kojic, Jonathan Stoever, Sean T.H. 532 Liu, Charlotte Cunningham-Rundles, Philip L. Felgner, Daniel Caplivski, Adolfo 533 Garcia-Sastre, Allen Cheng, Katherine Kedzierska, Olli Vapalahti, Jussi Hepojoki, 534 Viviana Simon, Florian Krammer, Thomas Moran. A serological assay to detect 535 SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. medRxiv. 2020. 536 27. Pan Y, Li X, Yang G, Fan J, Tang Y, Zhao J, et al. Serological 537 immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with SARS-CoV-2 infected COVID-538 19 patients. medRxiv. 2020. 539 28. Christine Dahlke JH. Robin Kobbe, Rene Santer, Till Koch, Anahita Fathi, My 540 L. Ly, Stefan Schmiedel, Peter H. Seeberger, ID-UKE COVID-19 study group, 541 Marylyn M. Addo, Felix F. Loeffler. Distinct early IgA profile may determine severity 542 of COVID-19 symptoms: an immunological case series. medRxiv. 2020. 543 29. Hongye Wang XH, Xian Wu, Te Liang, Xiaomei Zhang, Dan Wang, Fei Teng, 544 Jiayu Dai, Hu Duan, Shubin Guo, Yongzhe Li, Xiaobo Yu. SARS-CoV-2 proteome 545 microarray for mapping COVID-19 antibody interactions at amino acid resolution. 546 bioRxiv. 2020. 547 30. Bujang MA, Adnan TH. Requirements for Minimum Sample Size for Sensitivity 548 and Specificity Analysis. J Clin Diagn Res. 2016;10(10):YE01-YE6. 549 31. Yuan M, Wu NC, Zhu X, Lee CD, So RTY, Lv H, et al. A highly conserved 550 cryptic epitope in the receptor-binding domains of SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV.

551 Science. 2020.

- 552 32. McBride R, Fielding BC. The role of severe acute respiratory syndrome
- 553 (SARS)-coronavirus accessory proteins in virus pathogenesis. Viruses.
- 554 2012;4(11):2902-23.
- 555 33. Shi CS, Nabar NR, Huang NN, Kehrl JH. SARS-Coronavirus Open Reading
- 556 Frame-8b triggers intracellular stress pathways and activates NLRP3
- 557 inflammasomes. Cell Death Discov. 2019;5:101.
- 558 34. Yvonne CF Su DEA, Barnaby E Young, Feng Zhu, Martin Linster, Shirin
- 559 Kalimuddin, Jenny GH Low, Zhuang Yan, Jayanthi Jayakumar, Louisa Sun, Gabriel Z
- 560 Yan, Ian H Mendenhall, Yee-Sin Leo, David Chien Lye, Lin-Fa Wang, Gavin JD
- 561 Smith. Discovery of a 382-nt deletion during the early evolution of SARS-CoV-2.
- 562 bioRxiv. 2020.
- 563 35. Cui J, Li F, Shi ZL. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. Nat Rev 564 Microbiol. 2019;17(3):181-92.
- 565 36. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, Zheng XS, Yang XL, Hu B, et al. Molecular and
- serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple
 shedding routes. Emerg Microbes Infect. 2020;9(1):386-9.
- 568 37. Nisreen M.A. Okba MAM, Wentao Li, Chunyan Wang, Corine H.
- 569 GeurtsvanKessel, Victor M. Corman, Mart M. Lamers, Reina S. Sikkema, Erwin de
- 570 Bruin, Felicity D. Chandler, Yazdan Yazdanpanah, Quentin Le Hingrat, Diane
- 571 Descamps, Nadhira Houhou-Fidouh, Chantal B. E. M. Reusken, Berend-Jan Bosch,
- 572 Christian Drosten, Marion P.G. Koopmans, Bart L. Haagmans. SARS-CoV-2 specific 573 antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. bioRxiv. 2020.
- 574 38. Casadevall A, Pirofski LA. The convalescent sera option for containing 575 COVID-19. J Clin Invest. 2020;130(4):1545-8.
- 576 39. Fu Y, Cheng Y, Wu Y. Understanding SARS-CoV-2-Mediated Inflammatory
- 577 Responses: From Mechanisms to Potential Therapeutic Tools. Virol Sin. 2020.
- 578

Table 1. List of ORFs produced as Renilla-Antigen fusion protein

Antigen	Full name	Patient response	
Ν	Nucleocapsid	Yes	
М	Membrane	Yes	
Е	Envelope	No	
S	Spike	Yes	
S1	Spike S1 subunit	Yes	
S2	Spike S2 subunit	No	
S2'	Spike S2 subunit	Yes	
NSP1 (in ORF1a/b)	-	Yes	
ORF3a	-	Yes	
ORF3b	-	Yes	
ORF6	-	No	
ORF7a	-	Yes	
ORF7b	-	Yes	
ORF8	-	Yes	
ORF10	-	No	

Patient				
number	gender	age	sample day	SARS-COV-2 MIN LITERS
1	М	56	6	<1:10
2	F	62	4	<1:10
3	М	47	8	1/80
4	F	72	10	1/40
5	М	56	13	1/320
6	Μ	72	18	1/80
7	F	37	15	1/80
8	F	73	18	1/80
9	F	55	11	<1:10
10	М	64	19	1/320
11	F	63	19	1/640
12	Μ	60	22	1/160
13	Μ	37	14	1/320
14	F	62	22	1/160
15	Μ	63	22	1/80

Table 2. Hong Kong COVID-19 infected patient information

586 **Table 3**. Cut-off value, sensitivity, specificity, and Positive/Negative Predictive Values

587 for: each of the 11 relevant SARS-CoV-2 antigens tests, as well as the sums of the

588 11 relevant antigens, N+ORF3b+ORF8, ORF3b+ORF8, and S+S1+S2' tests.

Antigen	Cut-off	sensitivity	specificity	Positive predictive	Negative predictive
	value			value (PPV)	value (NPV)
Ν	46133	93.3%	100%	100%	93.75%
Μ	8684	0%	100%	0%	50%
S	4333	33.3%	100%	100%	60%
S1	7189	13.3%	100%	100%	53.57%
S2'	7635	0%	100%	0%	50%
NSP1	5862	20%	100%	100%	55.56%
ORF3a	9925	25%	100%	100%	55.56%
ORF3b	6686	86.6%	100%	100%	88.24%
ORF7a	7394	33.3%	100%	100%	60%
ORF7b	3355	13.3%	100%	100%	53.57%
ORF8	8728	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of the 11 relevant tests	73323	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of N+ORF3b+ORF8	22101	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of ORF3b+ORF8	13280	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of S+S1+S2'	17134	26.67%	100%	100%	57.69%



Figure 1. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins antibodies by LIPS. (a) SARS-CoV-2 genome ORF organisation (not to scale). (b-e) Antibodies against the four SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins Spike (S), Nucleocapsid (N), Membrane (M), Envelope (E) were measured by LIPS from COVID-19 patients, and age matched negative controls. Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. P values were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. * shows statistical significance between COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. ns, p=0.0591 *p<0.05, **p<0.01.

2000

0

COND'19

Negative

5000

0

COMD-19

Negative

5'

UTR





Figure 2. LIPS detection of antibody levels to the SARS-CoV-2 S protein subunits. (a) Antibodies against the S subunits S1, S2, and S2' by LIPS from COVID-19 patients and negative controls. (b) Full S, S1, S2, S2' antibodies LIPS responses in COVID-19 patients with low microneutralization (MN) titers (<160) versus high MN titers (\geq 160). (c) Full S antibodies LIPS responses in COVID-19 patients with low ELISA S IgG responses (<1) versus high ELISA IgG responses (\geq 1). Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. P values were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. * shows statistical significance between COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. *p<0.05, **p<0.01.







Figure 4. Sensitivity of LIPS tests for potential diagnostic use. (a) Cut-off values for the 11 relevant LIPS tests (dotted line) were calculated as mean of negatives + 3 Stdev. Early time-points (<day 14) COVID-19 samples are shown by the blue dots. Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). The red dotted line in ORF8 represents a 100% sensitivity and specificity. Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. (b) Sensitivity and specificity performances of the 11 LIPS tests.



Figure 5. Combining LIPS tests as a diagnostic tool for COVID-19. Cumulative antibody LIPS levels to the SARS-CoV-2 antigens in COVID-19 patients and negative controls, for (a) 11 relevant antigens (N, M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF10) (b) three most sensitive antigens (N, ORF3b, and ORF8), (c) selective antigens (ORF3b, and ORF8), and (d) 3 S relevant antigens (S, S1, S2'). (e-f) Detection of early time-points patients only with the sum of (e) 11 relevant Antigens and (f) three most sensitive antigens (N+ORF3b+ORF8). Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). The cut-off value of the sums is shown by the dotted line and was based on the mean + three stdev of the negative control group. Blue dots represents COVID-19 patients data points prior to day 14. (h-i) Differences of the antibody response means between COVID-19 and negative control populations as (h) scatter plot including the 11 relevant antigens, and as (i) pie chart excluding N. Each symbol represents the mean +/- stdev of the differences between COVID-19 and negative groups, for the 11 relevant antibody levels in light units (LU). *** p<0.001, **** p<0.001 versus all other antigens, otherwise indicated.