

1 **Rapid generation of neutralizing antibody responses in COVID-19 patients**

2 Mehul S. Suthar^{1, 2, 3*}, Matthew G. Zimmerman^{1, 2, 3#}, Robert C. Kauffman^{1, 2, 4#}, Grace Mantus^{1, 2,}
3 ^{4#}, Susanne L. Linderman^{2, 4}, Abigail Vanderheiden^{1, 2, 3}, Lindsay Nyhoff^{1, 2, 4}, Carl Davis^{2, 4}, Seyi
4 Adekunle^{1, 2, 4}, Maurizio Affer^{1, 2, 4}, Melanie Sherman⁵, Stacian Reynolds⁵, Hans P. Verkerke⁶,
5 David N. Alter⁶, Jeannette Guarner⁶, Janetta Bryksin⁶, Michael Horwath⁶, Connie M. Arthur⁶, Natia
6 Saakadze⁶, Geoffrey Hughes Smith⁶, Srilatha Edupuganti^{7,8}, Erin M. Scherer^{7,8}, Kieffer
7 Hellmeister^{7,8}, Andrew Cheng^{7,8}, Juliet A. Morales^{7,8}, Andrew S. Neish⁶, Sean R. Stowell⁶, Filipp
8 Frank⁹, Eric Ortlund⁹, Evan Anderson¹, Vineet D. Menachery¹⁰, Nadine Rouphael^{7,8}, Aneesh
9 Mehta⁸, David S. Stephens⁸, Rafi Ahmed^{2, 4}, John D. Roback⁶, Jens Wrammert^{1, 2, 4*}

10

11 ¹Department of Pediatrics, Division of Infectious Disease, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA 30322,
12 USA.

13 ²Emory Vaccine Center, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA.

14 ³Yerkes National Primate Research Center, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA.

15 ⁴Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA.

16 ⁵Emory Medical Laboratories, Emory Healthcare, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA

17 ⁶Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA 30322, USA.

18 ⁷Hope Clinic of the Emory Vaccine Center, , Emory University School of Medicine Decatur, Atlanta, GA, USA.

19 ⁸Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA.

20 ⁹Department of Biochemistry, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, USA

21 ¹⁰Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Institute for Human Infection and Immunity, World Reference Center
22 for Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses, University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX, USA.

23 #These authors contributed equally to this work.

24 *Correspondence: Mehul S. Suthar (mehul.s.suthar@emory.edu) and Jens Wrammert (jwramme@emory.edu)

25 Lead contact: Jens Wrammert (jwramme@emory.edu)

26

27

28 **SUMMARY**

29 SARS-CoV-2 is currently causing a devastating pandemic and there is a pressing need to
30 understand the dynamics, specificity, and neutralizing potency of the humoral immune response
31 during acute infection. Herein, we report the dynamics of antibody responses to the receptor-
32 binding domain (RBD) of the spike protein and virus neutralization activity in 44 COVID-19
33 patients. RBD-specific IgG responses were detectable in all patients 6 days after PCR
34 confirmation. Using a clinical isolate of SARS-CoV-2, neutralizing antibody titers were also
35 detectable in all patients 6 days after PCR confirmation. The magnitude of RBD-specific IgG
36 binding titers correlated strongly with viral neutralization. In a clinical setting, the initial analysis of
37 the dynamics of RBD-specific IgG titers was corroborated in a larger cohort of PCR-confirmed
38 patients (n=231). These findings have important implications for our understanding of protective
39 immunity against SARS-CoV-2, the use of immune plasma as a therapy, and the development of
40 much-needed vaccines.

41
42 **KEYWORDS:** COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, Neutralizing antibody; Spike protein, Receptor-binding
43 protein, Coronavirus, Protective immunity, Serology test, Humoral immune response

44

45 INTRODUCTION

46 COVID-19 is a global pandemic. There is a pressing need to understand the immunological
47 response that mediates protective immunity to SARS-CoV-2. Antibody responses to the spike (S)
48 protein are thought to be to the primary target of neutralizing activity during viral infection,
49 conferring superior protective immunity compared to the membrane (M), envelope (E), and
50 nucleocapsid proteins (Bolles et al., 2011; Buchholz et al., 2004; Deming et al., 2006). The S
51 glycoprotein is a class I viral fusion protein that exists as a metastable prefusion homotrimer
52 consisting of individual polypeptide chains (between 1100-1600 residues in length) responsible
53 for cell attachment and viral fusion (Bosch et al., 2003; Hoffmann et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020).
54 Each of the S protein protomers is divided into two distinct regions, the S₁ and S₂ subunits (Bosch
55 et al., 2003; Tortorici and Veessler, 2019). The S₁ subunit is a V-shaped polypeptide with four
56 distinct domains, Domains A, B, C, and D, with Domain B functioning as the receptor-binding
57 domain (RBD) for most coronaviruses, including the pathogenic β -coronaviruses such as SARS-
58 CoV-2, SARS and MERS (Fig. 1A; Supplementary Fig. 1A) (Li et al., 2005; Lu et al., 2013;
59 Tortorici and Veessler, 2019; Walls et al., 2020). Recent studies have shown that the SARS-CoV-
60 2 RBD interacts with the ACE2 receptor for cellular attachment (Hoffmann et al., 2020; Walls et
61 al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020). Sequence analysis of the RBD shows extensive homology in this
62 region to SARS (73%). In contrast, MERS and other seasonal coronaviruses show minimal
63 sequence homology to the SARS-CoV-2 RBD (7-18%) (Fig. 1B). Herein, we set out to understand
64 the dynamics, specificity, and neutralizing potency of the humoral immune response against the
65 RBD of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein during acute infection.

66

67 **The magnitude of RBD-specific antibody responses in acutely infected COVID-19 patients**

68 To determine the magnitude of antibody responses, Ig isotype, and IgG subclass usage against
69 the RBD of the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein, we analyzed a cohort of acutely infected COVID-19

70 patients (n=44) enrolled at two hospitals in the Emory Healthcare System in Atlanta (Emory
71 University Hospital and Emory University Hospital Midtown). These patients were recruited from
72 both the inpatient ward and the ICU (patient details are provided in Table 1). These samples
73 represent a cross-section of days after patient-reported symptom onset (3-30 days) and PCR
74 confirmation (2-19 days). As healthy controls, we used plasma samples collected at baseline in a
75 vaccine study performed in early 2019 (n=12). The RBD protein was cloned and expressed in
76 mammalian cells (Supplementary Fig. 1B) and was validated by ELISA using CR3022, a SARS-
77 specific human monoclonal antibody that cross-reacts with SARS-CoV-2 (ter Meulen et al., 2006)
78 (Supplementary Fig. 1C). Size exclusion chromatography shows that the recombinant RBD
79 protein is homogenous and does not form aggregates (Supplementary Fig. 1D). We found that a
80 majority of COVID-19 patients (36 out of 44) developed RBD-specific class-switched IgG
81 responses (Fig. 1C) (mean titer: 18500, range: <100-142765). These patients also showed IgM
82 and IgA responses of lower magnitude as compared to IgG (IgM mean titer: 3731, range: <100-
83 40197 and IgA mean titer: 973, range: <100-19918). All of the negative controls were below the
84 limit of detection in the endpoint analysis for binding to the RBD antigen (Fig. 1C, red). A
85 representative RBD-specific IgG ELISA assay for a subset of these donors is shown in Figure 1D
86 to illustrate the dynamic range of these measurements. A number of the COVID-19 patient
87 samples that scored either negative or low in the RBD IgG ELISA had higher titers of IgM (Fig.
88 1E, green). Finally, IgG subclass analysis showed that the COVID-19 patients exclusively made
89 RBD-specific IgG1 and IgG3, with no detectable IgG2 or IgG4. Taken together, these findings
90 illustrate that antibody class-switching to IgG occurs early during acute infection.

91

92 **Neutralization potency of antibody responses in COVID-19 patients**

93 We next determined the neutralization capacity of samples from the cohort of acutely infected
94 COVID-19 patients. We have developed a focus reduction neutralization titer (FRNT) assay for

95 SARS-CoV-2. In this assay, COVID-19 patient plasma is incubated with a clinical isolate of SARS-
96 CoV-2 followed by infection of VeroE6 cells (Harcourt et al., 2020). The neutralization potency of
97 the plasma sample is measured by the reduction in virally-infected foci. We screened plasma from
98 COVID-19 patients (n=44) and found that a majority of the samples (40/44) showed neutralization
99 capacity, with titers ranging from 1:5763 to 1:55 (Fig. 2A). A representative example of viral
100 neutralization is shown in Figure 2b where pre-incubation with control plasma yields about 250
101 foci whereas the COVID-19 patient sample completely inhibited the formation of infected foci (Fig.
102 2B). Representative neutralization curves for a subset of samples are shown to illustrate the
103 dynamic range of the results obtained (Fig. 2C). A plaque reduction neutralization titer (PRNT)
104 assay is the classic method for determining the neutralization capacity of a plasma sample against
105 coronavirus infection (Rockx et al., 2008). To confirm the efficiency of these two assays, we
106 compared the neutralization titers between a standard PRNT assay and an FRNT assay for a
107 subset of the patient samples (n=9). Overall, we observed a strong positive correlation between
108 these two assays (Fig. 2D), demonstrating the robustness of the FRNT assay Overall, these
109 findings demonstrate that neutralizing antibody responses are generated early during acute
110 COVID-19 infection.

111

112 **Kinetics of the antibody responses during acute SARS-CoV-2 infection**

113 The patient samples were collected across a range of days after symptom onset or PCR
114 confirmation of SARS-CoV-2 infection (Table 1). To understand the relationship between these
115 variables and RBD-specific IgG antibody titers and viral neutralization potency, we performed
116 correlation analyses. In all cases, we observed significant correlations between the number of
117 days elapsed after symptom onset or positive PCR test and the RBD-specific IgG titer or viral
118 neutralization titer (Fig. 3). Several key points regarding the kinetics of antibody responses can
119 be made from this correlation analysis. Antibody responses against the RBD (Fig. 3A), as well as

120 SARS-CoV-2 virus neutralization titers (Fig. 3B), can be detected in a majority of patients around
121 day 8 after symptom onset. When the number of days after PCR confirmation is used to assess
122 the duration of infection, both RBD-binding titers (Fig. 3C) and viral neutralization titers (Fig. 3D)
123 can be detected in many patients already between days 2-6. Beyond 6 days post-PCR
124 confirmation, all patients display both antibody binding and neutralization titers. Taken together,
125 these findings illustrate that both RBD-specific and neutralizing antibody responses occur rapidly
126 after SARS-CoV-2 infection.

127

128 **RBD-specific antibody titers as a surrogate of neutralization potency in acutely infected** 129 **COVID-19 patients**

130 We observed a wide range of RBD-specific and neutralizing antibody responses across the cohort
131 of acutely infected COVID-19 patients. We found that the magnitude of RBD-specific IgG titers
132 positively correlated with neutralization titers ($r^2= 0.7$; $p<0.0001$; Fig. 4A). Overall, we observed
133 viral neutralization activity in 40 out of 44 samples from acutely infected COVID-19 patients.

134

135 We next validated the RBD-specific IgG ELISA for high-throughput testing at the Emory Medical
136 Laboratories. For these analyses, we collected serum from 231 PCR-confirmed COVID-19 patient
137 samples within the first 22 days after PCR confirmation (Supplementary Table 1). In addition, 40
138 samples collected in 2019 were used as negative controls. These samples were grouped from 0-
139 3 days, 4-6 days, and 7 or more days after PCR confirmation and analyzed using a high-
140 throughput clinical RBD ELISA. The cumulative results of these efforts are shown as receiver
141 operating characteristic (ROC) curves (Fig. 4B). This assay is almost perfectly discriminatory on
142 day 7 or later after PCR confirmation, with an area under the curve (AUC) of 1.00 (n=83). When
143 utilized earlier in the disease course, the performance of this diagnostic assay is reduced. When

144 the RBD specific IgG ELISA were analyzed for the samples collected closer to the time of
145 infection, the AUC for the day 4-6 group (n=76) and the day 0-3 group (n=72) fell to 0.93 and
146 0.80, respectively. Using an OD cut-off of 0.175 resulted in calculated sensitivity and specificity
147 values of 97.5% and 98%, respectively. Taken together, these findings demonstrate that RBD-
148 specific IgG titers could be used as a surrogate of neutralization activity against SARS-CoV-2
149 infection and that the RBD assay is highly specific and sensitive. Further, this demonstrates the
150 necessity of appropriate timing of sample collection when using serologic diagnostic tests of
151 acutely infected COVID-19 patients (Lee et al., 2020; Okba et al., 2020).

152

153 **DISCUSSION**

154 In this study, we show that RBD-specific IgG antibody responses are rapidly induced during
155 severe and moderate acute COVID-19 infection, with most patients showing RBD-specific
156 antibody responses by 6 days post-PCR confirmation. Consistently, we found that class-switching
157 also occurs early during infection and is dominated by RBD-specific IgG1 and IgG3 responses.
158 We also detected both RBD-specific IgM and IgA responses at relatively lower levels as compared
159 to IgG. These responses result in neutralizing antibody responses that directly correlated with
160 RBD-specific IgG antibody titers. These findings strongly indicate that a robust humoral immune
161 response occurs early during severe or moderate COVID-19 infections.

162

163 The validation of the sensitive and selective RBD based clinical assay at EML and the correlation
164 with viral neutralization is promising for both diagnostic purposes and ongoing seroprevalence
165 studies of healthcare workers and the general population. These serology tests could be used for
166 making informed decisions for convalescent plasma therapy that are currently undergoing clinical
167 testing as a possible therapeutic or even prophylactic option (Bloch et al., 2020; Shen et al., 2020).
168 Further, the kinetic findings presented herein are essential for ongoing efforts aimed at applying
169 antibody testing for clinical diagnostic purposes, highlighting the importance of appropriate timing
170 of these tests relative to PCR testing and/or symptom onset after infection. A comprehensive
171 understanding of the dynamics of antibody responses after infection will also be key for
172 understanding disease pathogenesis, risk assessment in vulnerable populations, evaluation of
173 novel therapeutics, and development of vaccines.

174

175 The appearance of high titer neutralizing antibody responses early after the infection is promising
176 and may offer some degree of protection from re-infection. Future studies will need to define the

177 neutralizing titer which constitutes a robust correlate of protective immunity and determine the
178 durability of these responses over time (Liu et al., 2006). This information will be essential for
179 ongoing vaccine development efforts (Amanat and Krammer, 2020).

180

181 **Acknowledgments:** We would like to thank Laurel Bristow, Ariel Kay, Youssef Saklawi, Ghina
182 Alaaeddine, Nina McNair, Ellie Butler, Brandi Johnson, Christopher Huerta, Jennifer Kleinhenz,
183 Vinit Karmali, Yong Xu, Dongli Wang, Michele McCullough for sample processing at the Hope
184 Clinic. We also acknowledge the dedicated efforts of Hassan Bilal, DeAndre Brown, Davette
185 Campbell, Lisa Cole, Ginger Crews, Shanessa Fakour, Natalie Hicks, Mark Meyers, and
186 Katherine Normile for sample collection, processing, and organization. We thank Gabrielle
187 Holenstein, Corin Jones, Alethea Luo-Gardner, Hoa Nguyen, Keyanna Seville, and Corazon
188 Tomblin for the exceptional technical performance of the ELISA in EML. We also acknowledge
189 thorough and rapid chart reviews by Kari Broder. Finally, we thank all the participating patients,
190 and the hospital staff caring for them.

191
192 **Funding:** This work was funded in part by an Emory EVPHA Synergy Fund award (M.S.S and
193 J.W), and by the National Institutes of Health NIAID Infectious Diseases Clinical Research
194 Consortium (IDCRC) UM1 AI148684 (D.S.S, R.A and J.W), R01 AI137127 (J.W), ORIP/OD
195 P51OD011132 (M.S.S), R00 AG049092 (V.D.M) and World Reference Center for Emerging
196 Viruses and Arboviruses R24 AI120942 (V.D.M), and HIPC 5U19AI090023-10 (N.R, E.A and A.M)
197 and VTEU 1UM1AI148576-01 (E.A and N.R). The funders had no role in study design, data
198 collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

199
200 **Author contributions:**
201 M.S, S.R, H.P.V, D.N.A, J.G, G.M, S.L, A.V contributed to the acquisition, analysis, and
202 interpretation of the data, J. B and M.C.H contributed to the acquisition and interpretation of the
203 data, C.M.A and N.S. contributed to the acquisition of the data, G.H.S, M.G.Z, R.C.K contributed
204 to the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data, and helped draft the work, A.M, A.S.N
205 and S.R.S contributed to the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data, as well as the
206 conception and design of the work, D.S.S, L.N, S.A, M.A, and V.D.M contributed to the analysis,

207 and interpretation of the data, S.E served as the principal investigator of the clinical protocol for
208 acquisition of patient samples and contributed to the interpretation of data, E.S, K.H, A.C, J.A.M,
209 N.R, and E.A contributed to the acquisition and interpretation of the data, J.D.R, R.A, J.W, and
210 M.S.S contributed to the acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of the data, as well as the
211 conception and design of the work, and writing the manuscript.

212

213 **Declaration of interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

214

215 **References**

- 216 Amanat, F., and Krammer, F. (2020). SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines: Status Report. *Immunity* 52, 583-
217 589.
- 218 Bloch, E.M., Shoham, S., Casadevall, A., Sachais, B.S., Shaz, B., Winters, J.L., van Buskirk, C.,
219 Grossman, B.J., Joyner, M., Henderson, J.P., *et al.* (2020). Deployment of convalescent plasma
220 for the prevention and treatment of COVID-19. *J Clin Invest.*
- 221 Bolles, M., Donaldson, E., and Baric, R. (2011). SARS-CoV and emergent coronaviruses: viral
222 determinants of interspecies transmission. *Curr Opin Virol* 1, 624-634.
- 223 Bosch, B.J., van der Zee, R., de Haan, C.A., and Rottier, P.J. (2003). The coronavirus spike
224 protein is a class I virus fusion protein: structural and functional characterization of the fusion
225 core complex. *J Virol* 77, 8801-8811.
- 226 Buchholz, U.J., Bukreyev, A., Yang, L., Lamirande, E.W., Murphy, B.R., Subbarao, K., and
227 Collins, P.L. (2004). Contributions of the structural proteins of severe acute respiratory
228 syndrome coronavirus to protective immunity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 101, 9804-9809.
- 229 Deming, D., Sheahan, T., Heise, M., Yount, B., Davis, N., Sims, A., Suthar, M., Harkema, J.,
230 Whitmore, A., Pickles, R., *et al.* (2006). Vaccine efficacy in senescent mice challenged with
231 recombinant SARS-CoV bearing epidemic and zoonotic spike variants. *PLoS Med* 3, e525.
- 232 Harcourt, J., Tamin, A., Lu, X., Kamili, S., Sakthivel, S.K., Murray, J., Queen, K., Tao, Y.,
233 Paden, C.R., Zhang, J., *et al.* (2020). Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 from
234 Patient with 2019 Novel Coronavirus Disease, United States. *Emerg Infect Dis* 26.
- 235 Hoffmann, M., Kleine-Weber, H., Schroeder, S., Kruger, N., Herrler, T., Erichsen, S.,
236 Schiergens, T.S., Herrler, G., Wu, N.H., Nitsche, A., *et al.* (2020). SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry
237 Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell*
238 181, 271-280 e278.
- 239 Lee, Y.L., Liao, C.H., Liu, P.Y., Cheng, C.Y., Chung, M.Y., Liu, C.E., Chang, S.Y., and Hsueh,
240 P.R. (2020). Dynamics of anti-SARS-Cov-2 IgM and IgG antibodies among COVID-19 patients.
241 *J Infect.*
- 242 Li, F., Li, W., Farzan, M., and Harrison, S.C. (2005). Structure of SARS coronavirus spike
243 receptor-binding domain complexed with receptor. *Science* 309, 1864-1868.
- 244 Liu, W., Fontanet, A., Zhang, P.H., Zhan, L., Xin, Z.T., Baril, L., Tang, F., Lv, H., and Cao, W.C.
245 (2006). Two-year prospective study of the humoral immune response of patients with severe
246 acute respiratory syndrome. *J Infect Dis* 193, 792-795.

- 247 Lu, G., Hu, Y., Wang, Q., Qi, J., Gao, F., Li, Y., Zhang, Y., Zhang, W., Yuan, Y., Bao, J., *et al.*
248 (2013). Molecular basis of binding between novel human coronavirus MERS-CoV and its
249 receptor CD26. *Nature* 500, 227-231.
- 250 Okba, N.M.A., Muller, M.A., Li, W., Wang, C., GeurtsvanKessel, C.H., Corman, V.M., Lamers,
251 M.M., Sikkema, R.S., de Bruin, E., Chandler, F.D., *et al.* (2020). Severe Acute Respiratory
252 Syndrome Coronavirus 2-Specific Antibody Responses in Coronavirus Disease 2019 Patients.
253 *Emerg Infect Dis* 26.
- 254 Rockx, B., Corti, D., Donaldson, E., Sheahan, T., Stadler, K., Lanzavecchia, A., and Baric, R.
255 (2008). Structural basis for potent cross-neutralizing human monoclonal antibody protection
256 against lethal human and zoonotic severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus challenge. *J*
257 *Virology* 82, 3220-3235.
- 258 Shen, C., Wang, Z., Zhao, F., Yang, Y., Li, J., Yuan, J., Wang, F., Li, D., Yang, M., Xing, L., *et*
259 *al.* (2020). Treatment of 5 Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19 With Convalescent Plasma.
260 *JAMA*.
- 261 ter Meulen, J., van den Brink, E.N., Poon, L.L., Marissen, W.E., Leung, C.S., Cox, F., Cheung,
262 C.Y., Bakker, A.Q., Bogaards, J.A., van Deventer, E., *et al.* (2006). Human monoclonal antibody
263 combination against SARS coronavirus: synergy and coverage of escape mutants. *PLoS Med* 3,
264 e237.
- 265 Tortorici, M.A., and Veesler, D. (2019). Structural insights into coronavirus entry. *Adv Virus Res*
266 105, 93-116.
- 267 Walls, A.C., Park, Y.J., Tortorici, M.A., Wall, A., McGuire, A.T., and Veesler, D. (2020).
268 Structure, Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. *Cell* 181, 281-292
269 e286.
- 270 Wang, Q., Zhang, Y., Wu, L., Niu, S., Song, C., Zhang, Z., Lu, G., Qiao, C., Hu, Y., Yuen, K.Y.,
271 *et al.* (2020). Structural and Functional Basis of SARS-CoV-2 Entry by Using Human ACE2.
272 *Cell*.
- 273 Wrapp, D., Wang, N., Corbett, K.S., Goldsmith, J.A., Hsieh, C.L., Abiona, O., Graham, B.S., and
274 McLellan, J.S. (2020). Cryo-EM structure of the 2019-nCoV spike in the prefusion conformation.
275 *Science* 367, 1260-1263.
- 276

277 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

278 **Table 1. COVID-19 patient cohort**

279 **Figure 1. Antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 RBD in PCR-confirmed acutely infected**
280 **COVID-19 patients.** A) Structure of a SARS-CoV-2 spike protein (single monomer is shown) with
281 the RBD highlighted in red(Wang et al., 2020) B) Sequence homology analysis of SARS-CoV-2
282 spike protein RBD compared to SARS, MERS, and seasonal alpha- and beta-CoVs. C) ELISA
283 endpoint titers for SARS-CoV-2 RBD specific IgG, IgA and IgM in PCR confirmed acute COVID-
284 19 patients (n=44) and healthy controls collected in early 2019. Endpoint cutoff values were
285 calculated using the mean of the 12 healthy controls at 1/100 dilution, times 3 standard deviations
286 (shown as a dotted line). D) Representative ELISA assays for 10 patients and 12 healthy controls.
287 E) Direct comparison of IgM and IgG for individual donors. A number of the IgG negative or low
288 early samples were IgM positive (shown in green). F) Endpoint titer analysis of IgG subclass
289 distribution. Each experiment was performed at least twice and a representative data set is
290 shown.

291
292 **Figure 2. COVID-19 patient plasma neutralizes SARS-CoV-2.** A) Neutralization activity of
293 serum samples against SARS-CoV-2. The FRNT₅₀ titers of COVID-19 patients (n=44) and healthy
294 controls (n=10) sera were determined by a novel FRNT assay using an immunostain to detect
295 infected foci. Each circle represents one serum sample. The dotted line represents the maximum
296 concentrations of the serum tested (1/50). B) Representative sample showing a reduction in foci
297 from a neutralization assay with sera from an infected COVID-19 patient. C) Representative
298 FRNT₅₀ curves (n=22). The dotted line represents 50% neutralization. D) Comparison of PRNT₅₀
299 against FRNT₅₀ titers (n=9). Each experiment was performed at least twice and a representative
300 data set is shown.

301

302 **Figure 3. SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses correlate with the progression of acute SARS-**
303 **CoV-2 infection.** Comparison of RBD-specific IgG titers and neutralization titers with (A-B) days
304 after symptom onset or (C-D) days after PCR positive confirmation for each patient. Correlation
305 analysis was performed by log transformation of the endpoint ELISA titers followed by linear
306 regression analysis.

307

308 **Figure 4. RBD-specific antibody titers as a surrogate of neutralization potency in acutely**
309 **infected COVID-19 patients.** A) Comparison of RBD-specific IgG endpoint titers with SARS-
310 CoV-2-specific FRNT₅₀ titers. Correlation analysis was performed by log transformation of the
311 endpoint ELISA or FRNT₅₀ titers followed by linear regression analysis. B) The RBD-specific
312 ELISA was validated for high-throughput clinical testing in Emory Medical Laboratories. Sera
313 (n=231) were collected from COVID-19 patients within the first 22 days after PCR-confirmation
314 (Supplementary Table 1). Sera (n=40) collected in 2019 were used as negative controls. ROC
315 curves are shown comparing the true positive and false negative rates of the ELISA using different
316 OD cutoffs and sera collected at different times post-infection. Whereas the RBD ELISA produced
317 an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.80 when samples were collected close to the time of infection
318 (within 3 days of positive PCR; n=76), longer sampling times resulted in better performance.
319 Assay performance was nearly perfectly discriminatory (AUC = 1.00) when samples were
320 collected at least 7 days after the positive PCR (n=83).

321

322

323

324 **STAR Methods**

325 **CONTACT FOR REAGENT AND RESOURCE SHARING**

326 Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be
327 fulfilled by the corresponding authors Mehul Suthar (msuthar@emory.edu) and Jens Wrammert
328 (jwramme@emory.edu).

329

330 **EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS**

331 **Ethics statement.** The serum and plasma samples used for this study were collected at Emory
332 University Hospital and Emory University Hospital Midtown in Atlanta. All patients were diagnosed
333 with acute SARS-CoV-2 infection by PCR, and samples were collected at a range of times post-
334 PCR-confirmation. All collection, processing, and archiving of human specimens was performed
335 under approval from the University Institutional Review Board (IRB #00000510 and #00022371).
336 For IRB #00000510, informed consent was obtained prior to patient participation. For #00022371,
337 an IRB waiver was obtained allowing the use of discarded samples in the clinical laboratory at the
338 Emory Hospital.

339

340 **Virus and cells.** SARS-CoV-2 (2019-nCoV/USA_WA1/2020) was isolated from the first reported
341 case in the US (Harcourt et al., 2020). A plaque purified passage 4 stock was kindly provided by
342 Natalie Thornburg (CDC, Atlanta, GA). Viral titers were determined by plaque assay on Vero cells
343 (ATCC). Vero cells were cultured in complete DMEM medium consisting of 1x DMEM (Corning
344 Cellgro), 10% FBS, 25mM HEPES Buffer (Corning Cellgro), 2mM L-glutamine, 1mM sodium
345 pyruvate, 1x Non-essential Amino Acids, and 1x antibiotics.

346

347 **Cloning, expression, and purification of SARS-CoV-2 RDB.** A recombinant form of the spike
348 glycoprotein receptor-binding domain (RBD) from SARS-CoV-2, Wuhan-Hu-1 (GenPept:
349 QHD43416) was cloned for mammalian expression in human embryonic kidney expi293F cells.
350 The receptor-binding domain consisting of amino acids 319 (arginine) to 541 (phenylalanine) of
351 the SARS-Cov-2 S gene was amplified by PCR using a mammalian codon-optimized sequence
352 as the DNA template (Genscript MC_0101081). PCR amplification appended the first 12 amino
353 acids of the native S gene signal peptide sequence to the N-terminal end of the protein and, at
354 the C-terminal end a 6X polyhistidine tag preceded by a short linker sequence (GGGGS).
355 Forward and Reverse primer sequences consisted were:
356 5'-AGAGAATTCACCATGTTTCGTCTTCCTGGTCCTGCTGCCTCTGGTCTCCAGGGTGCAGC
357 CACCGAGTCTATC-3'
358 and 5'-CTCTAAGCTTCTATCATTAGTGGTGGTGGTGGTGGTGGCTTCCGCCTCCGCCGAA
359 GTTCACGCACTTGTTCCTTAC-3'. 25 uL PCR reaction conditions were: 1X Phusion HF Buffer,
360 0.2 mM dNTP, 0.63 units Phusion DNA polymerase, and 500 nM of each primer. PCR cycling
361 conditions were: initial denaturation at 98°C, 1 minute; then 25 cycles of: 98°C, 20 seconds, 65°C
362 30 seconds, 72°C 30 seconds; followed a final extension at 72°C for 5 minutes. Following
363 amplification, purified PCR products (QIAquick PCR Purification, Qiagen) were digested with
364 EcoRI-HF (NEB) and HindIII (NEB) and cloned into the EcoRI-HindIII cloning site of a mammalian
365 expression vector containing a CMV promoter (Genbank Reference ID FJ475055). Plasmid DNA
366 was prepared using the Qiagen PlasmidPlus Midi purification system and constructs were
367 sequence verified. Recombinant protein expression was performed in Expi293F cells according
368 to the manufacturer's instructions (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Briefly, expression plasmid DNA
369 was complexed with the expifectamine lipid-based transfection reagent. Complexes were added
370 to the cell suspensions shaking at 125 RPM and incubated overnight at 37°C in an 8% CO₂
371 humidified incubator. After 20 hours, protein expression supplements and antibiotics were added.
372 Cultures were then incubated for an additional three days to allow for expression into the

373 supernatant. Cell culture supernatants were harvested by centrifugation at 16,000xg for 10
374 minutes. Supernatants were sterile filtered through a 0.2 μ m filter and stored at 4°C for <7 days
375 before purification. Analytical SDS-PAGE was performed on supernatants and the protein
376 concentration in solution was determined by densitometry relative to the purified protein.
377 Recombinant RBD protein levels were between 100 mg and 150 mg per liter. Purification was
378 performed according to manufacturer's instructions using 5 mL HisTALON Superflow Cartridges
379 (Clontech Laboratories). Briefly, an additional 11.7 g/L of sodium chloride and 0.71 g/L of cobalt(II)
380 chloride hexahydrate were added to culture supernatants, which were adjusted to pH 7.5. The
381 supernatant was then loaded on to the column equilibrated with 10 column volumes of 50 mM
382 phosphate 300 mM sodium chloride buffer pH 7.5 (equilibration buffer). The column was washed
383 with 8 column volumes of equilibration buffer supplemented with 10 mM imidazole. Protein was
384 eluted with 6 column volumes of equilibration buffer supplemented with 150 mM imidazole. The
385 eluted protein was dialyzed overnight against 80 volumes of phosphate-buffered saline pH 7.2.
386 The protein was filter-sterilized (0.2 μ m) and normalized to 1 mg/mL by UV spectrophotometry
387 using an absorption coefficient of 1.3 AU at 280 nm=1 mg/mL. Proteins were aliquoted and stored
388 at -80°C prior to use. SDS-PAGE analysis of purified recombinant protein stained with coomassie
389 blue demonstrated that samples were >90% pure (Fig. 1). The RBD resolves at an apparent
390 molecular weight of 30 kDa (Fig. 1D) which is slightly larger than the theoretical molecular weight
391 of 26.5 kDa, presumably caused by glycosylation.

392
393 **Preparation of CR3022 monoclonal antibody and biotinylation.** The SARS-CoV S
394 glycoprotein specific antibody CR3022 was generated recombinantly using previously reported
395 heavy and light variable domain sequences deposited in GenBank under accession numbers
396 DQ168569 and DQ168570(ter Meulen et al., 2006). Antibody variable domain gene sequences
397 were synthesized by IDT and cloned into human IgG1 and human kappa expression vectors as
398 previously described (Smith 2009). Antibodies were produced in Expi293F cells according to the

399 manufacturer's recommendations by co-transfecting heavy and light chain plasmids at a ratio of
400 1:1.5. Antibodies were purified using rProtein A Sepharose Fast Flow antibody purification resin
401 (GE Healthcare) and buffer exchanged into PBS before use. Biotinylated versions of CR3022
402 used in viral neutralization assays were produced by combining the antibody with a 20 molar
403 excess of EZ-Link NHS-PEG4-Biotin (Thermo Fisher Scientific) for 1 hour at room temperatures.
404 Reactions were stopped by adding Tris pH 8 to a final concentration of 10 mM. The biotinylated
405 antibody was then buffer exchanged >1000X into PBS using a 10 kDa protein spin-concentrator
406 (Amicon).

407

408 **Sequence analysis and alignment.**

409 The SARS-CoV-2 spike protein structure(Wrapp et al., 2020) was visualized in Pymol
410 (Schrödinger, LLC). To assess the homology of coronavirus spike proteins, a global protein
411 alignment was performed in Geneious (Geneious, Inc.) with translations of genome sequences
412 accessed through NCBI Nucleotide. Sequences used were GenBank MN908947.3 (SARS-CoV-
413 2), RefSeq NC_004718.3 (SARS-CoV), RefSeq NC_019843.3 (MERS-CoV), NC_006577.2
414 (HCoV-HKU1), RefSeq NC_006213.1 (HCoV-OC43), RefSeq NC_005831.2 (HCoV-NL63), and
415 RefSeq NC_005831.2 (HCoV-229E). Homology at the RBD was determined by sequence identity
416 between SARS-CoV-2 RBD residues T302 to L560 (Walls et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2020).

417

418 **ELISA assays.** Recombinant SARS-CoV-2 RDB was coated on Nunc MaxiSorp plates at a
419 concentration of 1 µg/mL in 100 µL phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) at 4°C overnight. Plates
420 were blocked for two hours at room temperature in PBS/0.05%Tween/1% BSA (ELISA buffer).
421 Serum or plasma samples were heated to 56°C for 30 min, aliquoted, and stored at -20°C before
422 use. Samples were serially diluted 1:3 in dilution buffer (PBS-1% BSA-0.05% Tween-20) starting
423 at a dilution of 1:100. 100 µL of each dilution was added and incubated for 90 minutes at room

424 temperature. 100 μ L of horseradish peroxidase-conjugated isotype and subclass specific
425 secondary antibodies, diluted 1 to 2,000 in ELISA buffer, were added and incubated for 60
426 minutes at room temperature. Development was performed using 0.4 mg/mL o-phenylenediamine
427 substrate (Sigma) in 0.05 M phosphate-citrate buffer pH 5.0, supplemented with 0.012% hydrogen
428 peroxide before use. Reactions were stopped with 1 M HCl and absorbance was measured at
429 490 nm. Between each step, samples were washed four times with 300 μ L of PBS-0.05% Tween.
430 Prior to development, plates were additionally washed once with 300 μ L of PBS. Secondary
431 antibodies used for development were as follows: anti-hu-IgM-HRP, anti-hu-IgG-HRP, and anti-
432 hu-IgA-HRP (Jackson Immuno Research, and Mouse anti-hu-IgG1 Fc-HRP, Mouse anti-hu-IgG2
433 Fc-HRP, Mouse anti-hu-IgG3 Fc-HRP, or Mouse anti-hu-IgG4 Fc-HRP (Southern Biotech).

434

435 **Clinical RBD ELISA assay.** This assay was performed essentially as described above, with the
436 following modifications to increase throughput: all serum samples were diluted 1:200, and the
437 incubation times were reduced to 30 minutes after the addition of serum samples and the
438 secondary antibody conjugate.

439

440 **Focus Reduction Neutralization Assays.** Serially diluted patient plasma and COVID-19 (100-
441 200 FFU) were combined in DMEM + 1% FBS (Corning Cellgro), and incubated at 37°C for 1
442 hour. The antibody-virus mixture was aliquoted on a monolayer of VeroE6 cells, gently rocked to
443 distribute the mixture evenly, and incubated at 37°C for 1 hour. After 1 hour, the antibody-virus
444 inoculum was removed and prewarmed DMEM supplemented with 1% FBS (Optima, Atlanta
445 Biologics), HEPES buffer (Corning Cellgro), 2mM L-glutamine (Corning Cellgro), 1mM sodium
446 pyruvate (Corning Cellgro), 1x Non-essential Amino Acids (Corning Cellgro), 1x antibiotics
447 (penicillin, streptomycin, amphotericin B; Corning Cellgro) was mixed with methylcellulose
448 (DMEM [Corning Cellgro], 1% antibiotic, 2% FBS, 2% methylcellulose [Sigma Aldrich]) at a 1:1
449 ratio and overlaid on the infected VeroE6 cell layer. Plates were incubated at 37°C for 24 hours.

450 After 24 hours, plates were gently washed three times with 1x PBS (Corning Cellgro) and fixed
451 with 200 μ l of 2% paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences) for 30 minutes. Following
452 fixation, plates were washed twice with 1x PBS and 100 μ l of permeabilization buffer (0.1% BSA-
453 Saponin in PBS) (Sigma Aldrich), was added to the fixated Vero cell monolayer for 20 minutes.
454 Cells were incubated with an anti-SARS-CoV spike protein primary antibody conjugated to biotin
455 (CR3022-biotin) for 1-2 hours at room temperature, then with avidin-HRP conjugated secondary
456 antibody for 1 hour at room temperature. Foci were visualized using True Blue HRP substrate
457 and imaged on an ELISPOT reader (CTL). Each plate contained three positive neutralization
458 control wells, three negative control wells containing healthy control serum mixed with COVID-
459 19, and three mock-infected wells.

460

461 **QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

462 **Statistical analysis.** FRNT₅₀ curves were generated by non-linear regression analysis using the
463 4PL sigmoidal dose curve equation on Prism 8 (Graphpad Software). Maximum neutralization
464 (100%) was considered the number of foci counted in the wells infected with a virus mixed with
465 COVID-19 naïve healthy patient serum. Neutralization titers were calculated as $100\% \times [1 -$
466 $(\text{average number of foci in wells incubated with COVID-19 patient serum}) \div (\text{average number of}$
467 $\text{foci in wells incubated with control serum})]$. For the clinical data Receiver Operating Characteristic
468 (ROC) curves were generated separately for each of three cohorts of clinical validation samples
469 with progressively increasing PCR-to-serum collection intervals (0-3 days, 4-6 days, 7+ days).
470 Optical densities (OD) for each sample were entered into Microsoft Excel for Office 365 v16, and
471 a custom software package was used to iteratively compute the false positive rate (1 - specificity)
472 and true positive rate (sensitivity) at every OD cutoff level for each cohort. The false-positive rates
473 (x) and true positive rates (y) were then rendered as scatter plots to generate the ROC curves.

474 Correlations analyses were done by log transforming RBD binding titers or neutralization titers,
475 followed by linear regression analysis. The R^2 and p-value are reported in each figure.

476

477

478

479 **Supplemental Information**

480 **Supplementary Figure 1. Expression and purification of SARS-CoV-2 RBD.** A) Sequence
481 homology analysis of the full-length SARS-CoV-2 spike compared to SARS, MERS, and seasonal
482 alpha- and beta-CoVs. B) SDS-PAGE gel of purified SARS-CoV-2 RBD, cloned and expressed
483 in Expi293F cells by transient transfection. C) ELISA validation of the RBD protein using a
484 monoclonal antibody (CR3022) (ter Meulen et al., 2006) directed against the spike protein RBD.
485 D) Size exclusion chromatography of the recombinant RBD protein. The figure shows the elution
486 profile (UV absorption 280 nm) of 1 mg RBD protein analyzed in PBS buffer on a Superdex 75
487 (10/300) size exclusion column.


488


489 **Supplementary Table 1. Emory Medical Laboratories patient cohort (time after PCR-**
490 **confirmation)**





Table 1. COVID-19 patient cohort

Patient ID#	Age	Sex	Days after symptom onset	Days after + PCR	IgG	IgM	IgA	FRNT50
1	65	M	8	8	1692	507	<100	761
2	36	F	15	8	86698	664	313	2233
3	41	M	8	2	259	599	116	245
4	44	F	9	5	2560	947	442	194
5	56	M	17	5	10422	1574	4033	3200
6	80	M	29	7	22219	1242	176	2483
7	74	M	12	2	<100	<100	<100	<50
8	66	M	8	3	419	220	85	167
9	87	M	9	3	<100	<100	<100	124
10	75	M	18	6	1174	369	131	539
11	61	M	19	4	445	282	<100	645
12	80	M	5	5	899	470	316	167
13	66	M	10	2	4988	795	297	1502
14	37	F	14	3	202	578	<100	118
15	64	F	8	3	<100	166	<100	55
16	76	F	11	2	31205	2906	230	1718
17	70	F	11	2	1100	246	<100	138
18	63	F	12	5	<100	<100	<100	<50
19	70	M	5	4	<100	136	<100	156
20	66	M	22	7	4269	1207	324	496
21	33	F	7	3	243	325	<100	174
22	62	F	12	7	17917	4414	706	603
23	59	M	11	7	21323	3865	140	2799
24	58	F	11	3	317	364	258	175
25	76	M	17	7	28352	1493	6865	2561
26	49	M	16	3	15772	491	589	126
27	54	M	30	10	72949	13310	700	3341
28	73	M	11	15	69902	3412	19918	911
29	64	F	9	3	<100	119	161	67
30	37	F	13	3	205	419	<100	126
31	25	F	3	2	<100	<100	<100	<50
32	39	F	8	3	814	362	287	262
33	60	M	10	6	27557	50483	<100	5763
34	60	F	15	8	43072	443	214	337
35	56	F	18	8	71204	16298	1754	1177
36	60	M	17	12	142766	40197	<100	5378
37	52	M	12	5	<100	317	<100	108
38	73	M	11	4	683	303	<100	<50
39	48	M	8	6	9311	1750	884	1068
40	46	M	20	13	69361	706	1112	408
41	69	M	18	19	33684	5517	180	1882
42	55	M	8	4	377	1560	178	79
43	47	F	9	3	467	1042	<100	158
44	63	F	10	3	134	186	<100	99


Figure 1.









A.



B.





Supplementary Table 1. Emory Medical Laboratory patient cohort (time after PCR-confirmation)

Day post PCR confirmation	Number of cases (n)	Grouping (Days)	Total number
0	12	0-3	n=76
1	14	0-3	
2	20	0-3	
3	30	0-3	
4	21	4-6	n=72
5	29	4-6	
6	22	4-6	
7	15	7+	n=83
8	14	7+	
9	7	7+	
10	4	7+	
11	4	7+	
12	4	7+	
13	3	7+	
14	2	7+	
15	4	7+	
16	4	7+	
17	4	7+	
18	6	7+	
19	3	7+	
20	5	7+	
21	2	7+	
22	2	7+	