

1 **Kinetics and Isotype Assessment of Antibodies Targeting the Spike Protein Receptor**  
2 **Binding Domain of SARS-CoV-2 In COVID-19 Patients as a function of Age and Biological**  
3 **Sex.**

4 Nancy R. Graham<sup>1,2</sup>, Annalis N. Whitaker<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Camilla A. Strother<sup>1,4</sup>, Ashley K. Miles<sup>1,2</sup>, Dore  
5 Grier<sup>6</sup>, Benjamin D. McElvany<sup>1,2</sup>, Emily A. Bruce<sup>3,5,11</sup>, Matthew E. Poynter<sup>4,5,7,8,11</sup>, Kristen K.  
6 Pierce<sup>1,2,9,11</sup>, Beth D. Kirkpatrick<sup>1,2,5,9,11</sup>, Renee D. Stapleton<sup>7,8</sup>, Gary An<sup>10,11</sup>, Jason W.  
7 Botten<sup>1,2,3,4,5,11</sup>, Jessica W. Crothers<sup>5,9</sup>, Sean A. Diehl<sup>1,2,4,5,11,\*</sup>

8 **AFFILIATIONS**

9 <sup>1</sup>Department of Microbiology and Molecular Genetics, <sup>2</sup>Vaccine Testing Center, <sup>3</sup>Department of  
10 Medicine-Immunobiology, <sup>4</sup>Cellular, Molecular, and Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program,  
11 <sup>5</sup>Vermont Center for Immunology and Infectious Disease, <sup>6</sup>Department of Pathology and  
12 Laboratory Medicine, <sup>7</sup>Vermont Lung Center, <sup>8</sup>Department of Medicine-Pulmonary and Critical  
13 Care, <sup>9</sup>Medicine-Infectious Disease, <sup>10</sup>Department of Surgery, <sup>11</sup>Translational Global Infectious  
14 Disease Research Center, Larner College of Medicine University of Vermont, Burlington, VT,  
15 05405, USA

16 \*correspondence: [sean.diehl@med.uvm.edu](mailto:sean.diehl@med.uvm.edu)

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 SARS-CoV-2 is the newly emerged virus responsible for the global COVID-19 pandemic. There  
19 is an incomplete understanding of the host humoral immune response to SARS-CoV-2 during  
20 acute infection. Host factors such as age and sex as well the kinetics and functionality of  
21 antibody responses are important factors to consider as vaccine development proceeds. The  
22 receptor-binding domain of the CoV spike (RBD-S) protein is important in host cell recognition  
23 and infection and antibodies targeting this domain are often neutralizing. In a cross-sectional  
24 study of anti-RBD-S antibodies in COVID-19 patients we found equivalent levels in male and  
25 female patients and no age-related deficiencies even out to 93 years of age. The anti-RBD-S  
26 response was evident as little as 6 days after onset of symptoms and for at least 5 weeks after  
27 symptom onset. Anti-RBD-S IgG, IgM, and IgA responses were simultaneously induced within  
28 10 days after onset, but isotype-specific kinetics differed such that anti-RBD-S IgG was most  
29 sustained over a 5-week period. The kinetics and magnitude of neutralizing antibody formation  
30 strongly correlated with that seen for anti-RBD-S antibodies. Our results suggest age- and sex-  
31 related disparities in COVID-19 fatalities are not explained by anti-RBD-S responses. The multi-  
32 isotype anti-RBD-S response induced by live virus infection could serve as a potential marker by  
33 which to monitor vaccine-induced responses.

- 34 Key words: COVID-19, SARS-CoV-2, spike protein, Receptor-binding domain, Coronavirus,  
35 Serology, Humoral immune response, Neutralizing antibody, Isotypes

## 36 INTRODUCTION

37 Human pathogenic coronaviruses (CoV) such as severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS)-  
38 CoV-1, middle east respiratory syndrome (MERS)-CoV, and SARS-CoV-2 (all  $\beta$ -CoVs) have  
39 resulted from zoonoses and utilize cellular receptors to bind and access host cells for productive  
40 infection (1-3). CoV spike (S) proteins are large (>200 kDa) glycosylated trimeric structures that  
41 protrude from viral particles and enable binding of CoV to cellular receptors. SARS-CoV-2  
42 interacts with angiotensin converting enzyme-2 (ACE2) via a flexible receptor-binding domain  
43 (RBD) located on the distal tip of the S protein (4-7). After binding, several proteases act upon  
44 S, priming it to adopt large conformational shifts that facilitate entry into host cells(8). First the  
45 S1 domain (which contains RBD) is cleaved from the C-terminal S2 domain. For SARS-CoV-2  
46 this process may involve furin in the host cell membrane due to a novel furin-recognition site in  
47 the S1/S2 region (9-11). The S2 domain is further processed by other serine and cysteine-  
48 proteases such as trypsin, cathepsin, and TMPRSS2 to facilitate viral entry into the host cell (4,  
49 12).

50 Neutralizing antibodies to SARS CoV-1 have been isolated and were found to target  
51 RBD-S (13). One of these mAbs CR3022 was also found to bind SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S(14). At  
52 the polyclonal level, the quantity of anti-RBD S IgG antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 correlate  
53 well with neutralizing activity(15-18). Cross-neutralization amongst SARS viruses by RBD-S-  
54 targeting antibodies can occur (18-21). However, sequence homology for RBD-S is low for non-  
55 SARS  $\beta$ -CoVs (such as MERS) and for  $\alpha$ -CoVs such as NL63, OC43, 229E, and HKU1(16, 17).  
56 For these reasons serology for SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S is being used to help identify recovered  
57 COVID-19 patients as plasma donors for passive immunotherapy (22).

58 There are several risk factors for COVID-19 mortality but whether two of these – age and  
59 biological sex – are associated with the SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S immune response has to our  
60 knowledge not been addressed in the peer-reviewed literature. Furthermore, most serology

61 studies have been done in the setting of severe COVID-19 disease and, save for one study  
62 (17), without the benefit of detailed kinetics. Herein we tracked the kinetics and magnitude of  
63 neutralizing and anti-SARS-CoV-2 S and RBD-S antibodies in a cross-sectional cohort of PCR-  
64 confirmed COVID-19 patients.  
65

## 66 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

67 We chose a two-step ELISA–based RBD-S-focused approach to serology in our study  
68 population. Reagents and pre-print protocols were available in mid-March 2020, which indicated  
69 that RBD-S screening and full-S confirmation could identify specific and functional antibodies  
70 and be quickly operationalized. Using the established protocol (23) we confirmed the expected  
71 protein size of mammalian-expressed RBD-S (**Figure 1A**) and trimerized spike (**Figure 1B**)  
72 produced from DNA plasmids (gift from Florian Krammer, Mt Sinai School of Medicine). RBD-S  
73 antibodies were specific and correlated with neutralization (15), findings that have been  
74 validated using similar RBD-S-focused assays(16, 17). We confirmed RBD-S and S protein  
75 conformation by binding of CR3022 human IgG1 (**Figure 1C, D**). CR3022 was isolated as a  
76 SARS-S1 domain-binding single chain antibody fragment by phage display and is neutralizing  
77 as an IgG1(13). CR3022 binds adjacent to RBD-S in trimeric S of SARS-CoV-2 in a  
78 glycosylation-sensitive manner(14). Mammalian expression of appropriate size proteins and  
79 recognition by CR3022 together confirm that our protein preparations exhibited the expected  
80 characteristics.

81 We first piloted our antigen preps for the RBD-S IgG screening assay using serum  
82 samples from a PCR-confirmed severe COVID-19 patient (defined as admission to the Intensive  
83 Care Unit, ICU) who was admitted to the hospital 10 days following symptom onset and based  
84 on an early report suggesting that SARS-CoV-2 could trigger antibody responses in this  
85 timeframe (24). We compared IgG reactivity in this sample to decreasing amounts of our RBD-S  
86 antigen preparations against a fixed, recommended amount of commercially produced RBD-S  
87 protein derived from the protocol we used (23). We found that a wide range of locally produced  
88 RBD-S antigen yielded IgG reactivity equivalent to 100 ng of commercial antigen in an acute  
89 serum sample from this COVID-19-positive patient (**Figure 1E**). No signal was observed in a  
90 pre-2019 serum sample or in the absence of serum (**Figure 1E**). Using the standard 100 ng  
91 amount hereafter, we found that RBD-S–binding IgM and IgG were present at 10-13 days after

92 symptom onset. We did not detect any RBD-S-binding in healthy pre-2019 sera (**Figure 1F**), in  
93 agreement with extensive testing of this assay in pre-COVID-19 serum performed elsewhere  
94 (15). Due to different secondary antibodies for IgM and IgG detection we cannot conclude  
95 whether absolute levels of RBD-S IgG were higher than RBD-S IgM. Total IgG and IgM were  
96 readily detected in both COVID-19 and in healthy non-COVID-19 serum (**Figure 1G**).

97 For a cross-sectional COVID-19 serological survey we collected serum samples from 32  
98 patients that tested COVID-19 positive by nasopharyngeal swab RT-qPCR testing. All patients  
99 had been admitted to the hospital and 13/32 (40%) were admitted to the ICU. Twenty-five  
100 patients were subsequently discharged and 7 died. One to five serum samples were collected  
101 from each patient with the first sample being taken within approximately 9 days after diagnosis,  
102 in which diagnosis occurred around 5 days after symptom onset (**Table 1**). There was a  
103 53%:47% male: female distribution and patients were on average  $68 \pm 14$  years of age (range  
104 30 -93 years) (**Table 1**).

105 A male bias in COVID-19 mortality was reported early during the pandemic (25-27) and  
106 has been confirmed worldwide in a recent meta-analysis (28). One of the hypotheses to explain  
107 this is differences in adaptive immunity between males and females. Although the mean serum  
108 RBD-S IgG reactivity level appeared higher in male samples (O.D. = 1.8, n = 40) versus female  
109 samples (O.D. = 1.0, n = 37) this difference was not significant and the same maximum  
110 reactivity values were found in males and females (**Figure 2A**).

111 Although not absolute, it appears that irrespective of comorbidities, there is a higher risk  
112 of COVID-19 mortality and morbidity in older individuals (60 years of age and over) (29-31). We  
113 therefore assessed RBD-S IgG antibodies by age. There was a broad range of RBD-S IgG  
114 responses that did not differ as a function of age as assessed by correlation analysis ( $R^2 < 0.01$ ,  
115 **Figure 2B**). Notably, one of the highest RBD-S IgG responses was from a 93-year old patient. A  
116 serum sample from a 30-year old COVID-19 patient was negative for RBD-S IgG, but this  
117 sample was taken just three days after symptom onset, which may be too early for induction of

118 robust IgG responses. Taken together, we did not find evidence of biological sex- or age-related  
119 deficiencies in RBD-S IgG responses in COVID-19 patients.

120 RDB-S-reactive serum IgG was detected in 5 of 12 (42%) samples that were taken  
121 within 10 days of symptom onset (**Figure 2C**). After day 10 of symptoms, 98% of samples were  
122 positive for RBD IgG (**Figure 2C**). There were small variations in positive threshold for RBD by  
123 assay date (Figure S1). We therefore confirmed each sample (whether RBD-positive or not)  
124 with an endpoint titration and area under the curve calculation for reactivity against the full spike  
125 ectodomain trimer (15). Samples that were RBD-S-negative were also low for spike total  
126 reactivity (AUC) and titer (**Figures 2D, E**). Furthermore, we found a very strong correlation  
127 between RBD and spike IgG (**Figure 2F**). The low level of spike reactivity in RBD-negative  
128 samples could indicate a baseline cross-reactivity against other human coronaviruses (32). S  
129 cross-reactivity would presumably occur in regions outside the RBD given the low conservation  
130 of SARS-CoV-2 RBD compared to other human CoVs with the exception of SARS-CoV-1 (16).  
131 Nonetheless, we found a strong correlation between RDB-S IgG and microneutralization titers  
132 (**Figure 2G**), confirming the utility of RBD-S serology for estimation of functional neutralizing  
133 antibodies in agreement with other studies (15-17).

134 In the patient-specific RBD IgG data (**Figure S2A**) we found several patterns: initial  
135 seroconversion (e.g. patients 0003, and 0017), rapid increases (e.g. patients 0005, 0006, 0009,  
136 0011, 0020, occurring between days 10-20), and plateaued responses (e.g. patients 0012 and  
137 0021, occurring mainly after day 20). These responses were concordant with temporal patient-  
138 specific S IgG titers (**Figure S2B**). Anti-S titers in patients with a negative RBD-S test were  
139 generally low and in RBD-positive samples, followed the same trends as RBD-reactivity,  
140 providing further confirmation of robust serological responses to SARS-CoV-2 during acute  
141 COVID-19. At the patient level, neutralizing activity was observed after as few as five days after  
142 symptom onset and throughout the study period and was predominantly found in those samples  
143 with positive RBD-S IgG (**Figure S3**).

144 To assess antibody isotype dynamics during acute SARS-CoV-2 we followed RBD-S  
145 and full spike-specific IgM and IgA levels in the same samples for which RBD-S and spike IgG  
146 was determined. At the patient level we found robust co-occurrence of IgM, IgG, and IgA  
147 antibodies reactive to RBD-S in most samples, particularly in post-day 10 samples (**Figure S4**).  
148 Pooling all the data revealed that all pre-day 10 RBD-S responses for all isotypes were low.  
149 Around day 10, IgM targeting RBD-S as well as the switched isotypes IgG and IgA  
150 simultaneously rose. While RBD-reactive IgM and IgA responses tapered after 3 weeks post-  
151 onset (though remained higher than baseline), those for IgG continued to rise to a plateau that  
152 was sustained up to 5 weeks after symptoms onset (the most protracted timepoint measured,  
153 **Figure 3A**). Similar patterns were obtained for full spike-reactive antibodies (**Figure 3B**). These  
154 results suggesting that during acute infection COVID-19 patients undergo a seroconversion  
155 across isotypes to SARS-CoV-2 rather than an expansion of pre-existing anti-CoV antibodies.

156 Lastly, we assessed anti-RBD-IgG responses by clinical severity. All the patients in this  
157 study were hospitalized and 40% of were admitted to the intensive care unit. When we stratified  
158 by ICU admission and compared RBS-S IgG levels, we found a trend towards higher levels in  
159 those requiring ICU-level care ( $P = 0.09$ ) (**Figure 4A**). Additionally, we observed a significant  
160 association between RBD-S IgG and duration of ICU admission (**Figure 4B**). Lastly 7 of 32  
161 (22%) patients succumbed to COVID-19. While a significant difference in the median RBD-S  
162 IgG was not observed between survivors and decedents, a smaller range trending towards  
163 higher RBD-S reactivity was observed in those patients that died (**Figure 4C**). Although we did  
164 not have continuous monitoring of viral load in these patients during hospitalizations it is  
165 possible that RBD-S IgG levels reflect ongoing viral replication during more severe disease and  
166 in conjunction with other factors may allow for recovery.

167 Taken together, our results provide the first comprehensive survey of SARS-CoV-2 spike  
168 RBD antibodies that accounts for two key risk factors for COVID-19. Neither RBD-S nor S  
169 antibodies were significantly different as a function of biological sex. Anti-RBD-S and spike IgG



170 responses were induced across 6 decades of age with robust responses found in several  
171 samples from patients  $\geq 80$  years old. These results also extend kinetic analyses and confirm  
172 the paucity of anti-SARS-CoV-2 anti-spike responses in very early blood samples taken prior to  
173 day 10 after symptoms onset (17, 24). We also assessed protective anti-spike RBD responses  
174 as a function of level of hospital care and disease severity and found that duration of ICU-level  
175 care was associated with higher responses, possibly due to an extended period of SARS-CoV-2  
176 replication during severe disease. A limitation of our study is that we only followed symptomatic  
177 patients admitted to hospital; it is unclear whether antibody responses differ in asymptomatic or  
178 mildly symptomatic patients. We also did not directly assess whether the RBD-specific  
179 antibodies we studied were neutralizing at the clonal level, though we did observe a strong  
180 association with polyclonal RBD-S IgG responses and SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing activity. This is  
181 in agreement with other reports which confirm that RBD-S IgG levels correlate with neutralizing  
182 activity and that the RBD of SARS-CoV-2 is a potent target for neutralizing antibodies (16-18,  
183 20, 21, 33). It will be important to determine whether anti-RBD IgA or even IgM antibodies  
184 contribute to blocking activity.

185 **Methods.**

186 *COVID-19 samples.*

187 Patients were admitted to the University of Vermont Medical Center (UVMC), situated  
188 in a low-density (26-112 persons/km<sup>2</sup>) catchment area with a COVID-19 diagnosis from a PCR-  
189 positive swab testing performed within a CLIA-certified clinical laboratory. University of Vermont  
190 Institutional Review Board approval was granted under registration STUDY00881. Samples and  
191 patient data were obtained under Exemption 4, Waiver of Consent and UVM/UVMC HIPAA  
192 Authorization under 46.116(f)(1)(3), 46.164.512(i)(1)(2). Patient IDs are coded here as  
193 “CDDx.001-032”. Deidentified patient (age, sex) and clinical data (COVID-19 diagnosis, dates of  
194 symptom onset, hospitalization, intensive care unit admission) were obtained from the electronic  
195 health record.

196 **RBD-S and spike antigen preparations.**

197 pCAGGS plasmids containing hexahistidine-tagged SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein receptor  
198 binding domain (RBD-S) and trimerized SARS-CoV-2 (15, 23) were obtained as Whatman spots  
199 from Florian Krammer (Mt. Sinai School of Medicine), and transformed into *E.coli* to make  
200 plasmid stocks. We sequence verified these using pcaggs-F (5'-GTTCGGCTTCTGGCGTGT-3')  
201 and pcaggs-R (5'-TATGTCCTTCCGAGTGAGAG-3'). Plasmids were then transfected into  
202 Expi293F cells (Gibco #A14527) and protein was purified by Ni-NTA agarose resin (Qiagen  
203 #30230) as described (23). Protein was quantified using bovine serum albumin as a standard  
204 (Sigma A4505, Cohn Fraction V) and Bradford reagent (Bio-Rad, 5000006). Protein was run on  
205 denaturing 4–20% recast protein gels (Bio-Rad 4561094) and visualized by Coomassie blue  
206 staining with a 10-190 kDa protein ladder (Invitrogen 10748-010).

207 Spike Glycoprotein Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) from SARS-CoV-2, Wuhan-Hu-1,  
208 was also used as a positive control during assay set up and this reagent was produced in  
209 HEK293T cells under HHSN272201400008C and obtained through BEI Resources, NIAID, NIH:

210 Spike Glycoprotein Receptor Binding Domain (RBD) from SARS-Related Coronavirus 2,  
211 Wuhan-Hu-1, Recombinant from NR-52306.

## 212 **Preparation of CR3022 monoclonal antibody.**

213 CR3022 is a SARS-CoV S-specific antibody originally isolated by single chain variable region  
214 phage display and then cloned as an IgG1/kappa monoclonal human IgG1/ $\kappa$  (13). We received  
215 CR3022 heavy chain (HC) and light chain (LC) cloned into pFUSEss-CHlg-hG1 and pFUSE2ss-  
216 CLlg-hK, respectively (Invivogen) from Florian Krammer spotted on filter paper. We  
217 resuspended spots in 100  $\mu$ L TE and transformed 20  $\mu$ L E. coli (NEB C2987H) with 1  $\mu$ L  
218 followed by growth in the presence of Zeocin (25  $\mu$ g/mL, Invivogen, for CR3022-HC) and  
219 blasticidin (100  $\mu$ g/mL, Invivogen for CR3022 LC). Midi-preps were then sequenced confirmed  
220 CR3022HC (Genbank DQ168569) and LC (Genbank DQ168570) with primer HTLV-5'UTR  
221 (forward) 5'-GCTTGCTCAACTCTACGTC-3' and CR3022-HC in the reverse direction by primer  
222 Fc (reverse): 5'CTCACGTCCACCACCACGCA-3'. Recombinant CR3022 was expressed in  
223 293A cells (Invitrogen) by polyethyleneimine (Polysciences Inc.) transfection of 9  $\mu$ g each of  
224 CR3022-HC and LC, culture for 7 days, and protein A agarose bead purification as described  
225 (34). IgG was quantified by sandwich ELISA with anti-human IgG (Jackson ImmunoResearch  
226 109-005-008) as capture and horseradish peroxidase-conjugated anti-human IgG (Jackson  
227 ImmunoResearch, 109-005-008) as detection Ab with known human serum as a standard.

## 228 **Clinical RBD-S and S IgG ELISA testing**

229 For IgG against RBD-S from SARS-CoV-2 we followed Stadlbauer et al (23) and the Emergency  
230 Use Authorization granted to MSSM by the Food and Drug Administration on 4/15/2020  
231 (<https://www.fda.gov/media/137029/download>). Briefly, for RBD-S IgG levels 96-well plates  
232 were coated with 100 ng/well of purified RBD-S and then blocked with 3% milk in phosphate-  
233 buffered saline (PBS) containing 0.1% Tween-20 (T). Heat-inactivated (56°C for 1 hr) serum  
234 samples were diluted 1:5 in PBS, and 20  $\mu$ L of this was added to 180  $\mu$ L of dilution buffer (PBS-

235 T + 1% milk) in each well for 1:50 final dilution of sample. 100  $\mu$ L of sample is then added to  
236 each well and after 1 hr incubation at room temperature and washing with PBS-T using a Biotek  
237 ELx-405 Select CW (Biotek, Winooski, VT), IgG was detected with alkaline phosphatase-  
238 conjugated cross-adsorbed anti-human IgG (Sigma SAB3701277, diluted 1:2,500 in blocking  
239 buffer), washing, and addition of p-nitrophenylphosphate (Sigma N2770) substrate. The  
240 colorimetric reaction (optical density at 405 nm) was detected with a Cytation 3 (Biotek,  
241 Winooski, VT). Two negative control samples of pre-2019 serum were used on each plate and  
242 the average + three standard deviations above the mean were used as the assay cutoff for  
243 positivity.

244 For S detection heat-inactivated serum samples were diluted 1:5 in PBS and then 20  $\mu$ L  
245 was added to 180  $\mu$ L of dilution buffer in the starting well (for a final 1:100 starting dilution) then  
246 serially diluted 1:3 to an endpoint dilution of 1:8,100. IgG detection was performed as described  
247 above with 100  $\mu$ L of 1:100 sample. Endpoint titer was defined as the last dilution at which the  
248 signal was above the cutoff (defined as was done for RBD-S above). spike area under the curve  
249 (AUC) was calculated in Prism 8.4.3 (Graphpad Inc) from the OD<sub>405nm</sub> values from all six  
250 dilutions and using the negative control cutoff values as the baseline.

#### 251 **Testing for RBD-S and S IgM and IgA in clinical samples by ELISA**

252 Samples were handled as above for IgG except that the detection steps used alkaline  
253 phosphatase-conjugated anti-human IgM (Sigma A3437, diluted 1:1,000 in blocking buffer) or  
254 IgA (Sigma A3400, diluted 1:1,000 in blocking buffer).

#### 255 **SARS-CoV-2 microneutralization assay**

256 All experiments featuring infectious SARS-CoV-2 were conducted at the UVM BSL-3 facility  
257 under an approved Institutional Biosafety protocol. SARS-CoV-2 strain 2019-nCoV/USA\_USA-  
258 WA1/2020 (WA1) was generously provided by Kenneth Plante and the World Reference Center  
259 for Emerging Viruses and Arboviruses (WRCEVA) at the University of Texas Medical Branch  
260 and propagated in African green monkey kidney cells (Vero E6) that were kindly provided by J.L

261 Whitton. Vero E6 cells were maintained in complete Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium  
262 (cDMEM) (11965–092) containing 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (16140–071), 1% HEPES  
263 Buffer Solution (15630–130), and 1% penicillin-streptomycin (15140–122) purchased from  
264 Thermo Fisher Scientific (Carlsbad, CA). Cells were grown in a humidified incubator at 37°C  
265 with 5% CO<sub>2</sub>. To assess the neutralization capacity of patient sera against authentic SARS-  
266 CoV-2, we conducted a focus reduction neutralization test (FRNT). Each serum sample was  
267 heat inactivated via incubation at 56 °C for 1 h. Samples were then diluted serially in 25 µL of  
268 cDMEM, mixed with an equal volume of cDMEM containing 175 focus forming units (FFU) of  
269 SARS-CoV-2, and then incubated for 60 minutes at 37°C. Each serum sample was tested for  
270 neutralization at an initial dilution of 1:50 and then serially at 1:2 dilutions until reaching an  
271 endpoint of 1:3,200. The media from confluent Vero E6 cell monolayers in 96-well white  
272 polystyrene microplates (07-200-628, Thermo Fisher Scientific) was removed and 50 µL of each  
273 antibody-virus mixture was inoculated onto the cells and incubated at 37°C in a 5% CO<sub>2</sub>  
274 incubator for 60 minutes, after which the wells were overlaid with 1.2% methylcellulose in  
275 cDMEM and incubated at 37°C in a 5% CO<sub>2</sub> incubator for 24 h. Infected cells were fixed in 25%  
276 formaldehyde in 3X phosphate buffered saline (PBS). Cells were permeabilized with 0.1% 100X  
277 Triton in 1X PBS for 15 minutes and then incubated with a primary, cross-reactive rabbit anti-  
278 SARS-CoV N monoclonal antibody (40143-R001, Sinobiological) (1:20,000) followed by a  
279 peroxidase-labeled goat anti-rabbit antibody (5220-0336, SeraCare) (1:2,000) and then the  
280 peroxidase substrate (5510-0030, SeraCare). Images of the wells were captured using a Zeiss  
281 AxioCam MRC Imager.M1 microscope and viral foci were quantified manually. Focus counts  
282 were normalized to virus only control wells. FRNT<sub>50</sub> determinations were made using a non-  
283 linear regression curve fit (log[inhibitor] vs. normalized response – variable slope) in GraphPad  
284 Prism.

## 285 **Graphics and Statistical testing.**

- 286 All statistics and graphics were performed using R version 3.6.1 using standard packages or  
287 GraphPad Prism 8.4.3. Non-parametric LOESS (LOcal regrESSion) was used for smoothing.

288 **Acknowledgements**

289 We thank all health care workers and laboratory personnel who contributed to treatment and  
290 diagnosis of these and other COVID-19 patients. We thank the clinical research staff at the  
291 University of Vermont (UVM) Medical Center Pathology and Laboratory Medicine and the  
292 Vaccine Testing Center. We also thank the UVM Research Protections Office, Institutional  
293 Review Board, and Institutional Biosafety Committee for rapid turnaround of COVID-19-related  
294 projects. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to  
295 publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

296 **Funding**

297 This work was funded by a pilot grant to SAD and EB from the UVM Translational Global  
298 Infectious Disease Research Center (National Institute of Health grant P20GM125498).  
299 Additional funding was from NIH grant U01AI141997 to SAD, JWB, and BDK, the Office of the  
300 Vice President for Research at the University of Vermont to JWB, and the University of Vermont  
301 Larner College of Medicine Department of Surgery. Sequencing confirmation of reagents was  
302 performed in the Vermont Integrative Genomics Resource Sequencing Facility and was  
303 supported by the UVM Cancer Center, Lake Champlain Cancer Research Organization, UVM  
304 College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, and the UVM Larner College of Medicine.

305 **Author contributions:**

306 SAD, JWC, and JWB conceived and designed the project. NRG, ANW, CAS, BDM, and SAD  
307 performed experiments. AKM, DG, and JWC provided samples. EAB, JWB, MEP, KKP, BDK,  
308 RDS, GA, and SAD provided resources and/or key project input. SAD wrote the manuscript with  
309 input from all authors. Supervision: SAD, JWC, and JWB.

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

311 **REFERENCES**

- 312 1. Cui J, Li F, and Shi ZL. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. *Nat Rev*  
313 *Microbiol.* 2019;17(3):181-92.
- 314 2. Lu R, Zhao X, Li J, Niu P, Yang B, Wu H, et al. Genomic characterisation and  
315 epidemiology of 2019 novel coronavirus: implications for virus origins and receptor  
316 binding. *Lancet.* 2020;395(10224):565-74.
- 317 3. Zhou P, Yang XL, Wang XG, Hu B, Zhang L, Zhang W, et al. A pneumonia outbreak  
318 associated with a new coronavirus of probable bat origin. *Nature.* 2020;579(7798):270-3.
- 319 4. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, Schroeder S, Kruger N, Herrler T, Erichsen S, et al.  
320 SARS-CoV-2 Cell Entry Depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and Is Blocked by a Clinically  
321 Proven Protease Inhibitor. *Cell.* 2020;181(2):271-80 e8.
- 322 5. Wan Y, Shang J, Graham R, Baric RS, and Li F. Receptor Recognition by the Novel  
323 Coronavirus from Wuhan: an Analysis Based on Decade-Long Structural Studies of  
324 SARS Coronavirus. *J Virol.* 2020;94(7).
- 325 6. Watanabe Y, Allen JD, Wrapp D, McLellan JS, and Crispin M. Site-specific glycan  
326 analysis of the SARS-CoV-2 spike. *Science.* 2020;91:eabb9983-9.
- 327 7. Wrapp D, Wang N, Corbett KS, Goldsmith JA, Hsieh CL, Abiona O, et al. Cryo-EM  
328 structure of the 2019-nCoV spike in the prefusion conformation. *Science.*  
329 2020;367(6483):1260-3.
- 330 8. Hulswit RJ, de Haan CA, and Bosch BJ. Coronavirus Spike Protein and Tropism  
331 Changes. *Adv Virus Res.* 2016;96:29-57.
- 332 9. Hoffmann M, Kleine-Weber H, and Pohlmann S. A Multibasic Cleavage Site in the Spike  
333 Protein of SARS-CoV-2 Is Essential for Infection of Human Lung Cells. *Mol Cell.*  
334 2020;78(4):779-84 e5.
- 335 10. Jaimes JA, Andre NM, Chappie JS, Millet JK, and Whittaker GR. Phylogenetic Analysis  
336 and Structural Modeling of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein Reveals an Evolutionary Distinct  
337 and Proteolytically Sensitive Activation Loop. *J Mol Biol.* 2020;432(10):3309-25.
- 338 11. Jaimes JA, Millet JK, and Whittaker GR. Proteolytic Cleavage of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike  
339 Protein and the Role of the Novel S1/S2 Site. *iScience.* 2020;23(6):101212.
- 340 12. Ou X, Liu Y, Lei X, Li P, Mi D, Ren L, et al. Characterization of spike glycoprotein of  
341 SARS-CoV-2 on virus entry and its immune cross-reactivity with SARS-CoV. *Nat*  
342 *Commun.* 2020;11(1):1620.
- 343 13. ter Meulen J, van den Brink EN, Poon LL, Marissen WE, Leung CS, Cox F, et al. Human  
344 monoclonal antibody combination against SARS coronavirus: synergy and coverage of  
345 escape mutants. *PLoS Med.* 2006;3(7):e237.



- 346 14. Yuan M, Wu NC, Zhu X, Lee CD, So RTY, Lv H, et al. A highly conserved cryptic epitope  
347 in the receptor binding domains of SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV. *Science*.  
348 2020;368(6491):630-3.
- 349 15. Amanat F, Stadlbauer D, Strohmeier S, Nguyen THO, Chromikova V, McMahon M, et al.  
350 A serological assay to detect SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *Nat Med*.  
351 2020;5:562-12.
- 352 16. Premkumar L, Segovia-Chumbez B, Jadi R, Martinez DR, Raut R, Markmann A, et al.  
353 The receptor binding domain of the viral spike protein is an immunodominant and highly  
354 specific target of antibodies in SARS-CoV-2 patients. *Sci Immunol*. 2020;5(48).
- 355 17. Suthar MS, Zimmerman MG, Kauffman RC, Mantus G, Linderman SL, Hudson WH, et  
356 al. Rapid generation of neutralizing antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. *Cell*  
357 *Reports Medicine*. 2020.
- 358 18. Ju B, Zhang Q, Ge J, Wang R, Sun J, Ge X, et al. Human neutralizing antibodies elicited  
359 by SARS-CoV-2 infection. *Nature*. 2020.
- 360 19. Walls AC, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Wall A, McGuire AT, and Velesler D. Structure,  
361 Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. *Cell*.  
362 2020;181(2):281-92 e6.
- 363 20. Pinto D, Park YJ, Beltramello M, Walls AC, Tortorici MA, Bianchi S, et al. Cross-  
364 neutralization of SARS-CoV-2 by a human monoclonal SARS-CoV antibody. *Nature*.  
365 2020.
- 366 21. Wec AZ, Wrapp D, Herbert AS, Maurer DP, Haslwanter D, Sakharkar M, et al. Broad  
367 neutralization of SARS-related viruses by human monoclonal antibodies. *Science*. 2020.
- 368 22. Liu STH, Lin H-M, Baine I, Wajnberg A, Gumprecht JP, Rahman F, et al. Convalescent  
369 plasma treatment of severe COVID-19: A matched control study. *medRxiv*.  
370 2020:2020.05.20.20102236.
- 371 23. Stadlbauer D, Amanat F, Chromikova V, Jiang K, Strohmeier S, Arunkumar GA, et al.  
372 SARS-CoV-2 Seroconversion in Humans: A Detailed Protocol for a Serological Assay,  
373 Antigen Production, and Test Setup. *Curr Protoc Microbiol*. 2020;57(1):e100.
- 374 24. To KK, Tsang OT, Leung WS, Tam AR, Wu TC, Lung DC, et al. Temporal profiles of  
375 viral load in posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses  
376 during infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*.  
377 2020;20(5):565-74.
- 378 25. Wu Z, and McGoogan JM. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the  
379 Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of  
380 72314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. *JAMA*.  
381 2020.
- 382 26. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, et al. Epidemiological and clinical  
383 characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a  
384 descriptive study. *Lancet*. 2020;395(10223):507-13.

- 385 27. Guan WJ, Ni ZY, Hu Y, Liang WH, Ou CQ, He JX, et al. Clinical Characteristics of  
386 Coronavirus Disease 2019 in China. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(18):1708-20.
- 387 28. Scully EP, Haverfield J, Ursin RL, Tannenbaum C, and Klein SL. Considering how  
388 biological sex impacts immune responses and COVID-19 outcomes. *Nat Rev Immunol.*  
389 2020.
- 390 29. Verity R, Okell LC, Dorigatti I, Winskill P, Whittaker C, Imai N, et al. Estimates of the  
391 severity of coronavirus disease 2019: a model-based analysis. *Lancet Infect Dis.*  
392 2020;20(6):669-77.
- 393 30. Iaccarino G, Grassi G, Borghi C, Ferri C, Salvetti M, Volpe M, et al. Age and  
394 Multimorbidity Predict Death Among COVID-19 Patients: Results of the SARS-RAS  
395 Study of the Italian Society of Hypertension. *Hypertension.*  
396 2020:HYPERTENSIONAHA12015324.
- 397 31. Miller IF, Becker AD, Grenfell BT, and Metcalf CJE. Disease and healthcare burden of  
398 COVID-19 in the United States. *Nat Med.* 2020.
- 399 32. Meyer B, Drosten C, and Muller MA. Serological assays for emerging coronaviruses:  
400 challenges and pitfalls. *Virus Res.* 2014;194:175-83.
- 401 33. Wang Q, Zhang Y, Wu L, Niu S, Song C, Zhang Z, et al. Structural and Functional Basis  
402 of SARS-CoV-2 Entry by Using Human ACE2. *Cell.* 2020;181(4):894-904 e9.
- 403 34. Smith K, Garman L, Wrammert J, Zheng NY, Capra JD, Ahmed R, et al. Rapid  
404 generation of fully human monoclonal antibodies specific to a vaccinating antigen. *Nat*  
405 *Protoc.* 2009;4(3):372-84.
- 406 35. Smith SA, de Alwis AR, Kose N, Jadi RS, de Silva AM, and Crowe JE, Jr. Isolation of  
407 dengue virus-specific memory B cells with live virus antigen from human subjects  
408 following natural infection reveals the presence of diverse novel functional groups of  
409 antibody clones. *J Virol.* 2014;88(21):12233-41.  
410  
411


412 Tables

413 **Table 1**

<b>COVID-19 subjects</b>	<b>Male/ Female</b>	<b>AGE <math>\pm</math> S.D. [Range]</b>	<b>Days from symptoms to Dx</b>	<b>Days between Dx and 1<sup>st</sup> serum</b>
Swab PCR+ (n = 32)	17/15	68 $\pm$ 14 [30-93]	5.4 $\pm$ 4.7 [0-14]	8.6 $\pm$ 7.5 [0-35]

414

415 Figures



416

417 **Figure 1 | Validation of SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S and spike antigens in COVID-19 samples.**


418 Reducing SDS-PAGE analysis of (A) RBD-S and (B) trimeric spike purified from transiently

419 transfected mammalian HEK293 cells. (C) Binding of CR3022 IgG1 mAb to SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S

420 S and (D) trimerized spike. The anti-dengue virus 1M7 mAb (35) was used as a control (E)


421 Detection of serum IgG from a COVID-19 patient (left), but not from pre-2020 serum (center) or

422 no serum control (right). **(F)** Detection of IgM and IgG to RBD-S in serial serum samples from  
423 COVID-19 patient and not in pre-2020 healthy volunteer sera (all sera diluted 1:50 and for  
424 COVID-19 patient, day after onset is shown in label). **(G)** Total IgM and IgG reactivity in a 1:50  
425 dilution of serum from panel F.



426  
 427 **Figure 2 | IgG responses to SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S and spike. (A)** Comparison of RBD-S IgG  
 428 reactivity (OD 405nm) levels in samples from male or female patients ( $P = 0.18$ , student's t-test)  
 429 Note that multiple samples came from some patients. Boxplots show the 25-75<sup>th</sup> percentiles,  
 430 with median as horizontal line and whiskers as 95% confidence level and all individual samples.  
 431 **(B)** RBD-S IgG reactivity was assessed as a function of age **(C)** or days after symptom onset.  
 432 **(D)** Spike reactivity is expressed as area under the curve over six threefold serial dilutions


433 (1:100 – 1:8,100) and plotted against days of symptoms. **(E)** Spike IgG endpoint titer or **(F)** AUC  
434 is plotted against RBD-IgG reactivity. **(G)** SARS-CoV-2 microneutralization titers are plotted  
435 against RBD-S IgG reactivity. Cutoff values (dashed line) are shown. Spearman's Rho  
436 coefficient ( $R^2$ ), 95% confidence interval (shading), and  $P$ -value are shown for B-G.  
437



438 **Figure 3 | Antibody isotype usage during the response to SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S and spike.**

439 **(A)** RBD-S IgM, IgG, and IgA in serum (diluted 1:50) were determined by ELISA and plotted  
440 against days post onset of symptoms. LOESS-smoothed lines and 95% confidence intervals are  
441 shown for each isotype. **(B)** **(A)** Spike-reactive IgM, IgG, and IgA in serum (diluted 1:100) were  
442 determined by ELISA and plotted against days post onset of symptoms. LOESS-smoothed lines  
443 and 95% confidence intervals are shown for each isotype.





444  
445 **Figure 4 | SARS-CoV-2 RBD-S IgG responses during hospitalization. (A)** RBD-S IgG in  
446 patients that were hospitalized in the ICU or not were analyzed by student's t-test and *P*-value is  
447 shown. Boxplots show the median, 95% confidence level and all individual samples. **(B)** For ICU  
448 hospitalized patients, all RBD-S IgG values are presented as a function of ICU admission days.  
449 Spearman's Rho coefficient ( $R^2$ ), 95% confidence interval, and *P*-value are shown. **(C)** RBD-S  
450 IgG in patients that were deceased or discharged were analyzed by student's t-test and *P*-value  
451 is shown. Boxplots show the median, 95% confidence level, and all individual samples.