

35 **Abstract**

36

37 **Objectives** – To investigate longitudinal trajectory of SARS-CoV-2 neutralising antibodies and the
38 performance of serological assays in diagnosing prior infection and predicting serum neutralisation
39 titres with time

40

41 **Design** Retrospective longitudinal analysis of a COVID19 case cohort .

42

43 **Setting** NHS outpatient clinics

44

45 **Participants** Individuals with RT-PCR diagnosed SARS-CoV-2 infection that did not require
46 hospitalization

47

48 **Main outcome measures** The sensitivity with which prior infection was detected and quantitative
49 antibody titres were assessed using four SARS-CoV-2 serologic assay platforms. Two platforms
50 employed SARS-CoV-2 spike (S) based antigens and two employed nucleocapsid (N) based
51 antigens. Serum neutralising antibody titres were measured using a validated pseudotyped virus
52 SARS-CoV-2 neutralisation assay. The ability of the serological assays to predict neutralisation
53 titres at various times after PCR diagnosis was assessed.

54

55 **Results** The three of the four serological assays had sensitivities of 95 to 100% at 21-40 days post
56 PCR-diagnosis, while a fourth assay had a lower sensitivity of 85%. The relative sensitivities of the
57 assays changed with time and the sensitivity of one assay that had an initial sensitivity of >95%
58 declined to 85% at 61-80 post PCR diagnosis, and to 71% at 81-100 days post diagnosis. Median
59 antibody titres decreased in one serologic assay but were maintained over the observation period
60 in other assays. The trajectories of median antibody titres measured in serologic assays over this
61 time period were not dependent on whether the SARS-CoV-2 N or S proteins were used as
62 antigen source. A broad range of SARS-CoV-2 neutralising titres were evident in individual sera,
63 that decreased over time in the majority of participants; the median neutralisation titre in the cohort
64 decreased by 45% over 4 weeks. Each of the serological assays gave quantitative measurements
65 of antibody titres that correlated with SARS-CoV-2 neutralisation titres, but, the S-based
66 serological assay measurements better predicted serum neutralisation potency. The strength of
67 correlation between serologic assay results and neutralisation titres deteriorated with time and
68 decreases in neutralisation titres in individual participants were not well predicted by changes in
69 antibody titres measured using serologic assays.

70

71 **Conclusions** – SARS-CoV-2 serologic assays differed in their comparative diagnostic
72 performance over time. Different assays are more or less well suited for surveillance of populations
73 for prior infection versus prediction of serum neutralisation potency. Continued monitoring of
74 declining neutralisation titres during extended follow up should facilitate the establishment of
75 appropriate serologic correlates of protection against SARS-CoV-2 reinfection.

76 **Introduction**

77 The emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), the
78 causative agent of COVID-19, has resulted in a global pandemic with hundreds of thousands of
79 deaths and millions of illnesses. Diagnosis of SARS-CoV-2 infection is principally dependent on
80 RT-PCR using nasal and throat swabs, which is not ideally suited to mass population testing and
81 as such has largely been targeted at symptomatic individuals in many settings. RT-PCR-diagnosed
82 case numbers have therefore underestimated the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and
83 serology assays must be deployed to determine the true number of infections using a surveillance
84 approach. Serology assays also have a critical role in screening volunteers for vaccine trials and
85 convalescent plasma donations, as well as predicting infection or vaccine-induced immunity.
86 Although several commercially available SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays are in common use,
87 evaluation of their sensitivity has often used samples from hospitalised patients soon after
88 infection. Knowledge of the long-term kinetics of antibody titres and the corresponding
89 effectiveness of commercial assays is imperative if these testing protocols are to be accurately
90 interpreted¹⁻³.

91 Serology assays for SARS-CoV-2 primarily employ viral nucleocapsid (N) or the spike
92 surface protein (S) antigens. Because S binds to target cells through its receptor binding domain
93 (RBD) it is the target of neutralising antibodies. Therefore, S-based assays may be preferable to N-
94 based assays for the assessment of the risk of future re-infection⁴. Of course, this premise is
95 based on the assumptions (1) that neutralising antibodies constitute a major mechanism of
96 protective immunity, and (2) that S-based serology assays accurately predict neutralising antibody
97 activity.

98 Thus, major outstanding questions remain about the utilisation of serology that have
99 implications for ongoing public health testing strategies for SARS-CoV-2. These questions include
100 (1) how circulating antibody levels that are specific for each viral antigen change with time following
101 natural infection and (2) which serological assays best predict protective immunity. As yet, the
102 prognostic value of antibody measurements in situations where individuals may be re-exposed to
103 reinfection has yet to be demonstrated. Nevertheless, it is important to understand post infection
104 serology as measured using high throughput assays to enable correlates of protection to be

105 established. Here, we present the results of a longitudinal antibody testing study on a cohort of
106 mildly symptomatic, non-hospitalised COVID19 positive patients during the first few months of
107 convalescence. We compare the ability of four high-throughput automated assays to diagnose
108 prior SARS-CoV2 infection and to predict neutralising activity in convalescent serum.

109

110 **Methods**

111

112 **Participants**

113 Participants with prior RT-PCR-diagnosed COVID-19 were recruited. Recruits were surveyed to
114 determine the date of the positive PCR test, the date of onset of symptoms, and if their symptoms
115 required hospitalisation. Serum samples were taken at a baseline visit (~3.5 to ~8.5 weeks post
116 PCR test), and 2 weeks (visit 2), 4 weeks (visit 3) and 8 weeks later (visit 4). In total, 97
117 participants, who were not hospitalised during the course of their illness completed at least 3 visits.
118 The mean age of the participants was 44.2 years (21 – 65 y), with 70 female (72% of cohort)
119 participants. At visit 1 (baseline), the average number of days between PCR test and visit 1
120 (baseline) was 40.8 days (24 – 61 days); at visit 2 (2 weeks post-baseline), the average number of
121 days post-PCR test was 55.1 days (40 – 79 days); at visit 3 (4 weeks post-baseline), the average
122 number of days post-PCR test was 69.8 days (55 – 95 days); at visit 4 (8 weeks post-baseline), the
123 average number of days post-PCR test was 98.4 days (85 – 110 days). Ethical approval was
124 obtained for this study to be carried out through the NHS Lothian BioResource. All recruits gave
125 written and informed consent for serial blood sample collection. Patients and Public were not
126 involved in the design of this research.

127

128 **High throughput automated serology assays**

129 Four commercial assays, that employ either S or N protein antigens and are designed for high
130 throughput in healthcare settings were used. All the assays generate a qualitative positive/negative
131 result based on assay-dependent signal thresholds. The Abbott SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay detects
132 anti-N IgG using a two-step chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay (CMIA) method with an
133 acridinium-labelled anti-human IgG. The DiaSorin SARS-CoV-2 IgG assay is also a two-step CMIA

134 method targeting undisclosed epitopes in the SARS-CoV-2 S protein and employs an isoluminol
135 conjugated anti-human IgG. The Roche Anti-SARS-CoV total antibody assay is a two-step bridging
136 electrochemiluminescent immunoassay (ECLIA) using ruthenium-labelled and biotin conjugated N
137 protein. The Siemens SARS-CoV-2 total antibody assay is a one-step bridging CLIA method that
138 detects antibodies against the RBD of the S protein, using acridinium and biotinylated S1 RBD.
139 Assays were performed on the Abbott Architect and Diasorin Liason platforms (NHS Lothian), and
140 the Roche Elecsys (NHS Lanarkshire) and Siemens Atellica (NHS Tayside) platforms. Serum,
141 collected and stored according to the manufacturer's recommendations, was used in all cases.

142

143 **SARS-CoV-2 Neutralisation assays**

144 To measure neutralising antibody activity, serial dilutions of serum, beginning with a 1:12.5 dilution
145 were five-fold serially diluted in 96-well plates over four dilutions. Thereafter, approximately 5×10^3
146 infectious units of an HIV/CCNG/nLuc/SARS-CoV-2 pseudotype virus were mixed with the serum
147 dilutions at a 1:1 ratio and incubated for 1 hour at 37 degrees in a 96-well plate. The mixture was
148 then added to 293T/ACE2cl.22 target cells⁵ plated at 1×10^4 cells/well in 100 μ l medium in 96-well
149 plates the previous day. Thus, the final starting serum dilution was 1:50. Cells were cultured for
150 48h and harvested for NanoLuc luciferase assays, as previously described⁵.

151

152 **Results**

153 The cohort studied herein consists of participants who were not hospitalised during the course of
154 their illness and were therefore relatively mildly symptomatic. Participants were invited to report on
155 the occurrence and frequency of symptoms. Approximately 70% of people reported at least one of
156 the 3 main WHO -identified symptoms, namely fever, cough and anosmia. The most common of
157 symptom was anosmia and the majority of participants reported the presence of 2 of these 3
158 symptoms (Table 1). Serum samples were collected from 97 participants at ~ 4 weeks (visit 1), 6
159 weeks (visit 2) and 8 weeks (visit 3) post diagnosis (by RT-PCR). Additionally, serum was collected
160 from a subset (28 of the 97 participants) at ~ 12 weeks post diagnosis (visit 4).

161

162

163 **Table 1 Percentage of participants per cohort displaying the three main WHO symptoms**

	Fever	Cough	Anosmia	0 of 3 symptoms	1 of 3 symptoms	2 of 3 symptoms	All 3 symptoms	Self-reported recovered
Reported symptom	65	69	74	1	19	42	35	44
%	67%	71%	76%	1%	16%	43%	36%	49%

164 N = 97 for all reported symptoms apart from "self-reported recovered", where only 90 individuals responded to this survey question

165

166


167 We compared the diagnostic sensitivity of 4 high throughput SARS-CoV-2 serology assays
168 that are in routine use in hospital settings. Each assay gives a qualitative positive or negative
169 result, based on assay specific thresholds and sensitivities were calculated for each assay using
170 these thresholds. Inter and intra-assay analytical precision for each assay is detailed in
171 Supplementary Table 1. To account for the differences in time post PCR diagnosis that participants
172 made their first visit, sensitivity across a 20 day rolling time window was calculated. The Abbott,
173 Roche and Siemens assays all had sensitivities of 95 to 100% at 21-40 days post PCR-positive
174 test, while the Diasorin assay had a lower sensitivity of 85% (fig 1A). However, the relative
175 sensitivities of the assays changed with time. Specifically, the sensitivity of the Abbott assay
176 declined to 85% in the 61-80 day window, and 71% at >81 days post diagnosis (fig 1A).
177 Conversely, the sensitivities of the other assays were maintained or increased over time (fig 1A). In
178 terms of intra-individual change, 14/91 participants that were positive on the Abbott assay at visit 1
179 were negative by visit 3 or 4, whereas none of the participants with a positive result at visit 1 on the
180 other assays became negative at visit 3 or 4. For the Diasorin assay, 2 participants that were
181 negative at visit 1 were positive at visit 3 (both participants had an equivocal result at visit 1, and
182 showed a small increase above the assay threshold at visit 3). In the Siemens assay, 3 participants
183 were consistently negative, and in the Roche assay only a single participant was negative at each
184 visit.

185

186 The serological assays give a quantitative assessment of antibody titre as well as a threshold-
187 based positive/negative result. We next analysed changes in the quantitative results over time for
188 each platform (fig 1 B, C). Mean antibody titres decreased in the Abbott assay at visits 2 and 3

189 compared to visit 1 (fig 1B) but increased in the Diasorin and particularly the Roche assays and
 190 remained approximately constant in the Siemens assay (Fig1 B). Notably, 79 out of 97 (81%) of
 191 participants showed a decrease in antibody titre on the Abbott platform, while 82/97 (85%) showed
 192 an increase on the Roche assay, despite the fact that both assays detect N-specific antibodies (fig
 193 1 B, C). Negative or positive change was approximately equally likely in the S-based assays;
 194 specifically, 57% and 47% of intra-individual changes were negative for the Diasorin and Siemens
 195 assays respectively (fig 1 B, C).

196



216 **Fig 1. Longitudinal analysis of COVID-19 participant sera. (A)** Sensitivity of the Abbott, Diasorin, Siemens and Roche serological
 217 assays (as indicated) measured in samples collected at four different timepoints, as indicated, post PCR test and 95% confidence
 218 interval. **(B)** Relative antibody titres for the Diasorin, Siemens, Abbott and Roche, assays at visits 1-3, normalized to visit 1. Horizontal
 219 line indicates median value with 95% confidence interval. Statistical significance was assessed with the Wilcoxon test. **(C)** Values for


220 Diasorin, Siemens, Abbott and Roche serological assays for each participant plotted over time (each line represents one participant).
221 Assay thresholds are indicated by a dotted horizontal line.

222

223

224 We measured neutralising activity in serum samples from the first 3 visits for 80 of the 97
225 participants using a SARS-CoV-2 pseudotyped virus neutralisation assay. This assay employs
226 HIV-1-based virions carrying a nanoluciferase reporter, pseudotyped with the SARS-CoV-2
227 spike protein. We have previously shown that neutralisation titres obtained using these
228 pseudotyped particles correlate well with titres obtained using neutralisation of authentic SARS-
229 CoV-2⁵. Moreover, this assay has been successfully applied for analysis of convalescent plasma
230 samples and in a campaign to identify potent human monoclonal antibodies^{6,7}. Consistent with our
231 analyses of other cohorts^{6,7}, a broad range of neutralising titres were evident in sera collected from
232 80 participants at three timepoints (fig 2A). In samples collected at visit 1, the neutralising activity,
233 as determined by half-maximal neutralising titre (NT₅₀), ranged from <30 to 4300, with a geometric
234 mean of 234 (arithmetic mean was 411) (fig 2A, red symbols). Consistent with other cohorts^{6,7}
235 34/80 (42%) had NT₅₀ of less than 250 while only in 11/80 participants (14%) had NT₅₀ values
236 higher than 1000.

237 NT₅₀ values measured at each timepoint for individual participants correlated with each
238 other, although there was divergence in NT₅₀ values over time (fig 2 A inset). Notably, neutralising
239 activity decreased at each time point for the majority of participants (fig 2 A, blue and green
240 symbols). Overall, the decrease in median NT₅₀ was ~25% per two-week sampling interval,
241 resulting in a ~45% reduction in NT₅₀ over the 4 weeks between visit 1 and visit 3 (fig 2B). As a
242 result, distribution of NT₅₀ values the cohort differed between visits (fig 2C). The relative decline in
243 NT₅₀ between visits 1 and 2 versus visits 2 and 3 did not differ significantly, and the majority of
244 participants exhibited a similar relative decrease in neutralising activity over time, regardless of
245 their initial NT₅₀ values or the number of days post PCR at visit 1, suggesting exponential decay
246 (fig 2D).



247

248 **Fig 2 – Neutralisation activity in COVID-19 participant sera.** (A) Half-maximal neutralisation titres (NT₅₀s) for each individual
 249 participant measured in serum samples collected at three different visits, as indicated by color. Inserts show correlation of NT₅₀ values
 250 for samples collected at each visit, the spearman r is indicated ($p < 0.0001$). (B) Relative NT₅₀ values in sera obtained at visit 1 to 3,
 251 normalized to visit 1. Horizontal line represents median with 95% confidence interval. Statistical significance was assessed with the
 252 Wilcoxon test. (C) Frequency of sera with NT₅₀ values falling to various quantitative categories at each visit. (D) NT₅₀ values for each
 253 participant plotted over time (each line represents one participant). The limit of detection (LOD) is indicated by a dotted horizontal line.

254

255

256 NT₅₀ values at each sampling timepoint were poorly correlated with age (Supplementary fig
 257 1A), and no correlation was observed between age and NT₅₀ decay with time. As has been
 258 previously reported, there was a trend toward lower NT₅₀ values in females than in males^{6,7}, but
 259 there was no difference between sexes in NT₅₀ decay with time (Supplementary fig 1B). Individual
 260 clinical parameters such as GI symptoms, fever or recovery time, did not predict NT₅₀, serological
 261 values or decay parameters for any antibody measurement.

262 Next, we compared neutralising activity in serum with quantitative results obtained from the
 263 serological assays. Analysis of combined results from the three visits by 80 participants revealed a
 264 significant correlation between any combination of two serological assays (Supplementary fig 2).


265 However, stronger correlations were observed between the two S-based assays, Siemens and
266 Diasorin ($r=0.92$, $p<0.0001$) and between the two N-based assays Abbott and Roche ($r=0.81$,
267 $p<0.0001$), The S-based assays correlated less well, but significantly ($p<0.0001$), with the N-based
268 assays (Supplementary fig 2).

269 All the serological assays gave quantitative values that correlated with NT_{50} measurements,
270 but as expected, the S-based assay measurements correlated more closely with NT_{50}
271 measurements (fig 3A-D). The S1/S2-based Diasorin assay, was the best predictor of NT_{50}
272 ($r=0.84$, $p<0.0001$, fig 3A), followed by the RBD-based Siemens assay ($r=0.74$, $p<0.001$, fig 3B),
273 the N-based Abbott assay ($r=0.69$, $p<0.0001$, fig 3C) and, lastly, the Roche assay ($r=0.56$,
274 $p=0.0001$, Fig3D).

275 The correlation between NT_{50} and the individual serological assays was best at the first visit
276 and deteriorated to some extent thereafter (fig 3A-D, see color-coded r-values in individual graphs,
277 $p<0.0001$ for all correlations), The decrease in the strength of correlation might, in part, be
278 attributable to the fact that later sampling timepoints have more samples with lower NT_{50} values,
279 which may reduce measurement precision. The magnitude of the deterioration in the predictive
280 value differed between serological assays, with the S-based assays exhibiting larger decreases in
281 correlation coefficients ($r=0.89$ and 0.83 at visit 1, versus $r=0.83$ and 0.71 at visit 3 for DiaSorin and
282 Siemens assays respectively fig 3A-D), Despite the increasing disparity over time, the DiaSorin
283 assay was clearly superior at predicting NT_{50} at all visits (fig 3A-D).

284 Interestingly, comparison of the extent of change in neutralisation activity over the 4-week
285 observation interval with the concomitant change in values obtained using serological assays,
286 revealed only minimal correlation (fig 3E-H, supplementary fig 3). Notably, in most participants, the
287 decline in serum neutralising activity was clearly greater than the decline in antibody titre measured
288 using any serological assay (fig 3E-H supplementary fig 3). Even for the Diasorin assay, which
289 gave the best prediction of neutralising activity at each time point (fig 3A), declines in neutralising
290 activity were not well predicted by declines in Diasorin assay measurements (fig 3E,
291 supplementary fig 3). While both the Abbott assay and the NT_{50} measurements exhibited declining
292 antibody titres with time, the magnitudes of these declines did not correlate with each other (fig 3G,
293 supplementary fig 3).

294



295

296 **Fig 3 – Correlation of serology results with neutralisation titres. (A-D)** Serological assay values for the Diasorin (A), Siemens (B),
 297 Abbott (C) and Roche (D) assays versus NT₅₀ values. Samples collected at each visit are indicated by color and are plotted individually
 298 as well as on a composite graph. Spearman r for all visits (black) and individual visits are indicated ($p < 0.0001$). (E-H) Fold-change (visit
 299 1 to visit 3) in serological assay values for the Diasorin (E), Siemens (F), Abbott (G) and Roche (H) assay versus fold-change in NT₅₀
 300 values. Spearman r and p-value are indicated.

301

302 Discussion

303 Serological assays for infectious agents have two major and distinct uses, namely (1) to
 304 diagnose chronic infections (e.g. HIV-1) and (2) to determine past infection or immunisation status

305 (e.g. measles, VZV) which may be able to predict immunity from future infection. For example,
306 HIV-1 and HCV serological tests are crucial for diagnosis but have no role in prediction of
307 immunity. In contrast, for viruses such as VZV and measles, the main role of serology is to predict
308 immunity induced by vaccination or prior infection. The use of serological assays to determine
309 widespread seroprevalence is a relatively new application following the COVID19 pandemic, which
310 is different from how these assays have traditionally been used clinically and requires
311 understanding of how these assays perform in populations over time.

312 During the current SARS-CoV-2 pandemic it has become clear that the magnitude of
313 serologic immune responses is highly variable^{6,7}. Nevertheless, the vast majority of individuals with
314 a PCR-confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection generate antibodies at a sufficient level for diagnosis of
315 recent infection⁸. A number of commercial assays have been deployed for high throughput SARS-
316 CoV-2 antibody testing in a clinical setting, and evaluated mostly using hospitalized participants^{9,10}.
317 Non-hospitalised patients and those with mild disease typically have lower levels of antibodies than
318 hospitalized patients with severe illness¹¹⁻¹⁵. Using our cohort of non-hospitalized participants with
319 mild disease, all four assays evaluated herein had sensitivities at visit 1 (an average of 40.8 days
320 after PCR testing) that were comparable to the evaluations performed for these platforms using
321 hospitalised patients¹⁶. This would therefore make all four assays suitable for the detection of
322 COVID-19 antibodies shortly after infection as a confirmatory test for diagnostic purposes, when
323 used in conjunction with RT-PCR assays and clinical history

324 However, differences in assay diagnostic sensitivity become apparent at later time points.
325 Specifically, the sensitivity of the widely used Abbott assay declined with time, to ~70% at >81
326 days post PCR. Consequently, this assay is not appropriate for seroprevalence studies, for
327 identification of SARS-CoV-2 naive vaccine trial participants, or for investigation of individuals
328 presenting with long term chronic symptoms. Altering the positive/negative threshold, may mitigate
329 this issue¹⁷, but would not ultimately alter the downward trend in assay signal over time. Notably
330 our study is one of the few that would capture this information, as most other studies have
331 examined seroconversion at early time points^{14,18-20}. Reasons for the differences in assay
332 performance over time are unclear but cannot be attributed solely to the choice of antigen.
333 Although other studies have attributed a decline in sensitivity of an N based assay to an inherent

334 difference in the dynamics of S versus N antibodies²¹ our findings do not support this contention, at
335 least during the first ~100 days of convalescence. Both Abbott and Roche assays employ the N-
336 proteins as an antigen, but Abbott assay titres decline while those in the Roche assay increase
337 during this time period. One possible explanation for this difference is the use of an antigen
338 bridging approach in the Roche assay, where declines in the total amount of antibody might be
339 compensated by increases in affinity or avidity as antibodies mature through somatic
340 hypermutation. Alternatively, it is possible that the range of N epitopes recognized by sera might
341 change with time. Whatever the explanation, it is clear that that the trajectories of antibody titres
342 measured using assays based on recognition of the same or related antigens can differ²²⁻²⁵.
343 Overall, given their superior sensitivity at each of the time points investigated thus far, the Siemens
344 and Roche assays appear most appropriate for diagnosis of prior SARS-CoV-2 infection, at least
345 within 4 months of SARS-CoV-2 infection, and would report a higher population prevalence than
346 Abbott or DiaSorin assays in the 1 to 4 month post infection period.

347 While the Roche assay exhibited the best diagnostic sensitivity and is therefore well suited
348 for serosurveillance during this time period, it had the lowest ability to predict neutralising antibody
349 titres. This finding might be expected, as neutralising antibodies are directed to the S protein while
350 N-specific antibodies are not expected to be neutralising. The Diasorin assay best predicted
351 neutralising titres, and marginally outperformed the Siemens assay in this regard, perhaps
352 because the dominant neutralising and/or S-binding activity in at least some sera is provided by
353 antibodies that recognize epitopes outside the RBD^{26,27}. It is important to recognize however, that
354 many S-binding antibodies are not neutralising – measurements of S-binding antibodies remain
355 correlates of, and not direct measures of, neutralising antibodies⁷.

356 Very recent reports have also indicated that neutralising antibody titres decline with time²³
357 ²⁴, while another study reported that neutralisation titres remained stable for at least 3 months post
358 infection²⁸. However, in the latter case neutralisation titres were inferred based on a serologic
359 ELISA measurement that was calibrated using a neutralisation assay performed on a small subset
360 of samples. As shown herein, neutralising antibody levels indeed decline in most patients, even
361 those who apparently maintain S-binding or RBD-binding antibody titres measured in serology
362 assays. Thus, the trajectory of neutralising antibody levels cannot necessarily be deduced from

363 serologic measurements of S-binding antibodies, even though S-binding antibodies and
364 neutralising titres are broadly correlated.

365 Key questions in SARS-CoV-2 serology are the trajectory of of the antibody response and
366 to what degree the titres of neutralising antibodies, or antibodies that simply bind to S or N
367 correlate with protection from reinfection or severe disease. Serological studies based on hCoV
368 infection have shown that many adults possess detectable circulating antibodies against OC43 and
369 229E²⁹, and children seroconvert to NL63 and 229E before ~3.5 years of age³⁰. These baseline
370 levels increased upon infection, returning to baseline within one year. High levels of circulating
371 neutralising antibody correlated with protection from re-infection with the same strain of virus^{31 32}.
372 However, hCoV re-infections occur^{32 33}, with more mild illness and shorter duration of virus
373 shedding. Thus, in the case of seasonal hCoV, these data suggest that immunity may wane over
374 time. More limited data is available for SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV, although it suggests antibody
375 responses also decline in the majority of infected individuals³⁴.

376 If, as seems plausible, neutralising antibodies constitute a major protective mechanism
377 against SARS-CoV-2 infection, then the use of serological assays that use S-based antigens and
378 correlate best with NT₅₀ measurements would appear most appropriate for prognostication of
379 immunity. Conversely, if other mechanisms of immunity, such as long-lived memory T-cell
380 responses play a dominant role in protection from infection or severe disease³⁵⁻³⁸, then the optimal
381 choice of antigen for serology assays might differ. Because detailed analyses of T-cell responses
382 are not currently feasible in a high throughput clinical setting, future work should examine the
383 frequency of reinfection and clinical outcomes in cohorts with detailed longitudinal analyses of
384 serum antibodies to both N and S antigens to determine the prognostic value of such
385 measurements.

386

387 **Acknowledgements**

388 We acknowledge the support and hard work of the NHS Lothian BioResource team
389 including in particular David Harrison for his support with initiating this study; Frances Rae and
390 Craig Marshall for their advice and Linda MacLeod for her advice and hard work. NHS Lothian
391 laboratories and out-patients teams have also worked extremely hard to enable the provision of

392 this research study. In particular we would like to thank Joan Donnelly for her support and Susan
393 Taylor for her dedication and hardwork.

394

395 **Contributor and guarantor information**

396 Contributors: HW, SJ, TH and PDB conceived and designed the study. HW, BB, MS, ES, CR, JM,
397 SC, EF, NG, GH, KT and SJ acquired and analysed data using the serological assay platforms. FM
398 and JCCL performed the neutralisation assays. FM and TH did additional data analysis. HM, BB,
399 SJ and PDB wrote the first draft of the manuscript. HM, BB, FM, TH, SJ and PB critically reviewed
400 and revised the draft. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript for submission. HW,
401 BB and MS contributed equally. SJ and PDB are the guarantors. The corresponding author attests
402 that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been
403 omitted.

404

405 **Copyright statement**

406 The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf
407 of all authors, an exclusive licence on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit
408 this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJ PGL products and
409 sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence

410

411 **Competing interest statement**

412 All authors have completed the Unified Competing Interest form (available on request from the
413 corresponding author) and declare: no support from any organisation or financial relationships with
414 any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years, no
415 other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

416

417 **Transparency declaration**

418 Paul Bieniasz and Sara Jenks (Guarantors) affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and
419 transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been
420 omitted; there were no discrepancies from the study as planned.

421

422 **Details of ethical approval**

423 Ethical approval was obtained for this study to be carried out through the NHS Lothian

424 BioResource. All recruits gave written and informed consent for serial blood sample collection.

425 The Rockefeller University IRB reviewed and approved the study.

426

427 **Funding**

428 This work was supported by the NHS and Grants from the National Institutes of Allergy and

429 infectious Diseases R37AI640003 (to PDB) and R01AI078788 (to TH). There were no study

430 sponsors. The funders played no role in the design, analysis or reporting of this research.

431

432 **Data sharing statement**

433 Raw de-identified data for serology measurements and NT₅₀ measurements is available from the

434 authors on request. we plan to disseminate the results to study participants and or patient

435 organisations

436

437 **Checklist**

438 A filled in checklist for appropriate study type is attached

439

440

441 **Supplementary table**

442 **Supplementary Table 1 Inter-assay and intra-assay precision for main analyser serological**

443 **assays**

		Intra-assay precision ¹			Inter-assay precision ¹		
		Mean	SD	CV (%)	Mean	SD	CV (%)
Roche Cobas e 801 COI	Negative	0.09	0.0025	2.91	0.09	0.006	7.54
	Positive	13.85	0.14	1.00	13.85	0.44	3.14
Abbott Architect i2000 S/C	Negative	0.03	0.001	2.94	0.03	0.002	6.57
	Positive	8.11	0.04	0.50	8.11	0.07	1.20
Siemens Atellica AU	Negative	0.05	0.0039	7.70	0.05	0.009	1.70
	Positive	2.82	0.05	1.80	2.82	0.10	3.70
DiaSorin LIASON AU/ml	Negative	6.01	0.20	3.40	6.13	0.30	4.83
	Positive	69.72	1.06	1.52	69.10	1.98	2.86

444

445 ¹Based on negative and positive pooled patient material. Inter-assay precision was determined using the
446 mean of at least 5 replicates run on 3- 5 separate days for each assay.

447

448


449 **Supplementary Figures**

450

451 **Supplementary fig 1.**

452 **(A)** Age (years) versus NT₅₀ measured in sera collected at each visit. Spearman r and respective
453 p-values are indicated. **(B)** NT₅₀ in sera from male and female participants, collected at visits 1, 2
454 and 3. Horizontal lines indicate median values. Statistical significance was assessed with the
455 Mann-Whitney-test.

456




457

458

459 **Supplementary fig 2.**

460 **(A)** Spearman r for correlations of serological assay measurements and NT₅₀ for all samples
461 analysed (not divided by visit).

462



463

464


465

466

467 **Supplementary fig 3.**

468 Changes in antibody titres measured using each serology platform and using the neutralization


469 assay (relative to visit one which is plotted as 100%) at each visit for each individual participant.



470


471

472



473
474

475



476

477

478

479

480

481

References

482

1. Andersson M, Low N, French N, et al. Rapid roll out of SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing—a concern. *BMJ* 2020;m2420. doi: 10.1136/bmj.m2420

483

2. Özçürümez MK, Ambrosch A, Frey O, et al. SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing—questions to be asked. *Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology* 2020;146(1):35-43. doi: 10.1016/j.jaci.2020.05.020

484

3. GeurtsvanKessel CH, Okba NMA, Igloi Z, et al. An evaluation of COVID-19 serological assays informs future diagnostics and exposure assessment. *Nature Communications* 2020;11(1):3436. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-17317-y

485

4. Hess AS, Shardell M, Johnson JK, et al. Methods and recommendations for evaluating and reporting a new diagnostic test. *European Journal of Clinical Microbiology & Infectious Diseases* 2012;31(9):2111-16. doi: 10.1007/s10096-012-1602-1

486

5. Schmidt F, Weisblum Y, Muecksch F, et al. Measuring SARS-CoV-2 neutralizing antibody activity using pseudotyped and chimeric viruses. *Journal of Experimental Medicine* 2020;217(11):e20201181. doi: 10.1084/jem.20201181

487

6. Luchsinger LL, Ransegnola B, Jin D, et al. Serological Analysis of New York City COVID19 Convalescent Plasma Donors: Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS), 2020.

488

7. Robbiani DF, Gaebler C, Muecksch F, et al. Convergent antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in convalescent individuals. *Nature* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2456-9

489

8. Wajnberg A, Mansour M, Leven E, et al. Humoral immune response and prolonged PCR positivity in a cohort of 1343 SARS-CoV 2 patients in the New York City region: Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS), 2020.

490

9. Group TNS-C-SAEGTNS-C-SAE. Head-to-head benchmark evaluation of the sensitivity and specificity of five immunoassays for SARS-CoV-2 serology on >1500 samples. 2020 doi: 10.6084/M9.FIGSHARE.C.5046032.V1

491

10. Jääskeläinen A, Kuivanen S, Kekäläinen E, et al. Performance of six SARS-CoV-2 immunoassays in comparison with microneutralisation. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 2020;129:104512. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104512

492

11. Cervia C, Nilsson J, Zurbuchen Y, et al. Systemic and mucosal antibody secretion specific to SARS-CoV-2 during mild versus severe COVID-19: Immunology, 2020.

493

12. Dogan M, Kozhaya L, Placek L, et al. Novel SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody and neutralization assays reveal wide range of humoral immune response during COVID-19: Allergy and Immunology, 2020.

494

13. Klein S, Pekosz A, Park H-S, et al. Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody responses in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population: Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS), 2020.

495

14. Long Q-X, Liu B-Z, Deng H-J, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients with COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0897-1

496

- 514 15. Rijkers G, Murk J-L, Wintermans B, et al. Differences in antibody kinetics and functionality between severe and
515 mild SARS-CoV-2 infections.: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 516 16. Perkmann T, Perkmann-Nagele N, Breyer M-K, et al. Side by side comparison of three fully automated SARS-
517 CoV-2 antibody assays with a focus on specificity: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 518 17. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, et al. Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG Assay
519 and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol* 2020;58(8) doi: 10.1128/jcm.00941-20 [published
520 Online First: 2020/05/10]
- 521 18. Lou B, Li T-D, Zheng S-F, et al. Serology characteristics of SARS-CoV-2 infection since exposure and post
522 symptom onset. *European Respiratory Journal* 2020:2000763. doi: 10.1183/13993003.00763-2020
- 523 19. Pickering S, Betancor G, Pedro Galao R, et al. Comparative assessment of multiple COVID-19 serological
524 technologies supports continued evaluation of point-of-care lateral flow assays in hospital and community
525 healthcare settings: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 526 20. Staines HM, Kirwan DE, Clark DJ, et al. Dynamics of IgG seroconversion and pathophysiology of COVID-19
527 infections: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 528 21. Grandjean L, Saso A, Ortiz A, et al. Humoral Response Dynamics Following Infection with SARS-CoV-2. *medRxiv*
529 2020
- 530 22. Perreault J, Tremblay T, Fournier M-J, et al. Longitudinal analysis of the humoral response to SARS-CoV-2 spike
531 RBD in convalescent plasma donors: *Immunology*, 2020.
- 532 23. Ibarondo FJ, Fulcher JA, Goodman-Meza D, et al. Rapid Decay of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Persons with
533 Mild COVID-19. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2020:NEJMc2025179. doi: 10.1056/NEJMc2025179
- 534 24. Seow J, Graham C, Merrick B, et al. Longitudinal evaluation and decline of antibody responses in SARS-CoV-2
535 infection: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 536 25. Juno JA, Tan H-X, Lee WS, et al. Humoral and circulating follicular helper T cell responses in recovered patients
537 with COVID-19. *Nature Medicine* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41591-020-0995-0
- 538 26. Weisblum Y, Schmidt F, Zhang F, et al. Escape from neutralizing antibodies by SARS-CoV-2 spike protein
539 variants: *Microbiology*, 2020.
- 540 27. Barnes CO, West AP, Huey-Tubman KE, et al. Structures of human antibodies bound to SARS-CoV-2 spike reveal
541 common epitopes and recurrent features of antibodies. *Cell* 2020:S0092867420307571. doi:
542 10.1016/j.cell.2020.06.025
- 543 28. Wajnberg A, Amanat F, Firpo A, et al. SARS-CoV-2 infection induces robust, neutralizing antibody responses that
544 are stable for at least three months: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 545 29. Macnaughton MR. Occurrence and frequency of coronavirus infections in humans as determined by enzyme-linked
546 immunosorbent assay. *Infection and Immunity* 1982;38(2):419-23. doi: 10.1128/IAI.38.2.419-423.1982
- 547 30. Dijkman R, Jebbink MF, Gaunt E, et al. The dominance of human coronavirus OC43 and NL63 infections in
548 infants. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 2012;53(2):135-39. doi: 10.1016/j.jcv.2011.11.011
- 549 31. Callow KA. Effect of specific humoral immunity and some non-specific factors on resistance of volunteers to
550 respiratory coronavirus infection. *The Journal of Hygiene* 1985;95(1):173-89. doi:
551 10.1017/s0022172400062410
- 552 32. Callow KA, Parry HF, Sergeant M, et al. The time course of the immune response to experimental coronavirus
553 infection of man. *Epidemiology and Infection* 1990;105(2):435-46. doi: 10.1017/S0950268800048019
- 554 33. Edridge AW, Kaczorowska JM, Hoste AC, et al. Coronavirus protective immunity is short-lasting: *Infectious*
555 *Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 556 34. Kellam P, Barclay W. The dynamics of humoral immune responses following SARS-CoV-2 infection and the
557 potential for reinfection. *Journal of General Virology* 2020 doi: 10.1099/jgv.0.001439
- 558 35. Gallais F, Velay A, Wendling M-J, et al. Intrafamilial Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 Induces Cellular Immune
559 Response without Seroconversion: *Infectious Diseases (except HIV/AIDS)*, 2020.
- 560 36. Grifoni A, Weiskopf D, Ramirez SI, et al. Targets of T cell responses to SARS-CoV-2 coronavirus in humans with
561 COVID-19 disease and unexposed individuals. *Cell* 2020:S0092867420306103. doi:
562 10.1016/j.cell.2020.05.015
- 563 37. Le Bert N, Tan AT, Kunasegaran K, et al. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell immunity in cases of COVID-19 and SARS,
564 and uninfected controls. *Nature* 2020 doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2550-z
- 565 38. Sekine T, Perez-Potti A, Rivera-Ballesteros O, et al. Robust T cell immunity in convalescent individuals with
566 asymptomatic or mild COVID-19: *Immunology*, 2020.
- 567