

1 **Can we predict antibody responses in SARS-CoV-2? A cohort**
2 **analysis.**

3 Running title: Predict SARS-Cov-2 antibody response

4 **Authors:**

5 Mary Gaeddert (1), Philip Kitchen (1), Tobias Broger (1), Stefan Weber (1), Ralf
6 Bartenschlager (2), Anna Plaszczyca (2), Hans-Georg Kräusslich (3), Barbara Müller
7 (3), Margarida Souto-Carneiro (4), Maike Janssen (4), Carsten Müller-Tidow (4), Uta
8 Merle (5), Yannis Herrmann (1), Lukas Raedeker (1), Jakob Sebastian (1), Niall
9 Brindl (1), Tim Starck (6), Claudia M. Denking (1)

10

11 **Author affiliations:**

- 12 1. Division of Tropical Medicine, Center of Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg
13 University Hospital, Germany
- 14 2. Department of Infectious Diseases, Molecular Virology, Heidelberg University
15 Hospital, Heidelberg, Germany
- 16 3. Virology, Center of Infectious Diseases, Heidelberg University Hospital,
17 Heidelberg, Germany
- 18 4. Department of Internal Medicine V, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg,
19 Germany.
- 20 5. Department of Gastroenterology, Heidelberg University Hospital, Germany
- 21 6. Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University Hospital, Heidelberg,
22 Germany

23 **Corresponding author:**

24 Claudia M. Denkinger, Claudia.Denkinger@uni-heidelberg.de, Phone: 0049 6221 56-
25 22999, Fax: 0049 6221 56-5204

26 **Abstract word count:** 200/200

27 **Text word count:** 2,799/3,500

28

29 **Abstract**

30 *Background:* After infection with severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus
31 (SARS-CoV-2), Immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies and virus-specific neutralizing
32 antibodies (nAbs) develop. This study describes antibody responses in a cohort of
33 recovered COVID-19 patients to identify predictors.

34

35 *Methods:* We recruited patients with confirmed SARS-CoV-2 infection from
36 Heidelberg, Germany. Blood samples were collected three weeks after COVID-19
37 symptoms ended. Participants with high antibody titers were invited for follow-up
38 visits. IgG titers were measured by the Euroimmun Assay, and nAbs titers in a
39 SARS-CoV-2 infection-based assay.

40

41 *Results:* 281 participants were enrolled between April and August 2020 with IgG
42 testing, 145 (51.6%) had nAbs, and 35 (12.5%) had follow-up. The median IgG
43 optical density (OD) ratio was 3.1 (Interquartile range (IQR) 1.6-5.1), and 24.1%
44 (35/145) had a nAb titer >1:80. Higher IgG titers were associated with increased age
45 and more severe disease, and higher nAbs were associated with male gender and

46 CT-value of 25-30 on RT-PCR at diagnosis. The median IgG OD ratio on follow-up
47 was 3.7 (IQR 2.9-5.9), a median increase of 0.5 (IQR -0.3-1.7). Six participants with
48 follow-up nAbs all had titers \leq 1:80.

49

50 *Conclusions:* While age and disease severity were correlated with IgG responses,
51 predictive factors for nAbs in convalescent patients remain unclear.

52

53 **Keywords:** antibody, IgG, neutralizing antibodies, seroconversion, SARS-CoV-2,
54 COVID-19

55

56

57 **Introduction**

58 An understanding of the robustness of the antibody response against severe acute
59 respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) and its longevity is critical to
60 determine the necessary levels and duration of antibody titers that confer protection
61 against re-infection.

62

63 After infection with the severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-
64 2), about two thirds of hospitalized patients show IgG seroconversion within the first
65 two weeks of infection [1] while later it will be up to 90% [2]. In contrast for mild
66 cases, seroconversion might only be observed in 48% [2]. Previous studies in
67 hospitalized patients with Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) indicate some
68 correlation between disease severity and strength of the antibody response [3-6].
69 Also, studies have reported varying results regarding the change of IgG antibodies
70 over time, with some evidence that this time course may also be related to disease
71 severity [6-8].

72

73 Virus-specific neutralizing antibodies (nAbs) have the ability to inhibit virus replication
74 in an ongoing infection and are likely to play a role in preventing re-infection. It has
75 been shown that SARS-CoV-2 infection can result in the production of antibodies
76 with neutralizing properties in vitro and protective effects in animal models [9].
77 However, the precise correlation between IgG levels and nAb response [10], as well
78 as the predictors of nAbs in an effective and durable immune response against
79 SARS-CoV-2 [9, 11] have not been clarified. Similar to IgG levels, nAbs may

80 decrease several months after infection, but tend to remain higher following
81 symptomatic infection compared with asymptomatic [8].

82

83 Understanding the levels of IgG and nAbs that are relevant for protection is also
84 important for the use of convalescent plasma in the treatment of SARS-CoV-2.
85 Convalescent plasma has already been authorized by the FDA under Emergency
86 Use Authorization [12, 13], however the impact on patient outcomes has been
87 variable [14, 15]. There is therefore also an urgent need to identify factors that predict
88 which convalescent patients will have robust immune responses to SARS-CoV-2
89 infection and be suitable to serve as plasma donors.

90

91 The aim of this study is to describe the antibody response in a cohort of recovered
92 COVID-19 patients and identify predictors of total IgG and neutralizing antibody
93 responses. The results will be useful in identifying the most suitable plasma donors
94 and may further contribute to understanding the risk for future re-infection.

95

96 **Methods**

97 ***Study design and participants***

98 Convalescent COVID-19 patients from the Rhein-Neckar region surrounding
99 Heidelberg, Germany, were recruited for this study. Participants were identified by
100 the local Public Health Authority as meeting the current guidelines for COVID testing
101 (exposure to a SARS CoV-2 positive case, suggestive symptoms, or travel to a risk

102 area) and were tested in a certified test center in the Heidelberg area. Those who
103 tested positive for SARS-CoV-2 infection were contacted approximately two to three
104 weeks after the positive test and asked to participate in the study. A survey
105 conducted online or by telephone collected retrospective data on demographic and
106 clinical information, including symptoms, hospitalization, and measures of COVID-19
107 disease severity. After survey completion, participants were screened for potential
108 plasma donation. The inclusion criteria for plasma donation were age less than 65
109 years and no comorbidities. Participants from outside the Rhein Neckar region were
110 also recruited through a public advertisement of the COVID-19 plasma donor
111 program. These participants followed the procedures below but did not complete the
112 survey and are missing the demographic and clinical information.

113

114 The first study visit was conducted at the Heidelberg University Hospital at least three
115 weeks after symptoms ended. During this visit, a nasopharyngeal swab and blood
116 samples were collected for testing as described below. Convalescent patients with
117 high IgG levels (optical density (OD) ratio > 2.5) and a nAbs titer (> 1:80) were invited
118 to participate as plasma donors. Serologic testing was performed again at the time of
119 plasma donation.

120

121 All procedures were performed in accordance with the ethical standards of the
122 institutional research committee of Heidelberg University (study approval number
123 S686/2018). Written informed consent was obtained from each participant.

124

125 ***Molecular Assays***

126 Nasopharyngeal swabs (eSwabs, Copan) were analyzed with Allplex 2019-nCoV
127 Assay (Seegene Inc, Seoul, South Korea) and Tib-Molbiol 2019-nCoV LightMix (TIB
128 Molbiol, Berlin, Germany) for viral RNA using reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain
129 reaction (RT-PCR) designed to detect RdRP and N genes specific for SARS-CoV-2
130 and the E gene for all of Sarbecovirus including SARS-CoV-2. Cycle threshold-
131 values (CT-values) under 38 were considered positive.

132

133 ***Serological Assay***

134 Enzyme linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) measurements for determination of
135 IgG reactivity against the S1 domain of the viral spike (S) protein were carried out
136 using the Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2-ELISA (IgG) (EI 2606-9601 G;
137 EUROIMMUN Medizinische Labordiagnostika AG, Lübeck, Germany) test kit
138 according to the manufacturer's protocol. Samples were processed on an
139 Euroimmun Analyzer I instrument according to the manufacturer's instructions.
140 Immunoreactivity was determined by measuring the optical density at 450 nm
141 (OD450) and divided by the OD450 of a calibrator comprised in the kit to minimize
142 inter-assay variation. The interpretation of the semi-quantitative ratiometric values
143 obtained followed the manufacturer's test instructions: ratios <0.8 were classified as
144 negative, 0.8-1.1 as borderline, and ≥ 1.1 or higher as positive. Sera with an OD ratio
145 >2.5 were tested for the presence of neutralizing antibodies. A subset of samples
146 was also tested with an ELISA assay targeting viral nucleocapsid antigen using the
147 EDITM Novel Coronavirus COVID-19 IgG ELISA Kit (Epitope Diagnostics Inc, San

148 Diego CA, USA), according to the manufacturer's instructions. Samples were
149 analyzed in the SpectraMax M2^e multi-detection microplate reader (Molecular
150 Devices, USA) at 450nm. Samples with an O.D. at 450nm ≥ 0.22 were considered
151 positive. To minimize inter-assay variation the O.D. values were divided by the kit's
152 internal calibration control. The interpretation of the semi-quantitative ratiometric
153 values was carried out similarly as for the S1 domain of the viral spike protein.

154

155 ***Neutralization assay***

156 VeroE6 cells were seeded into 96-well plates one day before the assay. Serial
157 dilutions of sera starting from a 1:10 dilution were prepared in OptiMEM
158 (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) in a final volume of 75 μ l and
159 incubated with ~24,000 PFU of SARS-CoV-2 (BavPat1/2020 strain, European Virus
160 Archive) per well for 1 hour at 37 °C in a final volume of 150 μ l. One third of each
161 serum-virus mixture (50 μ l) was then used for infection (final MOI ~0.25). Infections
162 were performed in duplicates. At 20 hours post-infection, cells were fixed with 5%
163 formaldehyde and immune-stained using a primary mouse antiserum binding to
164 double-stranded RNA, a viral replication intermediate (J2 mouse antibody; Scicons,
165 Szirák, Hungary) and a secondary anti-mouse horseradish peroxidase-coupled
166 antibody (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). The signal was developed using the KPL
167 SureBlueTM TMB peroxidase substrate (Seracare, Milford, MA, USA) and measured
168 in a plate reader at a wavelength of 450 nm. Data were normalized to no-serum
169 control (100%) and mock-infected control (0%). The neutralization (NT) titer was

170 defined as the highest serum dilution resulting in more than 50% reduction of the
171 normalized signal.

172

173 ***Statistical Analysis***

174 We assessed factors associated with antibody response by analyzing demographic
175 and clinical characteristics of participants with different levels of IgG and nAbs. Linear
176 regression was performed to determine the association of demographic and clinical
177 characteristics with IgG antibody titers as a continuous outcome. Logistic regression
178 was performed to study the association of the same covariates with nAbs as a
179 categorical outcome. For both regression analyses, factors with a p-value <0.1 in the
180 univariate analysis were included in the multivariable model, and retained in the
181 model if the p-value was <0.05 using manual backward elimination. IgG titers from
182 convalescent and follow-up samples were compared using the Wilcoxon matched-
183 pairs signed-ranks test. Analysis was performed using Stata version 15.1 (StataCorp
184 LLC, College Station, TX).

185

186 ***Definitions***

187 The first swab collected by the Public Health Authority for initial diagnosis of SARS-
188 CoV-2 infection is referred to as the 'diagnostic swab', and the second swab
189 collected at the screening visit for plasma donation is referred to as the 'convalescent
190 swab'. An IgG OD ratio <1.1 was defined as negative, 1.1 to 2.5 as weak positive,
191 and >2.5 as high positive. NAbs were categorized into high and low, with titers $\leq 1:80$

192 defined as low and >1:80 as high by expert consensus after review of data from an
193 inpatient cohort.

194

195 An illness severity score was created using a combination of self-reported activity
196 restriction, the presence of COVID-19 symptoms indicative of severe disease (cough,
197 fever, or dyspnea), and hospitalization. The categories were defined as mild illness
198 (normal activity, none of the three symptoms, and not hospitalized), moderate illness
199 (restricted activity, symptomatic, and not hospitalized), and severe illness (severely
200 restricted activity, symptomatic, and hospitalized).

201

202 **Results**

203 A total of 281 participants were enrolled between April and August 2020. Survey
204 responses were available for 200 (71.2%) participants. The population was 55%
205 (107/194) male with a median age of 39 ([Interquartile range] IQR 29-50) (Table 1).
206 Only 3/171 (1.8%) participants were hospitalized, with one in intensive care. The
207 median CT-value at the time of diagnosis was available for 165/281 and was 25 (IQR
208 20 to 28). IgG testing was performed for all 281 participants and of these, ODs were
209 >2.5 in 145 (51.6%). Thirty-five participants (12.5%) had serology repeated at the
210 time of plasma donation.

211

212 Convalescent samples were collected from all participants a median of 34 days (IQR
213 28-43) after the diagnostic swab and 29 days (IQR 22 to 37) after the end of

214 symptoms. The median IgG OD ratio at the convalescent visit was 3.1 (IQR 1.6 to
215 5.1), with 58.7% (165/281) of participants categorized as having a highly positive
216 antibody response, 26.0% (73/281) with a positive response, and 15.3% 43/281
217 (15.3%) with a negative or borderline IgG antibody response. Only 24.1% of the
218 tested participants (35/145) displayed a nAb titer >1:80. All three hospitalized
219 participants displayed nAb titers of 1:160. The convalescent swab was positive by
220 RT-PCR in 9.1% (25/274) of participants and the median CT value was 37 (IQR 35 to
221 38). Of those who had a positive convalescent swab, 25% (5/20) had nAbs >1:80.

222

223 The IgG convalescent titer was highest in adults 18 to 29 years old, decreasing in 30-
224 to 44-year-olds, and increasing again in adults 45 to 60 years of age (Table 2 and
225 Figure 1). The nAbs titers, in contrast, did not show a statistically significant change
226 by age (Table 3 and Supplemental Figure 1). There was a correlation between
227 increasing IgG titer and nAbs titer although Kappa was low (OR=1.6 ([95%
228 Confidence Interval] 95%CI 1.3-1.9), $p < 0.001$, Kappa=0.095) (Figure 2). The IgG OD
229 ratio of convalescent sera was neither correlated with the CT-value of the diagnostic
230 swab ($p = 0.666$) (Supplemental Figure 2) nor with that of the convalescent swab
231 ($p = 0.727$).

232

233 The results of the multiple linear regression model on 200 patients with IgG results
234 and information from the survey showed that higher IgG antibody titers were
235 associated with age 45 to 60 years (0.8, 95%CI 0.05-1.6, $p = 0.036$), compared to age
236 30 to 44) and moderate/severe activity restriction (2.1, 95%CI 1.2-3.0, $p < 0.001$),

237 compared to normal activity) (Table 2). A similar analysis carried out on the 120
238 participants with survey results and nAb titers showed that male gender (2.2, 95% CI
239 0.9-5.6, $p=0.097$, compared to female) and a CT-value of 25-30 (4.9, 95%CI 0.9-
240 25.8, $p=0.062$, compared to CT-value>30) from the diagnostic swab were associated
241 with high nAb titers in the univariate logistic regression model at the 0.1 level (Table
242 3 and Supplemental Figure 3).

243

244 For the 63 participants tested with the nucleocapsid protein ELISA, IgG levels were
245 classified as negative for 24 (38.1%), 11 (17.5%) as weak positive, and 28 (44.4%)
246 as high positive. The correlation between the spike protein and nucleocapsid protein
247 assays was 73.0% (Kappa=0.548) and the nucleocapsid assay and nAbs was 16.7%
248 (Kappa=0.022) (Supplemental Figure 4).

249

250 The illness severity score was analyzed separately as it combined multiple variables
251 that were already included in the regression models. Based on the categories
252 outlined above, 32.3% (52/161) were defined as mild, 54.0% (87/161) as moderate,
253 and 13.7% (22/161) as severe illness. Participants with severe disease had median
254 IgG titers of 6.0 (IQR 3.8 to 7.6), compared to 2.5 (IQR 1.4 to 4.1) for those with mild
255 disease and 2.9 (IQR 1.5 to 4.7) for moderate disease ($p<0.001$). For nAbs, we
256 observed a trend that participants with more severe disease had high titers, but the
257 difference was not statistically significant (OR 1.9, 95%CI 0.9-3.8, $p=0.084$).

258

259 The 35 participants eligible for the follow-up testing had the second blood collection a
260 median of 46 days (IQR 23 to 57) after the convalescent testing. The median IgG OD
261 ratio was 3.7 (IQR 2.9 to 5.9), and 74.3% (26/35) were categorized as having a high
262 positive IgG response. The IgG titers showed a median increase of 0.5 (IQR -0.3 to
263 1.7) from convalescent to follow-up testing ($p < 0.001$) (Table 1 and Figure 3). The
264 nAbs titers from the six follow-up participants were all $\leq 1:80$ (Figure 4).

265

266 **Discussion**

267 This study describes the antibody response in a cohort of 281 recovered COVID-19
268 patients. Our results show that older age (45-65 years) and more severe disease
269 were associated with a stronger IgG response. This response was sustained up to 47
270 days after the convalescent sample in those who had a follow-up visit. However,
271 there was poor correlation between clinical characteristics and the strength of a
272 neutralizing antibody response. Furthermore, in the few participants that had nAbs
273 follow-up testing, a reduction in the neutralization capacity of the circulating IgG
274 antibodies was observed. The persistence of nAbs over time must be confirmed in
275 future studies with larger cohorts.

276

277 We found 15.3% of patients not to have an antibody response at initial testing. This
278 finding is similar to a finding in a study of over 1,300 SARS-CoV-2 patients in New
279 York City that reported IgG seroconversion to the S protein in 89% PCR-positive
280 patients at the time of initial testing from Wajnberg et al. Our observation of the IgG
281 response being correlated with age and disease severity confirms the findings of a

282 prior study by Klein et al, where older age and hospitalization was associated with
283 stronger anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody response quantified by both IgG levels against
284 the S protein and nAb titers [10]. In this study of 126 plasma donors, male sex and
285 older age were also observed to be associated, however we were only able to
286 deduce an association of nAbs but not IgG levels with male sex.

287

288 While our study showed persistence of an IgG response after a month and a half in
289 those with high initial IgG titers, a study of 365,000 adults in England by Ward et al.
290 showed a decline in the prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies over the course of
291 three months. The decline in IgG positivity was greatest among those who reported
292 no symptoms, a population that was underrepresented in our study [16].

293

294 These findings have implications for the selection of convalescent donors of plasma
295 for plasma therapy [13]. Thus, in order to improve the anti-SARS-CoV-2 IgG titers
296 present in the donated plasma, donors should be selected from those with a more
297 severe course of COVID-19 disease and asked to donate plasma as soon as
298 possible after convalescence [10, 17]. Furthermore, these findings might have
299 implications for immunity against repeat infections. However, further data is needed
300 to understand whether antibodies or T cells confer protective immunity to SARS-
301 CoV-2.

302

303 At the convalescent study visit, 9% of participants remained positive for SARS-CoV-2
304 on PCR. However, all CT-values were >30, indicating a low viral load and likely non-
305 viable virus particles. These data are in line with other studies reporting positive PCR
306 results up to 28 days and longer after symptom resolution [3, 18-20]. Surprisingly,
307 persistent viral shedding was not associated with IgG or nAbs response in our
308 analysis, supporting the idea that shed RNA is not an indicator of ongoing infection
309 [3, 8].

310

311 This study has several limitations. The criteria for plasma donation restricted
312 participation to healthy people under 60 years of age. Further, the survey responses
313 showed that most participants had relatively mild COVID-19 disease, although
314 asymptomatic participants were underrepresented and very few were hospitalized.
315 These factors indicate that the results may not be generalizable to populations who
316 are older than 60, have severe disease, have comorbidities, or to asymptomatic
317 patients. Most participants only had one serum sample collected, so there is limited
318 data on the change in antibody titers over time. The variability in the nAb response
319 would require evaluation of larger numbers of convalescent patients in order to yield
320 a better understanding of predictive factors.

321

322 This study also has several strengths. We present the IgG response in over 200
323 participants and nAbs in 145 participants. We also collected follow-up data for those
324 participants who had a strong IgG and nAbs response at baseline. The information

325 on illness severity and PCR results from both diagnosis and convalescent time-points
326 provided a fuller clinical picture.

327

328 **Conclusion**

329 While older age and disease severity were correlated with stronger IgG responses,
330 the predictive factors for strong neutralizing antibody response in convalescent
331 patients remain unclear.

332 **Footnote page:**

333 **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

334 **Funding:** This work was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and
335 Research (BMBF) program on emergency research funding for COVID-19 (funding
336 number 01KG20152) and internal funds of Heidelberg University Hospital.

337 **Corresponding author:**

338 Claudia M. Denking

339 Address: Section of Clinical Tropical Medicine, Center for Infectious Disease,
340 Heidelberg University Hospital, Im Neuenheimer Feld 324, Heidelberg 69120,
341 Germany

342 Telephone: 0049 6221 56-22999; Fax: 0049 6221 56-5204

343 Claudia.Denking@uni-heidelberg.de

344 **Author contributions:** CMD was responsible for the conceptualization and design of
345 the study and supervised the analysis and writing. MG was responsible for the
346 statistical analysis and writing. CMT, PK and TB were responsible for the literature
347 review and supported the conceptualization and design of the study. PK, YH, LR, JS,
348 MJ, NB, and TS were responsible for the survey and patient recruitment. SW and MJ
349 were responsible for the study visits and blood collection. HGK, RB, MSC, BM and
350 AP were responsible for the antibody testing. All authors contributed to data
351 interpretation, critically reviewed the first draft, and approved the final version and
352 agreed to be accountable for the work.

353 **Ethical Approval:** All procedures performed in studies involving human participants
354 were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee

355 of Heidelberg University (S686/2018) and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its
356 later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

357 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank all the participants who contributed to
358 the survey and plasma donation study. We are grateful to Maria Anders-Össwein,
359 Stefanie Wolf, and Ira Pistorius for their dedicated expert technical assistance.

360 **References**

- 361 1. Xiang F, Wang X, He X, et al. Antibody Detection and Dynamic Characteristics in
362 Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019. *Clinical infectious diseases : an official*
363 *publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America* **2020**; 71:1930-4.
- 364 2. Imai K, Kitagawa Y, Tabata S, et al. Antibody response patterns in COVID-19
365 patients with different levels of disease severity—Japan. *medRxiv*
366 **2020**:2020.11.20.20231696.
- 367 3. Tan W, Lu Y, Zhang J, et al. Viral Kinetics and Antibody Responses in Patients
368 with COVID-19. *medRxiv* **2020**:2020.03.24.20042382.
- 369 4. To KK-W, Tsang OT-Y, Leung W-S, et al. Temporal profiles of viral load in
370 posterior oropharyngeal saliva samples and serum antibody responses during
371 infection by SARS-CoV-2: an observational cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious*
372 *Diseases* **2020**; 20:565-74.
- 373 5. Zhao J, Yuan Q, Wang H, et al. Antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in patients of
374 novel coronavirus disease 2019. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* **2020**.
- 375 6. Chen Y, Zuiani A, Fischinger S, et al. Quick COVID-19 Healers Sustain Anti-
376 SARS-CoV-2 Antibody Production. *Cell* **2020**; 183:1496-507.e16.
- 377 7. Iyer AS, Jones FK, Nodoushani A, et al. Dynamics and significance of the antibody
378 response to SARS-CoV-2 infection. *medRxiv* **2020**:2020.07.18.20155374.
- 379 8. Long Q-X, Tang X-J, Shi Q-L, et al. Clinical and immunological assessment of
380 asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infections. *Nature Medicine* **2020**; 26:1200-4.
- 381 9. Bao L, Deng W, Gao H, et al. Reinfection could not occur in SARS-CoV-2 infected
382 rhesus macaques. *bioRxiv* **2020**:2020.03.13.990226.

- 383 10. Klein SL, Pekosz A, Park H-S, et al. Sex, age, and hospitalization drive antibody
384 responses in a COVID-19 convalescent plasma donor population. medRxiv
385 **2020**:2020.06.26.20139063.
- 386 11. Ju B, Zhang Q, Ge X, et al. Potent human neutralizing antibodies elicited by
387 SARS-CoV-2 infection. bioRxiv **2020**:2020.03.21.990770.
- 388 12. Valk SJ, Piechotta V, Chai KL, et al. Convalescent plasma or hyperimmune
389 immunoglobulin for people with COVID-19: a rapid review. The Cochrane database
390 of systematic reviews **2020**; 5:Cd013600.
- 391 13. Administration UFaD. Recommendations for Investigational COVID-19
392 Convalescent Plasma. Available at: [https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/recommendations-investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma)
393 [biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/recommendations-investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma)
394 [cber/recommendations-investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma](https://www.fda.gov/vaccines-blood-biologics/investigational-new-drug-ind-or-device-exemption-ide-process-cber/recommendations-investigational-covid-19-convalescent-plasma). 2021.
- 395 14. Simonovich VA, Burgos Pratz LD, Scibona P, et al. A Randomized Trial of
396 Convalescent Plasma in Covid-19 Severe Pneumonia. New England Journal of
397 Medicine **2020**; 384:619-29.
- 398 15. Libster R, Pérez Marc G, Wappner D, et al. Early High-Titer Plasma Therapy to
399 Prevent Severe Covid-19 in Older Adults. New England Journal of Medicine **2021**;
400 384:610-8.
- 401 16. Ward H, Cooke G, Atchison C, et al. Declining prevalence of antibody positivity to
402 SARS-CoV-2: a community study of 365,000 adults. medRxiv
403 **2020**:2020.10.26.20219725.
- 404 17. Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, et al. Neutralizing antibody responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a
405 COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their implications. medRxiv
406 **2020**:2020.03.30.20047365.

407 18. Wajnberg A, Mansour M, Leven E, et al. Humoral immune response and
408 prolonged PCR positivity in a cohort of 1343 SARS-CoV 2 patients in the New York
409 City region. medRxiv **2020**:2020.04.30.20085613.

410 19. Wang B, Wang L, Kong X, et al. Long-term coexistence of SARS-CoV-2 with
411 antibody response in COVID-19 patients. Journal of Medical Virology **2020**; 92:1684-
412 9.

413 20. Zhang G, Nie S, Zhang Z, Zhang Z. Longitudinal Change of Severe Acute
414 Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 Antibodies in Patients with Coronavirus
415 Disease 2019. The Journal of infectious diseases **2020**; 222:183-8.

416

417 **Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristic of participants with**
 418 **convalescent testing (n=281)**

	n/N	%
Demographics		
Age, median [IQR]	39 [29-50]	
Gender		
Male	107/194	55.2
Female	86/194	44.3
Diverse	1/194	0.5
Diagnosis		
CT value of diagnostic swab, median [IQR]	25 [20-28]	
CT value of diagnostic swab		
<25	87/165 ^a	52.7
25-30	54/165	32.7
>30	24/165	14.6
Convalescent testing		
Days from diagnosis to convalescent testing, median [IQR]	34 [28-43]	
Days from end of symptoms to		

convalescent testing, median [IQR]	29 [22-37]	
Result of convalescent swab		
Negative	249/274	90.9
Positive	25/274	9.1
CT value of convalescent swab if positive, median [IQR]	37 [35-38]	
IgG OD ratio, median [IQR]	3.1 [1.6-5.1]	
IgG result		
Negative/Borderline (<1.1)	43/281	15.3
Weak positive (1.1-2.5)	73/281	26.0
High positive (>2.5)	165/281	58.7
Neutralizing Antibodies		
Low ($\leq 1:80$)	110/145	75.9
High ($> 1:80$)	35/145	24.1
Neutralizing Antibodies if convalescent swab positive		
Low ($\leq 1:80$)	15/20	75.0
High ($> 1:80$)	5/20	25.0
Follow-up testing (N=35)		

Days from convalescent to follow-up blood draw, median [IQR]	46 [23-57]	
Follow-up IgG result, median [IQR]	3.7 [2.9-5.9]	
Follow-up IgG result		
Negative/Borderline (<1.1)	2/35	5.7
Weak positive (1.1-2.5)	5/35	14.3
High positive (>2.5)	28/35	80.0
Change in IgG from convalescent to follow-up, median [IQR]	0.5 [-0.3-1.7]	
Follow-up Neutralizing Antibodies		
Low ($\leq 1:80$)	6/6	100.0

419 ^aMissing data: gender=87, CT value of diagnostic swab=116, result of convalescent swab=7, results of
 420 nAbs for convalescent swab-positive=5

421 *participants missing results of the first swab were diagnosed outside of the University Hospital
 422 Heidelberg network)

423

424

425 **Table 2. Description of factors associated with Convalescent SARS CoV-2 IgG**
 426 **titers (n=200)**

Characteristic n/N (%)	Total population	OD Ratio, Median [IQR]	Simple Linear Regression Coef (95%CI), p-	Multiple Linear Regression Coef (95%CI), p-
---------------------------	---------------------	------------------------------	---	---

			value	value
Demographic				
Age				
18-29	50/200 (25.0)	3.7 [1.9-4.4]	0.1 (-0.8;1.0), 0.829	0.2 (-0.7;1.0), 0.666
30-44	75/200 (37.5)	2.6 [1.2-4.5]	Reference	Reference
45-60	75/200 (37.5)	3.6 [1.8-6.3]	0.9 (0.2;1.7), 0.017	0.8 (0.05-1.6), 0.036
Gender ^a				
Male	107/194 (55.2)	3.1 [1.5-5.1]	0.4 (-0.4;1.0), 0.405	
Female	86/194 (44.3)	3.3 [1.8-4.9]	Reference	
Diverse ^b	1/194 (0.5)	8.4 [8.4-8.4]		
Clinical				
Activity Restriction				
Normal activity	51/188 (27.1)	2.2 [1.2-3.9]	Reference	Reference
Minimal restriction	81/188 (43.1)	3.0 [1.8-4.3]	0.5 (-0.3;1.4), 0.187	0.6 (-0.2;1.4), 0.163
Moderate/Severe	56/188 (29.8)	5.0 [2.6-7.2]	2.2 (1.3;3.1), <0.001	2.1 (1.2;3.0), <0.001
Symptomatic				
No	4/188 (2.1)	2.5 [0.9-4.0]	Reference	
Yes	184/188 (97.9)	3.2 [1.8-5.1]	1.2 (-1.2;3.7), 0.325	
Fever only				

No	118/192 (61.5)	2.9 [1.5-4.5]	Reference	
Yes	74/192 (38.5)	3.5 [2.1-5.9]	0.9 (0.2;1.6), 0.010	
Fever, Dyspnea, or Cough				
No	76/192 (39.6)	2.8 [1.6-4.4]	Reference	
Yes	116/192 (60.4)	3.4 [1.9-5.6]	0.7 (0.03;1.4), 0.040	
Symptom duration				
0-10 days	60/200 (30.0)	2.9 [1.6-4.5]	Reference	
11-20 days	87/200 (43.5)	3.5 [2.1-5.7]	0.9 (0.1;1.7), 0.034	
>20 days	53/200 (26.5)	2.9 [1.4-5.0]	0.2 (-0.7;1.1), 0.731	
Convalescent testing				
Days from Symptom onset to convalescent testing				
0-35	63/180 (35.0)	2.6 [1.5-4.9]	Reference	
35-50	89/180 (49.4)	3.4 [2.0-5.5]	0.6 (-0.2;1.4), 0.145	
>50	28/180 (15.6)	3.5 [1.6-6.4]	0.7 (-0.4;1.8), 0.182	
CT value of diagnostic swab				
<25	79/151 (52.3)	3.3 [2.1-4.9]	-0.1 (-1.2;1.0), 0.880	

25-30	48/151 (31.8)	3.6 [1.6-5.8]	0.3 (-0.9;1.6), 0.569	
>30	24/151 (15.9)	3.5 [1.9-4.8]	Reference	
Result of convalescent swab				
Negative	177/199 (88.5)	3.0 [1.6-5.1]	Reference	
Positive	22/199 (11.1)	3.8 [2.2-4.7]	0.2 (-0.9;1.2), 0.780	

427 ^aMissing data: gender=6, Activity Restriction n=12; Symptomatic n=12; specific symptoms n=8; start of

428 symptoms n=20; diagnostic swab n=49; convalescent swab n=1

429 ^bDiverse gender (n=1) excluded from regression model

430

431

432 **Table 3. Description of factors associated with Convalescent SARS CoV-2**

433 **Neutralizing antibody titers (n=120)**

Characteristic n/N (%)	Total population	Low ($\leq 1:80$)	High ($> 1:80$)	Logistic Regression, Univariate OR (95% CI), p- value
Demographic				
Age				
18-29	31/120 (25.8)	25/90 (27.8)	6/30 (20.0)	Reference
30-44	40/120 (33.3)	31/90 (34.4)	9/30 (30.0)	1.2 (0.4-3.9), 0.748

45-60	49/120 (40.8)	34/90 (37.8)	15/30 (50.0)	1.8 (0.6-5.4), 0.269
Gender ^a				
Male	63/116 (54.3)	45/89 (50.6)	18/27 (66.7)	2.2 (0.9-5.6), 0.097
Female	52/116 (44.8)	44/89 (49.4)	8/27 (29.6)	Reference
Diverse ^b	1/116 (0.9)	0	1/27 (3.7)	
Clinical				
Activity Restriction				
Normal activity	27/114 (23.7)	23/87 (26.4)	4/27 (14.8)	Reference
Minimal restriction	43/114 (37.7)	33/87 (37.9)	10/27 (37.0)	1.7 (0.5-6.2), 0.394
Moderate/Severe	44/114 (38.6)	31/87 (35.6)	13/27 (48.2)	2.4 (0.7-8.4), 0.165
Fever only				
No	66/116 (56.9)	53/89 (59.6)	13/27 (48.2)	Reference
Yes	50/116 (43.1)	36/89 (40.5)	14/27 (51.9)	1.6 (0.7-3.8), 0.297
Fever, Dyspnea, or Cough				
No	41/116 (35.3)	35/89 (39.3)	6/27 (22.2)	Reference
Yes	75/116 (64.7)	54/89 (60.7)	21/27 (77.8)	2.3 (0.8-6.2), 0.109
Symptom duration				
0-10 days	37/120 (30.8)	30/30 (33.3)	7/30 (23.3)	Reference
11-20 days	59/120 (49.2)	43/90 (47.8)	16/30 (53.3)	1.6 (0.6-4.3), 0.362

>20 days	24/120 (20.0)	17/90 (18.9)	7/30 (23.3)	1.8 (0.5-5.9), 0.355
Convalescent testing				
CT value – diagnostic swab				
<25	53/96 (55.2)	42/71 (59.2)	11/25 (44.0)	1.7 (0.3-8.7), 0.522
25-30	28/96 (29.2)	16/71 (22.5)	12/25 (48.0)	4.9 (0.9-25.8), 0.062
>30	15/96 (15.6)	13/71 (18.3)	2/25 (8.0)	Reference
Result of convalescent swab				
Negative	101/119 (84.9)	75/89 (84.3)	26/30 (86.7)	Reference
Positive	18/119 (15.1)	14/89 (15.7)	4/30 (13.3)	0.8 (0.2-2.7), 0.752
Days Symptom onset to Antibody test				
0-35	40/112 (35.7)	31/86 (36.1)	9/26 (34.6)	Reference
35-50	58/112 (51.8)	45/86 (52.3)	13/26 (50.0)	1.1 (0.4-2.8), 0.907
>50	14/112 (12.5)	10/86 (11.6)	4/26 (15.4)	1.5 (0.4-5.8), 0.585
Days from diagnosis to Antibody test, median [IQR]		35 [30-43]	32 [25-40]	1.0 (1.0-1.0), 0.806

434 ^aMissing data: gender=4, Activity Restriction n=6; Symptomatic n=4; specific symptoms n=8;

435 diagnostic swab n=24; convalescent swab n=1; start of symptoms n=8

436 ^bDiverse gender (n=1) excluded from regression model

437

438 **Figure titles and legends**

439

440 **Figure 1. Convalescent SARS CoV-2 IgG by age category**

441 *The IgG OD ratio at the convalescent visit by age of the participant.*

442

443 **Figure 2. Convalescent SARS CoV-2 Neutralizing antibody and IgG titers**

444 *The IgG OD ratio compared to the Neutralizing antibody titer at the convalescent visit.*

445

446 **Figure 3. Change in SARS CoV-2 IgG levels from Convalescent to Follow-up testing**

447 *The change in IgG OD ratio from the convalescent to the follow-up time points for 35*

448 *participants with available data. Dark blue lines indicate increasing OD ratio, and light blue*

449 *lines indicate the same or decreasing OD ratio.*

450

451 **Figure 4. Change in SARS CoV-2 Neutralizing antibody from Convalescent to Follow-** 452 **up testing**

453 *The change in neutralizing antibody titers from the convalescent to the follow-up time points*

454 *for 5 participants with both timepoints available. There are two participants with 1:40 titers at*

455 *both Convalescent and Follow-up timepoints.*







