

1 **The comparative superiority of IgM-IgG antibody test to real-time reverse**
2 **transcriptase PCR detection for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis**

3 Rui Liu^{1#}, Xinghui Liu^{2#}, Huan Han¹, Muhammad Adnan Shereen³, Zhili Niu¹, Dong
4 Li¹, Fang Liu^{3,4}, Kailang Wu³, Zhen Luo^{5**}, Chengliang Zhu^{1*}

5 1. Department of Clinical Laboratory, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan
6 430060, P. R. China;

7 2. Department of Clinical Laboratory, Shanghai Gongli Hospital, the Second Military
8 Medical University, Pudong New Area, Shanghai 200135, P.R. China;

9 3. State Key Laboratory of Virology, College of Life Sciences, Wuhan University,
10 Wuhan 430072, P. R. China;

11 4. Wuhan Institute of Biotechnology, Wuhan 430075, P. R. China;

12 5. Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Virology, Institute of Medical
13 Microbiology, Jinan University, Guangzhou 510632, P. R. China

14

15

16 [#] Rui Liu and Xinghui Liu contributed equally to this work.

17

18 **Corresponding authors**

19 Chengliang Zhu, MD, Department of Clinical Laboratory, Renmin Hospital of Wuhan
20 University, 238 Jiefang Road, Wuhan 430060, P. R. China. E-mail address:
21 xinchengzhu@163.com

22 Zhen Luo, PhD, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Virology, Institute of
23 Medical Microbiology, Jinan University, 601 Huangpu Avenue, Guangzhou 510632,
24 P. R. China. E-mail address: zhluo18@jnu.edu.cn

25 **Running title:** Superiority of IgM-IgG antibody test for COVID-19

26

27 **Abstract**

28 **Background:** As the increasing number of Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19)
29 patients caused by the severe acute respiratory coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2), which
30 caused an outbreak initiated from Wuhan, China in December, 2019, the clinical
31 features and treatment of COVID-19 patients have been understood. However, it is
32 urgent to need the rapid and accurate detection for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis.
33 We aimed to evaluate the antibodies-based and nucleic acid-based tests (NAT) for
34 SARS-CoV-2-infected patients.

35 **Method:** We retrospectively and observationally studied 133 patients diagnosed with
36 SARS-CoV-2 and admitted in Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University, China, from
37 Feb 17 to Mar 1, 2020. Demographic data, symptoms, clinical examination,
38 laboratory tests, and clinical outcomes were collected. Data were compared between
39 IgM-IgG antibody test and real-time RT-PCR detection for COVID-19 patients.

40 **Results:** Of 133 patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection, there were 44 moderate cases,
41 52 severe cases, and 37 critical cases with no significant difference of gender and age
42 among three subgroups. Overall, the positive ratio in IgM antibody test was higher
43 than in RT-PCR detection. In RT-PCR detection, the positive ratio was 65.91%,
44 71.15%, and 67.57% in moderate, severe, and critical cases, respectively. Whereas,
45 the positive ratio of IgM/IgG antibody detection in patients was 79.55%/93.18%,
46 82.69%/100%, and 72.97%/97.30% in moderate, severe, and critical cases,
47 respectively. Moreover, the concentrations of antibodies were also measured in three
48 subgroups.

49 **Conclusion:** The IgM-IgG antibodies-based test exhibited a comparative superiority
50 to the NAT for COVID-19 diagnosis, which provides an effective complement to the
51 false negative results from NAT for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis.

52

53 **Keywords:** SARS-CoV-2, IgM/IgG antibody test, nucleic acid test, COVID-19

54 **Introduction**

55 The novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) rapidly spread all over the globe and caused
56 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) in infected persons after its initial emergence in
57 Wuhan, China, in December 2019. SARS-CoV-2 has infected 76,819 people out of
58 which 12,077 were critical, 2251 died (2.9% fatality rate) and 18,878 clinically
59 recovered during the first 50 days of the outbreak (1, 2). To mitigate the risk of spread
60 it is necessary to investigate and develop effective treatment and diagnostic options.
61 The signs and symptoms of SARS-CoV-2 infection are not specific, most are
62 associated with respiratory complications such as cough dyspnea, and viral
63 pneumonia, but the mortality of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia is
64 also considerable (3, 4). Therefore, specific COVID-19 diagnostic tests are required to
65 confirm suspected cases. Besides diagnostic techniques, appropriate samples or
66 specimens for the detection of the viral genome are also of high concern (5, 6).

67 Previous studies on COVID-19 pneumonia have largely focused on clinical
68 characteristics and epidemiology (7, 8). However, very limited details are available
69 related to effective diagnostic strategies. In the current situation, the specificity and
70 sensitivity of the tests are not widely known, therefore, testing of multiple specimen
71 types is recommended (9, 10). The most widely used tests in the current situation are
72 based on nucleic acid detection and antibodies detection. Although the viral nucleic
73 acid RT-PCR test has become the standard method for SARS-CoV-2 infection
74 diagnosis, high false negative rates were reported (11). Upon coronavirus infection,
75 IgM antibodies are produced as an early immune response after infection in the body,
76 which may indicate current infection or new infection. IgG antibodies are the main
77 antibodies produced as an immune response, indicating that the disease has entered a
78 recovery period or that there is a prior infection (12, 13). Therefore, combined tests of

79 immunoglobulin M (IgM) and immunoglobulin G (IgG) antibodies can not only
80 provide early diagnosis of infectious diseases but also help to evaluate the stage of
81 infection in the body (11).

82 To further facilitate the efforts of clinical staff in testing, we compared the
83 sensitivity and effectiveness of the currently available tests. We reported that serum
84 antibodies-based testing was more sensitive and efficient to be used as a diagnostic
85 option as compared to reverse transcriptase PCR, which exhibited comparatively
86 superior to the nucleic acid-based test for patients in different stages of SARS-CoV-2
87 infection. Our findings suggested that IgM-IgG antibody test provides an effective
88 complement to the false negative results from nucleic acid test for SARS-CoV-2
89 infection diagnosis.

90

91 **Materials and methods**

92 **Patients**

93 A total number of 133 patients diagnosed with SARS-CoV-2 in Renmin Hospital
94 (Wuhan University, China) from Feb 17 to Mar 1, 2020, were included as the case
95 group. All patients were diagnosed according to the "pneumonia diagnosis protocol
96 for novel coronavirus infection (trial version 5)", subjected to the tests including
97 clinical examination, Computed Tomography (CT) and real-time reverse-transcription
98 polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) for SARS-CoV-2. The SARS-CoV-2 group was
99 divided into three additional subgroups according to new pneumonia diagnosis and
100 treatment of COVID-19 (trial version fifth). The information of three subgroups was
101 divided as 44 moderate cases (22 males and 22 females, median age was 67.5
102 [64~71.75]), 52 severe cases (28 males and 24 females, median age was 68
103 [61.25~74]), and 37 critical cases (20 males and 17 females, median age was 70

104 [60~76.5]). There is no significant difference of sex and age among three subgroups.

105

106 **Data collection**

107 Data on biochemical parameters were obtained from all 133 confirmed SARS-CoV-2
108 infection patients, which was confirmed by a broad series of investigations including
109 clinical examination, laboratory tests, chest x-rays and two independent real-time
110 reverse-transcription polymerase chain reaction (rRT-PCR) for SARS-CoV-2, with
111 SARS-CoV-2 ORF1ab/N qPCR detection kit (GeneDx Biotech, Shanghai, China), as
112 well as using a SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection kit (YHLO Biotech, Shenzhen,
113 China). Clinical and laboratory information was collected during routine clinical work,
114 and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee and Institutional Review Board
115 of the Renmin Hospital of Wuhan University (certificate no. WDRY2020-K066).

116

117 **Statistical analysis**

118 SPSS software version 25.0 was used for statistical analysis. All quantitative data in
119 non-normal or unknown distribution were expressed as median and interquartile range.
120 Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to analyze differences among groups for the
121 measurement data that did not meet the normal distribution. The Chi-square (χ^2) test
122 was used for the difference between groups of enumeration data. In all tests, $P < 0.05$
123 was defined as statistically significant

124

125 **Results:**

126 **The value of IgM antibody and RT-PCR detection for SARS-CoV-2 infection** 127 **diagnosis**

128 The positive ratio was 78.95% (105/133) in IgM antibody test, while 68.42% (91/133)

129 in RT-PCR detection for SARS-CoV-2 infection, respectively, suggesting a higher
130 detection sensibility in IgM antibody test than in RT-PCR test (Table 1). However,
131 there were still false positive and false negative results in two tests. Overall, the
132 sensitivity was higher in case of antibody-based test, while lower sensitivity in case of
133 RT-PCR.

134

135 **The value of RT-PCR detection for viral RNA in COVID-19 patients in different**
136 **stages**

137 Considering the severity of COVID-19 patients from the critical care resources in
138 hospitals (3), for further analysis in details, the COVID-19 patients was divided into
139 three additional subgroups as 44 moderate cases (22 males and 22 females, median
140 age was 67.5 [64~71.75]), 52 severe cases (28 males and 24 females, median age was
141 68 [61.25~74]), and 37 critical cases (20 males and 17 females, median age was 70
142 [60~76.5]) with no significant difference of sex and age among three subgroups
143 ($P>0.05$).

144 Then, we desired to figure out the RT-PCR detection for viral RNA in three
145 subgroups of COVID-19 patients. In RT-PCR detection for viral RNA in patients
146 infected with SARS-CoV-2, the positive ratio was 65.91% in moderate cases, 71.15%
147 in severe cases and 67.57% in critical cases, respectively (Table 2). Of note, we didn't
148 observe significant differences in positive ratio among three subgroups of COVID-19
149 patients.

150

151 **The value of IgM-IgG antibody detection for COVID-19 patients in different**
152 **stages**

153 To further examine the test based on antibody in three subgroups of COVID-19

154 patients, moderate, severe and critical cases. In IgM antibody detection in patients
155 infected with SARS-CoV-2, the positive ratio was 79.55% in moderate cases, 82.69%
156 in severe cases and 72.97% in critical cases, respectively. Similarly, the positive ratio
157 from IgG antibody test was 93.18% in moderate cases, 100.00% in severe cases and
158 97.30% in critical cases, respectively (Table 3). We observed the positive ratio was
159 still higher in case of antibody-based test, while lower in case of RT-PCR for the
160 diagnosis of three subgroups of patients.

161

162 **The concentrations of IgM-IgG antibody detection for COVID-19 patients in**
163 **different stages**

164 Finally, the concentrations of IgM and IgG antibodies in serological test for
165 COVID-19 patients in different stages were measured. The concentration of IgM in
166 patients was 29.19 AU/ml [17.04~61.02] in moderate cases, 40.76 AU/ml
167 [13.56~90.13] in severe cases and 23.25 AU/ml [8.67~104.5] in critical cases,
168 respectively. Meanwhile, the concentration of IgG in patients was 147.73 AU/ml
169 [89.53~171.6] in moderate cases, 148.63 AU/ml [130.95~167.7] in severe cases and
170 140.4 AU/ml [93.79~162.8] in critical cases, respectively (Table 4). Collectively,
171 there were no significant differences in antibodies concentrations among three
172 subgroups of COVID-19 patients, but the test results still revealed as a considerable
173 diagnosis for COVID-19 progression.

174

175 **Discussion**

176 The outbreak of pneumonia caused by SARS-CoV-2 spreads rapidly, posing a serious
177 threat to the lives and health of the people. SARS-CoV-2 belongs to the coronavirus
178 beta genus, with a linear single-stranded positive-chain RNA, the seventh coronavirus

179 known to infect humans after SARS (2002) and MERS (2012) (14). There are various
180 assays developed to detect different regions of the SARS-CoV-2 genome using
181 RT-PCR (9, 15). In the present study, we applied both antibody and nucleic acid based
182 diagnostic strategies on suspected patients with moderate to critical symptoms for
183 COVID-19. Total 133 patients were tested, where 68.42% (91/133) were positive in
184 case of RT-PCR and 78.95% (105/133) in case of antibody test. It was observed that
185 antibody testing was rapid and had significantly higher efficiency and sensitivity.

186 Recently, chest CT scans were applied for the rapid detection of SARS-CoV-2
187 induced COVID-19 (10, 16). The chest X-ray or chest CT provides more information,
188 but these are not conclusive as not all the patients with COVID-19 develop
189 pneumonia, and many other things can cause pneumonia (17, 18). Therefore, a more
190 effective strategy such that testing antibodies or RNA is important. The conventional
191 serologic assays and CRISPR-nCoV based detection is also a novel approach for the
192 detection of SARS-CoV-2 (11, 19, 20). As SARS-CoV-2 is a new infectious disease
193 and the immunological testing reagents have recently been developed (11). Although
194 the antibodies generated after a period of the onset of infection, their detections were
195 found more promising in the current situation.

196 The IgM and IgG testing in combination are of great value for improving the
197 clinical sensitivity of early COVID-19 diagnosis. Certainly, it was been confirmed
198 that the detection sensibility was higher in IgG-IgM combined antibody test than in
199 individual IgG or IgM antibody test (11). In general, the coronavirus stimulates the
200 immune response and IgM antibodies are produced firstly and then quickly decline
201 until disappear, while on the other hand, IgG antibodies are usually produced after
202 IgM and continue to rise and remain high in the body for long periods of time (12, 13).
203 For treatment monitoring and status of the disease, the decrease or even disappearance

204 of the concentration of IgM and the increase in the concentration of IgG indicates the
205 severity of the patient and the immunity to the pathogenicity of SARS-CoV-2.
206 Therefore, further investigations should be made on a broad range and mainly focus
207 on the antibody's response pattern and severity status of the patient on the bases of
208 antibodies production.

209 In conclusion, the higher sensitivity for IgM/IgG antibody-based testing may be
210 associated with its concentration level. The higher level of confirmation of infection
211 in severe cases, the higher sensitivity, and lesser false negative results indicate that
212 diagnostic testing based on IgG has the potential to be accepted widely. Considering
213 the significance of this ongoing COVID-19 epidemic and risk of pandemics, we
214 believe that our findings are important in terms of providing the promising diagnostic
215 options based on age and sex groups, as well as the severity of symptoms. We further
216 recommend IgM-IgG antibody test provides an effective complement to the false
217 negative results from nucleic acid test for SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis.

218

219 **Acknowledgement**

220 This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China
221 (81672079 to CZ and 31800147 to ZL), the Open Research Fund Program of the State
222 Key Laboratory of Virology of China (2019KF001 to ZL), the Outstanding Leaders
223 Training Program of Pudong Health Bureau of Shanghai (PWR12018-05 to XL), and
224 the Key Disciplines Group Construction Project of Pudong Health Bureau of
225 Shanghai (PWZxq2017-15 to XL).

226

227 **Author contributions:** All the authors have accepted responsibility for the entire
228 content of this submitted manuscript and approved submission.

229

230 **Competing interests:** The funding organization(s) played no role in the study design;
231 in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; or in
232 the decision to submit the report for publication.

233

234 **References**

- 235 1. Khan S, Nabi G, Han G, Siddique R, Lian S, Shi H, Bashir N, Ali A, Shereen
236 MA. 2020. Novel coronavirus: how things are in Wuhan. *Clin Microbiol Infect*
237 doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2020.02.005.
- 238 2. Khan S, Siddique R, Ali A, Xue M, Nabi G. 2020. Novel coronavirus, poor
239 quarantine, and the risk of pandemic. *J Hosp Infect*
240 doi:10.1016/j.jhin.2020.02.002.
- 241 3. Yang X, Yu Y, Xu J, Shu H, Xia J, Liu H, Wu Y, Zhang L, Yu Z, Fang M, Yu T,
242 Wang Y, Pan S, Zou X, Yuan S, Shang Y. 2020. Clinical course and outcomes
243 of critically ill patients with SARS-CoV-2 pneumonia in Wuhan, China: a
244 single-centered, retrospective, observational study. *Lancet Respir Med*
245 doi:10.1016/S2213-2600(20)30079-5.
- 246 4. Chen N, Zhou M, Dong X, Qu J, Gong F, Han Y, Qiu Y, Wang J, Liu Y, Wei Y,
247 Xia J, Yu T, Zhang X, Zhang L. 2020. Epidemiological and clinical
248 characteristics of 99 cases of 2019 novel coronavirus pneumonia in Wuhan,
249 China: a descriptive study. *Lancet* doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30211-7.
- 250 5. Corman VM, Landt O, Kaiser M, Molenkamp R, Meijer A, Chu DKW,
251 Bleicker T, Brunink S, Schneider J, Schmidt ML, Mulders D, Haagmans BL,
252 van der Veer B, van den Brink S, Wijsman L, Goderski G, Romette JL, Ellis J,
253 Zambon M, Peiris M, Goossens H, Reusken C, Koopmans MPG, Drosten C.
254 2020. Detection of 2019 novel coronavirus (2019-nCoV) by real-time RT-PCR.
255 *Euro Surveill* 25.
- 256 6. Chu DKW, Pan Y, Cheng SMS, Hui KPY, Krishnan P, Liu Y, Ng DYM, Wan
257 CKC, Yang P, Wang Q, Peiris M, Poon LLM. 2020. Molecular Diagnosis of a
258 Novel Coronavirus (2019-nCoV) Causing an Outbreak of Pneumonia. *Clin*

- 259 Chem doi:10.1093/clinchem/hvaa029.
- 260 7. Huang C, Wang Y, Li X, Ren L, Zhao J, Hu Y, Zhang L, Fan G, Xu J, Gu X,
261 Cheng Z, Yu T, Xia J, Wei Y, Wu W, Xie X, Yin W, Li H, Liu M, Xiao Y, Gao
262 H, Guo L, Xie J, Wang G, Jiang R, Gao Z, Jin Q, Wang J, Cao B. 2020.
263 Clinical features of patients infected with 2019 novel coronavirus in Wuhan,
264 China. *Lancet* 395:497-506.
- 265 8. Wang D, Hu B, Hu C, Zhu F, Liu X, Zhang J, Wang B, Xiang H, Cheng Z,
266 Xiong Y, Zhao Y, Li Y, Wang X, Peng Z. 2020. Clinical Characteristics of 138
267 Hospitalized Patients With 2019 Novel Coronavirus-Infected Pneumonia in
268 Wuhan, China. *JAMA* doi:10.1001/jama.2020.1585.
- 269 9. Xie C, Jiang L, Huang G, Pu H, Gong B, Lin H, Ma S, Chen X, Long B, Si G,
270 Yu H, Jiang L, Yang X, Shi Y, Yang Z. 2020. Comparison of different samples
271 for 2019 novel coronavirus detection by nucleic acid amplification tests. *Int J*
272 *Infect Dis* doi:10.1016/j.ijid.2020.02.050.
- 273 10. Li Y, Xia L. 2020. Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): Role of Chest CT
274 in Diagnosis and Management. *AJR Am J Roentgenol*
275 doi:10.2214/AJR.20.22954:1-7.
- 276 11. Li Z, Yi Y, Luo X, Xiong N, Liu Y, Li S, Sun R, Wang Y, Hu B, Chen W,
277 Zhang Y, Wang J, Huang B, Lin Y, Yang J, Cai W, Wang X, Cheng J, Chen Z,
278 Sun K, Pan W, Zhan Z, Chen L, Ye F. 2020. Development and Clinical
279 Application of A Rapid IgM-IgG Combined Antibody Test for SARS-CoV-2
280 Infection Diagnosis. *J Med Virol* doi:10.1002/jmv.25727.
- 281 12. Zhu M. 2004. SARS Immunity and Vaccination. *Cell Mol Immunol* 1:193-8.
- 282 13. Li G, Fan Y, Lai Y, Han T, Li Z, Zhou P, Pan P, Wang W, Hu D, Liu X, Zhang
283 Q, Wu J. 2020. Coronavirus Infections and Immune Responses. *J Med Virol*

- 284 doi:10.1002/jmv.25685.
- 285 14. Cui J, Li F, Shi ZL. 2019. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses.
286 Nat Rev Microbiol 17:181-192.
- 287 15. Chan JF, Yip CC, To KK, Tang TH, Wong SC, Leung KH, Fung AY, Ng AC,
288 Zou Z, Tsoi HW, Choi GK, Tam AR, Cheng VC, Chan KH, Tsang OT, Yuen
289 KY. 2020. Improved molecular diagnosis of COVID-19 by the novel, highly
290 sensitive and specific COVID-19-RdRp/Hel real-time reverse
291 transcription-polymerase chain reaction assay validated in vitro and with
292 clinical specimens. J Clin Microbiol doi:10.1128/JCM.00310-20.
- 293 16. Lin C, Ding Y, Xie B, Sun Z, Li X, Chen Z, Niu M. 2020. Asymptomatic
294 novel coronavirus pneumonia patient outside Wuhan: The value of CT images
295 in the course of the disease. Clin Imaging 63:7-9.
- 296 17. Rothe C, Schunk M, Sothmann P, Bretzel G, Froeschl G, Wallrauch C,
297 Zimmer T, Thiel V, Janke C, Guggemos W, Seilmaier M, Drosten C, Vollmar P,
298 Zwirgmaier K, Zange S, Wolfel R, Hoelscher M. 2020. Transmission of
299 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. N Engl J
300 Med 382:970-971.
- 301 18. Chan JF, Yuan S, Kok KH, To KK, Chu H, Yang J, Xing F, Liu J, Yip CC,
302 Poon RW, Tsoi HW, Lo SK, Chan KH, Poon VK, Chan WM, Ip JD, Cai JP,
303 Cheng VC, Chen H, Hui CK, Yuen KY. 2020. A familial cluster of pneumonia
304 associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person
305 transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet
306 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30154-9.
- 307 19. Xiao SY, Wu Y, Liu H. 2020. Evolving status of the 2019 novel coronavirus
308 infection: Proposal of conventional serologic assays for disease diagnosis and

309 infection monitoring. J Med Virol doi:10.1002/jmv.25702.

310 20. Hou T, Zeng W, Yang M, Chen W, Ren L, Ai J, Wu J, Liao Y, Gou X, Li Y,

311 Wang X, Su H, Gu B, Wang J, Xu T. 2020. Development and Evaluation of A

312 CRISPR-based Diagnostic For 2019-novel Coronavirus. bioRxiv doi:

313 10.1101/2020.02.22.20025460

314

315

316 **Tables**

317 **Table 1 The comparison of IgM antibody and RT-PCR detection for**
 318 **SARS-CoV-2 infection diagnosis**

IgM	SARS-CoV-2 RNA		Sample Quantity
	+	-	
+	74	31	105
-	17	11	28
Total	91	42	133

319 Note: + stands for positive, while – stands for negative.

320

321 **Table 2 The RT-PCR detection for viral RNA in patients infected with**
 322 **SARS-CoV-2**

SARS-CoV-2 RNA	Moderate (n=44)		Severe (n=52)		Critical (n=37)		χ^2	P value
	No. (+)	Ratio (+)	No. (+)	Ratio (+)	No. (+)	Ratio (+)		
	NP	29	65.91%	38	73.08%	25		
ORF1ab	33	75.00%	42	80.77%	27	72.97%	0.84	0.657
NP & ORF1ab	29	65.91%	37	71.15%	25	67.57%	0.321	0.852

323 Note: No., number; Ratio (+), positive ratio.

324

325 **Table 3 The IgM-IgG antibody detection for patients infected with SARS-CoV-2**

Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2	Moderate (n=44)		Severe (n=52)		Critical (n=37)		χ^2	P value
	No. (+)	Ratio (+)	No. (+)	Ratio (+)	No. (+)	Ratio (+)		
	IgM	35	79.55%	43	82.69%	27		
IgG	41	93.18%	52	100.00%	36	97.30%	3.409	0.137

326

327 **Table 4 The comparison of concentrations of IgG and IgM antibodies (AU/ml)**
328 **in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2**

Antibodies against	Moderate	Severe	Critical	<i>P</i> value
SARS-CoV-2	n=44	n=52	n=37	
IgM	29.19 (17.04 ~ 61.02)	40.76 (13.56 ~ 90.13)	23.25 (8.67 ~ 104.5)	0.446
IgG	147.73 (89.53 ~ 171.6)	148.63 (130.95 ~ 167.7)	140.4 (93.79 ~ 162.8)	0.182

329 Note: The concentration unit of antibodies in serum samples is AU/ml. The value of

330 AU/ml >10 is considered as positive reaction.