

1 **Beyond the Spike: identification of viral targets of the antibody responses to**
2 **SARS-CoV-2 in COVID-19 patients**

3 Asmaa Hachim^{1^}, Niloufar Kavian^{1,2,3*^}, Carolyn A Cohen¹, Alex WH Chin⁴, Daniel
4 KW Chu⁴, Chris KP Mok¹, Owen TY Tsang⁵, Yiu Cheong Yeung⁵, Ranawaka APM
5 Perera⁴, Leo LM Poon⁴, Malik JS Peiris^{1,4}, Sophie A Valkenburg^{1*}

6

7 ¹HKU-Pasteur Research Pole, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing Faculty of
8 Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China.

9 ²Faculté de Médecine Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité, Assistance
10 Publique–Hôpitaux de Paris, Hôpital Universitaire Paris Centre, Centre Hospitalier
11 Universitaire Cochin, Service d’Immunologie Biologique, Paris, France.

12 ³Institut Cochin, INSERM U1016, Université Paris Descartes, Sorbonne Paris Cité,
13 Paris, France.

14 ⁴Division of Public Health Laboratory Sciences, School of Public Health, Li Ka Shing
15 Faculty of Medicine, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

16 ⁵Infectious Diseases Centre, Princess Margaret Hospital, Hospital Authority of Hong
17 Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

18

19 ^ These authors contributed equally to this work

20 * Corresponding authors

21 Niloufar Kavian and Sophie A. Valkenburg

22 HKU Pasteur Research Pole

23 School of Public Health

24 The University of Hong Kong

25 Niloufar@hku.hk; sophiev@hku.hk

26 **Abstract**

27 *Background:* The SARS-CoV-2 virus emerged in December 2019 and caused a
28 pandemic associated with a spectrum of COVID-19 disease ranging from
29 asymptomatic to lethal infection. Serology testing is important for diagnosis of
30 infection, determining infection attack rates and immunity in the population. It also
31 informs vaccine development. Although several serology tests are in use, improving
32 their specificity and sensitivity for early diagnosis on the one hand and for detecting
33 past infection for population-based studies, are priorities.

34 *Methods:* We evaluated the anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody profiles to 15 SARS-CoV-2
35 antigens by cloning and expressing 15 open reading frames (ORFs) in mammalian
36 cells and screened antibody responses to them in COVID-19 patients using the
37 Luciferase Immunoprecipitation System (LIPS).

38 *Results:* The LIPS technique allowed us to detect antibody responses in COVID-19
39 patients to 11 of the 15 SARS-CoV-2 antigens tested, identifying novel immunogenic
40 targets. This technique shows that antigens ORF3b and ORF8 allow detection of
41 antibody early in infection in a specific manner and reveals the immuno-dominance of
42 the N antigen in COVID-19 patients.

43 *Conclusion:* Our report provides an unbiased characterization of antibody responses
44 to a range of SARS-CoV-2 antigens. The combination of 3 SARS-CoV-2 antibody
45 LIPS assays, i.e. N, ORF3b, and ORF8, is sufficient to identify all COVID-19 patients
46 of our cohort even at early time-points of illness, whilst Spike alone fails to do so.
47 Furthermore, our study highlights the importance of investigating new immunogens
48 NSP1, ORF3b, ORF7a and ORF8 which may mediate immune functions other than
49 neutralization which may be beneficial or harmful to the patient.

50 **Introduction**

51 The acute pandemic respiratory disease COVID-19 is caused by a novel coronavirus
52 that belongs to the species *Severe acute respiratory syndrome-related coronavirus*
53 (SARS-CoV-2) (1, 2). There are at least 70 vaccine candidates against COVID-19 in
54 various stages of testing, development and human clinical trials (5). Urgency in
55 vaccine development and deployment to mitigate the pandemic has left some
56 fundamental immunological research questions outstanding, especially regarding the
57 range of virus immunogens that elicit antibody responses, their kinetics, specificity,
58 breadth, longevity and impact for long-term protection or immune-pathology.

59 Endemic human coronaviruses (HCoV) OC43, 229E, HKU1 and NL63 usually
60 cause a mild 'common cold'- like upper respiratory disease. SARS-CoV-2 belongs to
61 the β -coronavirus genus which includes SARS-CoV which emerged in 2002, and
62 Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus (MERS-CoV) which emerged in
63 2012, which are severe human diseases of zoonotic origin (4). As of 20th of April
64 2020, the World Health Organization has reported a total of 2,241,778 cases of
65 COVID-19 worldwide and 152,551 deaths (5). Ongoing research has reported the full
66 genome sequence (1), transcriptome (6) and the immune response to infection (7).

67 SARS-CoV-2 has 12 putative functional open reading frames (ORF) and
68 shares 82% nucleotide homology with SARS-CoV (8). There are at least four
69 structural proteins in SARS-CoV-2: Spike (S), Envelope (E), Membrane (M),
70 Nucleocapsid (N). The trimer S protein is cleaved into S1, containing the receptor
71 binding domain, and S2 subunits (8, 9), and S2 is further cleaved into S2' to form the
72 viral fusion peptide (6). The S protein is critical for viral entry and is a neutralising
73 target, as it is with SARS-CoV and MERS-CoV and is a key target for diagnostic tests
74 and vaccine development (10). The S1 subunit of SARS-CoV-2 shares about 70%

75 identity with the SARS-CoV, whereas the identity of the S2 subunit is up to 99% with
76 some evidence of cross-reactivity between the viruses (11). Apart from these
77 structural proteins, the SARS-CoV-2 genome encodes for around 20 putative non-
78 structural proteins (8). ORF1a/b encodes for a large polyprotein that is proteolytically
79 cleaved into 16 non-structural proteins (NSP1-16). Extra ORFs, such as ORF3a, 3b,
80 6, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10 may encode for proteins but their functions are unknown.

81 Encouragingly, reports have shown that SARS-CoV-2 patients develop
82 neutralising and high titer S1-specific antibody responses (11), and robust T and B
83 cellular responses (12). However, the magnitude of the antibody responses appears
84 related to the clinical severity of COVID-19 disease. In one recent report 10 of 175
85 confirmed patients did not develop a neutralising SARS-CoV-2 specific antibody
86 response (by pseudo particle assay), but binding antibodies were still detected (by
87 ELISA) (13). In patients with MERS (14) it has been shown that viral load and severe
88 disease correlates with the magnitude of the antibody response, however mild
89 diseases (in 4 of 6 mild subjects) may not lead to detectable antibody responses.
90 Furthermore, MERS-CoV seropositive dromedary camels can still be re-infected in
91 the presence of high antibody titers (15). Similarly, there are reports of waning of S1-
92 specific and neutralising antibodies in SARS-CoV infection (16). These instances of
93 low or no antibody responses by traditional serological approaches may lead to an
94 underestimation of asymptomatic and mild infection, and threaten the success of a
95 potential vaccine that targets the S1 alone. Therefore, a broader landscape of
96 antibody responses to a range of viral proteins needs to be assessed to better detect
97 the immunogenicity of SARS-CoV-2 infection to improve the understanding of
98 pathogenesis and immunity.

99 The Luciferase Immunoprecipitation system (LIPS) assay allows for a comprehensive
100 understanding of the antibody immune response against infectious agents (17) by the
101 expression of any protein or antigen as a recombinant Renilla luciferase (Ruc)-
102 antigen fusion. The LIPS technique has previously been used to distinguish infected
103 versus vaccinated cases for influenza due to the presence of antibodies against non-
104 structural proteins (18), and to characterize human infections by zoonotic spill over
105 from bat viruses (19). In this study, we used LIPS to assess the acute and
106 convalescent antibody responses to a panel of 15 potential SARS-CoV-2 antigens:
107 the 4 structural proteins (S, N, M and E), 3 S subunits (S1, S2, S2'), the 7 available
108 ORFs (ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10) and 1 relevant NSP within ORF1a/b (NSP1)
109 (20). Our data reports the most extensive landscape of antibody responses of
110 COVID-19 patients reported to date.

111 RESULTS

112 We made a panel of fifteen SARS-CoV-2 ORFs as *Renilla* luciferase–antigen fusion
113 proteins to assess the humoral immune responses in 15 COVID-19 infected patients
114 from Hong Kong compared with a panel of healthy negative controls using LIPS. The
115 four SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins show high amino-acid sequence homology with
116 SARS-CoV but not with other human coronaviruses responsible for common colds
117 (Supplementary Table 1). We detected significantly higher antibody responses to the
118 full Spike protein (S), the Nucleoprotein (N) and the Membrane protein (M) in COVID-
119 19 patients compared to healthy negative controls ($p < 0.0001$, $p = 0.023$, and
120 $p = 0.0116$ respectively, Figure 1bcd). COVID-19 patients did not show any increased
121 production of Envelope (E) antibodies (Figure 1e) compared to healthy negative
122 controls ($p = 0.0591$, Figure 1d).

123 We confirmed our results by traditional IgG ELISA, which correlated well with LIPS
124 LU responses ($R^2 = 0.5289$) for full-S (Supplementary figure 1ab). N-specific IgG by
125 ELISA is also elevated in COVID-19 patients (Supplementary figure 1c) but does not
126 correlate strongly with LIPS results (Supplementary figure 1d).

127 The S1 subunit, a key virus immunogen, detected significantly higher
128 antibodies in COVID-19 patients than negative controls (5191 ± 1469 LU versus
129 4003 ± 1062 LU, $p = 0.0288$, Figure 2a). Interestingly, there was no difference in the
130 antibodies to S2 in the LIPS assay between COVID-19 patients and negative controls
131 ($p = 0.5683$). Antibodies to the S2' cleaved subunit were significantly higher in COVID-
132 19 patients ($p = 0.0391$ for S2', Figure 2) but the overall in antibody levels between the
133 groups was considerable. Patients with higher SARS-CoV-2 micro neutralization
134 (MN) titers (> 160 reciprocal serum dilution) also had higher responses towards full-S

135 by LIPS, whilst there was no difference observed in LIPS responses to subunits S1,
136 S2 and S2' in high or low MN COVID-19 patients (Figure 2c, $p=0.0049$).

137 We next investigated the presence of antibodies specific to previously
138 uncharacterized ORFs to the SARS-CoV-2. As we could not produce the full
139 ORF1ab due to its extended length ($>21,000$ bp, (1)), we cloned and expressed a
140 representative antigen, non-structural protein 1 (NSP1). Bioinformatic predictions
141 have revealed a putative role for NSP1 in suppressing the antiviral host response (8).

142 We used LIPS to detect antibodies specific to NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF6,
143 ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF8 and ORF10 (Figure 3). COVID-19 patients had significantly
144 higher NSP1-antibody levels compared to negative controls (mean of 5301 ± 854.7
145 LU versus 3683 ± 726.4 LU, $p < 0.0001$, Figure 3a). Furthermore, significantly higher
146 antibody levels in COVID-19 patients were detected towards ORF3a, ORF3b,
147 ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF8 ($p=0.0302$, $p < 0.0001$, $p < 0.0001$, $p=0.0019$, $p < 0.0001$,
148 Figure 3b, c, e, f, g). The largest difference between COVID-19 and negative controls
149 in mean antibody signals among the ORFs was observed for ORF3b (7712 ± 2947
150 LU versus 3599 ± 1029 LU) and ORF8 (16933 ± 7489 LU versus 5440 ± 1096 LU)
151 (Figure 3c and g). Meanwhile there was no significant difference between COVID-19
152 patients and negative controls for ORF6 and ORF10 antigens (Figure 3d and h).

153 Globally, among the antibody responses tested in our LIPS assay, we detected
154 significant levels of antibodies specific to 11 antigens: N, M, S, S1, S2', NSP1,
155 ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF6 in the COVID-19 population (Table 1) at
156 all time-points of infection from day 4 to day 22 (see below in Figure 4 for early time-
157 point detection). We did not detect a significant production of antibodies to 4 of the
158 SARS-CoV-2 antigens tested: E, S2, ORF6 and ORF10 proteins.

159 Comparison of the global SARS-CoV-2 antibody responses from 15 COVID-19
160 patients reveals that anti-N antibodies dominate the humoral response detected by
161 LIPS (Figure 3i), whilst other antigens make lower and similar contributions to the
162 magnitude anti-SARS-Cov-2 antibody responses (Figure 5a).

163

164 **Absence of sex- and age- effect in our cohort**

165 Epidemiological data from many countries suggest that men develop more severe
166 COVID-19 related symptoms than women (21). We therefore evaluated the effect of
167 gender in our cohort of COVID-19 patients for antibody responses and found no
168 difference across all antigenic targets tested ($p=0.6289$, Supplementary Figure 2a).
169 Similarly, the SARS-CoV-2 antibody response was comparable between patients
170 aged below and above 60 years old ($p=0.9363$, Supplementary Figure 2b).

171

172 **Combined antigen test panels as a potential diagnostic tool for COVID-19**

173 We found significantly higher levels of 11 of the 15 antigens tested in the COVID-19
174 populations. Next, their ability to correctly identify COVID-19 patients was
175 determined. Therefore, a cut-off value of LIPS antibody signals, based on the mean
176 plus three standard deviations of the healthy negative control group (22-24), was
177 calculated for each of these 11 antigens, along with the sensitivity and specificity of
178 each test (Table 3, and Figure 4). The cut-off value of all 11 tests showed a high
179 specificity of the SARS-CoV-2 LIPS assays with no samples from the negative
180 control group being above the cut-off. On the other hand, 8 antigens showed a low
181 sensitivity (below 75% for M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF7a, ORF7b, Figure 4b),
182 hence being insufficient to correctly identify all the COVID-19 patients with high rates
183 of false negatives (Table 3), limiting their use for LIPS diagnostics. On the other

184 hand, the N, ORF3b and ORF8 antigens showed good sensitivity levels of 93.3%,
185 86.6% and 100% respectively (Table 3). Of note, ORF8 is the only of the 11 tests to
186 correctly identify all COVID-19 patients including at day 4 after onset of illness
187 (Figure 4a).

188 As many LIPS tests showed low sensitivity, we then used an approach based on the
189 combination of LIPS antibody LU signals for the 11 separate SARS-CoV-2 antigen
190 tests to efficiently detect SARS-CoV-2 exposure in this population (22-24). This
191 approach of combining the LU values from the 11 LIPS tests increased the sensitivity
192 to 100% for the diagnosis of COVID-19 infections during acute infection (Figure 5a,
193 blue dots for <14 days). Furthermore, combination of only 3 LIPS tests, those for
194 anti-N, ORF3b and ORF8 antibodies, also has a 100% sensitivity and specificity
195 (Figure 5b and Table 3). As ORF3b and ORF8 show the lowest homology to previous
196 SARS-CoV among all the viral proteins (8), we also looked separately at the
197 combination of responses towards ORF3b and ORF8 (Figure 5c). We observed the
198 same trend as above with all COVID-19 patients having a combined score above the
199 cut-off and all negative controls having a combined score below, and all early time-
200 points being correctly detected (Figure 4c). By combining only the 3 relevant Spike
201 protein LIPS tests (S, S1, S2'), the sensitivity of the LIPS test drastically decreased to
202 26.6% as only 4 of the 15 COVID-19 patients had a total combined LU above the cut-
203 off (Figure 5d). Interestingly all samples from early time-points (day 4 to day 13) had
204 LU signals under the cut-off value for S+S1+S2' (blue dots, Figure 5d). The
205 magnitude of the 11 relevant antigens, N+ORF3b+ORF8, as well as ORF3b+ORF8
206 responses significantly increase the detection of patients with early time-points
207 samples (Figure 5e, f). Therefore, the combinational use of ORF3b and ORF8 tests

208 alone could be sufficient to detect COVID-19 exposed subjects at any time-point of
209 infection.

210 Because endemic HCoVs are ubiquitous, the negative control plasma samples are
211 likely to have antibodies to a range of HCoVs. Sequence homology with other HCoV
212 could result in the detection of cross-reactive antibodies by LIPS and reduce
213 specificity of serological assays. Structural proteins of SARS-CoV-2 with other HCoV
214 structural proteins only share 18 to 40% homology (Supplementary table 1), making
215 potential cross-reactivity of existing antibodies unlikely and undetermined. Whilst
216 SARS-Cov-2 and SARS-CoV, N and S share 94% and 76% conservation
217 (Supplementary table 1), previous reports showed the lowest homology for ORF3b
218 and ORF8 at 32% and 40% amino acid homology respectively (8), making them the
219 most unique genes to SARS-CoV2.

220 To investigate specificity of the antibody responses to the panel of antigens, we
221 subtracted the mean LU levels of healthy negative controls from the mean LU of
222 COVID-19 infected patients and compared this difference across each antigen
223 (Figure 5b). We found that this difference was significantly higher for the N-specific
224 antibody response compared to all the other relevant antibody responses (M, S, S1,
225 S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b, and ORF8) ($p < 0.0001$, Figure 5b),
226 highlighting a possible dominance and specificity of N across the SARS-CoV-2
227 humoral immune responses. Besides N, the ORF8 and ORF3b also appear to be
228 important antigenic targets (Figure 5h, i). Statistical analysis (ANOVA) revealed that
229 ORF8 was significantly increased compared to all other antigens ($p < 0.0001$ versus
230 10 remaining antigens: M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, 7a, and 7b, Figure 5bc).
231 Whilst results for ORF3b were significant against the remaining 8 antigens (M, S, S1,

232 S2', NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, and 7b), excluding ORF7a (Figure 5c). Therefore, ORF3b
233 and ORF8 are newly identified as specific and unique antigenic targets.

234

235 **DISCUSSION**

236 SARS-CoV-2 antibody testing is an important component of the options for diagnosis
237 of recent and past COVID-19 infection. Antibody tests are crucial for determining
238 infection attack rates in the population, population immunity and inform vaccine
239 development. We report, for the first time, the detection of antibody responses
240 directed against an extensive spectrum of the SARS-CoV-2 antigens. Several
241 approaches have been developed to measure SARS-CoV-2-specific antibodies,
242 including micro neutralization assays (virus or pseudo virus-based (25)), ELISA
243 assays (11, 26), immunofluorescence (7), colloidal gold-based
244 immunochromatographic assays (27), and peptide/protein microarray (28) (29).
245 Using LIPS technology with crude lysates from transfected cells, we have screened
246 all the structural proteins along with all the ORFs of the SARS-CoV-2 virus (NSP1
247 only for ORF1ab) to identify new and unique antigenic targets of the humoral immune
248 response of COVID-19 patients.

249 Among the 15 proteins tested for antibody specificity, 11 antigens showed
250 significantly higher responses in the COVID-19 patients compared to healthy pre-
251 pandemic negative controls. For the Spike subunits, only antibodies to S1 and S2'
252 were elevated in COVID-19 patients by our LIPS test, and S2 responses were not
253 significantly different from the control group. The trimer S conformation and
254 maturation of viral particles by the cleavage of S2 during virus endocytosis to form
255 the S2' fusion peptide may result in a difference in their antigenicity. Patients with
256 higher MN titer had correspondingly higher levels of full-Spike LIPS and ELISA

257 results, establishing consistency among assays for the full-S protein. N antibody
258 responses detected were also elevated in patients, but the correlation between LIPS
259 and ELISA N antibody assays was lower.

260 We next cloned all the available ORFs of the virus ORF1ab (as NSP1 only), ORF3a,
261 ORF3b, ORF6, ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF8 and ORF10, to acquire more extensive
262 information of the immunogenic targets of the virus. We found that 6 of these 8 ORFs
263 induced a humoral immune response in the patients (NSP1 (ORF1ab), ORF3a,
264 ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b and ORF8). Furthermore, by calculating a cut-off value
265 based on the mean of the negative population + 3 standard deviations, we could
266 ascertain that only 3 out of these 11 antigens were useful in diagnostic tests with high
267 performance: N, ORF3b, and ORF8. By using the combined results of several
268 antibody signals and calculating a cut-off value for these responses, we found that
269 the sum of the 11 relevant antibody tests was highly sensitive and specific. Moreover,
270 combining only the 3 of the most informative and sensitive antigens, N, ORF3b and
271 ORF8, we achieved a sensitivity and specificity of 100%, correctly identifying all the
272 COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. A larger data set from COVID-19
273 patients and negative controls is needed to further refine and confirm the
274 performance of our test (30).

275 The Spike protein is responsible for virus entry into host cells and is the main antigen
276 that elicits neutralizing antibodies (10). Whilst we detected significant differences in
277 the magnitude of responses by LIPS between patients and controls for S, S1 and
278 S2', these antigens did not show high sensitivity levels, especially for sera collected
279 early post disease onset. The Spike protein is a trimer on the surface of virions, and
280 the conformation of our Ruc-S antigen should be assessed by conformation
281 dependent monoclonal antibodies to confirm whether the conformation of S protein in

282 our assay is well retained for antibody binding and affinity (31). Further LIPS tests
283 using the S RBD antigen alone are underway to assess the proportion of RBD-
284 specific antibodies as an important target of neutralizing antibodies (31). The S
285 protein also elicits non-neutralizing antibodies targeted to conserved epitopes (11),
286 and among our cohort an absence of *in vitro* neutralization has been observed for
287 some patients, especially at early time-points.

288 The combination of multiple antigens by LIPS beyond the Spike could be the basis
289 for supplementary serological tests useful to determine SARS-CoV-2 exposure to
290 overcome false negative results. We found that the single test detection of N, S or
291 ORF3b antibodies at early time-points (day 4 to day 14) results in a high proportion of
292 false negative results, whilst the minimal combination of N+ORF3b+ORF8 LIPS tests
293 is highly sensitive and specific.

294 Importantly, ORF3b and ORF8 are the least identical proteins to SARS-CoV (8), and
295 they do not exist in other strains of human coronaviruses. However very little is
296 known about their function and expression. Previous reports found the ORF3b of
297 SARS-CoV plays an important role in the interaction with the innate immune system
298 through inhibition of type 1 Interferon synthesis (33). In SARS-CoV, ORF8 has been
299 shown to accumulate in the Endoplasmic Reticulum and mediate cell death by
300 autophagy (32). In SARS-CoV-2, the functions of these ORFs have yet to be
301 determined. Importantly, ORF8 can only be found in human and bat SARS-like CoV
302 (35), and in our results we observed very low background detection in negative
303 control plasma resulting in highly specific results. However, there are recent reports
304 of the deletion of ORF8 in a few Singaporean COVID-19 patients (34) but this is not
305 reported elsewhere. Whilst ORF8-deletion SARS-CoV-2 viruses had reduced
306 replicative fitness, this issue may undermine the utility of ORF8 alone in serological

307 testing. In addition, NSP1 and ORF7a LIPS tests showed high significance for
308 COVID-19 patients. Though little is known about their function, bioinformatic
309 predictions reveal that both NSP1 and ORF7a could be involved in suppressing the
310 antiviral host response (6, 8). Therefore, the combined use of multiple antigens that
311 are sensitive and specific is needed for diagnostic serology.

312 Most commercially available or published serological tests use only the S antigen,
313 with a few using both the S and N antigens (11, 36, 37). Using extensive testing of
314 the virus antigens, we have shown that additional targets are important for early
315 detection of antibody responses and identification of COVID-19 patients. Potential
316 cross-reactivity of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies with other coronaviruses antibodies
317 cannot be excluded, but several recent data report that this cross-reactivity is minimal
318 (26). Therefore, the approach of combining several relevant antigens that are unique
319 to SARS-CoV-2, and immunogenic boosting specific antibodies would overcome
320 issues of cross-reactivity and increase the sensitivity of serological assays.
321 Screening of additional negative pre-pandemic samples with our LIPS approach is
322 needed to refine issues of cross-reactivity with other HCoV. The high orders of
323 magnitude and range of antibody quantity measured by our SARS-CoV-2 LIPS assay
324 is an advantage compared to ELISA Optical Density measurements. These
325 advantages may help with the rapid screening of recovered COVID-19 patients for
326 elevated antibodies to donate serum for the treatment of other patients by passive
327 transfer (38).

328 Our study does not report on antibody functions and data on Fc mediated functions
329 of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies are also still lacking (39). Therefore, Fc mediated
330 functions of antibodies directed against internal proteins from ORF3b and ORF8 will
331 be the focus of future studies. Furthermore, only IgG is bound to the protein A/G

332 used in the LIPS assays, therefore the use of protein L that binds the light chain of all
333 immunoglobulins could be of interest to detect IgM early responses in future
334 investigations. The E, S2, ORF6 and ORF10 antibodies did not show elevated levels
335 in COVID-19 patients in our assay, consistent with the findings of Wang H. *et al.* by
336 microarray (29). Further confirmation is needed using additional experimental
337 approaches before excluding their utility.

338 Our study is limited by small sample size and by the small number of sera collected
339 in the first few days after onset of symptoms. The absence of paired samples from
340 multiple time-points for the same patients is also a limitation. Longitudinal studies are
341 needed to further assess kinetics of antibody responses, especially to identify early
342 antibody responses for rapid diagnostic tests. The inclusion of additional time points,
343 greater sample size and asymptomatic cases are necessary to test the cut-off
344 sensitivity scores; and to confirm the diagnostic value of our LIPS assays and the
345 relevancy of ORF3b and ORF8 antibodies. Late-convalescent sera are needed to
346 assess antibody waning. We also need to investigate antibody profiles with disease
347 severity.

348 In conclusion, we found that COVID-19 patients not only produce antibodies to the
349 Spike protein, but also to other structural and non-structural proteins. The
350 nucleoprotein, and then ORF8, and ORF3 show an immunodominant and specific
351 humoral response compared with other SARS-CoV-2 antigenic targets tested. The
352 combined use of N+ORF3b+ORF8 provides a sensitive and specific method for the
353 detection of all COVID-19 patients in our cohort even at early time-points, whilst the
354 Spike protein does not. Our results provide insights into the overall spectrum of
355 antibody responses associated with COVID-19. We still need to investigate whether
356 antigens other than the virus spike confer protection. Such information will help

357 prioritize antigen targets for vaccine development, monoclonal antibody reagents and

358 detecting early responses to infection.

359

360 **Methods**

361 **Patients and samples collection**

362 Our study enrolled a total of 26 patients with RT-PCR confirmed COVID-19 infection
363 (Table 1). Fifteen patients were enrolled in Hong Kong (China, SAR) and all of them
364 provided informed consent. The study was approved by the institutional review board
365 of the Hong Kong West Cluster of the Hospital Authority of Hong Kong (approval
366 number: UW20-169). Plasma samples were collected from heparinized blood, and
367 heat-inactivated at 56°C, 30 mins. Gender- and age-matched plasma samples from
368 healthy subjects collected before the COVID-19 pandemic were used as negative
369 controls.

370

371 **SARS-CoV-2 gene cloning**

372 Based on previous studies describing the structure of the SARS-CoV-2 genome (1,
373 8), an extensive panel of 12 proteins (S, E, M, N, NSP1, ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8, 10)
374 was chosen for antibody testing by LIPS. Primers for the amplification of SARS-CoV-
375 2 proteins were designed (See protein ID in Table 1, and primers sequences in
376 Supplementary table 2). A RT-PCR was performed using extracted SARS-CoV-2
377 vRNA to amplify target genes corresponding to Structural and Non-structural proteins
378 of the virus (Table 1, (6)) using Platinum SuperScriptIII One Step RT-PCR system.
379 The bands were then extracted using Qiagen gel extraction kit (Qiagen, Germany)
380 and digested with BamHI and NotI or KpnI-HF and XhoI (New England Biolabs,
381 USA). Extracted products were ligated using T4 DNA ligase (New England Biolabs)
382 into the pREN2 plasmid (from Peter Burbelo NDICR, NIH). Plasmids were
383 transformed using DH10B competent cells and purified using PureYield Plasmid
384 midi-prep system (Promega).

385

386 **SARS-CoV-2 (Ruc)-antigen expression**

387 Constructs with pREN2-Renilla luciferase plasmid containing the SARS-CoV-2
388 antigen of interest were transfected into Cos1 cells using Fugene 6 (Promega) as per
389 manufacturer's instructions. Cells were harvested 48 hours later, lysed and
390 sonicated, and (Ruc)-antigen yields were measured using a Luminometer plate
391 reader (PerkinElmer) according to the protocol of Burbelo *et al.* (20).

392

393 **Measurement of antibody responses using Luciferase Immunoprecipitation**

394 **System (LIPS)**

395 The LIPS assays were performed following the protocol of Burbelo *et al.*, with the
396 following modifications (20). Briefly, (Ruc)-antigen (1e7 per well) and plasma (heat
397 inactivated and diluted 1:100) were incubated for 2 hours with shaking at 800rpm.
398 Ultralink protein A/G beads were added to the (Ruc)-antigen and serum mixture in a
399 96-deep-well polypropylene microtiter plate and incubated for 2 hours with shaking at
400 800rpm. The entire volume was then transferred into HTS plates and washed as
401 previously described. The plate was read using QUANTI-Luc Gold substrate
402 (Invivogen, rep-qlcg5) as per manufacturer's instructions and a MicroBeta JET
403 luminometer (PerkinElmer). Experimental controls include blank wells with antigens
404 and negative control serum from age matched non-infected patient plasma collected
405 prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

406

407

408 **Enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay**

409 ELISA assays were performed with the available SARS-CoV-2 proteins Spike
410 (S1+S2) and Nucleoprotein (N) proteins. Briefly, recombinant S and N proteins
411 (Sinobiological) were coated on 96-well flat-bottom immunosorbent plates (Nunc
412 Immuno MaxiSorp, Roskilde, Denmark) at a concentration of 100 ng/ml, in 100/ μ l
413 coating buffer (PBS with 53% Na₂CO₃ and 42% NaHCO₃, pH 9.6) at 4°C overnight.
414 An additional plate coated with a non-specific protein (blocking buffer, PBS with 5%
415 FBS) was used to measure the background binding of each sample. Following FBS
416 blocking and thorough washing, diluted plasma samples (1:100) were bound for
417 2 hours, further washed and then detected by an anti-human Ig secondary antibody
418 labelled with HRP specific for IgG (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA, USA).

419

420 **Microneutralization assay**

421 Plasma samples were diluted in serial two-fold dilutions commencing with a dilution
422 of 1:10, and mixed with equal volumes of SARS-CoV-2 at a dose of 200 tissue
423 culture infective doses 50% (TCID₅₀) determined by Vero E6 cells respectively. After
424 1 hour of incubation at 37°C, 35/ μ l of the virus-serum mixture was added in
425 quadruplicate to Vero or Vero E6 cell monolayers in 96-well microtiter plates. After 1
426 hour of adsorption, the virus-serum mixture was removed and replaced with 150/ μ l of
427 virus growth medium in each well. The plates were incubated for 3 days at 37°C in
428 5% CO₂ in a humidified incubator. Cytopathic effect was observed at day 3 post-
429 inoculation. The highest plasma dilution protecting 50% of the replicate wells was
430 denoted as the neutralizing antibody titer. A virus back-titration of the input virus was
431 included in each batch of tests.

432

433 **Multiple alignments of Coronaviruses**

434 Multiple amino acid alignments of structural proteins from HKU1 (AY597011.2),
435 HCoV-229E (AF304460.1), HCoV-OC43 (AY391777.1) and HCoV-NL63
436 (AY567487.2) were compared versus SARS-CoV-2 (MN908947) using CLUSTAL
437 2.1.

438

439 **Statistics**

440 GraphPad Prism 6 software (San Diego, CA) was used for statistical analysis.
441 Antibody levels are presented as the geometric mean +/- standard deviation (stdev).
442 For the calculation of sensitivity and specificity, cut-off limits for each antigen were
443 derived from the mean value plus three standard deviations of the controls. Non-
444 parametric Mann–Whitney U tests were used to compare the antibody levels
445 between COVID-19 and negative groups, using the GraphPad 8 Prism software.

446 **Competing interests**

447 A Hachim, N Kavian, LLM Poon, JSM Peiris and SA Valkenburg have filed a patent
448 application on the basis of the invention described in this study.

449

450 **Acknowledgements**

451 This study was partly supported by the Research Grants Scheme (GRF 17113718).

452 We thank Linfa Wang (Duke NUS, Singapore) for technical advice for establishing
453 the LIPS assay.

454 References

- 455 1. Wu F, Zhao S, Yu B, Chen YM, Wang W, Song ZG, et al. A new coronavirus
456 associated with human respiratory disease in China. *Nature*. 2020;579(7798):265-9.
- 457 2. Poon LLM, Peiris M. Emergence of a novel human coronavirus threatening
458 human health. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(3):317-9.
- 459 3. Amanat F, Krammer F. SARS-CoV-2 Vaccines: Status Report. *Immunity*.
460 2020.
- 461 4. Liu Y, Yan LM, Wan L, Xiang TX, Le A, Liu JM, et al. Viral dynamics in mild
462 and severe cases of COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2020.
- 463 5. World Health Organization. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation
464 reports 2020 [Available from: [https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)
465 [coronavirus-2019/situation-reports](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports)]
- 466 6. Zhang C, Zheng W, Huang X, Bell EW, Zhou X, Zhang Y. Protein Structure
467 and Sequence Reanalysis of 2019-nCoV Genome Refutes Snakes as Its
468 Intermediate Host and the Unique Similarity between Its Spike Protein Insertions and
469 HIV-1. *J Proteome Res*. 2020;19(4):1351-60.
- 470 7. Thevarajan I, Nguyen THO, Koutsakos M, Druce J, Caly L, van de Sandt CE,
471 et al. Breadth of concomitant immune responses prior to patient recovery: a case
472 report of non-severe COVID-19. *Nat Med*. 2020;26(4):453-5.
- 473 8. Chan JF, Kok KH, Zhu Z, Chu H, To KK, Yuan S, et al. Genomic
474 characterization of the 2019 novel human-pathogenic coronavirus isolated from a
475 patient with atypical pneumonia after visiting Wuhan. *Emerg Microbes Infect*.
476 2020;9(1):221-36.
- 477 9. Walls AC, Park YJ, Tortorici MA, Wall A, McGuire AT, Velesler D. Structure,
478 Function, and Antigenicity of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Glycoprotein. *Cell*. 2020.
- 479 10. Paules CI, Marston HD, Fauci AS. Coronavirus Infections-More Than Just the
480 Common Cold. *JAMA*. 2020.
- 481 11. Huibin Lv NCW, Owen Tak-Yin Tsang, Meng Yuan, Ranawaka A. P. M.
482 Perera, Wai Shing Leung, Ray T. Y. So, Jacky Man Chun Chan, Garrick K. Yip,
483 Thomas Shiu Hong Chik, Yiquan Wang, Chris Yau Chung Choi, Yihan Lin, Wilson W.
484 Ng, Jincun Zhao, Leo L. M. Poon, J. S. Malik Peiris, Ian A. Wilson, Chris K. P. Mok.
485 Cross-reactive antibody response between SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV infections.
486 *bioRxiv*. 2020.
- 487 12. Thevarajan I, Nguyen THO, Koutsakos M, Druce J, Caly L, van de Sandt CE,
488 et al. Breadth of concomitant immune responses prior to patient recovery: a case
489 report of non-severe COVID-19. *Nature Medicine*. 2020.
- 490 13. Wu F, Wang A, Liu M, Wang Q, Chen J, Xia S, et al. Neutralizing antibody
491 responses to SARS-CoV-2 in a COVID-19 recovered patient cohort and their
492 implications. *medRxiv*. 2020:2020.03.30.20047365.
- 493 14. Choe PG, Perera R, Park WB, Song KH, Bang JH, Kim ES, et al. MERS-CoV
494 Antibody Responses 1 Year after Symptom Onset, South Korea, 2015. *Emerg Infect*
495 *Dis*. 2017;23(7):1079-84.
- 496 15. Hemida MG, Chu DK, Poon LL, Perera RA, Alhammedi MA, Ng HY, et al.
497 MERS coronavirus in dromedary camel herd, Saudi Arabia. *Emerg Infect Dis*.
498 2014;20(7):1231-4.
- 499 16. Channappanavar R, Zhao J, Perlman S. T cell-mediated immune response to
500 respiratory coronaviruses. *Immunol Res*. 2014;59(1-3):118-28.
- 501 17. Burbelo PD, Goldman R, Mattson TL. A simplified immunoprecipitation method
502 for quantitatively measuring antibody responses in clinical sera samples by using

- 503 mammalian-produced Renilla luciferase-antigen fusion proteins. *BMC Biotechnol.*
504 2005;5:22.
- 505 18. Robertson AH, Mahic M, Savic M, Tunheim G, Hungnes O, Trogstad L, et al.
506 Detection of anti-NS1 antibodies after pandemic influenza exposure: Evaluation of a
507 serological method for distinguishing H1N1pdm09 infected from vaccinated cases.
508 *Influenza Other Respir Viruses.* 2020.
- 509 19. Uehara A, Tan CW, Mani S, Chua KB, Leo YS, Anderson DE, et al.
510 Serological evidence of human infection by bat orthoreovirus in Singapore. *J Med*
511 *Virol.* 2019;91(4):707-10.
- 512 20. Burbelo PD, Ching KH, Klimavicz CM, Iadarola MJ. Antibody profiling by
513 Luciferase Immunoprecipitation Systems (LIPS). *J Vis Exp.* 2009(32).
- 514 21. Conti P, Younes A. Coronavirus COV-19/SARS-CoV-2 affects women less
515 than men: clinical response to viral infection. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents.*
516 2020;34(2).
- 517 22. Burbelo PD, Keller J, Wagner J, Klimavicz JS, Bayat A, Rhodes CS, et al.
518 Serological diagnosis of pulmonary Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection by LIPS
519 using a multiple antigen mixture. *BMC Microbiol.* 2015;15:205.
- 520 23. Frey A, Di Canzio J, Zurakowski D. A statistically defined endpoint titer
521 determination method for immunoassays. *J Immunol Methods.* 1998;221(1-2):35-41.
- 522 24. Burbelo PD, Chaturvedi A, Notkins AL, Gunti S. Luciferase-Based Detection of
523 Antibodies for the Diagnosis of HPV-Associated Head and Neck Squamous Cell
524 Carcinoma. *Diagnostics (Basel).* 2019;9(3).
- 525 25. Nie J, Li Q, Wu J, Zhao C, Hao H, Liu H, et al. Establishment and validation of
526 a pseudovirus neutralization assay for SARS-CoV-2. *Emerg Microbes Infect.*
527 2020;9(1):680-6.
- 528 26. Fatima Amanat DS, Shirin Strohmeier, Thi Nguyen, Veronika Chromikova,
529 Meagan McMahon, Kaijun Jiang, Guha Asthagiri-Arunkumar, Denise Jurczynszak,
530 Jose Polanco, Maria Bermudez-Gonzalez, Giulio Kleiner, Teresa Aydillo, Lisa Miorin,
531 Daniel Fierer, Luz Amarilis Lugo, Erna Milunka Kojic, Jonathan Stoeber, Sean T.H.
532 Liu, Charlotte Cunningham-Rundles, Philip L. Felgner, Daniel Caplivski, Adolfo
533 Garcia-Sastre, Allen Cheng, Katherine Kedzierska, Olli Vapalahti, Jussi Hepojoki,
534 Viviana Simon, Florian Krammer, Thomas Moran. A serological assay to detect
535 SARS-CoV-2 seroconversion in humans. *medRxiv.* 2020.
- 536 27. Pan Y, Li X, Yang G, Fan J, Tang Y, Zhao J, et al. Serological
537 immunochromatographic approach in diagnosis with SARS-CoV-2 infected COVID-
538 19 patients. *medRxiv.* 2020.
- 539 28. Christine Dahlke JH, Robin Kobbe, Rene Santer, Till Koch, Anahita Fathi, My
540 L. Ly, Stefan Schmiedel, Peter H. Seeberger, ID-UKE COVID-19 study group,
541 Marylyn M. Addo, Felix F. Loeffler. Distinct early IgA profile may determine severity
542 of COVID-19 symptoms: an immunological case series. *medRxiv.* 2020.
- 543 29. Hongye Wang XH, Xian Wu, Te Liang, Xiaomei Zhang, Dan Wang, Fei Teng,
544 Jiayu Dai, Hu Duan, Shubin Guo, Yongzhe Li, Xiaobo Yu. SARS-CoV-2 proteome
545 microarray for mapping COVID-19 antibody interactions at amino acid resolution.
546 *bioRxiv.* 2020.
- 547 30. Bujang MA, Adnan TH. Requirements for Minimum Sample Size for Sensitivity
548 and Specificity Analysis. *J Clin Diagn Res.* 2016;10(10):YE01-YE6.
- 549 31. Yuan M, Wu NC, Zhu X, Lee CD, So RTY, Lv H, et al. A highly conserved
550 cryptic epitope in the receptor-binding domains of SARS-CoV-2 and SARS-CoV.
551 *Science.* 2020.

- 552 32. McBride R, Fielding BC. The role of severe acute respiratory syndrome
553 (SARS)-coronavirus accessory proteins in virus pathogenesis. *Viruses*.
554 2012;4(11):2902-23.
- 555 33. Shi CS, Nabar NR, Huang NN, Kehrl JH. SARS-Coronavirus Open Reading
556 Frame-8b triggers intracellular stress pathways and activates NLRP3
557 inflammasomes. *Cell Death Discov*. 2019;5:101.
- 558 34. Yvonne CF Su DEA, Barnaby E Young, Feng Zhu, Martin Linster, Shirin
559 Kalimuddin, Jenny GH Low, Zhuang Yan, Jayanthi Jayakumar, Louisa Sun, Gabriel Z
560 Yan, Ian H Mendenhall, Yee-Sin Leo, David Chien Lye, Lin-Fa Wang, Gavin JD
561 Smith. Discovery of a 382-nt deletion during the early evolution of SARS-CoV-2.
562 *bioRxiv*. 2020.
- 563 35. Cui J, Li F, Shi ZL. Origin and evolution of pathogenic coronaviruses. *Nat Rev*
564 *Microbiol*. 2019;17(3):181-92.
- 565 36. Zhang W, Du RH, Li B, Zheng XS, Yang XL, Hu B, et al. Molecular and
566 serological investigation of 2019-nCoV infected patients: implication of multiple
567 shedding routes. *Emerg Microbes Infect*. 2020;9(1):386-9.
- 568 37. Nisreen M.A. Okba MAM, Wentao Li, Chunyan Wang, Corine H.
569 GeurtsvanKessel, Victor M. Corman, Mart M. Lamers, Reina S. Sikkema, Erwin de
570 Bruin, Felicity D. Chandler, Yazdan Yazdanpanah, Quentin Le Hingrat, Diane
571 Descamps, Nadhira Houhou-Fidouh, Chantal B. E. M. Reusken, Berend-Jan Bosch,
572 Christian Drosten, Marion P.G. Koopmans, Bart L. Haagmans. SARS-CoV-2 specific
573 antibody responses in COVID-19 patients. *bioRxiv*. 2020.
- 574 38. Casadevall A, Pirofski LA. The convalescent sera option for containing
575 COVID-19. *J Clin Invest*. 2020;130(4):1545-8.
- 576 39. Fu Y, Cheng Y, Wu Y. Understanding SARS-CoV-2-Mediated Inflammatory
577 Responses: From Mechanisms to Potential Therapeutic Tools. *Virology*. 2020.
578
- 579

580 **Table 1.** List of ORFs produced as Renilla-Antigen fusion protein

Antigen	Full name	Patient response
N	Nucleocapsid	Yes
M	Membrane	Yes
E	Envelope	No
S	Spike	Yes
S1	Spike S1 subunit	Yes
S2	Spike S2 subunit	No
S2'	Spike S2 subunit	Yes
NSP1 (in ORF1a/b)	-	Yes
ORF3a	-	Yes
ORF3b	-	Yes
ORF6	-	No
ORF7a	-	Yes
ORF7b	-	Yes
ORF8	-	Yes
ORF10	-	No

581

582

583 **Table 2.** Hong Kong COVID-19 infected patient information

Patient number	gender	age	sample day	SARS-CoV-2 MN titers
1	M	56	6	<1:10
2	F	62	4	<1:10
3	M	47	8	1/80
4	F	72	10	1/40
5	M	56	13	1/320
6	M	72	18	1/80
7	F	37	15	1/80
8	F	73	18	1/80
9	F	55	11	<1:10
10	M	64	19	1/320
11	F	63	19	1/640
12	M	60	22	1/160
13	M	37	14	1/320
14	F	62	22	1/160
15	M	63	22	1/80

584

585

586 **Table 3.** Cut-off value, sensitivity, specificity, and Positive/Negative Predictive Values
 587 for: each of the 11 relevant SARS-CoV-2 antigens tests, as well as the sums of the
 588 11 relevant antigens, N+ORF3b+ORF8, ORF3b+ORF8, and S+S1+S2' tests.

Antigen	Cut-off value	sensitivity	specificity	Positive predictive value (PPV)	Negative predictive value (NPV)
N	46133	93.3%	100%	100%	93.75%
M	8684	0%	100%	0%	50%
S	4333	33.3%	100%	100%	60%
S1	7189	13.3%	100%	100%	53.57%
S2'	7635	0%	100%	0%	50%
NSP1	5862	20%	100%	100%	55.56%
ORF3a	9925	25%	100%	100%	55.56%
ORF3b	6686	86.6%	100%	100%	88.24%
ORF7a	7394	33.3%	100%	100%	60%
ORF7b	3355	13.3%	100%	100%	53.57%
ORF8	8728	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of the 11 relevant tests	73323	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of N+ORF3b+ORF8	22101	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of ORF3b+ORF8	13280	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sum of S+S1+S2'	17134	26.67%	100%	100%	57.69%

a

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.30.20085670>; this version posted May 2, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).




Figure 1. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins antibodies by LIPS. (a) SARS-CoV-2 genome ORF organisation (*not to scale*). (b-e) Antibodies against the four SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins Spike (S), Nucleocapsid (N), Membrane (M), Envelope (E) were measured by LIPS from COVID-19 patients, and age matched negative controls. Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. P values were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. * shows statistical significance between COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. ns, p=0.0591 *p<0.05, **p<0.01.




Figure 2. LIPS detection of antibody levels to the SARS-CoV-2 S protein subunits. (a) Antibodies against the S subunits S1, S2, and S2' by LIPS from COVID-19 patients and negative controls. (b) Full S, S1, S2, S2' antibodies LIPS responses in COVID-19 patients with low microneutralization (MN) titers (<160) versus high MN titers (≥160). (c) Full S antibodies LIPS responses in COVID-19 patients with low ELISA S IgG responses (<1) versus high ELISA IgG responses (≥1). Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. P values were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. * shows statistical significance between COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. *p<0.05, **p<0.01.




Figure 3. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 non-structural proteins antibodies by LIPS. (a-h) Antibodies against NSP1 (in ORF1ab), and other ORFs (ORF3a, 3b, 6, 7a, 7b, 8 and 10) were measured by LIPS to cover all the ORFs of the virus. Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). (i) Global individual immune responses detected by LIPS in the 15 COVID-19 patients for the 11 relevant antigens. Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. P values were calculated using the Mann-Whitney U test. * shows statistical significance between COVID-19 patients versus negative controls. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, **** $p < 0.0001$.





Figure 4. Sensitivity of LIPS tests for potential diagnostic use. (a) Cut-off values for the 11 relevant LIPS tests (dotted line) were calculated as mean of negatives + 3 Stdev. Early time-points (<day 14) COVID-19 samples are shown by the blue dots. Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). The red dotted line in ORF8 represents a 100% sensitivity and specificity. Background values were subtracted. Experiments were repeated twice. (b) Sensitivity and specificity performances of the 11 LIPS tests.

All samples



Early time-points samples only (<day 14)




Figure 5. Combining LIPS tests as a diagnostic tool for COVID-19. Cumulative antibody LIPS levels to the SARS-CoV-2 antigens in COVID-19 patients and negative controls, for (a) 11 relevant antigens (N, M, S, S1, S2', NSP1, ORF3a, ORF3b, ORF7a, ORF7b, ORF10) (b) three most sensitive antigens (N, ORF3b, and ORF8), (c) selective antigens (ORF3b, and ORF8), and (d) 3 S relevant antigens (S, S1, S2'). (e-f) Detection of early time-points patients only with the sum of (e) 11 relevant Antigens and (f) three most sensitive antigens (N+ORF3b+ORF8). Data represents the mean +/- stdev, and individual responses (n=15). The cut-off value of the sums is shown by the dotted line and was based on the mean + three stdev of the negative control group. Blue dots represents COVID-19 patients data points prior to day 14. (h-i) Differences of the antibody response means between COVID-19 and negative control populations as (h) scatter plot including the 11 relevant antigens, and as (i) pie chart excluding N. Each symbol represents the mean +/- stdev of the differences between COVID-19 and negative groups, for the 11 relevant antibody levels in light units (LU). *** p<0.001, **** p<0.0001 versus all other antigens, otherwise indicated.