

1 **Intrafamilial Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 Induces Cellular Immune Response without Seroconversion**

2 Floriane Gallais,^{1,2} Aurélie Velay,^{1,2} Marie-Josée Wendling,¹ Charlotte Nazon,^{1,2} Marialuisa Partisani,
3 ³ Jean Sibilia,^{4,2} Sophie Candon,⁵ and Samira Fafi-Kremer^{1,2}

4

5 ¹ Virology Laboratory, Strasbourg University Hospital, Strasbourg, France; ² Strasbourg University,
6 INSERM, IRM UMR-S 1109, F-67000 Strasbourg, France; ³ Le Trait d'Union, Strasbourg University
7 Hospital, Strasbourg, France; ⁴ Rheumatology Department, Strasbourg University Hospital, Strasbourg,
8 France; ⁵ Laboratory of Immunology and biotherapies, Rouen University Hospital, University of Rouen
9 Normandie, Rouen, France.

10 **Corresponding author.** Prof Samira FAFI-KREMER, Pharm.D., PhD, Virology Laboratory and INSERM
11 UMR_S 1109, Strasbourg University Hospitals, 3 rue Koeberlé, F-67000 Strasbourg, France; phone:
12 (33) 3 69 55 14 38; fax: (33) 3 68 85 37 50, e-mail: samira.fafi-kremer@unistra.fr

13

14 **Key words.** SARS-CoV-2, COVID-19, household exposure, serology, viral-specific T cell response.

15 **Abbreviations.** COVID-19: Corona Virus Disease 2019; SARS-CoV-2: severe acute respiratory
16 syndrome coronavirus 2; HCoV: human coronaviruses; RT-PCR: reverse transcriptase-polymerase
17 chain reaction; RBD: Receptor Binding Domain; IFN: interferon; PBMCs: Peripheral blood
18 Mononuclear Cells; HD: Healthy Donors

19

20

21 **Abstract.**

22 **Background.** In the background of the current COVID-19 pandemic, serological tests are being used
23 to assess past infection and immunity against SARS-CoV-2. This knowledge is paramount to
24 determine the transmission dynamics of SARS-CoV-2 through the post pandemic period. Several
25 individuals belonging to households with an index COVID-19 patient, reported symptoms of COVID-
26 19 but discrepant serology results.

27 **Methods.** Here we investigated the humoral and cellular immune responses against SARS-CoV-2 in
28 seven families, including nine index patients and eight contacts, who had evidence of serological
29 discordances within the households. Ten unexposed healthy donors were enrolled as controls.

30 **Results.** All index patients recovered from a mild COVID-19. They all developed anti-SARS-CoV-2
31 antibodies and a significant T cell response detectable up to 69 days after symptom onset. Six of the
32 eight contacts reported COVID-19 symptoms within 1 to 7 days after the index patients but all were
33 SARS-CoV-2 seronegative. Six out of eight contacts developed a SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell response
34 against structural and/or accessory proteins that lasts up to 80 days post symptom onset suggesting
35 a past SARS-CoV-2 infection.

36 **Conclusion.** Exposure to SARS-CoV-2 can induce virus-specific T cell responses without
37 seroconversion. T cell responses may be more sensitive indicators of SARS-CoV-2 exposure than
38 antibodies. Our results indicate that epidemiological data relying only on the detection of SARS-CoV-
39 2 antibodies may lead to a substantial underestimation of prior exposure to the virus.

40

41

42

43

44

45 **Introduction:**

46 Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) is a pandemic infection that raises a major concern all around
47 the world[1]. To contain the spread of the virus, several countries have imposed population
48 lockdown[2]. In France, the first cases of COVID-19 were recorded at the end of January 2020[3]. Due
49 to the rapid increase of new cases and mortality, the lockdown was imposed from March 17 to May
50 11, 2020. Since the lifting of the lockdown, the number of new cases of SARS-CoV-2 has decreased
51 significantly. However, it is not excluded that a second pandemic wave may occur in the future [4].

52 Estimation of immunizing infections is crucial in helping to predict the post pandemic dynamics of the
53 virus[4]. Serological tests for SARS-CoV-2 have been developed to determine the extent of immunity
54 to the virus[4], and immunity certifications based on these tests have been considered by some
55 European countries and by the US government [5]. Since their availability in France, anti-SARS-CoV-2
56 antibody assays met a huge demand from people to learn if they are protected. Surprisingly, several
57 individuals belonging to households with an index COVID-19 patient reported symptoms of COVID-19
58 but remained seronegative although no quarantine measures were respected by the index patient.
59 The absence of antiviral antibodies after exposure has been previously reported for other viral
60 infections. In these cases, the presence of viral specific-T cell responses provided proofs of viral
61 transmission[6-8].

62 In this study, we investigated the humoral and cellular response against SARS-CoV-2 in seven families
63 who reported serological discordances in their household.

64

65 **Methods:**

66 **Study subjects**

67 Seven households were enrolled in the study. Each involves at least one index patient with a
68 documented proof of positive reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) and /or

69 serological testing for SARS-CoV-2, and at least one contact with a negative SARS-CoV-2 serology. All
70 index patients recovered from a mild form of COVID-19 that occurred between March 2 and March
71 25, 2020. Clinical history was recorded for index patients and contacts. Blood samples for the present
72 study were collected between May 7 and May 28, 2020. Ten healthy donors, who have not been
73 exposed to COVID-19 patients and who have been tested negative for anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies,
74 were enrolled as controls. All the participants gave written informed consent for research according
75 to protocols approved by the institutional review board of Strasbourg University Hospitals (CE-2020-
76 34).

77

78 **SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR and Serological tests**

79 In house real-time reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) tests for SARS-CoV2 nucleic acid were
80 performed on nasopharyngeal swabs. Primer and probe sequences target two regions on the RdRp
81 gene and are specific to SARS-CoV2. Assay sensitivity is around 10 copies / reaction (Institut Pasteur,
82 Paris, France). Three serological assays were used to determine the presence of anti-SARS-CoV-2
83 antibodies in index patients and contacts: i) The Abbott Architect SARS-CoV-2 IgG is a
84 chemiluminescent microparticle immunoassay for detection of IgG against the SARS-CoV-2
85 nucleoprotein; and ii) The Euroimmun Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Assay is an enzyme-linked immunosorbent
86 assay (ELISA) for the detection of IgG against the SARS-CoV-2 S1 domain of the spike protein
87 including the immunologically relevant receptor binding domain (RBD). The two assays were
88 approved by the FDA and the French National Agency of Medicine and Health Products Safety
89 (ANSM) regarding their excellent analytical performances (Abbott Architect assay: sensitivity 100%
90 and specificity 100% [9], and Euroimmun assay: sensitivity 100% and specificity 97.7%)[10]. iii) The
91 Biosynex is a lateral flow assay for detection of IgM and IgG against the SARS-CoV-2 RBD of the Spike
92 protein S. This assay was also approved by the ANSM with excellent analytical performances

93 (specificity 99.4% and sensitivity 95.6% [11]). All of the three assays were tested according to
94 manufacturer's instructions.

95 **IFN- γ Enzyme-linked Immunospot assay**

96 T cell immune response against SARS-CoV-2 was investigated by performing an interferon-gamma
97 (IFN- γ) enzyme linked immunospot (ELISpot) assay in duplicate on fresh peripheral blood
98 mononuclear cells (PBMCs) isolated from heparin-anticoagulated blood. PBMCs were seeded at
99 200,000 CD3 positive cells/well and stimulated for 20 +/- 4 hours with overlapping 15-mer peptide
100 pools spanning the sequences of the entire SARS-CoV-2 spike glycoprotein (pools S1 and S2), the
101 nucleoprotein (N), the membrane protein (M), the envelope small membrane protein (E) and the
102 accessory proteins 3A, 7A, 8 and 9B (PepMix™, JPT Peptide Technologies, Strassberg, Germany). To
103 investigate the possibility of pre-existing cross-reactive coronavirus-specific T cells, PBMCs were
104 stimulated in parallel with peptide pools spanning the spike glycoprotein sequences of HCoV-229E
105 (ES1 and ES2) and HCoV-OC43 (OS1 and OS2), respectively. Phytohemagglutinin (PHA) was used as a
106 positive control and culture medium in quadruplicate as a negative control. After colorimetric
107 revelation of IFN γ capture (UCytech, Utrecht, The Netherlands), spots were counted using an ELISPOT
108 reader (AID, Strassberg, Germany). For each condition, the mean number of spot forming cells per
109 million CD3 positive cells was calculated from duplicates after subtraction of the background value
110 obtained from negative controls to determine the frequency of antigen specific T cells. The threshold
111 defining a significant SARS-CoV-2-specific response was set at exceeding 3 standard deviations of the
112 negative control background.

113

114 **Results**

115 **Index patients and contacts characteristics**

116 Nine index patients (P1, P2, P3A, P3B, P3C, P4, P5, P6 and P7) recovered from a mild COVID-19 with
117 positive serological testing for SARS-CoV-2 and eight contacts (C1, C2, C3, C4A, C4B, C5, C6 and C7)
118 with negative serological testing for SARS-CoV-2 were enrolled in the study. For each household,
119 blood samples were collected the same day, except for the household 5 (Table 1). The median age of
120 index patients was 45 years (range, 34-65 years) and four (50%) were male. They all had a normal
121 lymphocyte count (table 1). SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test was performed for 4 households (4, 5, 6 and 7)
122 in nasopharyngeal specimens. RT-PCR was positive for all the index patients and negative for all the
123 contacts (Table 1). Of the nine index patients, five were healthcare workers and two of them
124 reported a history of contacts with COVID-19 positive patients during their work. Patients reported
125 history of fever (n=5), cough (n=6), headache (n=6), anosmia (n=7), ageusia (n=6), and less often
126 dyspnea (n=2) and myalgia (n=2). The duration of symptoms varied from 2 to 15 days (median 7
127 days). All families rigorously washed their hands and all except one family (Household 2) avoided
128 hugs and kisses with household members. Only two index patients (P4 and P6) quarantined
129 themselves by dieting separately and/or wearing a mask one and three days after symptom onset,
130 respectively. Of the eight contacts, two (C3 and C6) had no symptoms, four had fever, three had
131 cough, four had headache and one had ageusia. The duration of symptoms varied from 1 to 11 days
132 (median 7 days) (Table 1).

133 Serological status for SARS-CoV-2 was confirmed for index patients and contacts by using three
134 different serological assays (Table 1). To determine whether SARS-CoV-2 specific T cells were induced
135 in index patients and contacts, fresh PBMC samples were stimulated with structural and accessory
136 SARS-CoV-2 proteins followed by IFN γ ELISPOT analysis. All index patients showed SARS-CoV-2-
137 specific IFN γ responses against at least four SARS-CoV-2 antigens with a maximum of eight antigens.
138 They all recognized the structural proteins S1, S2, N and M, and six of them recognized at least one

139 accessory protein (3A and/or 7A, 8, 9B), suggesting that they had developed SARS-CoV-2-specific T
140 cell responses (Fig.1A and 2). Importantly, blood samples were collected from 47 to 69 days post
141 symptom onset, which suggests that antiviral T cells are maintained in patients recovered from a
142 mild COVID-19 up to 69 days post symptoms.

143 Six of eight contacts demonstrated SARS-CoV-2 –specific IFN γ responses against at least one SARS-
144 CoV-2 antigen (Fig.1A and 2). The contacts C1 and C4A exhibited a T-cell reactivity against five SARS-
145 CoV-2 antigens including two structural proteins and three accessory proteins; the contact C5
146 exhibited a T-cell reactivity against the two structural proteins N and E and the accessory protein 9B;
147 the contacts C2, C6 and C7 exhibited a T-cell reactivity against S2, 8/9B and S1, respectively. Of note,
148 the frequencies of IFN γ -secreting T cells in contacts C1, C2, C4A, C5 and C7 were similar to those
149 displayed by the index patients and much higher than those detected in unexposed healthy donors
150 (HD) except for the antigen S2 for which HD10 displayed a similar frequency as for index patients and
151 contacts (Fig. 1A and 2). This suggests that the contacts had developed SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell
152 responses.

153 We tested index patients, contacts and unexposed healthy donors for the spike protein (pools S1 and
154 S2) of HCoV-229E and HCoV-OC43. They all but one unexposed healthy donor (HD9) showed a high
155 frequency of IFN γ -producing T cells directed against HCoV 229E and/or HCoV OC43 (Figure 1B).

156

157 Discussion

158 In this study, for the first time, we demonstrate that intrafamilial contacts can display a SARS-CoV-2-
159 specific T cell response in the absence of seroconversion. This T cell response provides evidence that
160 i) transient and/or anatomically contained SARS-CoV-2 infection must have occurred and ii) T cell
161 responses may be more sensitive indicators of SARS-CoV-2 exposure than antibodies.

162 Index patients and contacts showed different T cell immunodominance patterns. The structural
163 proteins S1, S2, M and N were clearly co-dominant and recognized by 100% of index patients.
164 Significant T-cell responses were also directed against accessory proteins. A similar pattern was
165 reported for SARS-CoV-2-positive patients by others [12, 13]. For the first time, our data demonstrate
166 that the mild forms of COVID-19 induce a significant T cell response detectable at least 69 days after
167 symptom onset.

168 Five of the six contacts who developed SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses were symptomatic.
169 Although their reactivity pattern was mainly restricted to one structural protein and/or nonstructural
170 proteins, the SARS-CoV-2 positive T cell responses observed in contacts showed similar frequencies
171 of SARS-CoV-2 IFN γ -producing T cells as compared to the index patients, which suggests that they
172 had developed SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell responses. Recently, by using a T cell receptor-dependent
173 Activation Induced Marker assay, Grifoni et al reported a CD4 $^{+}$ T cell response in 40-60% of
174 unexposed individuals especially against the S protein of SARS-CoV-2. They suggested that this T cell
175 response results from cross-reactivity with other coronaviruses [12]. While the amplitude of the T
176 cell response (including CD4 $^{+}$ and CD8 $^{+}$ T cells) specific to common coronaviruses, including the
177 highly prevalent HCoV-229E and the less prevalent HCoV-OC43 in France [14], were similar in index
178 patients, contacts and unexposed healthy donors, frequencies of SARS-CoV-2-specific IFN γ^{+} T cells
179 were much higher in index patients and contacts. These data indicate that the SARS-CoV-2-specific T
180 cell response detected in the contacts is specific and not only a result of a cross-reactivity with
181 common coronaviruses.

182 The observation of a detectable viral-specific T cell response without seroconversion is reminiscent
183 of what was observed for occupational or household exposure to hepatitis C where subclinical
184 transmission of HCV resulted in priming of a T-cell HCV-specific response in the absence of antibodies
185 [6, 7]. There are multiple explanations for the development of viral-specific T cells without an
186 antibody response. These include exposition to low doses of the virus with brief and transient viral
187 replication, a downstream event of protective innate immune responses or abortive replication of
188 defective viral genomes. Nevertheless, it is not clear whether these T cell responses without
189 antibodies provide protection against a reinfection.

190 Although our study has a limited sample size, the results reveal that individuals exposed to SARS-
191 CoV-2 may develop virus-specific T cell responses without antibodies. This newly discovered aspect
192 of the immune response against SARS-CoV-2 will significantly contribute to the understanding of the
193 natural history of COVID-19. Furthermore, our data indicate that epidemiological data relying solely
194 on the detection of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies may lead to a substantial underestimation of prior
195 exposure to the virus. Our data may also have implications for vaccine development and tracking the
196 future evolution of the SARS-CoV-2 pandemic.

197

198 **Acknowledgements:**

199 We thank all the participants to this study. This study was supported by the Strasbourg University
200 Hospital [COVID-HUS study- HUS N°7760].

201

202 **Conflict of interest disclosures:**

203 None reported.

204

205

206 **References**

- 207 1. Li Q, Guan X, Wu P, et al. Early Transmission Dynamics in Wuhan, China, of Novel Coronavirus-
208 Infected Pneumonia. *The New England journal of medicine* **2020**; 382:1199-207.
- 209 2. Studdert DM, Hall MA. Disease Control, Civil Liberties, and Mass Testing - Calibrating Restrictions
210 during the Covid-19 Pandemic. *The New England journal of medicine* **2020**.
- 211 3. Lescure FX, Bouadma L, Nguyen D, et al. Clinical and virological data of the first cases of COVID-19
212 in Europe: a case series. *The Lancet Infectious diseases* **2020**; 20:697-706.
- 213 4. Kissler SM, Tedijanto C, Goldstein E, Grad YH, Lipsitch M. Projecting the transmission dynamics of
214 SARS-CoV-2 through the postpandemic period. *Science* **2020**; 368:860-8.
- 215 5. Hall MA, Studdert DM. Privileges and Immunity Certification During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Jama*
216 **2020**.
- 217 6. Freeman AJ, Ffrench RA, Post JJ, et al. Prevalence of production of virus-specific interferon-gamma
218 among seronegative hepatitis C-resistant subjects reporting injection drug use. *J Infect Dis* **2004**;
219 190:1093-7.
- 220 7. Heller T, Werner JM, Rahman F, et al. Occupational exposure to hepatitis C virus: early T-cell
221 responses in the absence of seroconversion in a longitudinal cohort study. *J Infect Dis* **2013**;
222 208:1020-5.
- 223 8. Mizukoshi E, Eisenbach C, Edlin BR, et al. Hepatitis C virus (HCV)-specific immune responses of
224 long-term injection drug users frequently exposed to HCV. *J Infect Dis* **2008**; 198:203-12.
- 225 9. Bryan A, Pepper G, Wener MH, et al. Performance Characteristics of the Abbott Architect SARS-
226 CoV-2 IgG Assay and Seroprevalence in Boise, Idaho. *J Clin Microbiol* **2020**.
- 227 10. Beavis KG, Matushek SM, Abeleda APF, et al. Evaluation of the EUROIMMUN Anti-SARS-CoV-2
228 ELISA Assay for detection of IgA and IgG antibodies. *Journal of clinical virology : the official*
229 *publication of the Pan American Society for Clinical Virology* **2020**; 129:104468.
- 230 11. Fafi-Kremer S, Bruel T, Madec Y, et al. Serologic responses to SARS-CoV-2 infection among
231 hospital staff with mild disease in eastern France. *medRxiv* **2020**:2020.05.19.20101832.

232 12. Grifoni A, Weiskopf D, Ramirez SI, et al. Targets of T Cell Responses to SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus in
233 Humans with COVID-19 Disease and Unexposed Individuals. *Cell* **2020**.

234 13. Ni L, Ye F, Cheng ML, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2-Specific Humoral and Cellular Immunity in
235 COVID-19 Convalescent Individuals. *Immunity* **2020**.

236 14. Lepiller Q, Barth H, Lefebvre F, et al. High incidence but low burden of coronaviruses and
237 preferential associations between respiratory viruses. *J Clin Microbiol* **2013**; 51:3039-46.

238

239

240 **Figure legends**

241

242 **Figure 1. Frequency of IFN- γ spot forming cells against SARS-CoV-2 and two common human**
243 **coronaviruses antigens in index patients, contacts and unexposed healthy donors.** Means of spot
244 counts of IFN- γ T cell response per million of CD3 are indicated. The experiments were performed in
245 duplicates. T-cell secretion of IFN- γ was determined against (A) the SARS-CoV-2 structural proteins
246 S1, S2, N, M and the accessory proteins 3A, 7A, 8 and 9B and against (B) the structural proteins of
247 the human coronaviruses HCoV-229E (ES1, ES2) and HCoV-OC43 (OS1, OS2). Each color correspond
248 to one antigen. P, index patient; C, contact; HD, unexposed healthy donor.

249 **Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell response pattern in households.** Means of spot counts of IFN- γ T
250 cell response per million of CD3 against SARS-CoV-2 antigens in each household are shown. The X
251 axis represent the SARS-CoV-2 antigens. The experiments were performed in duplicates. White and
252 grey bars correspond to T cell responses detected in index patients and black bars correspond to
253 those detected in contacts. P, index patient, C, contact.

254

255

256

257

258

259

Table 1. Household clinical and virological characteristics.

Index patient and contact identification	Age range	Lymphocyte count (Giga/L)	Symptoms (days)	Time from symptom onset to serum collection (days)	SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR* (log cp/reaction)	SARS-CoV-2 serology test	Biosynex Antigen: Protein S (RBD)		Abbott Architect Antigen: Protein N (index value)	Euroimmun Anitgen: Protein S (index value)	SARS-CoV-2 specific T cell responses	
							IgM	IgG	IgG	IgG		
Household 1	P1	40-50	1.3	Yes (15)	58	ND	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive (3.36)	Positive (2.28)	Positive
	C1 (relative)	40-50	1.8	Yes (3)	53	ND	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive
Household 2	P2	50-60	2	Yes (13)	51	ND	Positive	Negative	Positive	Positive (4.3)	Positive (2.37)	Positive
	C2 (relative)	50-60	1.5	Yes (6)	44	ND	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive
Household 3	P3A	30-40	1.5	Yes (7)	51	ND	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (3.51)	Positive (3.97)	Positive
	P3B (relative)	30-40	1.6	Yes (5)	47	ND	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive (2.06)	Positive (1.52)	Positive
	P3C (relative)	60-70	1.7	Yes (9)	49	ND	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (8.4)	Positive (7.23)	Positive
	C3 (relative)	60-70	1.5	No	/	ND	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Household 4	P4 **	40-50	1.6	Yes (12)	57	Positive (8.39)	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (6.48)	Positive (4.24)	Positive
	C4A (relative)	40-50	1.7	Yes (10)	51	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive
	C4B (relative)	20-30	2.3	Yes (11)	48	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative
Household 5	P5	30-40	1.6	Yes (2)	68	Positive (7.65)	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (3.97)	Positive (4.86)	Positive
	C5 (relative)	30-40	2	Yes (7)	80	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive
Household 6	P6 ***	40-50	2.1	Yes (7)	69	Positive (3.99)	Positive	Positive	Positive	Positive (6.37)	Positive (5.73)	Positive
	C6 (relative)	40-50	2.2	No	/	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive
Household 7	P7	40-50	1.3	Yes (4)	64	Positive	Positive	Positive	Negative	Positive (4.18)	Positive (3.43)	Positive
	C7 (relative)	40-50	2.2	Yes (1)	64	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Negative	Positive

*: When available, SARS-CoV-2 viral load (log copies/reaction) in nasopharyngeal specimens is indicated

** : index patient quarantined himself by dieting separately and wearing a mask after positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing two days after symptom onset

***: index patient wear a mask after positive SARS-CoV-2 PCR testing three days after symptom onset

ND: Not done




Figure 1.






Figure 2. SARS-CoV-2-specific T cell response pattern in households