Antibody dynamics to SARS-CoV-2 in Asymptomatic and Mild COVID-19 patients

Qing Lei[1,+], Yang Li[2,+], Hongyan Hou[3,+], Feng Wang[3], Yandi Zhang[1], Danyun Lai[2], Banga Ndzouboukou Jo-Lewis[1], Zhaowei Xu[2], Bo Zhang[3], Hong Chen[2], Zhuqing Ouyang[1], Junbiao Xue[2], Xiaosong Lin[1], Yunxiao Zheng[2], Zhongjie Yao[1], Xuening Wang[2], Caizheng Yu[4], Hewei Jiang[2], Hainan Zhang[2], Huan Qi[2], Shujuan Guo[2], Shenghai Huang[5], Ziyong Sun[3,*], Shengce Tao[2,*], Xionglin Fan[1,*]

[1]Department of Pathogen Biology, School of Basic Medicine, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China

[2]Shanghai Center for Systems Biomedicine, Key Laboratory of Systems Biomedicine (Ministry of Education), Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

[3]Department of Laboratory Medicine, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China.

[4]Department of Public Health, Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China.

[5]Department of Microbiology, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Anhui Medical University, Hefei, Anhui, PR China.

[+] These authors contributed equally to this paper.

[*] e-mail: xlfan@hust.edu.cn; taosc@sjtu.edu.cn; zysun@tjh.tjmu.edu.cn

Abstract

Humoral immunity in asymptomatic infections with SARS-CoV-2 has not been well established. 63 healthy contacts, 63 asymptomatic individuals, and 51 mild patients were enrolled in this study and screened using nucleic acid testing (NAT) and commercial kits of serum IgM and IgG antibodies against recombinant nucleoprotein (N) and spike (S) proteins of SARS-CoV-2. Asymptomatic and mild patients were classified into at least four types based on NAT and serological tests, especially 81% and 25.4% negative NAT but positive IgM/IgG responses, respectively. Antibody dynamics were further demonstrated by IgM and IgG profile responses to SARS-CoV-2 proteome. IgM antibody responses against S1 were elicited in asymptomatic individuals as early to the seventh day after exposure and peaked on days from 17d to 25d, which might be used as early diagnostic biomarkers. Moreover, asymptomatic individuals evoked weaker S1 specific IgM and neutralizing antibody responses than mild patients. Most importantly, S1 specific IgM/IgG responses and the titers of neutralizing antibody in asymptomatic individuals gradually vanished in two months. Our findings might have important implications for serological survey, public health and immunization strategy.

SARS-CoV-2 is an emerging coronavirus, which was first recognized as the causal agent of COVID-19 in December 2019[1]. COVID-19 has rapidly spread around the world, and on 11 March 2020, the WHO has declared COVID-19 a global pandemic[2]. As of 28 June 2020, there have been

9,843,073 confirmed cases and 495,760 deaths, reported in 215 countries and territories worldwide[3].

The sharp rise in the number of global COVID-19 cases brings the fear of having viral transmission from asymptomatic individuals. Asymptomatic COVID-19 infection has been defined as a person infected with SARS-CoV-2 who has no clinical symptoms (such as fever, cough, or sore throat), yet nucleic acid testing positive for SARS-CoV-2[4]. As of February 11, 2020, there were 72,314 COVID-19 cases reported in China, and 889 cases (1.2%) belonged to asymptomatic infections[5]. As of April 14, 2020, a total of 6,764 asymptomatic infections reported in China, which accounts for about 5.9% of all cases. Importantly, 1,297 asymptomatic infections subsequently developed to the confirmed cases[6]. Moreover, an important role in the transmission of asymptomatic individuals has been documented in different countries[7-9]. Therefore, asymptomatic cases pose a significant infection control challenge.

To understand the humoral immunity against SARS-CoV-2 in asymptomatic infections, we first screened by RT-PCR from 11,776 personnel returning to work, and close contacts with the confirmed cases in different communities of Wuhan by investigation of clusters and tracing infectious sources. Only 12 asymptomatic individuals with a positive NAT result were found out. We further conducted a serological survey with the serum samples collected from all participants, using a validated assay for IgM and IgG antibodies against the recombinant antigens containing the nucleoprotein and the spike protein of SARS-CoV-2. Another 51 asymptomatic infections were further discovered because they had positive results for IgG alone, or both IgG and IgM. 63 healthy contacts with both negative results for NAT and antibodies were selected as negative controls. 51 mild patients without any preexisting conditions were also screened from 1056 patients during hospitalization in Tongji Hospital. A total of 177 participants were enrolled in this study and serial serum samples (n=213) were collected. Clear exposure history or days after symptoms onset were obtained from 48 healthy contacts, 36 asymptomatic infections and 51 mild patients. The research was conducted between 17 February 2020 and 28 April 2020. Serum IgM and IgG profiles of 177 participants were further probed using a SARS-CoV-2 proteome microarray. Neutralizing antibody responses in different population were detected by a pseudotyped virus neutralization assay system. The dynamics of IgM and IgG antibodies and neutralizing antibodies were analyzed with exposure time or symptoms onset.

Firstly, we found that 63 asymptomatic individuals were classified into four categories, based on the results of both NAT and ELISA tests. 81% (51/63) asymptomatic individuals had negative NAT but IgG alone (28/63), or both IgG and IgM (23/63) positive. Interestingly, 6.3 % (4/63) were only NAT positive and 12.7% (8/63) were positive for both NAT and IgG (Table 1). Mild patients were further defined as five types. Of mild patients, 25.4% (13/51) were NAT negative but positive IgG alone (4/51), or both positive for IgG and IgM (9/51). 60.3% reported positive results for NAT and IgG alone (10/51), or positive NAT, IgG and IgM (22/51). Importantly, 11.3% (6/51) mild patients were only NAT positive (Table 1).

To better understand the role of humoral immunity against infection and disease progression, SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM (red) and IgG (green) antibodies were further detected in parallel using a SARS-CoV-2 proteome microarray (Figure 1). Overall visualizations of IgM and IgG profiles were respectively shown in Figure 2 and 3. Surprisingly, healthy contacts also elicited IgM responses to several structural proteins such as N-Cter, S2, and E, and most of non-structural proteins such as ORF-7b, ORF-8, NSP1, NSP4, NSP5, NSP7, NSP8, NSP9, NSP16, NSP14, NSP15, and RdRp of SARS-CoV-2 (Figure 2). Low levels of IgG responses against N-Cter, and NSP1, NSP4, NSP7, NSP8, NSP9, NSP10, and RdRp were only induced in partial healthy contacts (Figure 3). It is noteworthy that both asymptomatic individuals and mild patients elicited higher levels of antibody responses (IgM or IgG) against S1, N, N−Nter, N-Cter, S2 and ORF-7b (Figure 4A and Figure 5A) than healthy contacts. Except NAT alone positive asymptomatic individuals, other asymptomatic individuals and different subgroups of mild patients induced higher levels of S1 and N specific IgM or IgG responses than healthy contacts (Figure 4B and 5B), although these antibody responses could not differentiate the same subgroup between asymptomatic and mild cases(Figure 4C and Figure 5C). Interestingly, 3 healthy contacts were clustered as asymptomatic infections, and 15 asymptomatic infections and 5 mild patients were recognized as healthy contacts by IgM profile response to SARS-CoV-2 proteome (Figure 2).

We further compared the dynamic change of S1, N, N−Nter, and N-Cter specific IgM and IgG antibodies in 48 healthy contacts and 36 asymptomatic individuals with different exposure time, and in 51 mild patients with days after symptoms onset (Figure 6 and Figure 7). Early to the seventh day after exposure, S1 and N specific IgM and IgG responses were induced in asymptomatic individuals and reached a peak on days from 17d to 25d. Then all of these antibodies began to decline. Except N specific IgG response, other antibodies could not be detectable 2 months after exposure. Interestingly, mild patients had a very distinct dynamic change of antibodies. Early to 1d, S1 specific IgM responses were induced in mild patients and persistently increased until 29 after symptoms onset. Moreover, mild patients elicited higher levels of N specific IgM and IgG responses, which maintained for at least 65 days.

Finally, we analyzed the dynamic change of the neutralizing antibody responses using a pseudotyped virus based neutralization assay (Figure 8). Interestingly, we found that 36.5% (23/63) asymptomatic individuals, mainly NAT positive (8/12), did not produce neutralizing antibody, 63.5% (40/63) asymptomatic infections and 19% (12/63) healthy contacts only induced low titers of neutralizing antibody, with the mean NT50 1:24 and 1:13, respectively (Figure 8A). Among three groups, mild patients stimulated the highest levels of neutralizing antibody with the mean NT50 1:269. Only 11.8% (6/51) mild patients, mainly NAT alone positive (4/6), did not elicit neutralizing antibody (Figure 8B). More importantly, the neutralizing antibody response in asymptomatic individuals was produced on 7d after exposure and peaked on days from 10d to 25d, then declined with exposure time. However, mild patients produced the neutralizing antibody early to 1d after symptom onset, and the titer rose persistently until 22 days and maintain for at least 65

days (Figure 8C).

Discussion

Our study first demonstrates that asymptomatic infection should be defined as a person has positive NAT or/and antibodies without clinical symptoms. In particular, about 81% asymptomatic infections had negative NAT, which indicates that the proportion of asymptomatic infections might be much higher than the current rate reported in China. NAT should be used in conjunction with serological testing to early identify asymptomatic infections and to benefit accurate estimation of the asymptomatic proportion. However, the role in the transmission of different subgroups of asymptomatic individuals remains to be investigated.

Although our findings highlight the value of serological testing, current commercial kits have several significant limitations. IgM antibody responses against S1 protein might be meaningful to assist NAT for earlier identification of asymptomatic individuals and diagnosis of COVID-19 patients, because of rapid emergence and disappearance. N specific IgG responses persist in the infected host for a longer time and should be suitable for serological survey. Therefore, serological testing should be performed based on S or N specific antibody response, not by simultaneously testing responses to S and N antigens of SARS-CoV-2. Moreover, IgM and IgG antibodies against both antigens cannot differentiate the same subgroup of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients, which indicates the infectiousness of asymptomatic infections. To achieve this end, further investigation to define more accurate serological markers, such as profiling B cells epitopes from S antigen should be encouraged.

Most importantly, the persisting antibodies in asymptomatic individuals only reacted to N, not to S1 antigen. Correspondingly, the titers of neutralizing antibody in asymptomatic individuals were very low and decreased rapidly, which indicate that the effectiveness of antibody-mediated immunity could not be used to guarantee the accuracy of an “immunity passport” or “risk-free certificate”. Together, our findings might indicate the risks of ‘shield immunity’ and asymptomatic individuals still need immunization with vaccines. Complying with strict public health measures remains the most important strategy to control the epidemic.

Materials

Definitions

In order to identify and report SARS-CocV-2 infection case in time, on Jan 28, 2020, the National Health Commission of China updated the COVID-19 Prevention and Control Plan (3th edition) and first emphasized the identification and quarantine of mild cases and asymptomatic infections. Close contacts with confirmed cases, persons with close social distance during extensive investigation of clusters and tracing infectious sources were considered as potential case sources. RT–PCR screening was carried out to find positive cases with or without clinical symptoms. On April 8, 2020, the lockdown had been lifted in Wuhan. Personnel returning to work were also

required to screen by RT-PCR. According to the COVID-19 Prevention and Control Plan (3th edition), all positive RT-PCR individuals were asked to provide detail information, including demography, preexisting conditions, exposure history, and symptoms, as well as screening records for the preceding 14 d. The negative persons also complied with home quarantine for 14d. An asymptomatic case was defined as an individual with a positive nucleic acid test result but without any relevant clinical symptoms during quarantine. A mild COVID-19 patient was defined as an individual with nasopharyngeal swabs that were positive for SARS-CoV-2, with symptoms such as fever, cough or sore throat, yet without lung image change. A close contact was defined as (1) anyone who had been within approximately 6 feet (2 meters) of a person infected with SARS-CoV-2 for longer than 10 min and (2) those who had direct contact with the infectious secretions of a COVID-19 patient.

Study design and participants

Between 17 February 2020 and 28 April 2020, 1056 mild COVID-19 patients were continuously recruited from Tongji Hospital, Wuhan, China. The confirmed diagnosis was defined as a positive RT-PCR result and patient symptoms, signs and laboratory tests during the hospital stay were collected. Only 51 mild COVID-19 patients who had a serial sera collection and without any preexisting conditions were selected. After screening for 11,766 individuals, only 63 individuals with asymptomatic infections and 63 healthy contacts without progression were informed in the study. Participants were traced consecutively for 65 days. Serum specimens were collected from each individuals and were stored at -80℃ until use. Of the 63 healthy contacts and 63 asymptomatic infections, 48 and 36 individuals had clear exposure time, respectively. Among 51 mild COVID-19 patients, partially had serial sera with a total of 87 samples.

Real-time RT-PCR

Throat swab or nasal swab specimens from the upper respiratory tract of all participants on enrollment were collected and maintained in viral transport medium. Before detection, all specimens were thermal inactivated in 56℃ for 30 min before detection. SARS-CoV-2 infection was confirmed using TaqMan One-Step RT-PCR Kits approved by the China Food and Drug Administration and performed as the requirements of the COVID-19 Prevention and Control Plan (3th edition). The RT-PCR assay kits detecting ORF1ab and N genes were provided by DAAN Gene Co., Ltd (Guangzhou, China). The cutoff Ct value was 40 for both genes, and the Ct values of both genes were less than 37 was defined as positive. The RT-PCR tests were performed according to manufacturers' instructions.

SARS-CoV-2 antibody detection

The IgM and IgG antibodies against recombinant nucleoprotein and spike protein of SARS-CoV-2 in serum specimens were detected by commercial kits according to the manufacturer's instructions

(YHLO Biotech, Shenzhen, China). The antibody levels ≥ 10 AU/ mL are reactive (positive), and the results < 10 AU/mL are negative.

Protein microarray fabrication

The proteins, along with the negative (BSA) and positive controls (anti-Human IgG and IgM antibody), were printed in quadruplicate on PATH substrate slide (Grace Bio-Labs, Oregon, USA) to generate identical arrays in a 2 x 7 subarray format using Super Marathon printer (Arrayjet, UK). The microarray was used for serum profiling as described previously with minor modifications. Protein microarrays were stored at -80 ℃ until use.

Microarray-based serum analysis

Proteomic microarray was conducted to probe all the samples. Briefly, a 14-chamber rubber gasket was mounted onto each slide to create individual chambers for the 14 identical subarrays. The arrays stored at -80 ℃ were warmed to room temperature and then incubated in blocking buffer (3% BSA in 1×PBS buffer with 0.1% Tween 20) for 3 h. Serum samples were diluted 1:200 in PBS containing 0.1% Tween 20, added with 0.1 mg/mL eGFP purified in the same manner as the eGFP tagged proteins and 0.5 mg/mL total E.coli lysate. A total of 200 μL of diluted serum or buffer only was incubated with each subarray for two hour overnight at room temperature4 ℃. The arrays were washed with 1×PBST and bound antibodies were detected by incubating with Cy3-conjugated goat anti-human IgG and Alexa Fluor 647-conjugated donkey anti-human IgM (Jackson ImmunoResearch, PA, USA), which were diluted 1: 1,000 in 1×PBST, and incubated at room temperature for 1 h. The microarrays were then washed with 1×PBST and dried by centrifugation at room temperature and scanned by LuxScan 10K-A (CapitalBio Corporation, Beijing, China) with the parameters set as 95% laser power/ PMT 550 and 95% laser power/ PMT 480 for IgM and IgG, respectively. The fluorescent intensity data was extracted by GenePix Pro 6.0 software (Molecular Devices, CA, USA). Signal Intensity was defined as the median of the foreground subtracted by the median of background for each spot and then averaged the triplicate quadruplicate spots for each protein. IgG and IgM data were analyzed separately. IgG and IgM profiles were built and clustering analysis were conducted to generate heatmaps for overall visualization.

Neutralization detection using pseudovirus neutralizaion assay

A full length codon-optimized spike protein (S) of the SARS-CoV-2 was first cloned into the lentivirus vector GV367, and then used to generate a eGFP-coexpressing pseudovirus by cotransfected into HEK293T cells with the other two viral packaging help vectors pHelper1.0 and pHelper2.0 (Genechem, Shanghai). 48h after transfection, the supernatants were collected after centrifugation with 4000 g for 10 min at 4℃, and further filtrated with 0.45 μm filter. The recombinant pseudovirus were further purified by centrifugation with 25000 rpm for 2 h at 4℃

and diluted with PBS. The titer of recombinant pseudovirus was quantified by fluorometry and RT-qPCR. The SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus neutralization assay was carried out on Vero E6 cells in a 96-well plate. 50 μl serial 2-fold diluted sera from 1:10 to 1:2560 of an individual were prepared, and equal volumes of SARS-CoV-2 pseudovirus were added and the plates were pre-incubated at 37 ℃ for 1 h. 100 μl of 104 Vero E6 cells were added into each well of a 96-well plate 24h before infection. After washed and added 100μl fresh culture medium, cells were incubated with 100 μl of sera-pseudovirus mixture for 48 h. The cells were collected by digested with 200 μl digestion solution and detected the number of eGFP-expressing cells by FACS. The positive rate of eGFP-expressing cells (PRG) was calculated after collected 1000 cells. Experiments were repeated twice. The neutralization rate (%) was calculated as following: Neutralization Rate(%) =PRGpesudovirus−PRGpesudovirus with serum/ (PRGpesudovirus−PRGblank)100%.

The half-maximal inhibitory concentration for plasma (NT50) of each serum sample was determined as the highest dilution ratio of serum with 50% neutralization rate by using log2 value of serum dilution of the same sample as the abscissa and different neutralization rate as the ordinate to draw the linear relationship line and calculated using nonlinear regression (SPSS).

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS or R software. Proteins were described as the medians and interquartile ranges (IQRs), and Mann–Whitney U test was conducted to test difference between two groups. The Log2NT50 was presented with mean (SD) and t test was used to test difference between two groups. The half-maximal inhibitory concentration for plasma (NT50) was determined using nonlinear regression (SPSS). Cluster analysis was performed with pheatmap package of R. Statistical significance was determined as a value of $p < 0.05$.

Ethical approval

The study was approved by the Ethical Committee of Tongji Hospital, Tongji Medical College, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, China (IRB ID:TJ-C20200128). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants enrolled in this study.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by grants from the National Mega-Projects of Science Research for the 13th Five-year Plan of China (No. 2018ZX10302302002-001), the Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81971909&), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (HUST COVID-19 Rapid Response Call No. 2020kfyXGYJ040).

Reference

1 Zhu, N. et al. A Novel Coronavirus from Patients with Pneumonia in China, 2019. N Engl J Med. 382, 727-733 (2020).

2 China Daily. WHO declares COVID-19 a pandemic. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/11/world/coronavirus-news.htm#link-682e5b06 (2020).

3 WHO. Coronavirus disease (COVID-2019) situation reports. Available at https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/situation-reports (2020).

4 National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China. COVID-19 Prevention and Control Plan, 4th edition. Available at http://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2020-02/07/content_5475813.htm (2020).

5 Z, W. & JM, M. Characteristics of and Important Lessons From the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Outbreak in China: Summary of a Report of 72 314 Cases From the Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention. JAMA. 323, 1239-1242 (2020).

6 Government of the People's Republic of China. Transcript of press conference on April 15, 2020. Available at http://www.nhc.gov.cn/xcs/s3574/202004/f2b50e681e7042f8bef2abf2029ffa13.shtml (2020).

7 C, R. et al. Transmission of 2019-nCoV Infection from an Asymptomatic Contact in Germany. N Engl J Med. 382, 970-971 (2020).

8 JF, C. et al. A familial cluster of pneumonia associated with the 2019 novel coronavirus indicating person-to-person transmission: a study of a family cluster. Lancet (London, England). 395, 514-523 (2020).

9 Zhang, J., Tian, S., Lou, J. & Chen, Y. Familial cluster of COVID-19 infection from an asymptomatic. Critical Care. 24, 119 (2020).

Table 1 Characteristics of study population

	All	Healthy contacts	Asymptomatic(N=63)				Mild(N=51)				
			Aa(NAT+ IgG-IgM-)	Ab(NAT+ IgG+IgM-)	Ac(NAT- IgG+IgM-)	Ad(NAT- IgG+IgM+)	Ma(NAT+ IgG-IgM-)	Mb(NAT+ IgG+IgM-)	Mc(NAT+ IgG+IgM+)	Md(NAT- IgG+IgM-)	Me(NAT- IgG+IgM+)
N	177	63	4	8	28	23	6	10	22	4	9
Age, years											
Mean(SD)	44.6(19.25)	43.2(19.85)	42.8(8.62)	40.6(10.85)	46.5(18.05)	44.7(17.89)	39.7(25.02)	39.7(23.77)	47.6(22.46)	45.0(31.12)	54.0(7.40)
Median(IQR)	46(30-59)	46(27-60)	41(36-50)	38(31-52)	50(29-58)	40(29-55)	38(29-46)	32(20-58)	51(30-64)	56(25-66)	55(48-59)
Sex, n(%)											
Male	85(48.0)	33(52.4)	0(0.0)	2(25.0)	13(46.4)	10(43.5)	3(50.0)	6(60.0)	11(50.0)	3(75.0)	4(44.4)
Female	92(52.0)	30(47.6)	4(100.0)	6(75.0)	15(53.6)	13(56.5)	3(50.0)	4(40.0)	11(50.0)	1(25.0)	5(55.6)

IQR, interquartile range; SD, standard deviation.



Figure. 1 **The SARS-CoV-2 proteome microarray layout and serum analysis**. (A) There are 23 proteins of SARS-CoV-2 on a single microarray. Each protein is triplicate. The triangles indicate different concentration of one protein. (B) One representative microarray probed with sera of healthy contacts, asymptomatic individuals and mild patients is shown. IgM and IgG responses are shown in red and green, respectively.



Figure. 2 **The overall SARS-CoV-2 specific IgM profiles**. Heatmap of IgM antibody responses of 63 healthy contacts, 63 asymptomatic individuals and 51 mild patients. Each square indicates the IgM antibody response against the protein (column) in the serum (row). The proteins and sample were arranged with clustering. The red, green and black dots represent non correctly clustered cases in mild, asymptomatic and healthy contacts, respectively. FI： Fluorescence Intensity.



Figure. 3 **The overall SARS-CoV-2 specific IgG profiles**. Heatmap of IgG antibody responses of 63 healthy contacts, 63 asymptomatic individuals and 51 mild patients. Each square indicates the IgG antibody response against the protein (column) in the serum (row). The proteins and sample were arranged with clustering. The red, green and black dots represent non correctly clustered cases in mild, asymptomatic and healthy contacts, respectively. FI: Fluorescence Intensity.



Figure. 4 **IgM and IgG response to S1 and N proteins in different groups**. (A) IgM and IgG response to S1 and N proteins in healthy contacts, asymptomatic individuals and mild patients. (B) Comparison of IgM and IgG responses to S1 and N proteins in different subgroups of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients with that of healthy contacts. (C) Comparison of IgM and IgG response to S1 and N proteins in the same subgroup of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients. Medians and interquartile range value for each group are indicated. Differences between groups were analysed using the Mann–Whitney U test. *** indicated p <0.001, ** indicated p <0.01, * p indicated <0.05, and n.s. indicated not significant.



Figure. 5 **IgM and IgG response to N-Nter, N-Cter and other proteins**. (A) IgM response to N-Nter, N-Cter and ORF-7b in healthy contacts, asymptomatic individuals and mild patients (left), IgG response to N-Nter, N-Cter and S2-1 in healthy contacts, asymptomatic individuals and mild patients (right). (B) Comparison of IgM (left) and IgG (right) responses to N-Nter and N-Cter in different subgroups of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients with that of healthy contacts. (C) Comparison of IgM and IgG response to N-Nter and N-Cter in the same subgroup of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients. Medians and interquartile range value for each group are indicated. Differences between two groups were analysed using the Mann–Whitney U test. *** indicated p <0.001, ** indicated p <0.01, * p indicated <0.05, and n.s. indicated not significant.



Figure. 6 **The dynamic change of S1 and N specific IgM and IgG antibody responses**. (A) The dynamic change of S1 and N specific IgM antibody responses. (B) The dynamic change of S1 and N specific IgG antibody responses. 48 healthy contacts and 36 asymptomatic individuals with clear exposure time were plotted in sections according to the exposure time. 51 mild COVID-19 patients with serial sera samples (n=87) were segmented according to the symptom onset. The yellow and green line show the levels of antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 in healthy contacts and asymptomatic at different times after exposure, respectively. The blue line show levels of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in mild patients at different times after symptom onset. The bars show medians and interquartile range (IQR).



Figure. 7 **The dynamic change of Nter, N-Cter specific IgM and IgG antibody responses**. (A) The dynamic change of Nter, N-Cter specific IgM Antibody responses. (B) The dynamic change of Nter, N-Cter specific IgG Antibody responses. 48 healthy contacts and 36 asymptomatic individuals with clear exposure time were plotted in sections according to the exposure time. 51 mild COVID-19 patients with serial sera partially (n=87) were segmented according to the symptom onset. The yellow and green line in the left show the levels of antibody responses against SARS-CoV-2 in healthy contacts and asymptomatic at different times after exposure, respectively. The blue line in the right show levels of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 in mild patients at different times after symptom onset. The bars show medians and interquartile range (IQR).



Figure. 8 **The titers and dynamic change of neutralizing antibody in different groups**. (A) Comparison of the titers of neutralizing antibody in different groups. (B) Comparison of the titers of neutralizing antibody in different subgroups of asymptomatic individuals and mild patients with that of healthy contacts. (C) The dynamic change of the titers of neutralizing antibody over time. 48 healthy contacts and 36 asymptomatic individuals with clear exposure time were plotted in sections according to the exposure time. 51 mild COVID-19 patients with serial sera samples were segmented according to the symptom onset. The yellow and green line show the dynamic change of neutralizing ability in healthy contacts(n=48) and asymptomatic individuals (n=36) at different times after exposure, respectively. The blue line shows the dynamic change of neutralizing ability in mild patients at different times after symptom onset. Samples with neutralizing titers below 1:10 were plotted at the dotted line (log2NT50=1). Statistical significance in A and B was determined using unpaired t-test and horizontal bars indicate mean and SD. NT50: Half-maximal inhibitory plasma neutralizing.